

Orange County Public Schools

# Timber Creek High



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>16</b>

# Timber Creek High

1001 AVALON PARK BLVD, Orlando, FL 32828

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

## Demographics

**Principal: Kelly Paduano**

Start Date for this Principal: 6/15/2016

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2018-19 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	<i>[Data Not Available]</i>
<b>2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Asian Students Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: A (67%) 2017-18: A (67%) 2016-17: B (58%) 2015-16: A (67%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">LaShawn Russ-Porterfield</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	N/A

\* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

## School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Orange County School Board.

## SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at [www.floridacims.org](http://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.

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

#### 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
Paduano, Kelly	Principal	
Flakes, Daphne	Assistant Principal	
Seavers, Vickie	Instructional Coach	
Wasko, Marc	Assistant Principal	
Sheeran, Richard	Assistant Principal	
Aliberti, Matthew	Dean	
Abromavage, Dorothea	Instructional Coach	
DeLeon, Yokasta	Dean	
Schall, Jo Lynn	Other	SAFE Coordinator
Petro, Tina	Instructional Technology	
Sherry, Shawna	Other	CTE Career Specialist
Hemann, Collen	Administrative Support	
Boettner, Jeff	Assistant Principal	
Mahaffey, Melanie	Instructional Media	

### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Wednesday 6/15/2016, Kelly Paduano

**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.*

8

**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.*

7

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

175

**Demographic Data**

<b>2020-21 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2018-19 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	<i>[Data Not Available]</i>
<b>2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Asian Students Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: A (67%) 2017-18: A (67%) 2016-17: B (58%) 2015-16: A (67%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">LaShawn Russ-Porterfield</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

**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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	912	861	848	919	3540
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	76	50	85	94	305
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	23	45	31	127
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44	95	89	74	302
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	97	76	125	118	416
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	110	64	66	86	326
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100	61	64	99	324

**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	0	0	0	0	0	114	88	119	129	450

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

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

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Thursday 7/23/2020

**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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	834	836	889	799	3358
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	139	149	185	184	657
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65	32	43	34	174
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	131	147	103	123	504
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	132	148	86	10	376

**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	0	0	0	0	0	100	105	93	76	374

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

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

**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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	834	836	889	799	3358
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	139	149	185	184	657
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65	32	43	34	174
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	131	147	103	123	504
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	132	148	86	10	376

**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	0	0	0	0	0	100	105	93	76	374

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

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

**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	73%	55%	56%	69%	51%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	61%	53%	51%	52%	46%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	50%	40%	42%	32%	34%	41%



School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Achievement	58%	43%	51%	53%	34%	49%
Math Learning Gains	52%	49%	48%	42%	33%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	46%	46%	45%	31%	33%	39%
Science Achievement	86%	70%	68%	77%	64%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	81%	73%	73%	75%	67%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey					
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)				Total
	9	10	11	12	
	(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
09	2019	75%	52%	23%	55%	20%
	2018	74%	50%	24%	53%	21%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	69%	50%	19%	53%	16%
	2018	69%	49%	20%	53%	16%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	85%	67%	18%	67%	18%
2018	85%	62%	23%	65%	20%

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
Compare		0%			
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	80%	69%	11%	70%	10%
2018	76%	65%	11%	68%	8%
Compare		4%			
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	44%	63%	-19%	61%	-17%
2018	47%	61%	-14%	62%	-15%
Compare		-3%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	62%	53%	9%	57%	5%
2018	73%	65%	8%	56%	17%
Compare		-11%			

**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	26	40	31	28	54	55	48	55		95	29
ELL	43	57	53	45	51	46	67	56		98	54
ASN	88	67	54	76	42		96	91		98	82
BLK	65	59	50	40	43	33	73	63		98	43
HSP	66	57	50	55	54	49	81	74		98	62
MUL	78	61	50	71	68		94	95		100	67
WHT	80	64	49	65	51	47	90	90		100	72
FRL	58	57	52	48	53	48	75	65		98	58

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	32	48	46	33	22	19	50	44		89	19
ELL	27	50	46	47	43	31	70	56		94	56
ASN	88	74		82	71		96	83		100	82
BLK	61	54	34	62	44	35	78	73		99	48
HSP	64	59	47	59	45	35	83	69		97	53
MUL	72	65	58	71	52		94	88		100	60
WHT	83	71	58	75	55	52	91	83		98	68
FRL	59	56	44	56	45	40	81	64		96	50
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	23	26	19	19	29	24	42	47		90	23
ELL	29	32	24	31	36	29	37	42		97	33
ASN	86	72		76	61	40	92	82		95	63
BLK	60	47	29	40	35	29	73	64		98	43
HSP	56	44	29	42	36	31	65	67		97	48
MUL	78	61		58	45	27	85	70		95	48
WHT	77	57	40	63	48	32	85	85		99	60
FRL	54	43	28	40	35	36	62	68		95	39

**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	66
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	59
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	731
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	46
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	57
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	77
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	57
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	64
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	76
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	70
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	61
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.**

The area of lowest performance for 2019 was the lowest 25th percentile for math. Timber Creek High School, however, made 6% gains in this area as we went from 40% of our math students in the lowest 25th percentile making gains to 46% of our students making gains in 2019. The analysis of this component by subgroup shows that all the subgroups made gains except for black students and white students. A 2% decrease occurred for black students while a 5% decrease occurred for white students. The decrease, however, did not appear to be significant when comparing the data to the other subgroups. Hispanic students, students with disabilities, and English language learners made significant increases of 14%, 36%, and 15% respectively. The strategies that were incorporated in the mathematics classroom appeared to be positively affecting overall student performance for the lowest 25th percentile and for most subgroups in this section. The team was unable to determine a specific contributing factor to the overall success. Individual student needs and the lack of foundational math skills may have contributed to the decrease in performance. Progress monitoring data in March, 2020 showed that 68% of algebra students and 53% of the geometry students were obtaining mastery of the standards. The subgroups that experienced decreases will continue to be monitored using formative and summative assessments throughout the school year to determine whether or not progress is being made.

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

Math achievement is the data component that showed the greatest decline with a 9% decrease in students scoring a level 3 or above on the algebra or geometry end-of-course exam. In 2018, 67% of students passed the algebra or geometry exam while 58% of students passed in 2019. A decrease of 3% occurred on the algebra EOC, and a decrease of 11% occurred on the geometry exam. A further analysis of the data shows that none of the subgroups increased in math achievement. A contributing factor to the decrease in math student achievement may have been advanced placement testing occurring during the same timeframe as the end-of-course exams. The changes in daily bell schedules as well as preparation for multiple tests may have affected student achievement. Another contributing factor may have been that these students were not being referred to MTSS during the 2018-2019 school year where data could be gathered to determine the need for additional support. Progress monitoring data in March, 2020 showed that 68% of algebra students and 53% of the geometry students were obtaining mastery of the standards. Based on this data, projections indicated that significantly more students would be successful on the math state assessments. Data will continue to be gathered this year to monitor for improvement, and documentation of students referred to MTSS, in math, will be closely monitored. The testing calendar will be monitored, and technology will be utilized to help students review and stay organized.

**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 High School scored higher than the state in the eight tested areas that contributed to the school grade for 2018-2019. The scores ranged from 1% higher (math lowest 25th percentile) to 18% higher (science achievement). English Language Arts achievement was the second highest gap with Timber Creek students performing 17% higher than the state. The English Language Arts, science, and social studies school grade components had greater positive gaps than the math components. A contributing factor to the success may have been the schoolwide focus on reading strategies in all subject areas. Another contributing factor may have been utilizing support personnel to provide instruction in small groups for students who were projected to be between a level 2 and 3 on the state tests.

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

The most improvement occurred in the area of the lowest 25th percentile making gains for math. The percentage of students making gains in this area improved from 40% to 46%. In order to address the need for increasing student achievement in math, professional learning communities for algebra and geometry met on a regular basis in order to collaborate on curriculum and analyze student data. Instructional decisions were made based on formative and summative assessments. Algebra and geometry teachers used reading strategies to help students increase their comprehension of mathematics word problems. Instructional personnel were strategically placed in algebra and geometry to provide support for students in the lowest 25th percentile. These actions were continued during the 2019-2020 school year.

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

An analysis of the Early Warning System data identified course failure in math and students with 2 or more indicators as areas of concern. Overall, approximately 12% of students failed a math class while approximately 13% of the students were tied to two or more warning indicators. The highest percentages in the two areas were occurring with the 11th and 12th grade students. The data shows that 15% of 11th graders and 13% of 12th graders struggled with their math courses, and 14% of 11th and 12th graders corresponded to two or more indicators.

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

1. Decrease the number of students failing a math course.
2. Increase English Language Arts, math, science, and social studies achievement.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:

**#1. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Timber Creek High School is working to build and establish a culture for social and emotional learning with adults and students. Academic learning is enhanced when students have opportunities to interact with others and make meaningful connections to subject material. In an analysis of the Cognia data, students expressed dissatisfaction with instructional strategies that led to achievement as well as feeling connected to an adult that they felt would advocate for them. FSA data and Early Warning Signs indicator data consistently showed that students were consistently struggling with math. In order for students to be successful, we need to focus on ensuring a school culture for social and emotional learning as we work towards helping students to be successful in their math courses.

**Measureable Outcome:** By June 2021, Timber Creek High School will decrease the number of students who are failing a math class by 2% as measured by the Early Warning Signs indicator data.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Daphne Flakes (daphne.flakes@ocps.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Timber Creek High School will use distributive leadership and social and emotional learning to strengthen team dynamics and collaboration in order to build academic expertise with all students.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** In order to achieve large-scale and sustainable improvement, it is necessary to invest in the collective capacity of a school building. To create a culture of social and emotional learning with adults 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 team dynamics necessary to collectively support positive organizational improvement and change. Research indicates that for sustainable improvement effort to be realized, collective ownership is necessary. Through a distributive leadership model our school can implement efficient and sustainable continuous practices that will support the social, emotional, and academic development of every student.

**Action Steps to Implement**

Professional development will be provided on helping teachers understand how social and emotional learning is connected to instructional strategies.

**Person Responsible:** Kelly Paduano (kelly.paduano@ocps.net)

Mathematics professional learning communities will collaborate on utilizing instructional strategies that support social and emotional learning. Data will be analyzed in order to make instructional decisions.

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

The district's professional learning community will focus on social and emotional learning. The training will be provided to school staff.

**Person Responsible:** Kelly Paduano (kelly.paduano@ocps.net)

**Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities**

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

**Academic achievement will continue to be monitored in English language arts, math, science and social studies. Progress monitoring data as well as classroom assessments will be analyzed by professional learning communities to make instructional decisions.**

## 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.

Timber Creek High School builds a positive school culture and environment by promoting student success. Our motto is "Together we will ensure success for all students." Social media such as Facebook, Twitter, and Instagram is utilized to promote a common message. Feedback is encouraged through these resources. Meetings with student input groups and professional learning communities help to create the culture of the school. The School Advisory Council, parent/teacher/student association, booster clubs, and parent groups (formal and informal) are surveyed for their ideas. All groups are encouraged to communicate with each other to determine if all are working towards the common goal. Communication is a top priority among all the stakeholders in order to ensure academic success in a supportive environment.

### 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

<b>1</b>	<b>III.A.</b>	<b>Areas of Focus: Culture &amp; Environment: Social Emotional Learning</b>				<b>\$0.00</b>
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
			1631 - Timber Creek High			\$0.00
			<i>Notes: Additional funding cannot be indicated at this time until we find out if grant applications were approved.</i>			
					<b>Total:</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>