

Alachua County Public Schools

Myra Terwilliger Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	23
Budget to Support Goals	24

Myra Terwilliger Elementary School

301 NW 62ND ST, Gainesville, FL 32607

<https://www.sbac.edu/terwilliger>

Demographics

Principal: Ashlea Zeller

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2017

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (53%) 2017-18: D (34%) 2016-17: D (38%) 2015-16: D (36%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Dustin Sims
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	N/A
Support Tier	N/A
ESSA Status	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Alachua County School Board on 10/6/2020.

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.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The mission is to establish a safe, positive, and respectful environment at Terwilliger Elementary and to ensure that all learners acquire the skills, knowledge, and a positive attitude to become independent thinkers in order to be successful both now and in future endeavors.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Terwilliger is a community of lifelong learners that demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and values required for productive global citizenship.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Zeller, Ashlea	Principal	Provides a common vision for data based instructional decision making, serves as a leader of learners to monitor student data, ensures the school-based team is implementing RTI, ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation, provides for adequate staff development to support RTI implementation, and communicates with parents regarding school-based RTI plans and Literacy Leadership Team (LLT) plans.
Alvarez, Jesely	Assistant Principal	Leads and evaluates school core content standards/programs; Identifies patterns of student need while working with the team to identify appropriate, effective intervention strategies; assists with whole school assessment programs that help to identify "at risk" students; assists in the design and implementation of progress monitoring, data collection, and data analysis. Monitors program usage of Achieve 3000 and IStation/iReady, IXL).
Weeks, Lillian	Guidance Counselor	Provides staff development on Google doc and other methods for charting progress; Conducts observations; Organizes Educational Planning Team meetings that include members of the RTI team and parents. Conducts classroom guidance lessons and conducts small group intervention to strengthen social skills. Attends IEP meetings and conducts 504 and Gifted meetings. Works closely with the school psychologist to ensure students in need of further academic evaluation are evaluated and results are shared with parents and teachers. Conducts mini lessons on social skills in classrooms; conducts bully prevention lessons in classrooms; counsels individual students regarding behavior; works with teachers to create individual behavior plans for students.
Amos, Meg	Instructional Coach	Facilitates and supports data collection activities; assists in data analysis; provides professional development and technical assistance to teachers regarding data-based instructional planning. Works with Title 1 Teacher Tutors and grade level teams to review data and form intervention groups.
Yarn, Aisha	Dean	To assist the Principal with the development, implementation and coordination of the student behavior-management program for the school. Continue to work with students on school wide behavior expectations and support teachers in implementing classroom management strategies that promote positive classroom communities.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Saturday 7/1/2017, Ashlea Zeller

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

0

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

5

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

36

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (53%) 2017-18: D (34%) 2016-17: D (38%) 2015-16: D (36%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Dustin Sims
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	N/A
Support Tier	N/A

ESSA Status	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Number of students enrolled	69	75	62	67	62	75	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	410
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25

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	0	0	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15

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	2	3	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 9/14/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	96	73	63	72	87	72	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	463
Attendance below 90 percent	4	15	11	12	15	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	72
One or more suspensions	2	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA or Math	1	2	13	10	7	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	3	19	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	2	5	4	11	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	96	73	63	72	87	72	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	463
Attendance below 90 percent	4	15	11	12	15	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	72
One or more suspensions	2	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA or Math	1	2	13	10	7	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	3	19	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	2	5	4	11	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

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	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	43%	59%	57%	43%	59%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	62%	57%	58%	47%	61%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	70%	49%	53%	41%	48%	52%
Math Achievement	36%	60%	63%	36%	63%	61%
Math Learning Gains	55%	61%	62%	39%	65%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	68%	49%	51%	28%	50%	51%
Science Achievement	35%	57%	53%	32%	55%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	38%	57%	-19%	58%	-20%
	2018	27%	56%	-29%	57%	-30%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	37%	55%	-18%	58%	-21%
	2018	28%	54%	-26%	56%	-28%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		10%				
05	2019	53%	55%	-2%	56%	-3%
	2018	23%	55%	-32%	55%	-32%
Same Grade Comparison		30%				
Cohort Comparison		25%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	39%	58%	-19%	62%	-23%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	39%	60%	-21%	62%	-23%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	38%	60%	-22%	64%	-26%
	2018	39%	60%	-21%	62%	-23%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				
05	2019	35%	57%	-22%	60%	-25%
	2018	28%	61%	-33%	61%	-33%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	33%	55%	-22%	53%	-20%
	2018	28%	55%	-27%	55%	-27%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

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	19	65	67	11	71	67					
BLK	36	63	67	28	51	56	23				
HSP	37	62		33	58						
MUL	50	61		35	67						
WHT	67	50		67	53						
FRL	39	60	67	35	56	67	35				

2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	11	41	44	8	25	25	23				
BLK	21	26	47	34	42	26	26				
HSP	23	30		31	42		29				
MUL	31	32		33	32		30				
WHT	44	30		53	60		50				
FRL	27	28	44	36	43	34	27				

2017 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 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	5	19	27	11	31	21	7				
BLK	40	48	46	30	37	29	20				
HSP	41	44		41	44						
MUL	44	35		42	58						
WHT	49	54		42	29		59				
FRL	39	43	40	34	40	33	30				

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index - All Students	53
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	369
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	50
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	46
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	48
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	53
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students 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
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	59
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	51
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

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

Our lowest performance was math achievement at 36% on the 2019 FSA. On the 2019-2020 AIMS Math Grade 4 Quarter 2 2019-20 36.3%; AIMS Math Grade 5 Quarter 2 2019-20 37.3%

We recognize our own personal growth as teachers has to continue to lie in a spiral review, usage of academic vocabulary, and content and pedagogical knowledge. We attribute the aforementioned math trends to a lack of rigorous instruction and student understanding of problem solving.

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

AIMS Math Grade 5 Quarter 2 2018-19 58.3% versus AIMS Math Grade 5 Quarter 2 2019-20 37.3% is a 21% decline.

Math achievement showed the greatest decline from the prior year by 21 percentage points. With the changes in test structure e.g. level of questions, teachers need to continue to improve instructional delivery towards standards of higher cognitive complexity. The following deficits contributed to this decline: academic vocabulary, number sense, and prior math knowledge. In addition, we recognize some students struggle with solving more abstract math problems.

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.

District AIMS Math Quarter 2 Grade 4 was 52.9%; School average 36.3%

Math achievement had the greatest gap when compared to the district average. The following factors contributed to the gap and any trends: teachers' understanding of grade level mathematical standards, the gap in students' prerequisite math skills, the ability to effectively answer abstract math word problems, and the new implementation of math curriculum, Big Ideas Math.

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

AIMS Math Grade 2 2018-19 44.1% to AIMS Math Grade 2 Quarter 2 2019-20 67.9% is a 23.8% improvement.

Our school hired an experienced educator who had a strong understanding of grade level mathematical standards. Our school continued the following actions: small group instruction and intervention in the area of math, math collaborative planning, increased focus on intervention groups in math, continued parent involvement (e.g. an additional math and science night partnered by University of Florida to engage parents in new math standards).

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

This year we have 20 students who are starting the year with 2 or more indicators in EWS. Our area of growth can be to raise their achievement level from 1 to 3 or higher to achieve proficiency.

Reflecting on the Early Warning System (EWS), we identify attendance as an area of potential concern. We would like to see our intermediate attendance below 90% decrease by 20% by the end of the year. Our second area of concern is the number of students in 5th grade with a level 1 score on their FSA in both ELA and Math. We will target these students to receive specific academic interventions to increase the likelihood of them achieving learning gains in ELA and Math.

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

1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math Achievement for all and specifically our LQ students
2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning
3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement
4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA for all and specifically our LQ students
5. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: A continued area of focus for the 2020-21 academic school year is student achievement in math proficiency.

Measureable Outcome: The measurable outcome we plan to achieve is to increase math achievement to 41% from 36%. We also plan to raise our lowest quartile in the area of math by 3%

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Jesely Alvarez (masencupja@gm.sbac.edu)

Evidence-based Strategy: The school will conduct a math academy where teachers will receive targeted professional development in math content and pedagogical knowledge from Lastinger Center, SI and district professional development staff.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The increase in teacher knowledge of the mathematical concepts will lead to an increase in student math achievement. Collaborative planning and effective teaching of standards based mathematical lessons utilizing Big Ideas Math and Connecting Math Concepts will help our students increase their understanding of grade level mathematical standards.

Action Steps to Implement

Teachers will participate in monthly PLC's in collaboration with the District math TSA, Lastinger Center, and the SI support team.

Person Responsible Ashlea Zeller (grahamae@gm.sbac.edu)

Teachers will continue to receive job embedded professional development using Big Ideas Math. Teachers will also receive Connecting Math Concepts professional development prior to using this program for differentiation to support the needs of all students within the mathematical classroom.

Person Responsible Ashlea Zeller (grahamae@gm.sbac.edu)

Teachers will target instruction towards students not mastering grade level standards through small group instruction and intervention after reviewing ISIP and iReady diagnostic data.

Person Responsible Ashlea Zeller (grahamae@gm.sbac.edu)

Classrooms will be equipped with instructional paraprofessional support.

Person Responsible Ashlea Zeller (grahamae@gm.sbac.edu)

Teachers will participate in quarterly planning days to develop a plan for effective instructional delivery of standards with a higher level of cognitive complexity.

Person Responsible Ashlea Zeller (grahamae@gm.sbac.edu)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Early Warning Systems

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: One of the school's priorities is to ensure a safe and well-rounded learning environment for all students. This was identified as a critical need due to our rise in out of school suspension rates.

In order to meet this goal, we will continue to implement our SEL curriculum from Collaborative Classrooms, Caring School Community (CSC) school wide. Per Collaborative Classrooms, Caring School Community (CSC) creates a culture of kindness and respect, where students are treated warmly in a safe and supportive environment. Teachers will begin the first 30 minutes of each day with the CSC program and receive coaching support and feedback in implementing the program with fidelity.

Measureable Outcome: Decrease the Out of School Suspension (OSS) rate by 15%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Aisha Yarn (yarnam@gm.sbac.edu)

Evidence-based Strategy: An evidence-based social and emotional learning and discipline program, Caring School Community, will be used to promote positive behavior through direct teaching of responsibility, empathy, and cooperation, creating a setting where students feel heard, known, and cared for.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The rationale for using this evidence-based program is to have a common language across our campus, have students be taught and understand appropriate behaviors, and keep families and community stakeholders well informed of our expectations.

Action Steps to Implement

Continued implementation of Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS). PBIS school rules posters are posted around campus, Twister Tickets provide a student recognition system for positive behaviors, and a variety of monthly PBIS events for students to promote PBIS at our school.

Person Responsible Aisha Yarn (yarnam@gm.sbac.edu)

We will co-host a book study with the Lastinger Center using the book, I Wish My Teacher Knew. We will discuss the impact of relationship building strategies in contributing to positive student behavior and success.

Person Responsible Ashlea Zeller (grahamae@gm.sbac.edu)

Our school counselor will continue to work closely with our social worker and community agencies to promote referrals for families and seek help for those who we have identified that need for our assistance.

Person Responsible Lillian Weeks (weekslt@gm.sbac.edu)

We will look to hire a family liaison to help with school attendance.

Person Responsible Ashlea Zeller (grahamae@gm.sbac.edu)

We will look for mentors for students who have been identified as needing additional support.

Person Responsible Ashlea Zeller (grahamae@gm.sbac.edu)

We will present monthly data on Out of School Suspension (OSS) statistics at our faculty meetings.

Person Responsible Aisha Yarn (yarnam@gm.sbac.edu)

We will have a selection of authentic children's literature to address conversations about culture and social emotional wellness. These text talks will be hosted in our morning meeting times by homeroom teachers with support from our Media Specialist.

Person Responsible Ashlea Zeller (grahamae@gm.sbac.edu)

Teachers will continue to use the Caring School Community curriculum and it is purposefully planned in our daily schedule from 7:45 to 8:15. We will also use the digital resources that have been provided to us from the company to help reach our students who have chosen the Digital Academy school option.

Person Responsible Jesely Alvarez (masencupja@gm.sbac.edu)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement

Area of Focus
Description and Rationale: At Terwilliger, we believe student engagement is tied to student performance and academic success. We want students to develop independence and take ownership of their learning.

Measureable Outcome: ELA, math, and science proficiency rates increase by 5% each on the 2021 Spring FSA & Science Assessment.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Ashlea Zeller (grahamae@gm.sbac.edu)

Evidence-based Strategy: Through job-embedded professional development, teachers will become well-informed and use best practices in the areas of explicit instruction and student engagement. Teachers will instruct students on how to monitor their own progress to improve overall academic success.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: If students are aware of their own academic performance and how they can improve via the data chats process they will increase proficiency in ELA, math, and science.

Action Steps to Implement

To increase student engagement, teachers will participate in job-embedded professional development, e.g. Lastinger Center Explicit Instruction/Student Engagement PD.

Person Responsible: Ashlea Zeller (grahamae@gm.sbac.edu)

Each semester, teachers will participate in learning walks to observe peer practice with the main focus being student engagement.

Person Responsible: Jesely Alvarez (masencupja@gm.sbac.edu)

Teachers will utilize student engagement tools and resources such as, Flocabulary, Kagan Strategies, and other cooperative learning structures.

Person Responsible: Jesely Alvarez (masencupja@gm.sbac.edu)

The leadership team, alongside the Lastinger Center, is also reading a book titled, High Leverage Practices for Inclusive Classrooms.

Person Responsible: Ashlea Zeller (grahamae@gm.sbac.edu)

Students will lead data chats with staff and community stakeholders to set academic goals to monitor their own learning throughout the school year.

Person Responsible: Ashlea Zeller (grahamae@gm.sbac.edu)

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus

Description and Rationale: A continued area of focus for the 2020-21 academic school year is student achievement in ELA proficiency.

Measureable Outcome: The measurable outcome we plan to achieve is to increase ELA achievement to 51% from 46%. We also want to raise our lowest quartile performance in ELA by 1 percentile point.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Ashlea Zeller (grahamae@gm.sbac.edu)

Evidence-based Strategy: Collaborative planning and effective teaching of standards based ELA lessons utilizing grade level appropriate text.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The increase in teacher knowledge of ELA standards will lead to an increase in student ELA achievement. Collaborative planning provides teachers of varied experience levels the opportunity to share strategies, resources, and ideas.

Action Steps to Implement

Teachers will participate in grade level planning days with support from district staff to review data and evaluate mastery of grade level standards.

Person Responsible Jesely Alvarez (masencupja@gm.sbac.edu)

Teachers will implement programs such as Saxon Phonics, MindPlay, ACT Now!, Achieve 3000 iReady, and Top Score Writing.

Person Responsible Jesely Alvarez (masencupja@gm.sbac.edu)

Teachers will participate in quarterly planning days with district support to review data and talk about mastery of standards with a higher level of cognitive complexity.

Person Responsible Jesely Alvarez (masencupja@gm.sbac.edu)

#5. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Teachers will differentiate instruction in both ELA and math so students can access and master academic standards.

Measurable Outcome: For our students in the lowest quartile, increase learning gains in ELA by 1% and math by 3% (in reference to the 2019 FSA scores). We want to raise the achievement of black students by 3% on the 2021 FSA ELA and Math assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Ashlea Zeller (grahamae@gm.sbac.edu)

Evidence-based Strategy: Small group, targeted instruction and data chats will help us make decisions for students to help increase their ELA and mathematical concept knowledge. We will also participate in job embedded culturally responsive teaching strategies with our differentiated instructional support coach.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: We want to continue to focus on our lowest quartile of students in the areas of ELA and math to increase their understanding towards proficiency.

Action Steps to Implement

Teachers will participate in student success team meetings to identify students in need of tier two and tier three instruction in both ELA and math.

Person Responsible Ashlea Zeller (grahamae@gm.sbac.edu)

Using iReady data, teachers will be able to evaluate how their instruction is impacting student ability to master grade level standards and make learning gains on this year's FSA.

Person Responsible Ashlea Zeller (grahamae@gm.sbac.edu)

Using AIMS data, teachers will be able to evaluate how their instruction is impacting student ability to master grade level standards and make learning gains on this year's FSA.

Person Responsible Ashlea Zeller (grahamae@gm.sbac.edu)

Primary classrooms will use Saxon Phonics, Language for Learning and Phonics for Reading to differentiate student needs.

Person Responsible Ashlea Zeller (grahamae@gm.sbac.edu)

Teachers will implement the program IRLA to address a variety of reading levels to support students work towards reading on grade level.

Person Responsible Ashlea Zeller (grahamae@gm.sbac.edu)

Teachers will participate in a series of JEPD that will continue to sharpen their practices when teaching diverse students and addressing their academic needs. This PD will be conducted by both our partners at the Lastinger Center as well as our own district differentiated instructional coach.

Person Responsible Ashlea Zeller (grahamae@gm.sbac.edu)

Teachers will participate in a training with Lastinger Center to talk about Text Talks and using children's literature books that reflect diverse students and their backgrounds.

Person Responsible Ashlea Zeller (grahamae@gm.sbac.edu)

#6. Leadership specifically relating to Leadership Development

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Terwilliger will have the chance to work with a Principal Specialist. The School Improvement Principal Specialist will support the identified schools in three key areas; they will help the principals of those identified schools hone their skills around accountable and shared leadership, maintain focus on Standards-based instruction and learning, and work with the school to cultivate a positive school culture and environment.

Measureable Outcome: The school will receive a school grade of C or better to show positive movement in all three areas of ELA, Math and Science on the 2021 Spring Assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Ashlea Zeller (grahamae@gm.sbac.edu)

Evidence-based Strategy: The Principal Specialist and leadership team will collaborate to review student data and effective teaching practices.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Terwilliger was able to make a C grade in 2018-2019. The goal would be to maintain improvement in the area of overall school performance and works towards closing the achievement gap and raising the performance of our lower quartile students in both ELA and Math.

Action Steps to Implement

Monthly PLC meetings with the Specialist and Leadership team at Terwilliger to discuss data and next steps.

Person Responsible Jesely Alvarez (masencupja@gm.sbac.edu)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

At Terwilliger, we will continue to focus on mastery of standards, standards aligned instruction, resource selection and continued collaborative planning as well as data diving to evaluate our students performance throughout the year so we can intervene and predict permanence on the 2021 FSA in ELA, Math and Science. We look to examine engagement strategies, explicit instruction and best instructional practices through Learning Walks, discussion and JEPD.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

One of the school's priorities is to ensure a safe and well-rounded learning environment for all students. This was identified as a critical need due to our disproportionate amount of African American males and their OSS rate 27%.

In order to meet this goal, we will continue to implement our SEL curriculum from Collaborative Classrooms, Caring School Community (CSC) school wide. Per Collaborative Classrooms, Caring School Community (CSC) creates a culture of kindness and respect, where students are treated warmly in a safe and supportive environment. Teachers will begin the first 30 minutes of each day with the CSC program and receive coaching support and feedback in implementing the program with fidelity.

An evidence-based social and emotional learning and discipline program, Caring School Community, promotes positive behavior through direct teaching of responsibility, empathy, and cooperation, creating a setting where students feel heard, known, and cared for. Teachers will begin the first 30 minutes of each day with the CSC program and receive coaching support and feedback in implementing the program with fidelity.

Continued implementation of Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS). PBIS school rules posters are posted around campus, Twister Tickets provide a student recognition system for positive behaviors, and a variety of monthly PBIS events for students promote PBIS at our school.

We will host a monthly PLC book club with UF with the book, Help for Billy. We will discuss how some students are impacted by trauma and factors that can be contributing to their behavior

success or the decline of that success.

Our guidance counselor will continue to work closely with our social worker and community agencies to promote referrals for families and seek help for those who we have identified that need for our assistance.

We will look to rehire a family liaison to help with school attendance.

We will incorporate lunch buddies for retained third graders and others who can benefit from the program. Our staff will also take on a personal mission of mentoring a number of students who have been identified as students who need additional people to believe in their success outside of their teacher and family.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Part V: Budget

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math				\$10,386.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	369-Technology-Related Rentals	0311 - Myra Terwilliger Elem. School	Title, I Part A		\$2,636.00
<i>Notes: Reflex Math</i>						
	5100	520-Textbooks	0311 - Myra Terwilliger Elem. School	Title, I Part A		\$7,750.00
<i>Notes: Connecting Math Concepts</i>						
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Early Warning Systems				\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Student Engagement				\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				\$427,144.63
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	369-Technology-Related Rentals	0311 - Myra Terwilliger Elem. School	Title, I Part A		\$18,600.00
<i>Notes: IReady for ELA</i>						
	5100	369-Technology-Related Rentals	0311 - Myra Terwilliger Elem. School	Title, I Part A		\$5,806.00
<i>Notes: Achieve 3000</i>						
	5100	520-Textbooks	0311 - Myra Terwilliger Elem. School	Title, I Part A		\$6,000.08
<i>Notes: Saxon Phonics</i>						
	5100	120-Classroom Teachers	0311 - Myra Terwilliger Elem. School	Title, I Part A		\$346,526.48

			<i>Notes: Classroom Reduction & Intervention</i>			
	5100	120-Classroom Teachers	0311 - Myra Terwilliger Elem. School	Title, I Part A		\$1,960.00
			<i>Notes: Title I Lead Teacher Supplement</i>			
	5100	390-Other Purchased Services	0311 - Myra Terwilliger Elem. School	Title, I Part A		\$2,987.40
			<i>Notes: Substitutes for class-size reduction units</i>			
	5100		0311 - Myra Terwilliger Elem. School	Title, I Part A		\$45,264.67
			<i>Notes: Additional instructions resources</i>			
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation				\$8,082.80
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	520-Textbooks	0311 - Myra Terwilliger Elem. School	Title, I Part A		\$1,527.00
			<i>Notes: Language for Learning</i>			
	6400	310-Professional and Technical Services	0311 - Myra Terwilliger Elem. School	Title, I Part A		\$3,000.00
			<i>Notes: American Reading Company - IRLA</i>			
	5100	520-Textbooks	0311 - Myra Terwilliger Elem. School	Title, I Part A		\$3,555.80
			<i>Notes: Phonics for Reading</i>			
6	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Leadership: Leadership Development				\$17,436.25
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	6300	110-Administrators	0311 - Myra Terwilliger Elem. School	Title, I Part A		\$17,436.25
			<i>Notes: Principal Specialist</i>			
					Total:	\$463,049.68