Timber Lakes Elementary

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Timber Lakes Elementary

2149 CROWN HILL BLVD, Orlando, FL 32828

https://timberlakeses.ocps.net/

Demographics

Principal: Jared Scott

Start Date for this Principal: 5/8/2018

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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	39%
2019-20 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%)
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

Timber Lakes Elementary

2149 CROWN HILL BLVD, Orlando, FL 32828

https://timberlakeses.ocps.net/

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2019-20 Title I School**	**2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School KG-5	No	38%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	64%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
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.

With the support of families and the community, we create enriching and diverse pathways that lead our students to success.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To ensure every student has a promising and successful future.

School Leadership Team

Membership
Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities 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	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Tuesday 5/8/2018, Jared Scott

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

53

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

0

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

54

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	39%
2019-20 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%)
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](#).	

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	10	106	145	140	158	153	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	712
Attendance below 90 percent	2	18	9	13	5	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	8	3	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	9	7	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

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	8	3	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 7/28/2020

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	
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	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	

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	
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	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	

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	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

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

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%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	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						
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%	0
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%	0
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%	0
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%	0
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%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	65

Hispanic Students	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
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%	0
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%	0
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%	0

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.

Proficiency of our students with disabilities showed the lowest performance, 29%. Not having solid systems in place was a contributing factor.

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

Science achievement for our students with disabilities showed the greatest decline in a year over year comparison. A lack of prior knowledge was the contributing factor.

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.

We significantly out performed the state in every category except one. The state out performed TLE in learning gains for the lowest 25%. A lack of standards based instruction lead to this.

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

Science scores increased by 8% year over year. Implementing science bootcamp on Saturdays and empowering the teachers lead to this.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

Looking at the EWS data, the one concern that sticks out the most is the increase in multiple grade levels of attendance below 90%.

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

1. Planning
2. Systems
3. Standards Based Instruction
4. Common Assessments
5. PLCs

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The district led DPLC will focus this year on social and emotional learning. This is a critical need for all teachers and leadership in order to establish and maintain positive relationships and make responsible decisions for the students.
Measurable Outcome:	The teachers and students will be using the Sanford Harmony materials as well as skills and strategies obtained from the district led DPLC
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jared Scott (jared.scott@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The school will be using tools acquired from the district led DPLC and from the Sanford Harmony SEL materials.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The district obtained and shared with each school the Sanford Harmony SEL materials.

Action Steps to Implement

Based off the tools received at the DPLC meetings as well as the Sanford Harmony SEL materials, implement and monitor the use of these tools throughout the school and classrooms.

Person Responsible	Jared Scott (jared.scott@ocps.net)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The students with disabilities showed the lowest learning gains among all subgroups within our school community.
Measurable Outcome:	The desired outcome is to improve learning gains for our students with disabilities by 5% year over year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jared Scott (jared.scott@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	1. Meet regularly with PLCs and ESE teacher to monitor the progress of the students with disabilities through the use of common assessments. 2. Ensure that all teachers are reteaching and retesting students based off outcomes of common assessments. 3. Ensure students are receiving pre-teaching support from the instructional coach. 4. Ensure that the ESE teacher and classroom teachers are working together.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	1. Bi-monthly data meetings with leadership team and grade level to review all data. 2. Ensure that ESE teacher participates in all data meetings 3. Leadership team will push into grade level PLCs on a weekly basis to monitor planning and instructions, especially for those targeted subgroup. 3. Review common assessment data as a grade level during PLCs with the leadership team on a weekly basis, focusing on the students with disabilities specifically.

Action Steps to Implement

Meet with PLCs and ESE teacher to monitor the progress of the students with disabilities through the use of common assessments.

Person Responsible	Jared Scott (jared.scott@ocps.net)

Ensure that teachers are reteaching and retesting students based off outcomes of common assessments.

Person Responsible	Jared Scott (jared.scott@ocps.net)

Ensure students are receiving pre-teaching support from the instructional coach.

Person Responsible	Sydney Nelson (sydney.nelson@ocps.net)

Ensure that the ESE teacher and classroom teachers are working together.

Person Responsible	Patricia Davis (patricia.davis2@ocps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

We will be part of the planning process. We will monitor instruction and we will adjust based on common assessment results.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

In order to establish a positive school culture and climate, all schools engage in ongoing, district-wide professional learning on leveraging social and emotional learning as well as leadership for student success. Through a distributive leadership model, schools use social and emotional learning to strengthen team dynamics and collaboration in order to build academic expertise in all students. Through this professional learning, schools across the district use the CASEL Core Competencies as a common language to support a positive culture of social and emotional learning and connect cognitive and conative strategies to support student success. A core team of teachers and administrators from each school, which includes a mental health designee, attend this district-wide professional learning throughout the year. The core team works with a broader school team and is charged with personalizing and implementing professional learning for school stakeholders, based on school and community needs. School leadership teams collaborate with stakeholders, through processes such as the School Advisory Council, to reflect on implementation and determine next steps. Development of positive culture and environment is further enhanced through district programs such as the Parent Academy. Schools utilize staff such as Parent Engagement Liaisons to bridge the community and school culture.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00