

Orange County Public Schools

Timber Lakes Elementary



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Timber Lakes Elementary

2149 CROWN HILL BLVD, Orlando, FL 32828

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

Demographics

Principal: Jared Scott

Start Date for this Principal: 7/27/2022

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2021-22 Title I School	No
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	39%
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 (67%) 2017-18: A (68%)
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	ATSI
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Orange County School Board on 1/24/2023.

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	12
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Timber Lakes Elementary

2149 CROWN HILL BLVD, Orlando, FL 32828

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

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 KG-5	No	39%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	67%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Orange County School Board on 1/24/2023.

SIP Authority

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

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

<https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

With the support of families and the community, we create enriching and diverse pathways that lead our students to success.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To ensure every student has a promising and successful future.

School Leadership Team

Membership

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
Scott, Jared	Principal	District Data Meetings District Initiatives School Data Meetings School Deliberate Practice School PD School Improvement Plan FSSAT Threat Assessment Team Budget Staffing DPLC COVID Reporting Social Media Weekly Community Newsletter Classroom Observations Assist with monitoring school wide data Learning Community/District Tasks Deputy Superintendent's Newsletter
Davis, Patricia	Assistant Principal	Facilities School Data Meetings Discipline-first contact Review Code of Conduct Quarterly Skyward Safety Drills COGNIA Accountability Corrections Safe School Plan Inventory Title IX-Primary Contact AM/PM/Lunch Duty Schedule Culturally Responsive Team Threat Assessment Team Veteran's Day COVID Reporting Social Media Internal Newsletter Assist with monitoring school wide data Data Management Calendar Classroom observations Deliberate Practice
Kearney, Jenene	Curriculum Resource Teacher	Testing School Data Meetings Certification Points Classroom Observations Monitor FBS Staff PD Assist with monitoring school wide data

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

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/27/2022, Jared Scott

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.*

35

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.*

0

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

45

Total number of students enrolled at the school

758

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

11

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

11

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	8	25	27	20	17	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	116
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	3	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	15	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	1	7	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	0	0	1	7	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25

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	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
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 8/15/2022

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

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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	77%	56%	56%				74%	57%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	68%						67%	58%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	68%						49%	52%	53%
Math Achievement	79%	46%	50%				83%	63%	63%
Math Learning Gains	65%						67%	61%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	48%						53%	48%	51%
Science Achievement	77%	61%	59%				77%	56%	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	78%	55%	23%	58%	20%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	72%	57%	15%	58%	14%
Cohort Comparison		-78%				
05	2022					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	71%	54%	17%	56%	15%
Cohort Comparison		-72%				

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	94%	62%	32%	62%	32%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	82%	63%	19%	64%	18%
Cohort Comparison		-94%				
05	2022					
	2019	73%	57%	16%	60%	13%
Cohort Comparison		-82%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	77%	54%	23%	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	15	27	30	32	31	25					
ELL	64	83	75	77	72	62	53				
ASN	88	86		93	86		91				
BLK	79	74		74	77		79				
HSP	68	61	63	70	59	41	67				
MUL	84			95							
WHT	83	71	78	83	62	48	92				
FRL	66	63	64	69	63	53	63				

2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	26			33							
ELL	59	50	45	76	38	20	54				
ASN	74	50		89	38		62				
BLK	85	92		69	17		62				
HSP	71	61	37	75	51	26	60				
MUL	91			91							
WHT	80	66		85	55		81				
FRL	72	70	53	71	43	28	62				
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	29	42	36	43	58	56	43				
ELL	61	60	52	69	57	46	58				
ASN	86	81		96	86		87				
BLK	70	63	30	74	53	31	75				
HSP	69	61	49	77	63	55	75				
MUL	60	42		80	50						
WHT	80	72	75	89	69	69	77				
FRL	63	64	47	70	54	48	70				

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)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	70
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	81
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	563
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	27
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	71
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	91
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	77
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	63
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	90
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	74
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	65
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?

Students with disabilities did not make adequate progress compared to other subgroups of students. Also, the learning gains of the lowest quartile of students in Math needs improvement as well.

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

The Florida Standards Assessment demonstrate the greatest need for improvement are our SWD's and the learning gains of the LQ in Math.

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 pandemic, students not having to attend school during the month of January, a large caseload for our ESE teacher and a lack of understanding of data for our classroom teachers were all contributing factors to these trends.

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

We had several significant increases in achievement. Timber Lakes had a 16 point increase in lowest quartile learning gains in ELA, a 16 point increase in Math learning gains, a 21 point increase in lowest quartile Math learning gains (this category still isn't high enough) and a 7 point increase in Science proficiency.

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

Consistency in systems tied to intervention, strong teachers and great resources lead to these increases.

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

After school tutoring, education in STEM, the implementation of small group instruction in the classroom and smaller FBS groups are all strategies/systems that will need to be implemented to accelerate learning.

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.

Timber Lakes will have professional development on the resources offered on IMS to support students in Reading and Math. We will also tie our instruction closely to the progress monitoring assessments throughout the year.

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

Our data meetings will be tied to the progress monitoring assessments and the common assessments.

Areas of Focus

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

:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

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

This subgroup was identified because it is our lowest performing subgroup and below the ESSA threshold.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The goal is for more than 43% of our SWD to be proficient as measured by the FAST assessment.

Monitoring:

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

1. Meet regularly with PLC's and ESE teacher to monitor the progress of the students with disabilities through the use of common assessments.
2. Ensure that all teachers are re-teaching and re-testing students based off outcomes of common assessments.
3. Ensure students are receiving pre-teaching support from the instructional coach.
4. Ensure that the ESE teacher and classroom teachers are working together.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jared Scott (jared.scott@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

1. Bi-monthly data meetings with leadership team and grade level to review all data.
2. Ensure that ESE teacher participates in all data meetings.
3. Leadership team will push into grade level PLC's on a weekly basis to monitor planning and instructions, especially for those targeted subgroup.
3. Review common assessment data as a grade level during PLC's with the leadership team on a weekly basis, focusing on the students with disabilities specifically.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Meet with PLC's and ESE teacher to monitor the progress of the students with disabilities through the use of common assessments, FAST and i-Ready.

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to B.E.S.T. Standards

Area of Focus Description and

Rationale:

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

This is the first year B.E.S.T. standards will be implemented schoolwide.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The goal is for teachers to deliver a curriculum that is 100% tied to the new standards.

Monitoring:

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

Through classroom observation and by monitoring common assessments

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Classroom observations will take place by visiting classrooms with a systematic schedule. Monitoring common assessments will take place through PLC's and planning sessions.

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

Classroom observations will take place by visiting classrooms with a systematic schedule. Monitoring common assessments will take place through PLC's and planning sessions.

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

RAISE

The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

Timber Lakes' area of focus is closing the gap for SWD and strong implementation of the B.E.S.T. standards. 17% of students are not on pace to be considered on level in K-2, based on iReady. To help close the gap for our SWD and ensure a proper education for all students, TLE will monitor iReady, common assessments, and FAST.

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

Timber Lakes' area of focus is closing the gap for SWD and strong implementation of the B.E.S.T. standards. 23% of students are not on pace to be considered on level in 3rd-5th, based on the FSA. To help close the gap for our SWD and ensure a proper education for all students, TLE will monitor iReady, common assessments, and FAST.

Measurable Outcomes:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)

TLE's goal is for 85% of students to be on level in reading as measured by iReady. That would be an increase from 83% during the 2021-2022 school year.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

TLE's goal is for 80% of students to be on level in reading as measured by FAST. That would be an increase from 77% during the 2021-2022 school year.

Monitoring:

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

Monitoring will take place through ongoing PLC's where student data from iReady, FAST, and common assessments will be reviewed and analyzed. Instructional decisions related to placement in intervention groups will be based on said data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Scott, Jared, jared.scott@ocps.net

Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. Â§7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

Instructional strategies that will be implemented include; Kagan collaborative structures, small groups with the teacher, walk to intervention, and instructional strategies aimed at different learning styles. We will also use varied resources that are research based that also include technological and traditional.

Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

The strategies that we will implement this year are research based and have been shown to have a positive affect on student outcomes.

Action Steps to Implement:

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
Systems will be in place for monitoring instruction and student outcomes through PLC and classroom observations.	Scott, Jared, jared.scott@ocps.net

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.

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

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

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