# 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**<br>(per MSID File) | Active |
| **School Type and Grades Served**<br>(per MSID File) | Elementary School<br>KG-5 |
| **Primary Service Type**<br>(per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| **2019-20 Title I School** | No |
| **2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate**<br>(as reported on Survey 3) | 39% |
| **2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented**<br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities*<br>English Language Learners<br>Asian Students<br>Black/African American Students<br>Hispanic Students<br>Multiracial Students<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| **School Grades History** | 2018-19: A (67%)<br><br>2017-18: A (68%)<br><br>2016-17: A (65%)<br><br>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**<br>(per MSID File) | Active |
| **School Type and Grades Served**<br>(per MSID File) | Elementary School<br>KG-5 |

| | |
|---|---|
| **Primary Service Type**<br>(per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| **2019-20 Title I School** | No |
| **2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate**<br>(as reported on Survey 3) | 39% |
| **2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented**<br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities*<br>English Language Learners<br>Asian Students<br>Black/African American Students<br>Hispanic Students<br>Multiracial Students<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| **School Grades History** | 2018-19: A (67%)<br>2017-18: A (68%)<br>2016-17: A (65%)<br>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 |