

St. Johns County School District

Timberlin Creek Elementary School



2022-23 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	15
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

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
2021-22 Title I School	No
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	10%
2021-22 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	2021-22: A (69%) 2018-19: A (70%) 2017-18: A (70%)
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 is pending approval by the St. Johns 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	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

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)	2021-22 Title I School	2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	No	10%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	31%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	A		A	A

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the St. Johns 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.

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

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.:

Name	Position 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.
Tumbelty, Allison	Assistant Principal	Mrs. Tumbelty 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. Tumbelty will serve as the LEA for Educational Student Education.
Hudson, Stephanie	Assistant Principal	Ms. Hudson 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. She will also work in the role as an LEA for the school.
Renaud, Lyndsey	Instructional Coach	Mrs. Renaud 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 teachers plan instruction, creating system-wide policies and procedures, and facilitating professional development.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Saturday 7/1/2017, Linda Edel

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

3

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

12

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

83

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,253

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

15

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

24

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current 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	175	207	191	222	217	209	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1221
Attendance below 90 percent	24	16	20	13	12	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	99
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	9	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	9	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	10	25	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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	3	5	7	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	3	4	5	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 8/9/2022

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	190	167	194	196	179	191	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1117
Attendance below 90 percent	39	27	43	31	26	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	185
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	5	10	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	8	14	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	8	9	25	35	24	39	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	140

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	4	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10

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	5	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	190	167	194	196	179	191	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1117
Attendance below 90 percent	39	27	43	31	26	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	185
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	5	10	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	8	14	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	8	9	25	35	24	39	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	140

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	4	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10

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	5	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Students retained two or more times	0	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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	83%	74%	56%				83%	75%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	76%						71%	67%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	60%						53%	59%	53%
Math Achievement	82%	50%	50%				86%	77%	63%
Math Learning Gains	74%						66%	69%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	44%						53%	59%	51%
Science Achievement	61%	77%	59%				76%	72%	53%

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
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	88%	78%	10%	58%	30%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	79%	77%	2%	58%	21%
Cohort Comparison		-88%				
05	2022					
	2019	81%	76%	5%	56%	25%
Cohort Comparison		-79%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	91%	82%	9%	62%	29%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	82%	82%	0%	64%	18%
Cohort Comparison		-91%				
05	2022					
	2019	86%	80%	6%	60%	26%
Cohort Comparison		-82%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	77%	73%	4%	53%	24%
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	44	52	45	47	45	30	23				
ELL	54	75		75	75						
ASN	77	81		85	90		73				
BLK	73	50		60	75						
HSP	75	74		77	71	43	56				
MUL	72	55		67	73						
WHT	85	79	64	83	73	45	63				
FRL	61	72		62	52	27	50				
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	50	56	50	44	32	25	42				
ELL	71			86							
ASN	82	82		85	91		100				
BLK	79			63							
HSP	84	73		70	82		73				
MUL	100			93							
WHT	85	66	58	84	60	45	72				
FRL	75	64		83	36		64				
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				

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	69
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	480

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	41
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	70
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	65
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	66
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	67
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Multiracial Students	
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	70
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	54
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

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?

At Timberlin Creek, the science achievement scores continue to decline each school year. A deficit of 14 points was recorded for the 2022 assessment. Learning gains for the lowest 25% [in both ELA and mathematics] continues to decline. Comparison data for our lowest 25% from 2021 and 2022 indicates a -2 in ELA learning gains, and a -9 in mathematics learning gains. Learning gains for our general education population of students continues to be positive - comparison data from 2021 and 2022 indicates a + 8 in ELA learning gains, and a +12 in mathematics learning gains. For subgroup comparison data, Timberlin Creek maintains a continuous concern for our SWD subgroup. Although our overall % for ELA learning gains increased from 53% in 2019 to 60% in 2022, our school will need to implement additional intervention measures to maintain this status from year to year. Subgroups that include black students, and students who receive free/reduced lunch are a focal point for our school.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Timberlin Creek: The greatest need for improvement parallel the learning gains for our lowest 25%of students in both English Language Arts and mathematics. The three-year trend for students with disabilities, students who are within the black subgroup, and the free-reduce lunch subgroup are included within our focus areas.

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

1. Timberlin Creek Elementary needs to review the data related to the FRL subgroup and the black subgroup with an increased frequency and intensity. 2. Timberlin Creek started an intervention time with students from our SWD subgroup in January 2022. Students received a weekly intervention block for 45 minutes. New actions required to address this need for improvement would include: begin the weekly intervention block in September 2022, instead of waiting until mid-year. Identify a research-based program that provides a continuum of literacy skills/concepts and an effective progress monitoring tool that provides interim data. Training paraprofessionals and ESE teachers to effectively implement this instructional tool to maximize the students' learning gains, and achievement levels. Our administrative team and our ESE achievement coach are working collaboratively to design an ESE fidelity check template that oversees the implementation of accommodations within the general education classroom.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Timberlin Creek Elementary demonstrated the most improvement in the area of learning gains. Learning gains for our general education population of students continues to be positive - comparison data from 2021 and 2022 indicates a + 8 in ELA learning gains, and a +12 in mathematics learning gains.

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

Contributing factors to this important include preparing and following a strategic master schedule that promotes student learning in a tiered plan. In both content areas of English Language Arts and mathematics, students participate in Tier 1 instruction. Instruction for all students that exemplify grade level standards and consistent resources. Tier 2 instruction focuses on data-specific interventions and flexible grouping. Tier 3 instruction provides ESE students with concentrated instruction that parallels IEP goals and intensive instruction.

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

In order to accelerate learning, the instructional personnel and the administrative team at Timberlin Creek Elementary will need to review Tier 1 instruction with more detailed segments of time. For example, how much of a 90-minute ELA instructional period is whole group instruction, small group instruction, targeted/differentiated instruction, etc. There is an overall need to follow the district curriculum maps with focus and rigor - teachers should be using the district approved resources with fidelity and consistency.

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.

Professional development opportunities parallel the K-12 comprehensive evidence-based reading plan. Timberlin Creek Elementary is conducting weekly walk-throughs that become part of our monthly Literacy Leadership Team meetings. We use this specific data to refer back to the information that relates to the % of time spent in whole group instruction versus small group instruction. Training related to Lexia Core5 has been accompanied with specific resource trainings related to our SAVVAS resource and all of the digital resources that align to the B.E.S.T standards. Through the observational process, data will be collected to establish grade level learning pods and peer observations. This data will be utilized to set-up professional development focus groups in our PLCs.

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

Professional development with our administrative team will be part of the sustainability. Timberlin Creek Elementary has acquired two new assistant principals with no previous administrative experience and a new Instructional Literacy Coach. Principal and Literacy Leadership Team will need to develop systems/processes that are consistent and reliable; developing an accountability scale for the implementation of the tiered master schedule, inclusive of all educational components.

Areas of Focus

Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement

Area of Focus
Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Literacy walk-throughs, informal observations and formal observations have provided insight into the instructional practices that are being presented at Tier 1. Students at Timberlin Creek display high levels of compliance within the classroom setting and during instructional delivery - yet may not display high levels of engagement. This rote approach to instructional delivery parallels the low % of learning gains for our lowest 25% of students. The % of achievement and learning gains for our general education population of students could be higher with increased time on task and monitoring of understanding.

Measurable Outcome:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

TCE will increase ELA and mathematics learning gains of the lowest 25% of students (bottom quartile) to 70%.

Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

The data that is acquired by the weekly literacy walk-throughs will help out Literacy Leadership Team determine what specific components of the literacy block are most commonly 'featured' within the instruction. This data will be used in a comparative analysis of evaluative elements within our observation system. Peer observations and corresponding focus areas will be filtrated into grade level PLCs.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

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

Evidence-based Strategy:
Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

We will continue to utilize the tiered level of supports to include the ESE support facilitators across grade levels so all students are working through the ELA essential standards and receiving the differentiated support they require but we will increase the monitoring and support to ensure fidelity. We have acquired one additional VE teacher to help intensify the ESE small groups even more. PLC teams will continue to base instruction on ELA formative and summative data as well as Lexia Core 5 to plan for differentiated groups in tiers 2 and 3. We will also have basic paraprofessionals work with bottom quartile students across grade levels that need extra support that do not have an IEP.

Rationale for Evidence-based

Literacy walk-throughs, informal observations and formal observations have provided insight into the instructional practices that are being presented at Tier 1. Students at Timberlin Creek display high levels of compliance within the classroom setting and during

Strategy:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.
Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.

instructional delivery - yet may not display high levels of engagement. This rote approach to instructional delivery parallels the low % of learning gains for our lowest 25% of students. The % of achievement and learning gains for our general education population of students could be higher with increased time on task and monitoring of understanding.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

1. Develop and monitor tiered schedule of ELA supports across grade levels.
2. Use basic paraprofessionals to work regularly with bottom quartile students without an IEP.
3. Use VE paraprofessional & additional ESE/VE teacher to further intensify ESE small groups.
4. Provide common planning time to ensure an effective PLC process.
5. Provide ILC support across grade level teams with implementation, new SAVVAS ELA resources and data chats.
6. Implement a Literacy Leadership Team to review and problem-solve 'findings' from the literacy walk-through data. What instructional practices are happening at Tier 1 instruction?

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

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

<p>Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.</p>	<p>Learning gains for the lowest 25% [in both ELA and mathematics] continues to decline. Comparison data for our lowest 25% from 2021 and 2022 indicates a -2 in ELA learning gains, and a -9 in mathematics learning gains.</p>
<p>Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.</p>	<p>For the lowest 25% of the TCE student population, an increase of + 10% points will be the outcome for the 2023 year ends scores. Learning gains for the lowest 25% in ELA will be 70% or higher, and learning gains for the lowest 25% in mathematics will be 54% or higher.</p>
<p>Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.</p>	<p>Formative assessments, summative Assessments and district assessment data analyzed regularly as part of the PLC process. Lexia-Core5 reports + Cambium data results.</p>
<p>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</p>	<p>Allison Tumbelty (allison.tumbelty@stjohns.k12.fl.us)</p>
<p>Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being</p>	<p>We will continue to utilize the tiered level of supports to include the ESE support facilitators across grade levels so all students are working through the ELA and mathematics essential standards and receiving the differentiated support the students require. We will increase the monitoring and support to ensure fidelity. We have one additional ESE/VE teacher to help intensify the ESE interventions. PLC teams will include analyzing ELA and mathematics formative and summative data as well as STAR & Cambium to plan for differentiated groups in Tier 2 and Tier 3. We will also have basic paraprofessionals work with bottom quartile students across grade levels that need extra support in ELA &</p>

implemented for this Area of Focus.

mathematics that do not have an IEP. We will also ensure students receive individualized digital pathways work in mathematics as well as ELA.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

With the use of additional instructional support to further intensify ESE small groups and support struggling students that do not have an IEP as well as individualized math digital pathway use for students, we will have increased opportunities of intensive instruction for all of our bottom quartile students on a regular basis which will increase proficiency for that group of students.

Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

1. Develop and monitor tiered schedule of ELA & mathematics supports across grade levels.
2. Use basic paraprofessionals to work regularly with bottom quartile students without an IEP.
3. Use VE paraprofessional and additional ESE/VE teacher to further intensify ESE small groups.
4. Include analyzing ELA + mathematical data and planning for differentiated Tier 2 and Tier 3 groups in the PLC process.
5. Add Lexia-Core5 for individualized instruction for all students across grade levels.

Person

Responsible

Allison Tumbelty (allison.tumbelty@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

#3. Transformational Leadership specifically relating to Specific Teacher Feedback/Walkthroughs

Area of Focus

Description and

Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Reviewing the literacy walk-throughs, a high % of Tier 1 instruction is within a whole group delivery.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

The Literacy Leadership Team would like to see a higher % of differentiated strategies/learning techniques are being implemented during Tier 1 instruction.

Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

1. During an ELA block of instruction, what % of walk-throughs are conducted during whole group?
2. Are multi-sensory strategies being utilized within the lessons?
3. Do administrators and teachers understand all of the various literary components?

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lyndsey Renaud (lyndsey.renaud@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Literacy Walk-throughs, a requirement of the FLDOE Comprehensive Reading Plan, will be analyzed monthly by the Literacy Leadership Team. This data will be discussed and alternative professional development trainings will be implemented. Peer observations with a focal point will be conducted within grade levels, and learning will be discussed within PLCs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Literacy Walk-throughs, a requirement of the FLDOE Comprehensive Reading Plan, will be analyzed monthly by the Literacy Leadership Team. All of the information presented within these discussions will lend to a more thorough review of Tier instruction, and the effectiveness of instructional practices.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

1. During an ELA block of instruction, what % of walk-throughs are conducted during whole group?
2. Are multi-sensory strategies being utilized within the lessons?
3. Do administrators and teachers understand all of the various literary components?
4. Monthly analysis of literacy walk-throughs.
5. Peer observations and discussions embedded within PLCs.

Person Responsible

Lyndsey Renaud (lyndsey.renaud@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

#4. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to PBIS/Character Counts!

**Area of Focus
Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**

Although there was a slight reduction of students being sent to the office with documentation, we want to continue to focus on the teacher implementation of their Tier 1 classroom management strategies in classrooms. We will continue 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 students being sent to the administrative office as well as Tier 2 and Tier 3 referrals.

**Measurable Outcome:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**

With the implementation of a school-wide PBIS plan, there should be less administrative involvement in classroom management, a reduction of unannounced students being sent to the front office for Tier 1 behaviors and a decrease in the loss of instructional time because of time taken away due to Tier 1 behaviors. This information/data can be tracked/measured in eSchool PLUS and Performance Matters.

**Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**

We can monitor the success of implementation through the MTSS/RTI behavior system and eSchool PLUS referrals.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Stephanie Hudson (stephanie.hudson@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

**Evidence-based Strategy:
Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**

We will use the evidence based positive behavior strategies of the PBIS program. School counselors will use daily lessons to support the school wide expectations. Classroom teachers will be encouraged to use Sanford Harmony during their daily morning meetings.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for**

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.

selecting this strategy.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

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

Stephanie Hudson (stephanie.hudson@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

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.

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

Administrative Team - Foster and monitor a consistent implementation of classroom Tier 1 plans. Promote and support the school wide PBIS program.

Teachers - Implement and follow through with Tier 1 classroom management plans. Support and promote the PBIS program.

Faculty & Staff - Support classroom management plans as well as the school wide PBIS program.

Students - Follow classroom management plans, SOAR expectations, PBIS expectations.

Parents - Support the implementation of the school wide PBIS plan and discuss the expectations with their student(s).