Timber Springs Middle

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Timber Springs Middle

16001 TIMBER PARK LN, Orlando, FL 32828

https://timberspringsms.ocps.net/

Demographics

Principal: Steven Soubasis

Start Date for this Principal: 1/16/2017

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
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)	49%
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 (68%) 2017-18: B (61%) 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade
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.](http://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 Springs Middle

16001 TIMBER PARK LN, Orlando, FL 32828

https://timberspringsms.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)
Middle School 6-8	No	48%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	71%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade	A	A	B

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
Cantrell, Eric	Principal	The principal is responsible for oversight of all curriculum and instruction which includes school operations. Budgeting and accounting is an area of responsibility where needs and constraints are assessed in order to adequately fund instructional initiatives aimed at reducing achievement gaps and increasing learning gains. This includes SELL, scheduling, promoting instructional leadership, school and community relations, program planning, assessments, evaluations, school activities and functions. In addition, the principal is responsible for enforcement of district-wide policies, guidelines and procedures. The principal oversees school-wide progress monitoring of student data in an effort to close achievement gaps for student sub-populations, facilitates, and supports professional learning community groups within the school (PLC). The principal monitors instructional staff to ensure effective instructional strategies are consistently implemented in all classrooms. School and community stakeholders are communicated with regularly regarding the academic initiatives and progress of our students.
Soubasis, Steven	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal: Mr. Soubasis is responsible for curriculum and instruction, for devising and implementing the master schedule.facilitating PLCs and MTSS/Data meetings with the Math Department. Evaluating instructional staff is another area of responsibility to ensure effective instructional strategies are consistently implemented in all classrooms. Communication with school and community stakeholders regularly is key to engaging and involving parents and community members regarding academic initiatives and progress of our students.
Shepherd, Natalie	Dean	Dean: Ms. Shepherd is responsible for overseeing school-wide positive behavior plan and discipline. Facilitating PLCs and MTSS/Data meetings with the Science Department is another area where the Dean is involved. Ms. Shepherd will be working in PLCs, PDs, staff meetings, and data meetings to share not only discipline data, but to support teachers academically as well as with student behavioral concerns that may impact learning. She will help coach teachers who need support with classroom management, and she will support the MTSS Tier 1 & 2 behavioral concerns which includes working with community members..
Grullon, Laura	Other	SAFE Coordinator: Ms. Grullon will support and monitor mental health and SEL initiatives for our students in an effort to better meet their needs. Ms. Grullon will support our deans and counselors to build a community where students are safe, and are able to come to her with any concerns.
Stella, Elizabeth	School Counselor	Ms. Stella will support all students academic, emotional, and life needs. She will teach character education, teen safety matters, college and career readiness, and support behavior interventions. She will also be in charge of 6th grade 504's.
Henry, Sharon	School Counselor	Ms. Henry will support all students academic, emotional, and life needs. She will teach character education, teen safety matters, college and career

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		readiness, and support behavior interventions. She will also be in charge of 7th and 8th grade 504's.
Kingsley, Samantha	Instructional Coach	CRT: Ms. Kingsley is a leading member of PLCs and MTSS/Data meetings with the Math Department. She serves as testing coordinator and oversees scheduling and administration of all standardized testing including i-Ready, CELLA/WIDA, PMA, MPA, EOC, FSA. Ms. Kingsley is charged with helping teachers understand effective instructional practices, and facilitates growth in demonstrating effective strategies that lead to high student achievement levels. She will work with the new teacher program to provide support in an effort to help retain them as great teachers for many years to come. Ms. Kingsley will be working with student intervention groups, working in PLCs, PDs, staff meetings, and data meetings.
Nesbitt, Erin	Instructional Coach	Instructional Coach: Ms. Nesbitt serves as a leading member of PLCs and MTSS/Data meetings with the ELA Department. She provides coaching to instructional staff through non-evaluative observations and coaching conferences. Ms. Nesbitt will be in charge of helping teachers as a coach and helping lead their instruction to a high achievement level. She supports our new teachers to help retain them as great teachers for many years to come. She will be working with student intervention groups, working in PLCs, staff meetings, data meetings, and providing professional develop opportunities for all instructional staff.
Tomlinson, Alice	Instructional Coach	Instructional Coach: Ms. Tomlinson is a leading member of PLCs and MTSS/Data meetings with the ELA Department. She provides coaching to instructional staff through non-evaluative observations with feedback and coaching conferences. Ms.Tomlinson is in charge of helping teachers as a coach and helping to lead their instructional practices to a high level that positively impact student learning. She will support our new teachers in an effort to help retain them as great teachers for many years to come. Ms. Tomlinson will be be working with student intervention groups, participating in PLCs, staff meetings, data meetings, and providing professional development opportunities for all instructional staff.
Craft, Linda	Other	Staffing Specialist: Ms. Craft participates in MTSS meetings to ensure proper focus and interventions are being implemented with additional support services as well as for ESE students. She plays a primary role in individual Tier 3 student meetings to determine the appropriateness of initiating ESE an evaluation. Ms. Craft will take care of our students with an IEP (ESE) or EP (Gifted), or 504 Plan. She supports the MTSS process and ensures students receive facilitated support to better meet their educational needs. Mrs. Craft works closely with all teachers, and leadership to identify and provide support services to students who may have specific needs because of the MTSS process, or that is relative to their specific staffing classification and/or placement.

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Carter Inge, Gwendolyn	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal: Ms. Carter-Inge is charged with oversight of school operations. She facilitates PLCs and MTSS/Data meetings with the Social Studies Department. The assistant principal evaluates instructional staff to ensure effective instructional strategies are consistently implemented in all classrooms. Ms. Carter-Inge communicates with school and community stakeholders regularly regarding the academic initiatives and progress of our students.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 1/16/2017, Steven Soubasis

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.*
4

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.*
15

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
60

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
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)	49%
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 (68%) 2017-18: B (61%) 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	292	337	319	0	0	0	0	948
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	12	59	0	0	0	0	100
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	13	0	0	0	0	22
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	45	21	0	0	0	0	80
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	17	16	0	0	0	0	43
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	34	36	36	0	0	0	0	106
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	47	31	0	0	0	0	108

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	0	0	0	35	42	42	0	0	0	0	119

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	1	1	0	0	0	0	2

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 7/8/2020

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	304	323	296	0	0	0	0	923
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	30	27	0	0	0	0	78
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	59	43	0	0	0	0	129
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	73	41	0	0	0	0	142
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	41	80	50	0	0	0	0	171

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	0	0	0	20	70	41	0	0	0	0	131

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	1	2	1	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	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	304	323	296	0	0	0	0	923
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	30	27	0	0	0	0	78
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	59	43	0	0	0	0	129
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	73	41	0	0	0	0	142
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	41	80	50	0	0	0	0	171

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	0	0	0	20	70	41	0	0	0	0	131

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	1	2	1	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	68%	52%	54%	0%	52%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	61%	52%	54%	0%	53%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	49%	45%	47%	0%	42%	44%
Math Achievement	75%	55%	58%	0%	53%	56%
Math Learning Gains	67%	55%	57%	0%	55%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	58%	50%	51%	0%	48%	50%
Science Achievement	65%	51%	51%	0%	49%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	82%	67%	72%	0%	67%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey				
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)			Total
	6	7	8	
	(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
06	2019	68%	52%	16%	54%	14%
	2018	64%	48%	16%	52%	12%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison						

ELA						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
07	2019	65%	48%	17%	52%	13%
	2018	63%	48%	15%	51%	12%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				
08	2019	68%	54%	14%	56%	12%
	2018	67%	55%	12%	58%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
06	2019	70%	43%	27%	55%	15%
	2018	62%	35%	27%	52%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	68%	49%	19%	54%	14%
	2018	74%	51%	23%	54%	20%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				
08	2019	52%	36%	16%	46%	6%
	2018	20%	32%	-12%	45%	-25%
Same Grade Comparison		32%				
Cohort Comparison		-22%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
08	2019	63%	49%	14%	48%	15%
	2018	61%	49%	12%	50%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019					
2018					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019	81%	66%	15%	71%	10%

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	76%	66%	10%	71%	5%
Compare		5%			
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	95%	63%	32%	61%	34%
2018	81%	61%	20%	62%	19%
Compare		14%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	100%	53%	47%	57%	43%
2018	92%	65%	27%	56%	36%
Compare		8%			

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	30	41	32	41	58	58	27	60			
ELL	47	55	45	60	66	56	40	60	83		
ASN	82	68	64	93	79		83	96	97		
BLK	64	55	54	65	58	39	63	84	75		
HSP	62	61	50	70	68	62	55	77	78		
MUL	94	79		92	62		91		82		
WHT	71	59	35	80	67	59	72	84	88		
FRL	59	59	45	66	62	55	52	74	78		
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	19	39	38	24	35	31	25	38			
ELL	38	52	46	49	50	32	39	60	73		
ASN	80	61	18	85	67		67	96	87		
BLK	69	66	48	62	55	44	57	71	69		
HSP	63	58	44	62	48	33	60	75	78		
MUL	86	43		77	62						

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	67	56	41	77	57	37	77	84	85		
FRL	61	54	42	61	48	32	56	70	75		
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

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	683
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	43
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	59
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	83
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	62
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 Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	83
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	68
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.

ELA/Reading lowest 25% was our lowest performing data component at 49%. This is not a trend as this is only the second year of data for our school, and previously our lowest category was Math lowest 25% at 36% in 2018. This is based upon FSA data from 2018-2019. PMAs for Civics, Algebra, Geometry, and Science were also conducted. 2018-2019 middle of year (MOY) ELA=57%, Math = 56%, Science 71%, Civics = 74%, and Acceleration courses = 82%. The 2019-2020 data yielded the following results: ELA=57%, Math=57%, Science = 57%. Civics=74%, and Acceleration courses = 82%.

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

Timber Springs Middle School did not decline in any components from the previous year. Science achievement remained the same at 65% based upon FCAT Science for 8th grade for 2018-2019. The implementation of Science PMAs (for 8th grade) where the Science content area was changed from Physical Science Honors in 2018-2019 to Comprehensive Science 3 in 2019-2020 was a more inclusive academic content not previously taught as part of the progression for the middle school Science curriculum.
For 2019-2020 PMA Levels 3, 4, and 5 are considered "On Target" thus, we had 71% (231/327) of our students on target for Quarter 1. For Quarter 2 PMA Levels 3, 4, and 5 are considered "On Target" thus, we had 57% (188/328) of our students on target.

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.

Timber Springs Middle was above the state average in each category. The lowest percent being ELA lowest 25%, we outgained the state average by 2%. In 2017-2018 we were 4% below the state average, but gained 6% in ELA lowest 25%. Also in 2017-2018 we were 15% below the state in Math lowest 25%, but made 22% in gains to go 7% above the state average for the 2018-2019 school year. We had a strong emphasis on differentiation as teachers worked with our lowest 25%, along with strong tutoring programs to support our students and their needs. For progress monitoring assessments, i-Ready Reading, and i-Ready Math assessments were conducted for all grade levels. The 2019-2020 data yielded the following results: ELA=57%, Math=57%, Science=57%,. Civics=74%, and Acceleration courses = 82%. Contributing factors for gaps included, different student population for each grade level from one school year to the next (e.g. from 18-19 to 19-20), an increased number of students with disabilities, more students with diverse cultures/educational backgrounds and limited English proficiency, physiological changes, and the implementation of Science PMAs (for 8th grade) where the Science content area was changed from Physical Science Honors in 2018-2019 to Comprehensive Science 3 in 2019-2020 which was a more inclusive academic content not previously taught. With two-thirds of our students reaching their I-Ready mid-year goals, the correlation to progress monitoring assessments as compared to the first quarter shows we are on track for an increase in student achievement.

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

The data component showing the most improvement was Math lowest 25% which gained 22% points from the previous year. Last year we were at 36%, and this year we moved to 58%. This data is based upon FSA data for 2018-2019. Progress Monitoring Assessments (PMAs) for Algebra and

Geometry were also conducted. For 2018-2019 middle of the year scores for Math = 56%. In comparison, the 2019-2020 data yielded the following results for Math=57%.

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

Looking at our current 8th graders there was a large increase in 2 or more indicators from 6th to 7th grade. In 6th grade there were only 26 students with 2 or more, and as 7th graders it increased to 70 students with 2 or more indicators. We would want to decrease numbers back down under 30. Areas of concern are as follows:
1) Student achievement: Decrease the number of students failing ELA and Math courses, decrease number of students scoring at Level 1 on FSA for Math and ELA. We want to increase the number of students scoring Level 4 and 5 on FSA Math and ELA.
2) Attendance: Increase the attendance rate, decrease the number of students with one or more suspensions, decrease the percentage of student attendance below 90% thereby decreasing the the number of course failures for ELA and Math. We will use our current list of students to help us track student's data throughout the year, and put support systems in place for the students who have the potential to have more than one indicator.

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

1. Increase ELA and Math learning gains in the lowest 25%.
2. Build and establish a culture for social emotional learning with adults and students in our school.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Increase ELA and Math learning gains in the lowest 25%.

Measurable Outcome:	We would like to make gains by 3% in Mathematics and ELA lowest 25%. We will use MTSS meetings, weekly PLC's, data chats to analyze data and discuss interventions, as well implement effective instructional strategies. Specifically, we will use culminating tasks, formative assessments i-Ready, PMAs and MAP (Algebra and Geometry), small groups and differentiated instruction.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Steven Soubasis (steven.soubasis@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Students make additions and deletions to revise previous knowledge and thinking processes in order to deepen understanding through progress monitoring.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	49% of our ELA students and 58% of our math students in the lowest 25% made learning gains in 2018-2019. This is an improvement from the previous school year; however, consideration is given that no state assessments were administered for the 2019-2020 school year. 2019-2020 school-wide data points included teacher observations with actionable feedback, implementing coaching cycles for teachers, monitoring effective use of the rotational model in addition to i-Ready Reading, i-Ready Math, and PMAs. MTSS groups are pulled three times per week for Math and ELA/Reading support. Tutoring in ELA/Reading and Math was provided for students identified as lowest 25% twice weekly for grades 6-8 and tutoring was also provided for those needing assistance with Calculus Project (Algebra and Geometry) after school. This includes all sub-groups as their progress is measured with mid-year assessments.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Weekly PLC's to analyze data and create intervention groups.

Person Responsible	Erin Nesbitt (erin.nesbitt@ocps.net)

2. Coaches and administration will monitor intervention groups during classroom observations.

Person Responsible	Steven Soubasis (steven.soubasis@ocps.net)

3. Instructional coaches will meet with individual teachers to plan support for tier 2 & 3 instruction, including students with disabilities.

Person Responsible	Alice Tomlinson (alice.tomlinson@ocps.net)

4. Through classroom observations continue to support teachers who may need time to implement feedback, conduct new coaching recommendations to see the effectiveness of small group interventions.

Person Responsible	Erin Nesbitt (erin.nesbitt@ocps.net)

5. Tutoring programs will be implemented to support student needs and address achievement gaps.

Person Responsible	Erin Nesbitt (erin.nesbitt@ocps.net)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Build and establish a culture for social and emotional learning at our school with adults and students. Academic learning is enhanced when students have opportunities to interact with others and make meaningful connections to subject materials. By ensuring our school has a culture for social and emotional learning, we will address the following school needs: Professional development for teachers relating to acceptance, tolerance, and diversity (Cultural Responsiveness and SEL). Stakeholder buy-in (i.e. students, staff, parents)
Measurable Outcome:	TSMS will use the following to determine the effectiveness of social emotional learning incorporated throughout our school: * Improvement in Early Warning Systems indicator data which includes student achievement for those in the lowest quartile for ELA/Reading and Math and Attendance as our primary areas of concern * Cognia surveys with emphasis on increasing community involvement, increased communication, and effective strategies being used to monitor progress * Anticipated impact of culture and climate on student achievement * Decreased disciplinary infractions/consequences * School-based surveys to be conducted during the school year to monitor progress and include all stakeholders (ie. students, staff, community)
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Alice Tomlinson (alice.tomlinson@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Use distributive leadership and social and emotional learning to strengthen team dynamics and collaboration in order to build academic expertise with all students. Our school will plan and implement two cycles of professional learning to provide training, opportunities for safe practice, and examination of impact data. Our school will monitor and measure the impact of our implemented professional learning through analysis of culture and climate survey data, needs assessments, classroom observations, and school environment observations. We will modify our plan of action as indicated by data, student needs, and adult needs.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	In order to achieve large-scale and sustainable improvement, it is necessary to invest in the collective capacity of a school building. To create a culture of social and emotional learning with adults and students, it is critical to harness the professional skills and leadership capabilities of everyone in the school. Through a distributive leadership model, our school will strengthen the team dynamics necessary to collectively support positive organizational improvement and change.

Action Steps to Implement	

Use cycles of professional learning that integrate academics and social and emotional learning.

Person Responsible	Natalie Shepherd (natalie.shepherd@ocps.net)

Monitor, measure, and modify cycles of professional learning that support data based instructional decisions that enhance school improvement efforts.

Person Responsible	Eric Cantrell (eric.cantrell@ocps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

NA

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, TSMS engages 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, TSMS uses 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 TSMS, which include 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. The school leadership team collaborates 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.

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: Instructional Practice: Small Group Instruction				$33,550.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	380800-OFFICE SUPPLIES CONSUMABLE-TRAINING	1852 - Timber Springs Middle	General Fund	11.0	$400.00

			Notes: Supplies for professional development to support effective instructional strategies such as small group/differentiated instruction.			
	5100	120-Classroom Teachers	1852 - Timber Springs Middle	General Fund	11.0	$9,000.00
			Notes: Tutoring will be provided to students needing additional support three days per week.			
	5100	140-Substitute Teachers	1852 - Timber Springs Middle	General Fund	11.0	$2,000.00
			Notes: Substitutes will be provided for teachers to attend additional training on effective instructional delivery relating to small group instruction.			
	5100	120-Classroom Teachers	1852 - Timber Springs Middle	General Fund	11.0	$22,150.00
			Notes: Two teachers will be assigned an additional class period of ELA and/or Math for MTSS with small group students.			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning				$1,200.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	120-Classroom Teachers	1852 - Timber Springs Middle	General Fund	11.0	$400.00
			Notes: Provide supplies and resources for professional development to support teachers' effective implementation of SEL strategies.			
	5100	140-Substitute Teachers	1852 - Timber Springs Middle	General Fund	12.0	$800.00
			Notes: Provide substitute teachers for instructional staff attending additional training for effective implementation of SEL strategies with students.			
					Total:	$34,750.00