Timbercrest Elementary School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Timbercrest Elementary School

2401 EUSTACE AVE, Deltona, FL 32725

http://myvolusiaschools.org/school/timbercrest/pages/default.aspx

Demographics

Principal: Lonnie Tidmarsh J

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2019

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
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	98%
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 Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (58%) 2017-18: B (57%) 2016-17: B (60%)
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 Volusia 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

Timbercrest Elementary School

2401 EUSTACE AVE, Deltona, FL 32725

http://myvolusiaschools.org/school/timbercrest/pages/default.aspx

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 PK-5	Yes	72%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	57%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		B	B	B

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Volusia 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.

T ogether we can achieve
I ntegrity
G oals
E xcellence
R espect, responsibility and
S uccess!

Provide the school's vision statement.

We believe that students will learn when...
- there is a positive, welcoming environment where they are respected, supported by all stakeholders, and encouraged to take risks.
- lessons are engaging, relevant, and hands-on.
- instruction is meaningful, purposeful, and differentiated.
- feedback is immediate and specific.
- their learning styles and individual learning timelines are respected.

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
Tidmarsh, Lonnie	Principal	2021-2022 School Improvement Plan Administrator and Contact 2021-2022 Title I Administrator and Contact 2021-2022 Timbercrest MTSS Leadership Team Member The school-based MTSS leadership team identifies school based resources (both materials and personnel) to determine the continuum of academic and behavioral supports available to students at the individual school site. Academic and behavioral data are considered in order to determine priorities and functions of other existing teams (e.g., Problem Solving Team, PBIS Team, and Professional Learning Communities). The Problem Solving process (i.e., Problem Identification, Analysis of Problem, Intervention Implementation and Response to Intervention) is used as the way of work of all teams and not just for individual student concerns. Adherence to the Problem Solving process ensures that individual, class-wide, and school-wide issues are addressed systematically with data; that interventions (supports) are tiered to the targeted problems; and that a plan is in place to monitor progress. The school improvement plan is data driven and focuses on areas of school-based need for both specific content areas as well as specific student populations. Similarly, MTSS is a data-driven framework that seeks to find solutions/resources matched in intensity to student need in academic and behavioral areas. The MTSS framework follows the district's four-step problem solving process, with RtI as an integral component of the process. As a result, the school improvement plan is based on a strategic analysis of data, and identified resources (as identified by the MTSS school based leadership team) are matched to the needs of the students/schools. Building the SIP within the context of MTSS results in the school determining the areas of most significant need and, as importantly, enables the school to develop a plan that can be addressed based on existing resources.
Miles, Michelle	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal Exceptional Student Education (ESE) Administrator and Contact Positive Behavioral Interventions & Supports (PBIS) Administrator and Contact 2021-2022 Timbercrest MTSS Leadership Team Member
Cook, Tricia	Teacher, K-12	1st Grade Teacher 1st Grade Team Lead 2021-2022 Timbercrest MTSS Leadership Team Member
Amoroso, Michele	Teacher, K-12	2rd Grade Teacher 2rd Grade Team Lead 2021-2022 Timbercrest MTSS Leadership Team Member

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
San, Krista	Teacher, K-12	3rd Grade Teacher 3rd Grade Team Lead 2021-2022 Timbercrest MTSS Leadership Team Member
Ginn, Michelle	Teacher, K-12	5th Grade Teacher 5th Grade Team Lead 2021-2022 Timbercrest MTSS Leadership Team Member
Gould, Kendra	Teacher, K-12	Support Facilitation Teacher ESE Team Lead 2021-2022 Timbercrest MTSS Leadership Team Member
Bryant, Rylee	Teacher, K-12	Teacher on Assignment 2021-2022 Timbercrest MTSS Leadership Team Member
Kuches, Kristy	Instructional Coach	K-5th Instructional Coach 2021-2022 Timbercrest MTSS Leadership Team Member
Morris, Jennifer	Teacher, K-12	K Grade Teacher K Grade Team Lead 2021-2022 Timbercrest MTSS Leadership Team Member

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 7/1/2019, Lonnie Tidmarsh J

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.*

0

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

0

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

54

Total number of students enrolled at the school

744

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

6

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	99	115	113	131	145	115	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	718
Attendance below 90 percent	13	26	15	19	20	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	109
One or more suspensions	1	4	6	0	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	23	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	1	25	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	5	4	2	3	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17

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	2	0	1	7	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24

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

Date this data was collected or last updated
Monday 8/9/2021

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	73	114	126	154	117	141	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	725
Attendance below 90 percent	4	6	4	3	8	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
One or more suspensions	6	4	1	7	9	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
Course failure in ELA	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	16	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	16	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39

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	1	0	0	6	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	73	114	126	154	117	141	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	725
Attendance below 90 percent	4	6	4	3	8	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
One or more suspensions	6	4	1	7	9	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
Course failure in ELA	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	16	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	16	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39

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	1	0	0	6	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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				64%	56%	57%	65%	55%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				61%	56%	58%	56%	51%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				46%	46%	53%	40%	39%	48%
Math Achievement				69%	59%	63%	73%	60%	62%
Math Learning Gains				58%	56%	62%	55%	54%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				39%	43%	51%	46%	40%	47%
Science Achievement				66%	57%	53%	67%	58%	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	65%	58%	7%	58%	7%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	64%	54%	10%	58%	6%
Cohort Comparison		-65%				
05	2021					
	2019	61%	54%	7%	56%	5%
Cohort Comparison		-64%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	73%	60%	13%	62%	11%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					

MATH							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	70%	59%	11%	64%	6%
Cohort Comparison		-73%				
05	2021					
	2019	62%	54%	8%	60%	2%
Cohort Comparison		-70%				

SCIENCE							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	65%	56%	9%	53%	12%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

For the English Language Arts and Mathematics sections the number represents the total number of students tested during the i-Ready window. Percent proficiency is percentage of students scoring "Early On Grade Level" or "Mid or Above Grade Level" on the i-Ready diagnostic assessment.

For the Science section the number represents the total number of students tested.This number consists of more than one assessment. / Percent proficiency is percentageof students scoring 70% or above on the assessments.

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	100 / 24.00%	106 / 42.45%	105 / 63.81%
	Economically Disadvantaged	83 / 20.48%	87 / 35.63%	87 / 57.47%
	Students With Disabilities	18 / 5.56%	20 / 10.00%	18 / 33.33%
	English Language Learners	14 / 21.43%	16 / 12.5%	16 / 37.50%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	101 /18.81%	103 / 37.86%	104 / 57.69%
	Economically Disadvantaged	83 / 16.87%	85 / 31.76%	86 / 53.49%
	Students With Disabilities	19 / 5.25%	18 / 11.11%	18 / 33.33%
	English Language Learners	14 / 0.00%	15 / 6.67%	15 / 43.73%

Grade 2				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	113 / 36.28%	120 / 60.00%	128 / 61.72%
	Economically Disadvantaged	81 / 33.33%	89 / 56.18%	94 / 55.32%
	Students With Disabilities	18 / 16.67%	18 / 16.67%	22 / 31.82%
	English Language Learners	10 / 20.00%	11 / 36.36%	11 / 54.55%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	111 / 18.92%	121 / 42.98%	122 / 61.48%
	Economically Disadvantaged	80 / 15.00%	90 / 37.78%	89 /57.3%
	Students With Disabilities	18 / 11.11%	19 / 5.26%	18 / 22.22%
	English Language Learners	11 / 27.27%	11 / 36.36%	11 / 63.64%

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	132 / 51.52%	141 / 68.09%	142 / 83.80%
	Economically Disadvantaged	98 / 46.94%	103 / 66.99%	104 / 83.65%
	Students With Disabilities	25 / 24.00%	29 / 48.28%	28 / 71.43%
	English Language Learners	23 / 30.43%	23 / 65.22%	23 / 73.91%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	133 / 19. 55%	144 / 43.75%	138 / 73.19%
	Economically Disadvantaged	98 / 14.29%	105 / 42.86%	100 / 70.00%
	Students With Disabilities	24 / 12.5%	31 / 19.35%	26 / 50.00%
	English Language Learners	22 / 0.00%	24 / 33.33%	22 / 63.64%

Grade 4				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	110 41.82%	123 / 43.09%	127 / 48.03%
	Economically Disadvantaged	88 / 38.64%	100 / 39.00%	102 / 44.12%
	Students With Disabilities	21 / 9.52%	25 / 12.00%	26 / 15.38%
	English Language Learners	25 / 12.00%	31 / 9.68%	35 /17.14%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	108 / 27.78%	119 / 46.22%	112 / 63.39%
	Economically Disadvantaged	86 / 25.58%95 / 43.16%	95 / 43.16%	91 / 60.44%
	Students With Disabilities	21 / 0.00%	23 / 13.04%	22 / 36.36%
	English Language Learners	24 / 0.00%	28 / 14.29%	26 / 42.31%

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	128 / 33.09%	133 / 41.67%	132 / 42.96%
	Economically Disadvantaged	107 / 32.14%	110 / 36.67%	109 / 37.61%
	Students With Disabilities	24 / 3.85%	24 / 0.00%	23 / 11.54%
	English Language Learners	17 / 33.33%	17 / 33.33%	17 / 52.94%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	129 / 29.46%	137 / 35.04%	139 / 53.24%
	Economically Disadvantaged	107 / 27.10%	113 / 31.86%	116 / 48.28%
	Students With Disabilities	25 / 8.00%	24 / 8.33%	25 / 20.00%
	English Language Learners	15 / 40.00%	17 / 35.29%	17 / 47.06%
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	625 / 65%	510 / 65%	381 / 69%
	Economically Disadvantaged	522 / 60%	421 / 63%	312 / 64%
	Students With Disabilities	116 / 21%	95 / 29%	65 / 32%
	English Language Learners	83 / 59%	65 / 50%	48 / 59%

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	29	33	27	32	11	7	19				
ELL	45	65		42	29		47				
BLK	50	31		54	8		58				
HSP	53	44	33	51	26	27	53				
MUL	57			62							
WHT	59	45		65	29	10	59				
FRL	53	42	35	53	27	19	51				
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	23	30	23	26	46	43	36				
ELL	58	66	47	54	57	55	57				
BLK	54	50		56	46		53				
HSP	57	58	38	61	57	39	56				
MUL	75	79		71	65		75				
WHT	71	63	55	79	62	44	81				
FRL	61	55	44	65	55	39	59				
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	32	46	39	32	31	38	21				
ELL	56	65	44	60	60	43	40				
BLK	66	45	25	70	50	40	53				
HSP	61	57	41	66	52	49	60				
MUL	59	65		57	59						
WHT	69	56	44	81	57	47	79				
FRL	63	52	35	70	52	45	64				

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	44
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	59
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	354

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	96%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	26
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	48
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	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	40
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	43
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	60
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Multiracial Students	
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	45
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	42
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?

Concerns with Learning Gains in math across the board (28%). Areas of concern with math Learning Gains in the Lowest 25% (17%) in the area of mathematics according to 2020-2021 FSA data. Also, the Subgroup Federal Index identified our Students with Disabilities and African Americans as ESSA subgroups needing supports. Learning Gains of the SWD in the area of mathematics decrease from 45% to 29%. Our ESSA subgroup Students with Disabilities saw an increase in the area of math achievement (57%), decrease in learning gains (-16%), and decrease in learning gains of lowest 25% (-53%). Our ESSA subgroup African Americans saw an increase in the area of math achievement (54%), increase in learning gains (+8%), and decrease in learning gains of lowest 25% (-56%). Concerns with Learning Gains in ELA across the board (45%). Areas of concern with ELA Learning Gains in the Lowest 25% (34%) in the area of ELA according to 2020-2021 FSA data. Also, the Subgroup Federal Index identified our Students with Disabilities and African Americans as ESSA subgroups needing supports. Learning Gains of the SWD in the area of ELA decrease from 61% to 45%. Our ESSA subgroup Students with Disabilities saw a decrease in the area of ELA achievement (56%), decrease in learning gains (-16%), and decrease in learning gains of lowest 25% (-29%). Our ESSA subgroup African Americans saw a decrease in the area of ELA achievement (50%), decrease in learning gains (-19%), and decrease in learning gains of lowest 25% (-26%).

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

Learning Gains in math demonstrate the greatest need for 2021-2022 school year. The Lowest 25% in the area of mathematics according to 2020-2021 FSA data shows a decrease of 22%. Math proficiency achievement decreased 11% as a school. Within our lowest 25% math achievement decreased 30%. Within our ESSA subgroups (Students with Disabilities and African Americans), a 16% decrease in Learning Gains (SWD) in the area of math and only 8% of our African American students made Learning Gains in math. In our ESSA subgroup SWD we had a decrease of 53% in our math lowest quartile. In our ESSA subgroup AA, we had 56% decrease in our math lowest quartile. Learning Gains in ELA demonstrate a need for 2021-2022 school year. The Lowest 25% in the area of ELA according to 2020-2021 FSA data shows a decrease of 16%. ELA proficiency achievement decreased 8% as a school. Within our lowest 25% ELA achievement decreased 22%. Within our ESSA subgroups (Students with Disabilities and African Americans), a 16% decrease in Learning Gains (SWD) in the area of ELA and a decrease of 19% in our African American students making Learning Gains in ELA. Additionally, in our ESSA subgroup SWD we had a decrease of 29% in our ELA lowest quartile. In our ESSA subgroup AA, we had 26% decrease in our ELA lowest quartile. Additional training is needed for our general education teachers related to earning Learning Gains for all students and our ESSA subgroup-Students with Disabilities and African American.

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

The inconsistencies with the COVID pandemic situation with ICP from 2019-2020 and 2020-2021. Espcially concerning is the missing that year of testing in 2019-2020. Other concerns include 2020-2021 LIVE attendance, the LIVE delivery model, online supports, and distractions contributed to a decline in academic improvements. In 2019-2020 a contributing factor was a focus as a school on proficiency rather that specific student learning gains. Another factor was disruption in our intervention/enrichment plans. Our Academic Coach is going to do weekly rotations during the math block to support the teachers (with a focus on the lowest quartile students). Learning Walks will check on classroom Focus Boards as well as look for student engagement in the lowest quartile students. Guidance will work with the Lowest Quartile students during lunch as well as Special Area times. Media will offer an Enrichment Club with a focus on Grades 3-5 during the lunch period. Our teachers will be working with the lowest quartile DAILY in both ELA and Math. During PLCs, teachers will be looking at the Lowest Quartile students weekly and deciding what we need to do. We will continue to review the Progress Monitoring weekly with a focus on math. We will be looking at individual student achievement during PLCs (with a specific focus on SWD and AA ESSA subgroups).

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

Math Achievement went from 42% to 57% an increase of 15%. Our African Americans made a 4% gain in overall math achievement, 8% gain in math learning gains, and 5% gain in science achievement.

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

1. Implemented a modified walk-to intervention in math K-5th.
2. Add math intervention time (30 minutes) within the master schedule.
3. Increased math intervention with math intervention teacher.

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

1. Focus on Math Learning gains for all students with extra support for our lowest quartile
2. Strategic grouping based on data for Math intervention
3. Collaboration during PLC for Math, ELA and Science
4. Weekly Support from Academic Coach during Math with a focus on lowest quartile

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.

1. Teacher and Parent Training on how learning gains/school grade are computed
2. Small Group training for math and focusing on remediation and enrichment (depth/rigor)
3. ELA training on new curriculum

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

Guidance teaching 3-5th grade lowest quartile groups some test-taking skills during meetings

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	This Area of Focus aligns to Strategic Plan Goal 1: Engage all students in high levels of learning EVERY day. As a result of our Needs Assessment and Analysis it revealed that our Math Proficiency was at 58%, Math Learning Gains were 28% and the Lowest Quartile performed at 17%. Further analysis revealed that most of the students in our Lowest Quartile were also in one or more of our two targeted ESSA Subgroups; SWD and AA, that performed below 41%. Improve learning gains in math for all 4th & 5th grade students, including students achieving in lowest 25%.
Measurable Outcome:	Improve learning gains in Math for all 4th & 5th grade students, including students achieving in lowest 25%. Increase Math overall proficiency from 58% to 63%. Increase Math LQ learning gains from 28% to 55%, including ESSA subgroups, SWD and AA. Additionally, only 17% of our students in the lowest quartile made Learning Gains in math according to Math FSA 2020-2021. Increase the percent of students in Lowest Quartile making Learning Gains in math to 55%. Further analysis revealed that our focus will include Learning Gains with the students in our targeted ESSA Subgroups Students with Disabilities (29%) and African American (8%).
Monitoring:	This Area of Focus will be monitored through frequent classroom observations using a walkthroughs tool with specific math look-fors, and data chats to determine instructional adjustments needed to impact student growth. Also, coaching cycles based on teacher need as demonstrated through weekly classroom observations and student performance data. Through PLC and collaboration, teachers will be monitoring a focus on math Learning Gains (including ESSA Subgroups SWD and AA). The Stocktake process will also monitor prior to the SIP Mid-Year Review. Additionally, progress monitoring with happen through ongoing discussion and PLCs, data discussion/chats with District level support through PLCs, and individiual student data chats (to include teacher, academic coach, administration, intervention teachers, ESE representative, and other support needed).
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kristy Kuches (kkuches@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Our evidence-based strategy is Teacher Clarity. We will monitor it through frequent walkthroughs by school-based administrations, coaches, and the district support team. Grade level teams and individual teachers will receive feedback to guide them in planning and instructing for input on students' learning and determining next steps. Learning Walks (both school based and district) will be part of our strategy that will monitor the Area of Focus. Small group Professional Development with extra support from the district. Data chats about individual students during PLC and with support from District Content Specialist. Ongoing monitoring of individual student progress of learning gains.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Teacher Clarity has an effect size of 0.75 (Hattie, 2009). The average affect size is 0.40, which is equal to approximately one year of learning. At 0.75, it is likely that the impact on students is significantly greater than average when teacher clarity is implemented with fidelity. Hattie describes teacher clarity and excellent teachers as those who: 1) have appropriately high expectations. 2) share their notions of success criteria with students. 3) ensure that there is constructive alignment between the lesson, the task, and the assignment. 4) ensure that the delivery of the lesson is relevant, accurate, and comprehensible to students 5) provide welcome feedback about where to move to next.

> This approach will have the biggest impact on moving individual students' learning gains. We are moving away from working just on proficiency to move a student's through with a focus on learning gains. We will target individual students' needs.

Action Steps to Implement

Share with the entire faculty and staff, the data the SLT examined that determined the need for implementation of Teacher Clarity.

Person Responsible   Lonnie Tidmarsh (ljtidmar@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Provide ongoing professional learning in Teacher Clarity during ERPLs and Teacher duty day.

Person Responsible   Kristy Kuches (kkuches@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Second Semester-Use of Focus Boards in every classroom that include Learning Targets/Learning Intentions and Success Criteria to ensure students know what they are learning.

Person Responsible   Lonnie Tidmarsh (ljtidmar@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Conduct Collaborative Planning that includes planning for alignment between the standard/benchmark, the lesson, and the tasks. Planning will also include teachers "doing the work, to know the work" to provide worked examples that illustrate desired outcomes for their students.

Person Responsible   Kristy Kuches (kkuches@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Teams will engage in ongoing teacher clarity work during PLCs and integrate the following questions into their discussions: Where are we going? Where are we now? How do we move learning forward? What did we learn today? Who benefitted and who did not?

Person Responsible   Lonnie Tidmarsh (ljtidmar@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Conduct PLCs focused on identifying learning targets/intentions, discuss ideas for instruction, review student work, determine students who need additional instruction or intervention to be successful. Data discussions based on individual student data (Learning Gains) rather than just proficiency level.

Person Responsible   Lonnie Tidmarsh (ljtidmar@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	This Area of Focus aligns to Strategic Plan Goal 1: Engage all students in high levels of learning EVERY day. As a result of our Needs Assessment and Analysis it revealed that our ELA Proficiency was at 56%, ELA Learning Gains were 45% and the Lowest Quartile performed at 34%. Further analysis revealed that most of the students in our Lowest Quartile were also in one or more of our two targeted ESSA Subgroups; SWD and AA, that performed below 41%. Improve learning gains in math for all 4th & 5th grade students, including students achieving in lowest 25%.
Measurable Outcome:	Improve learning gains in ELA for all 4th & 5th grade students, including students achieving in lowest 25%. Increase ELA overall proficiency from 56% to 63%. Increase ELA LQ learning gains from 45% to 56%, including ESSA subgroups, SWD and AA. Additionally, only 34% of our students in the lowest quartile made Learning Gains in ELA according to ELA FSA 2020-2021. Increase the percent of students in Lowest Quartile making Learning Gains in ELA to 55%. Further analysis revealed that our focus will include Learning Gains with the students in our targeted ESSA Subgroups Students with Disabilities (45%) and African American (31%).
Monitoring:	This Area of Focus will be monitored through frequent classroom observations using a walkthroughs tool with specific ELA look-fors, and data chats to determine instructional adjustments needed to impact student growth. Also, coaching cycles based on teacher need as demonstrated through weekly classroom observations and student performance data. Through PLC and collaboration, teachers will be monitoring a focus on ELA Learning Gains (including ESSA Subgroups SWD and AA). The Stocktake process will also monitor prior to the SIP Mid-Year Review. Additionally, progress monitoring with happen through ongoing discussion and PLCs, data discussion/chats with District level support through PLCs, and individiual student data chats (to include teacher, academic coach, administration, intervention teachers, ESE representative, and other support needed).
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Rylee Bryant (rabryant@volusia.k12.fl)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Our evidence-based strategy is Teacher Clarity. We will monitor it through frequent walkthroughs by school-based administrations, coaches, and the district support team. Grade level teams and individual teachers will receive feedback to guide them in planning and instructing for input on students' learning and determining next steps. Learning Walks (both school based and district) will be part of our strategy that will monitor the Area of Focus. Small group Professional Development with extra support from the district. Data chats about individual students during PLC and with support from District Content Specialist. Ongoing monitoring of individual student progress of learning gains.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Teacher Clarity has an effect size of 0.75 (Hattie, 2009). The average affect size is 0.40, which is equal to approximately one year of learning. At 0.75, it is likely that the impact on students is significantly greater than average when teacher clarity is implemented with fidelity. Hattie describes teacher clarity and excellent teachers as those who: 1) have appropriately high expectations. 2) share their notions of success criteria with students. 3) ensure that there is constructive alignment between the lesson, the task, and the assignment. 4) ensure that the delivery of the lesson is relevant, accurate, and comprehensible to students 5) provide welcome feedback about where to move to next.

This approach will have the biggest impact on moving individual students' learning gains. We are moving away from working just on proficiency to move a student's through with a focus on learning gains. We will target individual students' needs.

Action Steps to Implement

Share with the entire faculty and staff, the data the SLT examined that determined the need for implementation of Teacher Clarity.

Person Responsible   Lonnie Tidmarsh (ljtidmar@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Provide ongoing professional learning in Teacher Clarity during ERPLs and Teacher duty day.

Person Responsible   Kristy Kuches (kkuches@volusia.k12.fl.us)

First Semster-Use of Focus Boards in every classroom that include Learning Targets/Learning Intentions and Success Criteria to ensure students know what they are learning.

Person Responsible   Rylee Bryant (rabryant@volusia.k12.fl)

Conduct Collaborative Planning that includes planning for alignment between the standard/benchmark, the lesson, and the tasks. Planning will also include teachers "doing the work, to know the work" to provide worked examples that illustrate desired outcomes for their students.

Person Responsible   Rylee Bryant (rabryant@volusia.k12.fl)

Teams will engage in ongoing teacher clarity work during PLCs and integrate the following questions into their discussions: Where are we going? Where are we now? How do we move learning forward? What did we learn today? Who benefitted and who did not?

Person Responsible   Lonnie Tidmarsh (ljtidmar@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Conduct PLCs focused on identifying learning targets/intentions, discuss ideas for instruction, review student work, determine students who need additional instruction or intervention to be successful. Data discussions based on individual student data (Learning Gains) rather than just proficiency level.

Person Responsible   Lonnie Tidmarsh (ljtidmar@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	This Area of Focus aligns to Strategic Plan Goal 1: Engage all students in high levels of learning EVERY day. As a result of our Needs Assessment and Analysis it revealed that our ESSA Subgroup Students With Disabilities was below 41%. Further analysis revealed that most of the students in our Lowest Quartile were also in our ESSA Subgroups. Improve learning gains in Math & ELA for our ESSA Subgroup SWD.

Measurable Outcome:	Improve learning gains in our ESSA Subgroup Students With Disabilities. Increase math LG in our ESSA Subgroup SWD from 29% to 55%. Increase SWD math LQ from 7% to 55%. Increase ELA LG in our ESSA Subgroup SWD from 45% to 60%. Increase SWD ELA LQ from 27% to 55%.
Monitoring:	This Area of Focus will be monitored through frequent classroom observations using a walkthroughs tool with specific math/ELA look-fors, and data chats to determine instructional adjustments needed to impact student growth. Also, coaching cycles based on teacher need as demonstrated through weekly classroom observations and student performance data. Through PLC and collaboration, teachers will be monitoring a focus on ELA Learning Gains and math Learning Gains for our ESSA Subgroup SWD. The Stocktake process will also monitor prior to the SIP Mid-Year Review. Additionally, progress monitoring with happen through ongoing discussion and PLCs, data discussion/ chats with District level support through PLCs, and individiual student data chats (to include teacher, academic coach, administration, intervention teachers, ESE representative, and other support needed).
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kendra Gould (klgould@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Our evidence-based strategy is Teacher Clarity. We will monitor it through frequent walkthroughs by school-based administrations, coaches, and the district support team. Grade level teams and individual teachers will receive feedback to guide them in planning and instructing for input on students' learning and determining next steps. Learning Walks (both school based and district) will be part of our strategy that will monitor the Area of Focus. Small group Professional Development with extra support from the district. Data chats about individual students during PLC and with support from District Content Specialist. Ongoing monitoring of individual student progress of learning gains. Professional Development on how to read IEPs and strategies to meet specific needs based on the IEP.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Teacher Clarity has an effect size of 0.75 (Hattie, 2009). The average affect size is 0.40, which is equal to approximately one year of learning. At 0.75, it is likely that the impact on students is significantly greater than average when teacher clarity is implemented with fidelity. Hattie describes teacher clarity and excellent teachers as those who: 1) have appropriately high expectations. 2) share their notions of success criteria with students. 3) ensure that there is constructive alignment between the lesson, the task, and the assignment. 4) ensure that the delivery of the lesson is relevant, accurate, and comprehensible to students 5) provide welcome feedback about where to move to next. This approach will have the biggest impact on moving individual students' learning gains. We are moving away from working just on proficiency to move a student's through with a focus on learning gains. We will target individual students' needs.

Action Steps to Implement

Provide ongoing professional learning on IEPs and how to implement IEPs during ERPLs and Teacher duty day.

Person Responsible Kendra Gould (klgould@volusia.k12.fl.us)

DOJ Settlement Training

Person Responsible Lonnie Tidmarsh (ljtidmar@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Share with the entire faculty and staff, the data the SLT examined that determined the need for implementation of Teacher Clarity.

Person Responsible Lonnie Tidmarsh (ljtidmar@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Provide ongoing professional learning in Teacher Clarity during ERPLs and Teacher duty day.

Person Responsible Lonnie Tidmarsh (ljtidmar@volusia.k12.fl.us)

First Semster ELA/Second Semster Math-Use of Focus Boards in every classroom that include Learning Targets/Learning Intentions and Success Criteria to ensure students know what they are learning.

Person Responsible Rylee Bryant (rabryant@volusia.k12.fl)

Conduct Collaborative Planning that includes planning for alignment between the standard/benchmark, the lesson, and the tasks. Planning will also include teachers "doing the work, to know the work" to provide worked examples that illustrate desired outcomes for their students.

Person Responsible Kendra Gould (klgould@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Teams will engage in ongoing teacher clarity work during PLCs and integrate the following questions into their discussions: Where are we going? Where are we now? How do we move learning forward? What did we learn today? Who benefitted and who did not?

Person Responsible Lonnie Tidmarsh (ljtidmar@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Conduct PLCs focused on identifying learning targets/intentions, discuss ideas for instruction, review student work, determine students who need additional instruction or intervention to be successful. Data discussions based on individual student data (Learning Gains) rather than just proficiency level.

Person Responsible Lonnie Tidmarsh (ljtidmar@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	This Area of Focus aligns to Strategic Plan Goal 1: Engage all students in high levels of learning EVERY day. As a result of our Needs Assessment and Analysis it revealed that our ESSA Subgroup Africian Americans was below 41%. Further analysis revealed that most of the students in our Lowest Quartile were also in our ESSA Subgroups. Improve learning gains in Math & ELA for our ESSA Subgroup AA.
Measurable Outcome:	Improve learning gains in our ESSA Subgroup Africian Americans. Increase math LG in our ESSA Subgroup AA from 8% to 55%. Increase AA math LQ from 0% to 55%. Increase ELA LG in our ESSA Subgroup AA from 31% to 55%. Increase AA ELA LQ from 20% to 55%.
Monitoring:	This Area of Focus will be monitored through frequent classroom observations using a walkthroughs tool with specific math/ELA look-fors, and data chats to determine instructional adjustments needed to impact student growth. Also, coaching cycles based on teacher need as demonstrated through weekly classroom observations and student performance data. Through PLC and collaboration, teachers will be monitoring a focus on ELA Learning Gains and math Learning Gains for our ESSA Subgroup AA. The Stocktake process will also monitor prior to the SIP Mid-Year Review. Additionally, progress monitoring with happen through ongoing discussion and PLCs, data discussion/chats with District level support through PLCs, and individiual student data chats (to include teacher, academic coach, administration, intervention teachers, ESE representative, and other support needed).
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Lonnie Tidmarsh (ljtidmar@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Our evidence-based strategy is Teacher Clarity. We will monitor it through frequent walkthroughs by school-based administrations, coaches, and the district support team. Grade level teams and individual teachers will receive feedback to guide them in planning and instructing for input on students' learning and determining next steps. Learning Walks (both school based and district) will be part of our strategy that will monitor the Area of Focus. Small group Professional Development with extra support from the district. Data chats about individual students during PLC and with support from District Content Specialist. Ongoing monitoring of individual student progress of learning gains.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Teacher Clarity has an effect size of 0.75 (Hattie, 2009). The average affect size is 0.40, which is equal to approximately one year of learning. At 0.75, it is likely that the impact on students is significantly greater than average when teacher clarity is implemented with fidelity. Hattie describes teacher clarity and excellent teachers as those who: 1) have appropriately high expectations. 2) share their notions of success criteria with students. 3) ensure that there is constructive alignment between the lesson, the task, and the assignment. 4) ensure that the delivery of the lesson is relevant, accurate, and comprehensible to students 5) provide welcome feedback about where to move to next. This approach will have the biggest impact on moving individual students' learning gains. We are moving away from working just on proficiency to move a student's through with a focus on learning gains. We will target individual students' needs.

Action Steps to Implement

Share with the entire faculty and staff, the data the SLT examined that determined the need for implementation of Teacher Clarity.

| **Person Responsible** | Lonnie Tidmarsh (ljtidmar@volusia.k12.fl.us) |

Provide ongoing professional learning in Teacher Clarity during ERPLs and Teacher duty day.

| **Person Responsible** | Kristy Kuches (kkuches@volusia.k12.fl.us) |

First Semster ELA/Second Semester Math-Use of Focus Boards in every classroom that include Learning Targets/Learning Intentions and Success Criteria to ensure students know what they are learning.

| **Person Responsible** | Rylee Bryant (rabryant@volusia.k12.fl) |

Conduct Collaborative Planning that includes planning for alignment between the standard/benchmark, the lesson, and the tasks. Planning will also include teachers "doing the work, to know the work" to provide worked examples that illustrate desired outcomes for their students.

| **Person Responsible** | Lonnie Tidmarsh (ljtidmar@volusia.k12.fl.us) |

Teams will engage in ongoing teacher clarity work during PLCs and integrate the following questions into their discussions: Where are we going? Where are we now? How do we move learning forward? What did we learn today? Who benefitted and who did not?

| **Person Responsible** | Lonnie Tidmarsh (ljtidmar@volusia.k12.fl.us) |

Teams will engage in ongoing teacher clarity work during PLCs and integrate the following questions into their discussions: Where are we going? Where are we now? How do we move learning forward? What did we learn today? Who benefitted and who did not?

| **Person Responsible** | Lonnie Tidmarsh (ljtidmar@volusia.k12.fl.us) |

Conduct PLCs focused on identifying learning targets/intentions, discuss ideas for instruction, review student work, determine students who need additional instruction or intervention to be successful. Data discussions based on individual student data (Learning Gains) rather than just proficiency level.

| **Person Responsible** | Lonnie Tidmarsh (ljtidmar@volusia.k12.fl.us) |

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the SafeSchoolsforAlex.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.

After comparing our school's SESIR incident and discipline data to other schools across the state, we have identified threats or intimidations and out of school suspensions as areas of concern. They are ranked high. Our school plans to reduce these areas by implementing the following.

School will:
- provide a refresher on PBIS strategies including the addition of Tier 3 supports
- provide Department of Justice trainings
- provide incident data to teachers monthly at faculty meetings
- New teachers will receive a full PBIS training.
PBIS will encourage positive behavior and attendance.

Teachers will:
- stand at door to monitor students
- develop clear expectations with students and other strategies to solve a conflicts

Data chats will take place monthly with the PBIS team and quarterly during Faculty Meetings to discuss the above implementation plan (what's working and what's not) based on the data.Time has been designated on the master calendar for SEL to be integrated within the Social Studies curriculum.

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.

Timbercrest will hold Parent Involvement Nights such as a S.T.E.A.M. Night, Literacy Night, Weekly Tuck in Tuesday videos, Literacy Night, and Publix Math Night. These events will include the Timbercrest Leadership Team, teachers from other Volusia County Schools and volunteers from higher education universities such as UCF and DSC. We also host Meet the Teacher day, two Open House nights TBD, and Title 1 Parent Meetings TBD. PTA Events will be held throughout the year to include the community in events. Our volunteer coordinator will seek additional business partners to provide incentives for student achievement in the areas of academics and behavior. We are also continuing to build a school-wide student

incentive program to support our Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports initiative. This house system reward program will include parents and business partners.

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

Leadership Team- will organize and facilitate parent involvement nights such as a S.T.E.A.M. Night, Literacy Night, Weekly Tuck in Tuesday videos, Literacy Night, Publix Math Night, Meet the Teacher, Open House, and Title 1 Parent Meetings.

Stocktake Team- will monitor the 2021-2022Timbercrest School Improvement Plan and provide specific feedback related to the areas of focus with specific action steps for each focus area.

PBIS Team- will facilitate the implementation of the PBIS and house system initiatives at Timbercrest and monitor discipline data throughout the school year.

SAC Team- will review school data and the 2021-2022 School Improvement Plan. Will provide specific feedback related to the areas of focus and general improvement related to creating a positive culture and environment at Timbercrest.

PTA-will help support parent invlovement nights including S.T.E.A.M. Night, Literacy Night, Weekly Tuck in Tuesday videos, Literacy Night, and Publix Math Night through volunteers and financial support.

Additionally, PTA will host an Ice Cream Social (General PTA Meeting), fall school festival, and other PTA sponsored events.