

Orange County Public Schools

Timber Lakes Elementary



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	19
Positive Culture & Environment	21
Budget to Support Goals	21

Timber Lakes Elementary

2149 CROWN HILL BLVD, Orlando, FL 32828

<https://timberlakeses.ocps.net/>

Demographics

Principal: Jared Scott

Start Date for this Principal: 7/14/2021

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	39%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (67%) 2017-18: A (68%) 2016-17: A (65%)
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	

* 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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	19
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	21

Timber Lakes Elementary

2149 CROWN HILL BLVD, Orlando, FL 32828

<https://timberlakeses.ocps.net/>

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School KG-5	No	30%
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	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		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	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Scott, Jared	Principal	District Data Meetings District Initiatives School Data Meetings School Deliberate Practice School PD School Improvement Plan FSSAT Threat Assessment Team Budget Staffing DPLC COVID Reporting Social Media Weekly Community Newsletter Classroom Observations Assist with monitoring school wide data Learning Community/District Tasks Deputy Superintendent's Newsletter
Davis, Patricia	Assistant Principal	Facilities School Data Meetings Discipline-first contact Review Code of Conduct Quarterly Skyward Safety Drills COGNIA Accountability Corrections Safe School Plan Inventory Title IX-Primary Contact AM/PM/Lunch Duty Schedule Culturally Responsive Team Threat Assessment Team Veteran's Day COVID Reporting Social Media Internal Newsletter Assist with monitoring school wide data Data Management Calendar Classroom observations Deliberate Practice
Kearney, Jenene		Testing School Data Meetings Certification Points Classroom Observations Monitor FBS Staff PD Assist with monitoring school wide data

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		AM/PM/Lunch Supervision 1 Intervention group Field Trips Master Schedule New teacher induction Other Duties as Assigned

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/14/2021, 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.*

47

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

47

Total number of students enrolled at the school

720

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

11

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.

7

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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	72	104	102	142	132	168	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	720
Attendance below 90 percent	0	8	9	5	11	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	8	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	8	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	8	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12

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	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 7/28/2021

2020-21 - 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	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	

2020-21 - 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	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	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis**School Data Review**

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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				74%	57%	57%	75%	56%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				67%	58%	58%	68%	55%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				49%	52%	53%	56%	48%	48%
Math Achievement				83%	63%	63%	84%	63%	62%
Math Learning Gains				67%	61%	62%	63%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				53%	48%	51%	59%	46%	47%
Science Achievement				77%	56%	53%	69%	55%	55%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

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	2021					
	2019	78%	55%	23%	58%	20%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	72%	57%	15%	58%	14%
Cohort Comparison		-78%				
05	2021					
	2019	71%	54%	17%	56%	15%
Cohort Comparison		-72%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	94%	62%	32%	62%	32%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	82%	63%	19%	64%	18%
Cohort Comparison		-94%				
05	2021					
	2019	73%	57%	16%	60%	13%
Cohort Comparison		-82%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	77%	54%	23%	53%	24%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

iReady

District Common Assessments

PMA's

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	49%	58%	72%
	Economically Disadvantaged	39%	48%	62%
	Students With Disabilities	27%	38%	52%
	English Language Learners	42%	51%	65%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	36	52	72
	Economically Disadvantaged	29	45	65
	Students With Disabilities	16	32	52
	English Language Learners	26	42	62
Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	46%	67%	79%
	Economically Disadvantaged	36%	57%	69%
	Students With Disabilities	26%	47%	59%
	English Language Learners	39%	60%	72%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	27	53	71
	Economically Disadvantaged	20	47	65
	Students With Disabilities	12	33	51
	English Language Learners	17	43	61

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	60%	79%	82%
	Economically Disadvantaged	50%	69%	72%
	Students With Disabilities	40%	59%	62%
	English Language Learners	53%	72%	75%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	29	62	76
	Economically Disadvantaged	22	65	69
	Students With Disabilities	19	42	56
	English Language Learners			
Grade 4				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	57%	66%	79%
	Economically Disadvantaged	50%	59%	72%
	Students With Disabilities	37%	46%	59%
	English Language Learners	47%	56%	69%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	44	67	82
	Economically Disadvantaged	37	60	75
	Students With Disabilities	24	47	62
	English Language Learners	34	57	72

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	50%	60%	66%
	Economically Disadvantaged	43	53	59
	Students With Disabilities	30	40	46
	English Language Learners	40	50	56
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	47	67	79
	Economically Disadvantaged	40	60	72
	Students With Disabilities	27	47	59
	English Language Learners	37	57	69
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	68	72	79
	Economically Disadvantaged	62	66	69
	Students With Disabilities	53	57	59
	English Language Learners	59	62	66

Subgroup Data Review

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	26			33							
ELL	59	50	45	76	38	20	54				
ASN	74	50		89	38		62				
BLK	85	92		69	17		62				
HSP	71	61	37	75	51	26	60				
MUL	91			91							
WHT	80	66		85	55		81				
FRL	72	70	53	71	43	28	62				
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				

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
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				

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	60
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	71
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	482
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	95%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	30
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	52
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	62
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	65
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	57
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	91
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	73
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	59
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

Science achievement, Math achievement and math learning gains show improvement across most sub groups while ELA seems stagnate in most subgroups and dropped for the lowest 25%.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

ELA in the lowest 25% will be a point of emphasis as well as the achievement gaps (ELA/math) in students with disabilities (SWD). SEL will also be a priority as there is evidence to support its efficacy in the classroom.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

Attention placed in other areas, lack of SEL systems and less support for SWD were contributing factors. In response, a heavy emphasis will be placed on literacy across the board as well improved support systems for SWD and implementation of an SEL team focused on standardizing the SEL school-wide.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Science achievement (+8%) and math learning gains (+4%) both show solid improvement.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

Our school has placed a large focus on STEM/STEAM. We have developed a STEM lab for students to get hands on experience with science and math material. We also participated in the STEM club competitions wherein students created machines and structures to compete against other schools in various STEM events.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

FBS interventions will be optimized and focused on improving literacy on an individual student level, along with accelerated tutoring and SEL strategies will be used with fidelity.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

SEL trainings, center trainings and trainings on academic conversations will be provided.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

Walk to intervention, weekly PLC's and collaborative planning will be imbedded in the culture.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Other 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.
Monitoring:	The school will be using tools acquired from the district led DPLC and from the Sanford Harmony SEL materials.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy:	The district obtained and shared with each school the Sanford Harmony SEL materials.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	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.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#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%.
Monitoring:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Meet regularly with PLC's and ESE teacher to monitor the progress of the students with disabilities through the use of common assessments. 2. Ensure that all teachers are re-teaching and re-testing 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.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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 PLC's on a weekly basis to monitor planning and instructions, especially for those targeted subgroup. 3. Review common assessment data as a grade level during PLC's with the leadership team on a weekly basis, focusing on the students with disabilities specifically.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Meet with PLC's and ESE teacher to monitor the progress of the students with disabilities through the use of common assessments.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.floridacims.org), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

Timber Lakes Elementary has had very few discipline problems in recent years. Our areas of concern are more focused on improving student relationships and instilling a sense of community on campus wherein students feel connected to the school and each other. We will work to improve in this area through SEL strategies and the House System.

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.

Timber Lakes Elementary continues to focus on making the school an integral part of the community. This means involving stake holders in the decision making process of school wide initiatives, having a presence on social media platforms, celebrating student success with the community and reaching out to help those in need.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

Our teachers work tirelessly to prepare their students for the world that awaits them and school leadership works to support these efforts in any way possible. Our parents are very supportive of the work being done and are quite active on campus. Local business owners are involved in SAC and work to provide resources for students and events.

Part V: Budget

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

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