

St. Johns County School District

Timberlin Creek Elementary School



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents	
School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Timberlin Creek Elementary School

555 PINE TREE LN, St Augustine, FL 32092

<http://www-tce.stjohns.k12.fl.us/>

Demographics

Principal: Linda Edel

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2017

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-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)	10%
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 (70%) 2017-18: A (70%) 2016-17: A (78%) 2015-16: A (76%) 2014-15: A (87%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
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 was approved by the St. Johns County School Board on 10/1/2019.

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	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Timberlin Creek Elementary School

555 PINE TREE LN, St Augustine, FL 32092

<http://www-tce.stjohns.k12.fl.us/>

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 PK-5	No	9%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	23%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the St. Johns County School Board on 10/1/2019.

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.

We are a community, Together Creating Excellence, using tools of the information age to inspire personal growth, creative thinking, and exemplary character. We strive to be Safe, Organized, demonstrate an Awesome Attitude and display Respect in order to SOAR like exemplary EAGLES.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Timberlin Creek will inspire good character and a passion for lifelong learning in all students, creating educated and caring contributors to the world.

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
Edel, Linda	Principal	Mrs. Edel promotes and supports high student achievement by providing curricular and instructional leadership, maintains overall school site operations; receives, distributes and communicates information to enforce District and State policies; maintains a safe school environment; coordinates site activities and communicates information to staff, students, parents, and community members. Observing teachers and evaluating learning materials to determine areas where improvement is needed.
Caldwell, Heather	Assistant Principal	Mrs. Caldwell is responsible for assisting Mrs. Edel in the leadership, coordination, supervision, and management of the school program and operation. Responding to disciplinary issues. Coordinating use of school facilities for day-to-day activities and special events. Working with teachers to develop curriculum standards. Observing teachers and evaluating learning materials to determine areas where improvement is needed. Mrs. Caldwell will serve as the LEA for Educational Student Education.
Kelley, Crystal	Instructional Coach	Mrs. Kelley takes a hands-on approach to improving instruction and effectiveness by working at various levels [classroom, school, system-wide] to directly improve all content instruction, student learning and foster teacher development. This may include modeling lessons in classrooms, helping teacher groups plan instruction, creating system-wide policies and procedures, and facilitating professional development.
Roach, Patrick	Assistant Principal	Mr. Roach is responsible for assisting Mrs. Edel in the leadership, coordination, supervision, and management of the school program and operation. Responding to disciplinary issues. Coordinating use of school facilities for day-to-day activities and special events. Working with teachers to develop curriculum standards. Observing teachers and evaluating learning materials to determine areas where improvement is needed.

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	155	143	168	169	156	160	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	951
Attendance below 90 percent	8	8	6	6	3	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	6	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	1	8	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20

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		0	0	0	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

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		2	1	2	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Students retained two or more times		0	0	2	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

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

66

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 8/30/2019

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	4	11	5	11	4	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	3	9	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24

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		0	0	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

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	4	11	5	11	4	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	3	9	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24

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	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

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	83%	75%	57%	86%	74%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	71%	67%	58%	75%	64%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	53%	59%	53%	62%	52%	52%
Math Achievement	86%	77%	63%	91%	75%	61%
Math Learning Gains	66%	69%	62%	79%	69%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	53%	59%	51%	67%	60%	51%
Science Achievement	76%	72%	53%	83%	69%	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	155 (0)	143 (0)	168 (0)	169 (0)	156 (0)	160 (0)	951 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	8 (4)	8 (11)	6 (5)	6 (11)	3 (4)	7 (9)	38 (44)
One or more suspensions	0 (0)	0 (1)	1 (0)	0 (0)	1 (1)	0 (0)	2 (2)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	6 (1)	3 (0)	1 (1)	10 (2)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (3)	8 (9)	11 (12)	20 (24)

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	88%	78%	10%	58%	30%
	2018	79%	78%	1%	57%	22%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	79%	77%	2%	58%	21%
	2018	83%	74%	9%	56%	27%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019	81%	76%	5%	56%	25%
	2018	80%	73%	7%	55%	25%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	91%	82%	9%	62%	29%
	2018	84%	80%	4%	62%	22%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	82%	82%	0%	64%	18%
	2018	91%	83%	8%	62%	29%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				
05	2019	86%	80%	6%	60%	26%
	2018	85%	79%	6%	61%	24%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	77%	73%	4%	53%	24%
	2018	80%	73%	7%	55%	25%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
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	48	55	46	55	50	43	40				
ELL	70			80							
ASN	93	85		91	79		56				
BLK	62			46							
HSP	79	63		85	67		80				
MUL	100			100							
WHT	81	69	49	86	63	53	79				
FRL	60	73	62	71	73	75	56				
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	36	46	41	50	56	48	39				
ELL	45			91							
ASN	90	70		98	83		94				
BLK	30			40							
HSP	69	43	42	71	48	36	50				
MUL	65	56		75	69		45				
WHT	82	67	61	87	65	63	84				
FRL	65	57	53	67	57	37	68				
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	54	55	51	70	62	56	48				
ASN	98	87		100	97		100				
BLK	42			42							
HSP	77	78		79	74	54	83				
MUL	67	73		71	55						
WHT	88	73	58	95	79	71	83				
FRL	69	75	69	82	63	57	38				

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	70
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	

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	488
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	48
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	75
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	81
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	54
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	75
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	100

Multiracial Students	
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	69
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	67
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.

Our lowest performance were in the areas of lowest quartile in both reading and math. We decreased from the previous year from a 57% proficient to 53% proficient in reading. In math, we decreased to 53% from a 58% the previous year. We believe this is due, in part, to the ESE service model used the past few years of mostly pull out resource as well as there only being two ESE support facilitation teachers for all of students with disabilities in the general education population.

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

The biggest decline was in math lowest quartile gains which was a drop of 5% from the previous year. Not only the ESE resources and model mentioned above, but also not identifying students for RTI in time contributed to this decline.

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 scores were above the state in all areas with the exception of the ELA lowest quartile which was the same as the state at 53%. Our ELA lowest quartile has the potential to be much higher with a

focus on common, grade level instructional groups within PLC process and common intervention times across grade levels.

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

The biggest improvement was evident in ELA learning gains which increased 7% from a 64% to 71%. Our PLC focus including the identification and unpacking of essential standards last year was in the area of ELA and contributed to this growth.

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

In looking past all of the data including the EWS data, we also know there is a concern of lost instructional time due to discipline issues that are not reflected in eschoolPLUS. The other areas of concern include our SWD that have the lowest performance and gains across subject areas.

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

1. ELA Lowest Quartile
2. Math Lowest Quartile
3. Math Learning Gains
4. SWD
5. PBIS

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Lowest Quartile ELA
Rationale	Last year's data showed our ELA lowest quartile as one of our lowest performance areas. We decreased to 53% from 57% the previous school year.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	TCE will increase the lowest quartile ELA performance by 7%, moving from 53% to 60%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Linda Edel (linda.edel@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	We will develop a tiered system of support to include students with disabilities and the ESE support facilitators across grade levels so ALL students are working through the ELA essential standards from their current level of performance. We will include an additional paraprofessional to assist with the lowest quartile students without IEPs during this time. We will increase our grade level instructional small group time to four times a week instead of once weekly.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	With the use of the additional paraprofessional and ESE support facilitator, we will create increased opportunities for our lowest quartile in ELA to receive more focused support regularly. A tiered system of supports in ELA will ensure that ALL students will receive the differentiated support they require.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Develop a tiered schedule of ELA supports across grade levels 2. Hire an additional paraprofessional [through SAI funds] to target lowest quartile students without an IEP 3. Hire an additional ESE support facilitator 4. Provide common planning time to ensure an effective PLC process 5. ILC support grade level teams with implementation, ELA resources, and data digs
Person Responsible	Linda Edel (linda.edel@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

#2	
Title	Lowest Quartile Mathematics
Rationale	Last year's data showed our math lowest quartile as the lowest performance area. The score decreased from 58% to 53% proficiency.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	TCE will increase the lowest quartile math performance by 7% from 53% to 60% proficiency.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Heather Caldwell (heather.caldwell@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	We will develop a tiered system of supports during math to include students with disabilities and the ESE support facilitators across grade levels so that all students are working through math essential standards from their current level of performance. We will include an additional paraprofessional to assist with the lowest quartile students who do not have IEPs during this time. We will increase our grade level math instructional small group time to four times a week instead of once weekly. We will also implement the Pearson math resource across grade levels.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	With the use of the additional paraprofessional and support facilitator, we will create increased opportunities for our lowest quartile to receive more focused math support regularly. A tiered system of supports in math will ensure all students will receive the differentiated instruction they require.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Develop a tiered schedule of math supports across grade levels. 2. Hire an additional paraprofessional [through sai funds] to target lowest quartile students without an IEP 3. Hire an additional support facilitator 4. Provide common planning time to ensure an effective PLC process 5. ILC will support grade level teams with implementation, Pearson math program, math resources and data digs.
Person Responsible	Heather Caldwell (heather.caldwell@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

#3	
Title	Implementation of PBIS Plan
Rationale	Last school year, administration observed a deficit in Tier 1 classroom management strategies in classrooms. This led to students being sent to the office and missing instructional time. We need to provide teachers with resources and supports as part of a school-wide positive behavior interventions and support system so that they can strengthen Tier 1 strategies. This proactive approach will decrease the amount of Tier 2 and Tier 3 behaviors in the school.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	With the implementation of a school-wide PBIS plan, there will be less administration involvement and a decrease in the loss of instructional time devoted to Tier 1 behaviors.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Patrick Roach (patrick.roach@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	We can monitor the success of implementation through the MTSS/RTI behavior system and eSchoolPLUS referrals.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	With the implementation of a school-wide, tiered PBIS plan, teachers will be empowered to create a positive classroom culture with clear expectations. Teachers will also have resources and knowledge to address any problem behaviors through steps included in the PBIS plan.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Develop clear, school wide PBIS expectations 2. Provide teachers with detailed steps to take and resources to utilize in order to effectively implement the PBIS plan 3. Teach and model Tier 1 strategies to all stakeholders 4. Implement school-wide reward system with support through PTO, community and business partners to positively reinforce behavioral expectations throughout the school year.
Person Responsible	Patrick Roach (patrick.roach@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

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).