

Orange County Public Schools

Timber Creek High School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|-----------|
| SIP Authority and Purpose | 3 |
| I. School Information | 6 |
| II. Needs Assessment/Data Review | 11 |
| III. Planning for Improvement | 16 |
| IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review | 24 |
| V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence | 24 |
| VI. Title I Requirements | 26 |
| VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus | 27 |

Timber Creek High

1001 AVALON PARK BLVD, Orlando, FL 32828

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

| SIP Sections | Title I Schoolwide Program | Charter Schools |
|--|---|------------------------|
| I-A: School Mission/Vision | | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1) |
| I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring | ESSA 1114(b)(2-3) | |
| I-E: Early Warning System | ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III) | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2) |
| II-A-C: Data Review | | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2) |
| II-F: Progress Monitoring | ESSA 1114(b)(3) | |
| III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection | ESSA 1114(b)(6) | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4) |
| III-B: Area(s) of Focus | ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii) | |
| III-C: Other SI Priorities | | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9) |
| VI: Title I Requirements | ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g) | |

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

To ensure every student has a promising and successful future.

Provide the school's vision statement.

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

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|----------------------|---------------------|---|
| Wasko, Marc | Principal | Oversees overall school operations Oversees foreign language and fine arts departments Budget Teacher and administrative evaluations Oversee professional development |
| Flakes, Daphne | Assistant Principal | Oversees mathematics and CTE departments Mental Health Support Team Title IX Coordinator School Survey |
| Sheeran, Richard | Assistant Principal | Oversees English language arts and exceptional student education departments Testing Digital Support and Technology MTSS/Gifted/504 |
| Boettner, Jeff | Assistant Principal | Oversees science and wellness departments Safety and Security Discipline and Supervision Facilities Athletics and Activities Threat Assessment Team |
| DeLeon, Yokasta | Dean | Discipline and Supervision Threat Assessment Team Positive Pathways Liaison Food and Nutrition Services Title IV Backup |
| Abromavage, Dorothea | Other | AP Coordinator Advanced Placement/SAT/ACT Testing Advanced Placement Choice College Board Liaison College and Career Monitoring Cambridge Coordinator |
| Seavers, Vickie | Instructional Coach | Professional Development Data Reporting New Teacher Support Interns Grant Coordinator School Improvement Plan |
| Mahaffey, Melanie | Instructional Media | Professional Development Canvas Support |

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|----------------|---------------------|---|
| | | Device Inventory/Reporting Loss/Theft Investigations Inventory for Library Materials and Textbooks |
| Roth, Suzanne | Reading Coach | MTSS Team Concordant Score Monitoring English Language Arts Support Reading teacher |
| Nielsen, Karen | Assistant Principal | Oversees guidance and social studies departments Master schedule Dual enrollment/Advanced Studies Monitors graduation rate State reporting English Language Learners |

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

The School Improvement Plan (SIP) is developed based on state test results and input from the stakeholders. The School Leadership Team consists of administrators, support staff, and teachers. Data from the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (FAST) in reading for grades 9 and 10 as well as the Benchmark for Excellent Student Thinking (B.E.S.T.) end-of-course exams for algebra 1 and geometry is analyzed. Results from the Next Generation Sunshine State Standards (NGSSS) Assessments in biology and United States History are also reviewed. Areas of strength and areas that need improvement are determined in order to develop the areas of focus. Data results are shared with professional learning communities and staff during planning days. The School Advisory Council (SAC) consists of parents, teachers, administrators, and students. The SIP is shared with SAC and in order to obtain feedback. Student input is gathered not only from representatives on SAC but also from the leaders in the Student Government Association.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

Progress on the School Improvement Plan will be monitored based on a variety of assessments. Common assessments will be used at the end of units to determine student progress on the standards for English language arts, algebra 1, geometry, biology, and United State history. FAST Progress Monitoring 1 and 2 will be used to monitor English Language Arts progress during the school year, and STAR Algebra and Geometry tests will be used around the end of each nine weeks to assess math progress. District progress monitoring assessments at the end of each nine weeks for biology and United States history will be utilized to monitor student progress in these areas. Professional Learning Communities will meet weekly or biweekly with administrators and support staff to discuss student

achievement, and the School Leadership Team will meet quarterly to discuss the district and state results from progress monitoring. The SIP will be revisited each nine weeks to determine if revisions are needed to increase student achievement.

Demographic Data

Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

| | |
|--|--|
| 2023-24 Status (per MSID File) | Active |
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | High School 9-12 |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| 2022-23 Title I School Status | No |
| 2022-23 Minority Rate | 62% |
| 2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate | 36% |
| Charter School | No |
| RAISE School | No |
| ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024 | N/A |
| Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) | No |
| 2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities (SWD) English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL) |
| School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline. | 2021-22: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A |
| School Improvement Rating History | |
| DJJ Accountability Rating History | |

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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 | | |
| Absent 10% or more days | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 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 that have two or more early warning indicators:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|------|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | | |
| Absent 10% or more days | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1008 | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 197 | |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 81 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 75 | |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 402 | |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 356 | |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 402 | |

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 477 |

The number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | | |
| Absent 10% or more days | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

The number of students identified retained:

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

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review**ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)**

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

| Accountability Component | 2023 | | | 2022 | | | 2021 | | |
|---------------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement* | 63 | 49 | 50 | 68 | 49 | 51 | 73 | | |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 61 | | | 65 | | |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 41 | | | 51 | | |
| Math Achievement* | 53 | 34 | 38 | 52 | 36 | 38 | 46 | | |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 57 | | | 32 | | |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 52 | | | 26 | | |
| Science Achievement* | 83 | 66 | 64 | 80 | 31 | 40 | 79 | | |
| Social Studies Achievement* | 84 | 66 | 66 | 86 | 43 | 48 | 81 | | |
| Middle School Acceleration | | | | | 44 | 44 | | | |
| Graduation Rate | 99 | 87 | 89 | 99 | 62 | 61 | 100 | | |
| College and Career Acceleration | 71 | 65 | 65 | 76 | 70 | 67 | 77 | | |
| ELP Progress | 52 | 45 | 45 | 58 | | | 62 | | |

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index | |
|--|-----|
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI) | N/A |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 72 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 0 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 505 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 7 |
| Percent Tested | 97 |
| Graduation Rate | 99 |

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index | |
|--------------------------------------|-----|
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI) | N/A |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 66 |

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

| | |
|--|-----|
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 0 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 730 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 11 |
| Percent Tested | 97 |
| Graduation Rate | 99 |

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)**2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY**

| ESSA Subgroup | Federal Percent of Points Index | Subgroup Below 41% | Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41% | Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32% |
|----------------------|--|---------------------------|--|--|
| SWD | 48 | | | |
| ELL | 61 | | | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | 89 | | | |
| BLK | 68 | | | |
| HSP | 68 | | | |
| MUL | 75 | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | 75 | | | |
| FRL | 66 | | | |

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY

| ESSA Subgroup | Federal Percent of Points Index | Subgroup Below 41% | Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41% | Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32% |
|----------------------|--|---------------------------|--|--|
| SWD | 46 | | | |
| ELL | 57 | | | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | 79 | | | |
| BLK | 59 | | | |
| HSP | 64 | | | |

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY

| ESSA Subgroup | Federal Percent of Points Index | Subgroup Below 41% | Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41% | Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32% |
|---------------|---------------------------------|--------------------|---|---|
| MUL | 72 | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | 72 | | | |
| FRL | 60 | | | |

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22 | C & C Accel 2021-22 | ELP Progress |
|--------------|----------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|--------------|
| All Students | 63 | | | 53 | | | 83 | 84 | | 99 | 71 | 52 |
| SWD | 25 | | | 26 | | | 51 | 57 | | 27 | 6 | |
| ELL | 35 | | | 40 | | | 67 | 59 | | 76 | 7 | 52 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | 83 | | | 77 | | | 90 | 92 | | 92 | 6 | |
| BLK | 53 | | | 43 | | | 70 | 82 | | 57 | 6 | |
| HSP | 57 | | | 46 | | | 79 | 78 | | 64 | 7 | 53 |
| MUL | 56 | | | 47 | | | 83 | 96 | | 70 | 6 | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 70 | | | 63 | | | 88 | 89 | | 80 | 7 | 36 |
| FRL | 52 | | | 45 | | | 75 | 79 | | 58 | 7 | 51 |

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 | ELP Progress |
|--------------|----------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|--------------|
| All Students | 68 | 61 | 41 | 52 | 57 | 52 | 80 | 86 | | 99 | 76 | 58 |
| SWD | 25 | 37 | 31 | 24 | 46 | 50 | 43 | 63 | | 97 | 39 | |
| ELL | 33 | 54 | 50 | 39 | 48 | 46 | 59 | 71 | | 100 | 72 | 58 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | 80 | 69 | 47 | 76 | 68 | | 95 | 88 | | 100 | 88 | |

| 2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 | ELP Progress |
| BLK | 62 | 58 | 40 | 37 | 49 | 41 | 67 | 78 | | 100 | 59 | |
| HSP | 61 | 59 | 43 | 45 | 54 | 48 | 74 | 82 | | 100 | 75 | 59 |
| MUL | 73 | 55 | 23 | 71 | 67 | | 86 | 91 | | 100 | 79 | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 76 | 63 | 38 | 62 | 61 | 63 | 87 | 92 | | 99 | 79 | |
| FRL | 54 | 53 | 40 | 40 | 52 | 45 | 67 | 81 | | 99 | 68 | 60 |

| 2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 | ELP Progress |
| All Students | 73 | 65 | 51 | 46 | 32 | 26 | 79 | 81 | | 100 | 77 | 62 |
| SWD | 29 | 43 | 39 | 22 | 31 | 26 | 33 | 53 | | 100 | 35 | |
| ELL | 41 | 64 | 61 | 36 | 39 | 32 | 63 | 57 | | 100 | 69 | 62 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | 85 | 69 | 53 | 62 | 39 | | 83 | 97 | | 100 | 88 | |
| BLK | 67 | 67 | 43 | 40 | 30 | 21 | 72 | 80 | | 100 | 58 | |
| HSP | 64 | 60 | 50 | 36 | 28 | 27 | 72 | 78 | | 100 | 69 | 61 |
| MUL | 83 | 82 | | 54 | 29 | | 81 | 95 | | 100 | 88 | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 80 | 69 | 53 | 59 | 36 | 29 | 86 | 83 | | 100 | 84 | |
| FRL | 60 | 60 | 50 | 36 | 30 | 31 | 67 | 72 | | 100 | 62 | 61 |

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

| ELA | | | | | | |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 10 | 2023 - Spring | 67% | 49% | 18% | 50% | 17% |
| 09 | 2023 - Spring | 62% | 46% | 16% | 48% | 14% |

ALGEBRA

| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| N/A | 2023 - Spring | 49% | 47% | 2% | 50% | -1% |

GEOMETRY

| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| N/A | 2023 - Spring | 61% | 45% | 16% | 48% | 13% |

BIOLOGY

| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| N/A | 2023 - Spring | 82% | 63% | 19% | 63% | 19% |

HISTORY

| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| N/A | 2023 - Spring | 83% | 62% | 21% | 63% | 20% |

III. Planning for Improvement**Data Analysis/Reflection**

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

According to the 2022 assessment data, English language arts achievement for students in the lowest 25th percentile showed the lowest performance. Only 41% of the ninth and tenth grade students in the lowest 25% demonstrated learning gains even though 61% of ninth and tenth grade students overall made learning gains. Data released in June 2023 for the FAST ELA showed that 62% of ninth grade students and 67% of tenth grade students demonstrated grade level proficiency. Learning gains were not calculated for the 2023 assessment.

If achievement data is only considered for the 2022 and 2023 assessments in English language arts, math, biology, and United States history, then mathematics achievement would be the component with lowest performance. Math achievement reflects performance on both algebra 1 and geometry. The 2022 assessment data showed that 52% of students in algebra 1 and geometry achieved proficiency. Data released in June 2023 for the B.E.S.T. algebra 1 and geometry assessments showed that 48% of students achieved proficiency in algebra 1 while 62% of students achieved proficiency in geometry.

During the 2021-2022 school year, the decrease in the area of English language arts and mathematics

was affected by the learning losses that had occurred during the pandemic. Students were back for face-to-face instruction, but student attendance varied due to spikes in COVID infections throughout the year and parents' concern for their students' health. Online and face-to-face tutoring was offered; however, student participation was lower than anticipated. A lower level of reading comprehension was seen in students during the 2021-2022 school year which impacted their ability to comprehend grade level texts. During the 2022-2023, new standards were implemented in English language arts and mathematics along with new instructional materials. The statewide assessments were also revised. Inconsistent student attendance continued to be a factor in student achievement results.

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

The greatest decline that occurred in English language arts achievement for the students in the lowest 25th percentile during the 2021-2022 school year. Learning gains dropped from 51% in 2021 to 41% in 2022. Learning gains were not calculated by the state for the 2023 assessments. When comparing overall student achievement for English language arts, math, biology, and U.S. History during the 2022-2023 school year, the greatest decline was in English language arts. Students in grade 9 dropped from 70% being proficient in 2022 on the FSA ELA test to 62% being proficient on the FAST ELA test in 2023. Students in the 10th grade remained at the same level of proficiency with 67% at grade level on the FSA ELA test in 2022 and on the FAST ELA test in 2023. The factors that contributed to this drop were the same as mentioned in question 1.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

Timber Creek students performed better than the state average in all areas except in English Language Arts for the students in the 25th percentile. Timber Creek had 41% of students in the lowest 25th percentile making gains which is equal to the state average. The biggest gap in achievement was in the area of English Language Arts. The 2022 assessment data showed that 68% of ninth and tenth grade students were at proficiency level while the state average was 52% at the proficiency level. The gap of 16% was consistent with the gap in 2019 of 17%. According to the 2023 results for the FAST PMA 3, Timber Creek had 62% of students in ninth grade scoring at the proficiency level compared to 52% for the state average. The proficiency level of tenth grade students at Timber Creek was 67% compared to the state average of 48%. The consistent high level of proficiency in English Language Arts can be contributed to the collaboration within the ninth and tenth grade Professional Learning Communities (PLCs). The PLCs met weekly to plan and analyze data. Intervention periods were utilized to work with students who were not mastering the standards. The MTSS Coordinator and the English Language Arts interventionists worked with the ELA teachers to provide additional support to students outside of the classroom.

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

When comparing the assessment data from 2021 and 2022, mathematics achievement showed the biggest improvement. Student learning gains for the lowest 25th percentile increased from 26% of math students making gains in 2021 to 52% of math students making gains in 2022. Overall learning gains in mathematics increased from 32% of math students making learning gains in 2021 to 57% of students making learning gains in 2022. According to the 2023 assessment data, 48% of algebra 1 students scored at the proficiency level compared to 46% in 2022. Data on the geometry students showed 62% of them scoring at the proficiency level in 2023 compared to 55% in 2022. Learning gains were not calculated in 2023. In 2022, all students were back in school face-to-face compared to the hybrid model of some students at home and some students on campus for class. The Professional Learning Communities were restructured, and the emphasis on planning and analyzing data helped to increase collaboration, which contributed to an increase in scores.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

EWS data was not reported for grades 9-12 during the 2022-2023 school year.

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

Timber Creek High School's highest priorities are as follows.

- 1) Increase the number of students at proficiency in English Language Arts in ninth and tenth grades.
- 2) Increase the number of students at proficiency in algebra 1 and geometry.
- 3) Increase the number of students at proficiency in biology and U.S. history.
- 4) Increase student attendance.

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority 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 crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Subgroup data for the percentage of students scoring at proficiency for English Language Arts, algebra 1, and geometry has been consistently lower than the overall school percentage for proficiency for the past three reporting cycles. The percentage of students with disabilities who have made learning gains is less than the overall percentage of students who have made learning gains in English and math. When compared to other subgroups, students with disabilities have the lowest percentages of proficiency and learning gains.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By June 2024, Timber Creek High School will increase the number of ninth and tenth grade students making learning gains on the 2024 statewide language arts end of the year progress monitoring assessment by 2%.

Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored through the quantitative data collected throughout the year. Student achievement in English language arts will be monitored through school and district common assessments as well as state progress monitoring assessments. Data will be analyzed by the leadership team and professional learning communities after each assessment in order to determine where students achieved mastery and where they need additional support in their learning.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Richard Sheeran (richard.sheeran@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Timber Creek High School will use distributive leadership to strengthen team dynamics and collaboration in order to build academic expertise with the students and provide school supports for the families.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

In order to achieve large-scale and sustainable improvement, it is necessary to invest in the collective capacity of a school community, including its families. To strengthen a culture of learning with families, staff, and students, it is critical to harness the professional skills and leadership capabilities of everyone in the school.

Through a distributive leadership model, our school will strengthen the integration of instructional strategies and deliberate practices that will support the academic development of every student. Research indicates that for sustainable improvement efforts to be realized, collective ownership is necessary. Through a distributive leadership model Timber Creek High School can implement efficient and sustainable continuous improvement practices that will support the academic development of every student.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Weekly meetings of the members of the ninth and tenth grade English Language Arts PLC will help identify student learning needs to prepare for academic instruction. The instructional coach and the Multi-Tiered System of Support Coordinator will work with the ELA PLCs to provide classroom support and data analysis.

Person Responsible: Richard Sheeran (richard.sheeran@ocps.net)

By When: Data analysis will occur quarterly after each assessment.

#2. 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 crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Subgroup data for the percentage of students scoring at proficiency for English Language Arts, algebra 1, and geometry has been consistently lower than the overall school percentage for proficiency for the past three reporting cycles. The percentage of students with disabilities who have made learning gains is less than the overall percentage of students who have made learning gains in English and math. When compared to other subgroups, students with disabilities have the lowest percentages of proficiency and learning gains.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By June 2024, Timber Creek High School will increase the number of students making learning gains on the 2024 statewide algebra 1 and geometry end of year assessments by 2%.

Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored through the quantitative data collected throughout the year. Student achievement in algebra 1 and geometry will be monitored through school and district common assessments as well as state progress monitoring assessments. Data will be analyzed by the leadership team and professional learning communities after each assessment in order to determine where students achieved mastery and where they need additional support in their learning.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Daphne Flakes (daphne.flakes@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Timber Creek High School will use distributive leadership to strengthen team dynamics and collaboration in order to build academic expertise with the students and provide school supports for the families.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

In order to achieve large-scale and sustainable improvement, it is necessary to invest in the collective capacity of a school community, including its families. To strengthen a culture of learning with families, staff, and students, it is critical to harness the professional skills and leadership capabilities of everyone in the school.

Through a distributive leadership model, our school will strengthen the integration of instructional strategies and deliberate practices that will support the academic development of every student. Research indicates that for sustainable improvement efforts to be realized, collective ownership is necessary. Through a distributive leadership model Timber Creek High School can implement efficient and sustainable continuous improvement practices that will support the academic development of every student.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Weekly meetings of the members of the algebra 1 and geometry PLCs will help identify student learning needs to prepare for academic instruction. The instructional coach and the Multi-Tiered System of Support Coordinator will work with the algebra 1 and geometry PLCs to provide classroom support and data analysis.

Person Responsible: Daphne Flakes (daphne.flakes@ocps.net)

By When: Data analysis will occur quarterly after each assessment.

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Attendance data from 2022 showed that 1008 students missed 10 or more days of school. In 2023, the number of students missing 10 or more days of school dropped to 924. Students who are not in school cannot grow academically and limit their college and career opportunities for future success. A positive school culture and environment would help to keep students connected to critical supports.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By June 2024, Timber Creek High School will decrease the number of students having 10 or more absences by 2%.

Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored through the attendance reports pulled weekly. The leadership team will analyze the data and work with support staff to determine student needs.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Daphne Flakes (daphne.flakes@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Through a distributive leadership model, schools use a common language to support a positive culture of learning and utilize cognitive and conative strategies to support student success.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Through distributive leadership, Timber Creek High School continues to work on building and establishing a culture for learning with adults and students. Student learning continues to be enhanced with opportunities to interact with other students and participate in activities that have meaningful connections to the curriculum. The school leadership team collaborates with students, staff, and families to address changing needs and support continuous school improvement as well as student success.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Attendance reports will be gathered and analyzed by administration to determine students in need of intervention. Administrators, teacher leaders, and instructional support personnel will meet to determine next steps for student success.

Person Responsible: Daphne Flakes (daphne.flakes@ocps.net)

By When: Attendance reports will be pulled weekly. Governance meetings will meet monthly or quarterly.

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C)).

Timber Creek High School is not identified as ATSI, TSI, or CSI.

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

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

N/A

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

N/A

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 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 Measurable Outcomes

N/A

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

N/A

Monitoring

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 impact student achievement outcomes.

N/A

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:

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. §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?

N/A

Rationale:

Explain the rationale for selecting 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 evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

N/A

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**

N/A

Title I Requirements**Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements**

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))

List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

N/A

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.

List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

N/A

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii)

N/A

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

N/A

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

N/A

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

N/A

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

N/A

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

N/A

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

N/A

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

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

| | | | |
|---------------|--------|--|---------------|
| 1 | III.B. | Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities | \$0.00 |
| 2 | III.B. | Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities | \$0.00 |
| 3 | III.B. | Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Other | \$0.00 |
| Total: | | | \$0.00 |

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

No