
Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	11
III. Planning for Improvement	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	0
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Timberlin Creek Elementary School

555 PINE TREE LN, St Augustine, FL 32092

<http://www-tce.stjohns.k12.fl.us/>

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.

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, 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
Edel, Linda	Principal	Mrs. Edel promotes and supports high student achievement by providing curricular and instructional leadership, maintaining overall school site operations; receiving, distributing, and communicating information to enforce district and state policies; maintaining a safe school environment; coordinating site activities and communicates information to faculty & 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 LEA for Exceptional Student Education.
Gilbert, Lisa	Assistant Principal	Ms. Gilbert 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. Ms. Gilbert will serve as LEA for Exceptional Student Education.
Sawruk, Samantha	Assistant Principal	Ms. Sawruk 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 the school facilities for day-to-day activities and special events. Verifying accountability of safety protocols and implementation of the Positive Behavioral Interventions and Support Program. Working with teachers to develop curriculum standards, access resources, and conduct professional learning communities each week. Observing teachers and evaluating learning materials to determine areas where improvement is needed.

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 development of the School Improvement Plan has been limited to our school leadership team. Information related to the needs assessment was formulated by data. The school leadership team designs four (4) goals each school year that surrounds the data that is acquired. The 23_24 SIP will include one academic goal for English Language Arts, one academic goal for Mathematics, a goal that encompasses the subgroups of (a.) SWD and Black Early Literacy, and (b.) SWD and Black Reading.

The final goal for Timberlin Creek Elementary will include our continued growth and development of the Positive Behavioral Interventions and Support Program.

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))

The School Improvement Plan will be monitored after each of the progress monitoring sessions of F.A.S.T. Specific components of the School Improvement Plan will be monitored by specific intervention plans and tools. [i.e. A research-based program with specific quarterly progress monitoring tools/ assessments. i.e. Wilson Reading Systems or Voyager Passport] A review of the 2024 PM 3 data will determine specific small group interventions inclusive of (a.) SWD once per week for 45 minutes on Wednesday afternoons (b.) small group interventions for students who scored in the 20-30 percentile range, specifically completed by a certified tutor (c.) small group interventions for students who scored in the 31-40 percentile range, specifically completed by a certified tutor with reading endorsement credentials.

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)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	31%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	10%
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	30	25	15	18	21	15	0	0	0	124
One or more suspensions	3	3	4	1	4	5	0	0	0	20
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	3
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	18	12	21	0	0	0	51
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	12	12	21	0	0	0	45
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	15	13	7	0	0	0	35

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	5	2	0	0	0	7

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	2	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	9
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	24	16	20	13	12	14	0	0	0	99
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	1	1	2	0	0	0	6
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	5	3	0	0	0	8
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	5	3	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	9	18	0	0	0	27
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	9	18	0	0	0	27
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	10	25	18	0	0	0	0	0	53

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	2	3	5	7	7	0	0	0	24

The number of students identified retained:

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

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	24	16	20	13	12	14	0	0	0	99
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	1	1	2	0	0	0	6
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	5	3	0	0	0	8
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	5	3	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	9	18	0	0	0	27
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	9	18	0	0	0	27
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	10	25	18	0	0	0	0	0	53

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	2	3	5	7	7	0	0	0	24

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	3	4	5	5	1	0	0	0	0	18
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*	74	70	53	83	74	56	85		
ELA Learning Gains				76			68		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				60			62		
Math Achievement*	76	73	59	82	50	50	82		
Math Learning Gains				74			62		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				44			53		
Science Achievement*	71	69	54	61	77	59	75		
Social Studies Achievement*					69	64			
Middle School Acceleration					54	52			
Graduation Rate					69	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	96	66	59						

* 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	79
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	394
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	69
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	480
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

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	49			
ELL	73			
AMI				
ASN	81			
BLK	63			
HSP	69			
MUL	86			
PAC				
WHT	75			

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%
FRL	55			

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	41			
ELL	70			
AMI				
ASN	81			
BLK	65			
HSP	66			
MUL	67			
PAC				
WHT	70			
FRL	54			

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	74			76			71					96
SWD	53			44			39				4	
ELL	50			73							3	96
AMI												
ASN	76			88			82				4	
BLK	53			73							2	
HSP	70			70			57				4	
MUL	85			79							3	

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
PAC												
WHT	74			75			74				4	
FRL	61			54			43				4	

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	83	76	60	82	74	44	61					
SWD	44	52	45	47	45	30	23					
ELL	54	75		75	75							
AMI												
ASN	77	81		85	90		73					
BLK	73	50		60	75							
HSP	75	74		77	71	43	56					
MUL	72	55		67	73							
PAC												
WHT	85	79	64	83	73	45	63					
FRL	61	72		62	52	27	50					

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	85	68	62	82	62	53	75					
SWD	50	56	50	44	32	25	42					
ELL	71			86								
AMI												
ASN	82	82		85	91		100					
BLK	79			63								
HSP	84	73		70	82		73					
MUL	100			93								
PAC												
WHT	85	66	58	84	60	45	72					
FRL	75	64		83	36		64					

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
05	2023 - Spring	74%	71%	3%	54%	20%
04	2023 - Spring	79%	76%	3%	58%	21%
03	2023 - Spring	74%	72%	2%	50%	24%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	79%	78%	1%	59%	20%
04	2023 - Spring	84%	79%	5%	61%	23%
05	2023 - Spring	72%	74%	-2%	55%	17%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	70%	70%	0%	51%	19%

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.

Black Early Literacy and Black Reading showed the lowest performance rate from PM1 to PM3. Black students' performance from the initial progress monitoring assessment to the final PM assessment was represented by a -11 for Early Literacy and a -20 for Reading. From the 22_23 school year, this subgroup was represented with a 75% in ELA achievement, and a 50% in ELA learning gains.

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

First grade students' ELA scores declined from the 22_23 school year. This grade level has never shown a decline in scores. STAR English Language Arts assessments from PM1-PM3 reflected a negative performance. Students in Grade 1 went from a 74% on initial progress monitoring assessment to a 67% on the final progress monitoring assessment, a -7% decline in performance.

First grade students' MATHEMATICS scores declined from the 22_23 school year. This grade level has never shown a decline in scores. STAR Mathematics assessments from PM1-PM3 reflected a negative performance. Students in Grade 1 went from a 93% on initial progress monitoring assessment to a 89% on the final progress monitoring assessment, a -4% decline in performance.

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.

State averages were not presented as comparable scores for the primary level students. For the Cambium assessment in Grades 3-5, all progress monitoring scores for PM1-PM2-PM3 were higher at Timberlin Creek Elementary than the state averages. State % of change for the Reading PM1 to PM3 was 17%, and our school presented at a 26% change from PM1 to PM3. State % of change for the Mathematics PM1 to PM3 was 41%, and our school presented at a 55% change from PM1 to PM3.

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

According to the Cambium data - students in the subgroups for Grades 3-4-5 demonstrated a positive, upward trend in the category of Level 3+ % change from PM 1 to PM3. READING: Data indicates that these students score 50% on PM1 and increased by 26 percentage points to a 76% on PM3. MATHEMATICS: Data indicates that these students score 24% on PM1 and increased by 55 percentage points to a 79% on PM3. SWD: Data indicates that these students score 21% on PM1 and increased by 32 percentage points to a 53% on PM3. BLACK: Data indicates that these students score 47% on PM1 and increased by 16 percentage points to a 63% on PM3. Timberlin Creek reviewed specific progress monitoring data during professional learning communities, and revised the specificity in the flexible grouping during the focused intervention classes. A specific focus on research-based assessments and interventions.

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

In reviewing the Early Warning Systems report, concerns presented include: (a.) the number of students who were absent more than 10% of instruction and (b.) FSA data results with a Level 1 in Grade 4 and Grade 5

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

1. Performance of primary grade level students in the Black subgroup within Early Literacy and Reading.
2. Sustainability of increased % change from PM1 to PM3 for SWD subgroup.
3. Investigate specifically the % change from PM1 to PM3 for Grade 1.
At/Above benchmark declined from 74% to 67%.
4. Primary Grade Levels: Raise the overall % change for the category of READING to above 3%.
Overall READING % went from 69% PM1 to 80% in PM2 and then declined to 72% for PM3.

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority 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 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.

Literacy walk-throughs, informal observations and formal observations have provided insight into the instructional practices 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 consistently demonstrate high levels of engagement. This rote approach to instructional delivery parallels the decline in performance % for the final progress monitoring scores. The % change for our general education population of students could result in higher PM scores with increased rigor, 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.

In the content area of English Language Arts, TCE would like to see a +10% change in performance for each progress monitoring period.

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 assist the 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 filtered into Professional Learning Communities.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

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

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.)

We will continue to use 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 differentiated support. Increase monitoring and support to ensure fidelity. PLC teams will continue to base instruction on formative and summative data, as well as LexiaCore 5 to plan for differentiated groups at Tier 2 and Tier 3. Intervention supports will align to four (4) different categories of data: students in the SWD subgroup, students in the Black subgroup, students in the 20-30% percentile range, and students in the 31-40% range.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Literacy walk-throughs, informal observations and formal observations have provided insight into the instructional practices 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 consistently demonstrate high levels of engagement. This rote approach to instructional delivery parallels the decline in performance % for the final progress monitoring scores. The % change for our general education population of students could result in higher PM scores with increased rigor, time on task, and monitoring of understanding.

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.

1. Develop and monitor tiered schedule of ELA supports.
2. Intensify the duration and specificity of intervention with SWD subgroup.
3. Intensify the duration and specificity of intervention with Black subgroup.
4. Provide common planning time to ensure an effective PLC process.
5. Identify high yield strategies within Tier 1 instruction.
6. Quarterly review of data and EWS information.

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

By When: Progress monitoring data reviews on a quarterly basis.

#2. 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.

TCE would like to continue to focus on the teacher implementation of their Tier 1 classroom management strategies. Provide teachers and students with resources and supports as part of a school-wide positive behavior interventions and support system so that Tier 1 strategies can be strengthened. This proactive approach will decrease the number of students being sent to the administrative office, school counselor office - 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 and reduced % of missing instruction presentations/loss of instructional time. This information/data can be tracked and measured in eSchool PLUS referrals/incidents and Performance Matters.

Monitoring:

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

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

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Samantha Sawruk (samantha.sawruk@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

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.)

We will use the evidence based PBIS program. School counselors will present daily Character Counts! lessons to support school-wide expectations. Additional programming, such as Overcoming Obstacles, will be introduced to a new morning SEL component.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

With the implementation of a school-wide, tiered PBIS plan, the faculty and staff will be empowered to create a positive classroom culture with clear expectations. Teachers will also have resources and knowledge to address problem behaviors through steps in the PBIS plan.

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.

1. Develop clearly defined school-wide PBIS expectations.
2. Provide faculty with detailed steps to take and resources 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: Samantha Sawruk (samantha.sawruk@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: PBIS/Character Counts! Data once per month

#3. 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.

Although the PM3 scores were a positive trend upwards, TCE will work to sustain and increase the achievement levels between each progress monitoring period by a higher % of change. **READING & EARLY LITERACY:** To compare performance levels, all students scored 72% on PM3, while SWD scored a 53% from PM3. Early literacy data indicated an 85% performance score on PM3, while SWD scored a 56% from PM3. For students in Grades 3-5, the overall % performance of Level 3+ was 76% on PM3 and the % of Level 3+ performance for Students with Disabilities was 53%.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Formative assessments, summative assessments and district assessment analyzed regularly as part of the PLC process. LexiaCore 5 reports and usage in small group instruction, in the classrooms. Progress monitoring results will be analyzed and compared to interventions specific to IEP goals. The continued implementation of additional intervention supports on Wednesdays will be utilized to provide focus instruction to students via work with paraprofessionals.

Monitoring:

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

We will continue to use the tiered level of supports to include the ESE support facilitators across grade levels so all students are working through the English Language Arts and Mathematics essential standards, receiving the differentiated support the students require. We will increase the monitoring and support to ensure fidelity. TCE has adjusted paraprofessionals' schedules to maximize the support for students with an IEP.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

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

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.)

Students' interventions will specifically be matched to a research-based program. Wilson Reading Systems and/or Voyager Passport will be comprehensive programs that are consistent and fluid in approach.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Additional instructional support from paraprofessionals within the general education setting will assist in a comprehensive approach to working alongside our bottom quartile of students. Increased opportunities for more intensive instruction and an increase in proficiency.

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.

1. Develop and monitor tiered schedule of support for all grade levels.
2. Utilize paraprofessionals in a different capacity with bottom quartile.
3. Utilize research-based programs to provide intensive instruction.
4. Appropriate and substantial usage and implementation of LexiaCore 5.

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

By When: Implementation dated at the start of the 23_24 SY. Quarterly data reviews and progress monitoring within the designated research-based programs.