

Orange County Public Schools

Timber Lakes Elementary



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	8
Planning for Improvement	13
Title I Requirements	15
Budget to Support Goals	17

Timber Lakes Elementary

2149 CROWN HILL BLVD, Orlando, FL 32828

<https://timberlakeses.ocps.net/>

Demographics

Principal: Jared Scott

Start Date for this Principal: 7/30/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	39%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (67%) 2017-18: A (68%) 2016-17: A (65%) 2015-16: A (66%) 2014-15: A (76%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	

ESSA Status	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Orange County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	8
Planning for Improvement	13
Title I Requirements	15
Budget to Support Goals	17

Timber Lakes Elementary

2149 CROWN HILL BLVD, Orlando, FL 32828

<https://timberlakeses.ocps.net/>

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2018-19 Title I School	2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School KG-5	No	41%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	66%

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	A	A	A	A

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Orange County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at

<https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

To lead our students to success with the support and involvement of families and the community

Provide the school's vision statement.

To be the top producer of successful students in the nation

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Scott, Jared	Principal	
Davis, Patricia	Assistant Principal	
Nelson, Sydney	Instructional Coach	
Whalen, Heather	Other	
Kearney, Jenene	Instructional Coach	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	132	138	140	166	160	145	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	881
Attendance below 90 percent	10	16	13	10	13	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	8	6	8	19	5	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	15	14	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators		1	0	3	9	6	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	26

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)

54

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 7/30/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	17	15	8	7	16	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	72
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA or Math	14	10	15	18	10	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	79
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	18	16	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	3	4	2	11	10	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42

Prior Year - Updated

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	17	15	8	7	16	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	72
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA or Math	14	10	15	18	10	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	79
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	18	16	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	3	4	2	11	10	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	74%	57%	57%	77%	54%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	67%	58%	58%	61%	58%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	49%	52%	53%	40%	53%	52%
Math Achievement	83%	63%	63%	82%	61%	61%
Math Learning Gains	67%	61%	62%	68%	64%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	53%	48%	51%	57%	54%	51%
Science Achievement	77%	56%	53%	68%	50%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
Number of students enrolled	132 (0)	138 (0)	140 (0)	166 (0)	160 (0)	145 (0)	881 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	10 (17)	16 (15)	13 (8)	10 (7)	13 (16)	8 (9)	70 (72)
One or more suspensions	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (1)	0 (0)	0 (1)
Course failure in ELA or Math	8 (14)	6 (10)	8 (15)	19 (18)	5 (10)	8 (12)	54 (79)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	15 (18)	14 (16)	21 (24)	50 (58)

Grade Level Data

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

NOTE: An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	78%	55%	23%	58%	20%
	2018	75%	55%	20%	57%	18%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	72%	57%	15%	58%	14%
	2018	71%	54%	17%	56%	15%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				
05	2019	71%	54%	17%	56%	15%
	2018	74%	55%	19%	55%	19%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	94%	62%	32%	62%	32%
	2018	89%	61%	28%	62%	27%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	82%	63%	19%	64%	18%
	2018	84%	62%	22%	62%	22%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		-7%				
05	2019	73%	57%	16%	60%	13%
	2018	75%	59%	16%	61%	14%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		-11%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	77%	54%	23%	53%	24%
	2018	67%	53%	14%	55%	12%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	29	42	36	43	58	56	43				
ELL	61	60	52	69	57	46	58				
ASN	86	81		96	86		87				
BLK	70	63	30	74	53	31	75				
HSP	69	61	49	77	63	55	75				
MUL	60	42		80	50						
WHT	80	72	75	89	69	69	77				
FRL	63	64	47	70	54	48	70				
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	27	62	55	41	46	44	19				
ELL	52	66	60	64	55	42	20				
ASN	88	71		98	66		93				
BLK	69	67	50	77	45	45	42				
HSP	67	69	51	80	57	57	62				
MUL	82	67		76	75						

2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
WHT	82	66	80	87	73	71	81				
FRL	69	69	47	78	61	58	69				
2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	39	43	37	44	64	63	17				
ELL	62	55	45	67	73	71	47				
ASN	85	64		96	79		87				
BLK	71	50		83	54		69				
HSP	75	63	48	78	65	55	65				
MUL	78	62		83	69						
WHT	80	61	44	84	72	59	66				
FRL	66	55	43	76	66	63	60				

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	68
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	74
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	544
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	44
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	60
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	

Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	87
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	57
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	65
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	58
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	76
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	62
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

Learning gains of the lowest 25% of students in reading and math made the least growth. Timber Lakes does a great job working with and moving proficient students. We didn't have the same success with students who are struggling. While systems are in place to ensure success of all students, we need to make sure that we provide teachers with the support, resources, and professional development opportunities so that all students make adequate academic growth.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline.

Learning gains of the lowest 25% in reading and math made the greatest decline in year over year data.

We did not specifically monitor this group of students as intensely as we will moving forward. New systems were put in place in 2018-2019 (PLCs to discuss common assessment data) to monitor the school as a whole, but we could have focused more on the performance of students in our lowest 25% to ensure that the interventions and targeted instruction being delivered to this cohort of students was having the desired effect.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

Our proficiency in reading, math, and science had a significant gap as in we did much better than the state average. In regards to negative gaps, again it was our lowest 25%.

Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

Our greatest improvement came from our science proficiency. I attribute this to using common assessments, review students responses, and the science boot camp that took place before the assessment.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

Course failure and attendance below 90% are the two areas of concern.

Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for schoolwide improvement in the upcoming school year.

1. Implement project based learning school wide
2. Inject passion and creativity into teaching
3. individualize learning for each student
4. Create a culture of "we" not "me"
5. Improve student achievement as measured by FSA

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1

Title

Increasing learning gains of the lowest 25% of students in ELA

Rationale

The students in the lowest 25% are our most fragile learners and therefore deserve our greatest effort to help close the gap between them and our most proficient students.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve

The desired outcome is to improve learning gains for our lowest 25% of students by 5% year over year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy

1. Meet regularly with PLCs to monitor the progress of the lowest 25% through the use common assessments.
 2. Ensure that teachers are reteaching and retesting students based off outcomes from common assessments.
 3. Ensure students are receiving pre-teaching support from instructional coach.
 4. Increase FBS block to allow for more time to close foundational gaps.
 5. Implement after school and Saturday school tutoring.
 6. Use high engagement strategies within the classroom.
1. Bi-monthly data meetings with leadership team and grade level to review iReady and classroom data.
 2. Leadership team will push into grade level PLCs on a weekly basis to monitor planning and instruction, especially for those targeted subgroups.
 3. Review common assessment data as a grade level during PLCs with the leadership team on a weekly basis, focusing in on the lowest 25%.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy

Action Step**Description**

1. 1. Meet regularly with PLCs to monitor the progress of the lowest 25% through the use common assessments.
2. Ensure that teachers are reteaching and retesting students based off outcomes from common assessments.
3. Ensure students are receiving pre-teaching support from instructional coach.
4. Increase FBS block to allow for more time to close foundational gaps.
5. Implement after school and Saturday school tutoring.
6. Use high engagement strategies within the classroom.

Person Responsible

Jared Scott (jared.scott@ocps.net)

#2	
Title	Increasing learning gain of the lowest 25% of students in Math
Rationale	The students in the lowest 25% are our most fragile learners and therefore deserve our greatest effort to help close the gap between them and our most proficient students.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	The desired outcome is to increase learning gains of the lowest 25% of students by 5% year over year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Meet regularly with PLCs to monitor the progress of the lowest 25% through the use common assessments. 2. Ensure that teachers are reteaching and retesting students based off outcomes from common assessments. 3. Ensure students are receiving pre-teaching support from instructional coach. 4. Increase FBS block to allow for more time to close foundational gaps. 5. Implement after school and Saturday school tutoring. 6. Use high engagement strategies within the classroom.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Bi-monthly data meetings with leadership team and grade level to review iReady and classroom data. 2. Leadership team will push into grade level PLCs on a weekly basis to monitor planning and instruction, especially for those targeted subgroups. 3. Review common assessment data as a grade level during PLCs with the leadership team on a weekly basis, focusing in on the lowest 25%.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Meet regularly with PLCs to monitor the progress of the lowest 25% through the use common assessments. 2. Ensure that teachers are reteaching and retesting students based off outcomes from common assessments. 3. Ensure students are receiving pre-teaching support from instructional coach. 4. Increase FBS block to allow for more time to close foundational gaps. 5. Implement after school and Saturday school tutoring. 6. Use high engagement strategies within the classroom.
Person Responsible	[no one identified]

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).

Part IV: Title I Requirements

Additional Title I Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Schoolwide Improvement Plan to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, Â§ 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students.

The school is a center point for the community. Timber Lakes has many events to help foster a sense of community with its stakeholders. One of the goals of the school is to provide special experiences for families at TLE.

PFEP Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services.

- During Meet the Teacher, students and parents will be given an orientation about rules and procedures at Timber Lakes
- Each teacher will provide parents with daily progress reports and establish ongoing communication with parents
- Teachers will establish classroom rules and procedures within the first couple of days of school in order to maintain an effective classroom environment
- Students will be assessed to determine grade level base line data
- Parents will be informed of student academic needs, progress and end of the year academic goals
- Dean "talks" will occur to reinforce our positive behavior system and expectations
- School counselor provides information on middle school transition
- Quarterly review of the Student Code of Conduct

Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another.

Timber Lakes uses all resources necessary to meet student needs. The Literacy Leadership Team (LLT) meets with each grade level team to identify areas in need of improvement. We identify possible resources and then coordinate how to acquire those resources. The LLT meets during bi-monthly data meetings to ensure that the resources acquired are effectively being used. As the year goes on, the LLT coordinates with each grade level to determine if the resources are indeed effective to determine continued use. The entire Leadership Team is responsible for reviewing data to progress monitor student growth. Administration is responsible for reviewing unit/lesson plans and conducting classroom observations. The Leadership Team conducts daily administrative meetings to correlate all pieces and determine if each available resource is being used with fidelity and to what extent.

Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact.

Timber Lakes conducts a variety of activities to expose students to College and Career Readiness.

- Many professionals from the community come talk to our students about careers during Teach In.

- Our 5th grade students take an annual field trip to UCF.
- We celebrate College Spirit every Friday by wearing college shirts.

Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations.

The school is implementing an innovation plan which will include academies tied to local businesses.

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Increasing learning gains of the lowest 25% of students in ELA	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Increasing learning gain of the lowest 25% of students in Math	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00