Timberlin Creek Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Timberlin Creek Elementary School

555 PINE TREE LN, St Augustine, FL 32092

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

Demographics

Principal: Linda Edel

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2017

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	10%
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 (70%) 2017-18: A (70%) 2016-17: A (78%) 2015-16: A (76%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A

> * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the St. Johns County School Board on 2/16/2021.

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

Timberlin Creek Elementary School

555 PINE TREE LN, St Augustine, FL 32092

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

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	No	7%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	29%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	A	A	A	A

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the St. Johns County School Board on 2/16/2021.

SIP Authority

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

We are a family in which everyone is capable of success. We strive for social, emotional, and academic growth for all students by fostering a love of learning, supporting creative thinking, and building exemplary character.

Provide the school's vision statement.

At Timberlin Creek Elementary, "Every student matters, every moment counts."

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

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Saturday 7/1/2017, Linda Edel

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.*
6

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
67

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	10%
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 (70%) 2017-18: A (70%) 2016-17: A (78%) 2015-16: A (76%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	

SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	[Cassandra Brusca](#)
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).	

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	164	168	158	169	170	182	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1011
Attendance below 90 percent	0	2	1	1	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	2	4	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	2	4	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	7	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	7	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28

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	0	2	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9

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	1	4	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
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

Saturday 8/1/2020

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

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

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

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	83%	75%	57%	86%	74%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	71%	67%	58%	75%	64%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	53%	59%	53%	62%	52%	52%
Math Achievement	86%	77%	63%	91%	75%	61%
Math Learning Gains	66%	69%	62%	79%	69%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	53%	59%	51%	67%	60%	51%
Science Achievement	76%	72%	53%	83%	69%	51%

	EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey						
Indicator	**Grade Level (prior year reported)**						**Total**
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
	(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	88%	78%	10%	58%	30%
	2018	79%	78%	1%	57%	22%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	79%	77%	2%	58%	21%
	2018	83%	74%	9%	56%	27%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019	81%	76%	5%	56%	25%
	2018	80%	73%	7%	55%	25%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	91%	82%	9%	62%	29%

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

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	77%	73%	4%	53%	24%
	2018	80%	73%	7%	55%	25%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	48	55	46	55	50	43	40				
ELL	70			80							
ASN	93	85		91	79		56				
BLK	62			46							
HSP	79	63		85	67		80				
MUL	100			100							
WHT	81	69	49	86	63	53	79				
FRL	60	73	62	71	73	75	56				
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	36	46	41	50	56	48	39				
ELL	45			91							
ASN	90	70		98	83		94				
BLK	30			40							
HSP	69	43	42	71	48	36	50				
MUL	65	56		75	69		45				
WHT	82	67	61	87	65	63	84				

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
			2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS								
FRL	65	57	53	67	57	37	68				

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
			2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS								
SWD	54	55	51	70	62	56	48				
ASN	98	87		100	97		100				
BLK	42			42							
HSP	77	78		79	74	54	83				
MUL	67	73		71	55						
WHT	88	73	58	95	79	71	83				
FRL	69	75	69	82	63	57	38				

ESSA Data

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

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	70
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	488
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	48
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	75
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	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	81
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	54
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	75
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	100
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	69
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	67
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.

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

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

The biggest decline was in mathematics- the lowest quartile gains which was a drop of 5% from the previous year. Not only the ESE resources and model mentioned above, but also not identifying students for RTI in a timely manner contributed to the decline. The MTSS team continues to review Tier 1 instruction and the appropriateness of Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions in RTI.

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.

TCE scores were above the state in all areas with the exception of the ELA lowest quartile which was the same as the state at 53%. Our lowest quartile has the potential to be much higher with a focus on common, grade level instructional groups within the PLC process and common intervention times across grade levels.

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

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

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

TCE believes that there is a loss of instructional time due to discipline issues that are [at times] not reflected as a disciplinary referral. The PBIS plan will assist classroom teachers in structured Tier 1 strategies. The other areas of concern include our subgroup of SWD that have the lowest performance and gains across subject areas.

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

1. ELA Lowest Quartile
2. Mathematics Lowest Quartile
3. Math Learning Gains
4. Subgroup Data for SWD
5. PBIS

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Lowest Quartile ELA
Measurable Outcome:	TCE will increase the lowest quartile ELA performance by +7 moving from 53% to 60%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Linda Edel (linda.edel@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	We will develop a tiered system of support to include students with disabilities and the ESE support facilitators across grade levels so all students are working through the ELA essential standards from their current level of performance. We will include an additional paraprofessional to assist with the lowest quartile students without an IEP during this time. We will increase our grade level instructional small group time to four times a week to instead of once per week.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	With the use of the additional paraprofessional [SAI] and ESE support facilitator, we will create increased opportunities for our lowest quartile in ELA to receive more focused support regularly. A tiered system of supports in ELA will ensure that all students receive the differentiated support they require.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Develop a tiered schedule of ELA supports across grade levels.
2. Continue to utilize the additional paraprofessional to target lowest quartile students without an IEP.
3. Continue to utilize the third ESE Support Facilitation teacher work with students at Tier 2 and Tier 3.
4. Provide common planning time to ensure an effective PLC process.
5. Continue with ILC support across grade level teams with implementation, ELA resources, and data chats.

Person Responsible	Linda Edel (linda.edel@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Lowest Quartile Mathematics
Measurable Outcome:	TCE will increase the lowest quartile mathematics performance by +7 from 53% to 60% proficiency.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Linda Edel (linda.edel@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	We will develop a tiered system of support to include students with disabilities and the ESE support facilitators across grade levels so all students are working through the math essential standards from their current level of performance. We will include an additional paraprofessional to assist with the lowest quartile students without an IEP during this time. We will increase our grade level instructional small group time to four times a week to instead of once per week. We will also continue the implementation of the Envisions Math curricular resources across grade levels.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	With the use of the additional paraprofessional [SAI] and ESE support facilitator, we will create increased opportunities for our lowest quartile in mathematics to receive more focused support regularly. A tiered system of supports in mathematics will ensure that all students receive the differentiated support they require.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Develop a tiered schedule of ELA supports across grade levels.
2. Continue to utilize the additional paraprofessional to target lowest quartile students without an IEP.
3. Continue to utilize the third ESE Support Facilitation teacher work with students at Tier 2 and Tier 3.
4. Provide common planning time to ensure an effective PLC process.
5. Continue with ILC support across grade level teams with implementation, Envision Mathematics resources, and data chats.

Person Responsible	Linda Edel (linda.edel@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Last school year, the administrative team observed a deficit in Tier 1 classroom management strategies in classrooms. This led to students being sent to the office and missing instructional time. We need to provide teachers with resources and supports as part of a school-wide positive behavior interventions and support system so that they can strengthen Tier 1 strategies. This proactive approach will decrease the number of Tier 2 and Tier 3 referrals.
Measurable Outcome:	With the implementation of a school-wide PBIS plan, there will be less administrative involvement and a decrease in the loss of instructional time devoted to Tier 1 behaviors. This information/data can be measured in eSchoolPLUS and Performance Matters.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Patrick Roach (patrick.roach@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	We can monitor the success of implementation through the MTSS/RTI behavior system and eSchoolPLUS referrals.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	With the implementation of a school-wide, tiered PBIS plan, teachers will be empowered to create a positive classroom culture with clear expectations. Teachers will also have resources and knowledge to address any problem behaviors through steps included in the PBIS plan.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Develop clearly defined school-wide PBIS expectations.
2. Provide teachers with detailed steps to take and resource to utilize in order to effectively implement the PBIS plan.
3. Teach and model Tier 1 strategies to all stakeholders.
4. Implement school-wide reward system to reinforce behavioral expectations throughout the school year.

Person Responsible	Patrick Roach (patrick.roach@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

The MTSS team continues to review Tier 1 instruction and the appropriateness of Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions in RTI. We continue to collaborate through the PLC process to ensure that all students are exposed to common formative and summative assessments + essential standards.

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.

Behavioral Mission Statement
Our mission is to provide rigorous intellectually engaging instruction in conjunction with positive behavioral support to encourage academic success and on task behaviors.

Beliefs and Purpose
Every school-wide behavior management plan is designed to be an instrument of support and inclusion, rather than removal and isolation and should enhance the capacity of the system overall.

Timberlin Creek Elementary is fully committed to participating in the Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports (PBIS) program. PBIS is a data-driven framework to promote and maximize academic success and behavioral proficiency. It is a systems approach to enhancing the capability of schools to educate all students by developing research-based, school-wide, and classroom behavior support systems. The process focuses on improving our ability to teach and support positive behavior for all students. Schools are successful when students are encouraged and allowed to grow academically, socially, and emotionally. The ultimate goal of PBIS is to create a safe and productive environment where educators can teach and all students can learn without disruption. By setting clear social and behavioral expectations and directly teaching our students how to model those expectations, we can create a positive and productive atmosphere where ALL students have an environment where they CAN succeed and grow both academically and socially.

Using a School–Wide PBIS will allow Timberlin Creek Elementary to:

? Teach students the behaviors we expect
? Provide a safe environment where students can excel academically and socially
? Encourage positive behavior and interactions
? Decrease problem behaviors and keep students in class
? Reduce the number of office discipline referrals

As part of the PBIS initiative, our school has defined a set of school-wide expectations and rules for behaviors in all areas of the school. These expectations will be posted throughout the school in hallways, the cafeteria, restrooms and other common locations. All students will be explicitly taught these behavioral expectations through school developed lesson plans that include examples and non-examples of the specific expectation being addressed. Students will not only be taught about the behavioral expectations, but they will be provided with opportunities to discuss and practice them as well. By detailing every expected behavior and teaching students in a positive way, we will provide a common language for everyone in the building, including students, teachers, front office staff, paraprofessionals, and all support personnel.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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