



SECTION 1: THE BACKGROUND

School Name: Timbercrest Middle School

Year: 2026-27

The Central Vision (North Star)

At Timbercrest Middle School, we are a community that is respectful, responsible and inclusive. We are committed to creating a school community that ensures equity for all, done through our continued work to develop positive relationships with the focus on our students feeling a sense of belonging, and connectedness to school. We challenge and support all students to make significant growth in essential life and academic skills.

Focus Population: Who is furthest from racial and educational justice?

Multilingual Learners / English Language Learners and students identifying as Hispanic/Latino, followed closely by Students with Disabilities — the three subgroups with the widest reading gaps in this year's data (see Section 2). This continues and sharpens last year's Hispanic/Latino equity focus based on the current data.

Learning Problem (Big Picture)

Timbercrest students decode and access grade-level text well — but a persistent gap opens up when they have to comprehend informational/nonfiction text and reason about it in writing (finding evidence, elaborating, and organizing an argument). That gap is present for all students, but it is dramatically wider for Multilingual Learners and Students with Disabilities, and moderately wider for Hispanic/Latino students, than for the school as a whole.

SECTION 2: THE SYSTEMIC NARRATIVE

ROOT CAUSE

The central node or pattern that connects our academic, behavioral, and cultural challenges.

The Holistic Inquiry	Response
The Surface Symptoms	<i>What data points are flashing red (Spring 2025-26)?</i> • SBAC ELA — met/exceeded standard: Grade 6: 76.2%, Grade 7: 84.4%, Grade 8: 77.6% (n≈666 total). Grade 8 dips back down after Grade 7's peak. • SBAC writing sub-scores (all grades, essays scored): Conventions averages 84% of possible points — but Evidence/Elaboration and Organization/Purpose each average only ~56%. Students can write correctly; they struggle to elaborate with evidence and organize an argument. • i-Ready Reading, Spring: 69.1% of students on/above grade level overall (Gr 6: 70.4%, Gr 7: 74.4%, Gr 8: 63.2%). • i-Ready comprehension sub-domains (Spring, % on/above): Vocabulary 71.9%, Comprehension: Literature 69.0%, Comprehension: Informational Text 65.4% (the lowest) — while

	decoding skills are near ceiling (Phonics 98.1%, High-Frequency Words 99.1%). • Equity gaps in overall reading placement (Spring): English Language Learners 29.4% on/above vs. 70.2% for non-ELL peers (n=17); Students with Disabilities 44.9% vs. 72.0%; Hispanic/Latino students 62.5% vs. 69.6%. • English Language Learners (ELL). Our English Language Learners (n=17) show the largest academic gap in the building, with 29.4% on or above grade level in Spring i-Ready Reading compared to 70.2% of their non-ELL peers. Panorama tells us this is not a connection problem. These students report the strongest supportive relationships (99%), sense of belonging (78%), and value of school (69% vs. 56%) of any group. However, they report lower classroom effort (71% vs. 83%), positive feelings (64% vs. 75%), and self-efficacy (54% vs. 66%). • Students with Disabilities (SWD). Students with disabilities are 44.9% on or above grade level in Spring i-Ready Reading, compared to 72.0% of their peers. Panorama shows lower ratings across nearly every scale, with the largest gaps in self-efficacy (54% vs. 66%), self-reflection (49% vs. 58%), sense of belonging (66% vs. 74%), and valuing of school (48% vs. 56%). Supportive relationships remain strong (91%). • Hispanic/Latino Students. Hispanic/Latino students show the smallest academic gap (62.5% on or above grade level in Spring i-Ready Reading vs. 69.6%), but Panorama suggests their confidence is lagging behind current performance. Self-efficacy (56% vs. 66%), self-reflection (49% vs. 58%), and valuing of school (48% vs. 56%) all trail the school average, even though supportive relationships are high (90%).
The Systemic Root	<i>What are the causes? Are they interconnected and how?</i> Foundational decoding skills are essentially mastered schoolwide, which points to a set of interconnected, fixable causes rather than a single deficit: • Core instruction and grading reward correct mechanics (Conventions) more than they explicitly teach or assess evidence-based reasoning. • Comprehension support for informational/nonfiction text is not yet embedded consistently across content areas, not just ELA. • Academic vocabulary and text-structure demands fall hardest on Multilingual Learners, who are still building English proficiency alongside content. • Current staffing and common-planning time for ELL and Special Education co-teaching are not yet sized to the gap for those two groups. • Without a shared, schoolwide instructional language for these strategies, a strategy taught in one classroom doesn't transfer across a student's full schedule.

SECTION 3: THE INTERCONNECTED ACTION MAP

THEORY OF ACTION

Based on the data and root cause analysis, we believe that if we prioritize explicit instruction in academic vocabulary, text annotation/close reading, and structured evidence-based discussion across every content area, backed by protected intervention time and common planning for ELA, ELL, and Special Education staff, then our Multilingual Learners, Students with Disabilities, and Hispanic/Latino students will close the gap in informational-text comprehension and evidence-based writing. We believe this because when students get repeated, explicit practice building and defending a claim with evidence across multiple classes, not just ELA, their comprehension and their confidence as readers and thinkers grow alongside their writing skill.

SYSTEMIC GOAL

Increase every student's ability to comprehend informational text and reason about it in writing, with intensified, embedded support for Multilingual Learners, Students with Disabilities, and Hispanic/Latino students, to close the Evidence/Elaboration and Organization gap identified in Section 2.

Multidimensional Systems	Strategic Activities (The “Work”)	Resource Inputs (The “Fuel”)
Instruction <i>(Instructional & Academic)</i>	Activity: ● Prioritize and facilitate staff PD and collaboration on domain-specific reading standards and the district's three Tier 1 strategies — Explicit Academic Vocabulary Instruction, Strategic Text Annotation & Close Reading, and Structured Academic Discussion & Text-Based Response, starting in ELA and expanding across content areas (District AOP 4.1.c.1), in partnership with ELA teachers (4.1.c.2). ● Targeted small-group reteaching of informational-text comprehension strategies during advisory for identified ELL, SPED, and Hispanic/Latino students. ● Continue and expand co-taught sections with explicit evidence-based (claim-evidence-reasoning) writing supports.	Resources: ● PLC time and August-November PD days ● ELL and Special Education co-teaching staffing ● Advisory intervention blocks ● Academic Moves for College and Career Readiness (Burke & Gilmore) ● Reading Nonfiction (Beers & Probst)
Culture <i>(Cultural & Emotional)</i>	Activity: ● Partner with the SDLT, students, and families to create and promote a school-wide focus on reading comprehension (District AOP). ● Advisory lessons that connect students' own backgrounds and identities to informational texts (culturally responsive text selection).	Resources: ● SEL/advisory curriculum time ● SDLT ● ELL department collaboration ● Interpretation/translation support for family sessions ● Counseling team

	• Student “text talks,” oral rehearsal of a claim and evidence before writing, particularly to benefit Multilingual Learners. • Listening sessions with Hispanic/Latino and multilingual families, and ensure equitable access to counseling/mental health supports regardless of language, disability, or background (District AOP 3.4).	• Neurodiversity-Affirming Schools (Kirchner-Morris & Morin)
Structure <i>(Structural & Policy)</i>	Activity: • Protect Advisory time specifically for informational-text small-group reteaching, without pulling students from electives. • Build common planning time between ELA, Special Education, and ELL teachers into the master schedule. • Revise grading/feedback practice so Evidence/Elaboration and Organization get their own explicit feedback and reteach cycle, not just a single holistic writing grade.	Resources: • Master Schedule • PLC data-review protocol using iReady and SBAC subscores

SECTION 4: THE RIPPLE EFFECT SCAN

SYSTEMS THINKING

Before acting, we scan for how this plan might unintentionally hurt another part of the system.

Potential Negative Ripple	The Mitigation Strategy	Cross-System Connection
Pulling identified students for extra reading/writing intervention during Advisory could crowd out SEL/community-building time or elective access.	• Intervention scheduled only within Advisory time, never electives. • Weekly SEL/advisory rotation stays intact and is monitored.	Connects to Belonging/Climate Goal.
Asking content-area teachers (science, social studies) to embed more informational-text writing could raise workload or expose that some feel underprepared to teach writing explicitly.	• PLC-based PD: 1–2 embedded CER writing tasks per semester, not a full redesign.	Connects to Staff PD & Retention Goal.
The district's Sept./Oct. 2026 deadlines (Tier 1 PD, then SDLT/student/family engagement)	• Front-load Tier 1 strategy PD into August in-service days/September PD.	Connects to District AOP Implementation Goal.

compress a lot of new work into the first six weeks of school.	Sequence SDLT and family engagement for October, after staff have first exposure to the strategies.	
Naming Multilingual Learners, Students with Disabilities, and Hispanic/Latino students as the focus population could unintentionally feel deficit-framed rather than asset-based if not handled with care.	- Center student voice and agency in text-talks and family listening sessions. - Share growth data, not just gap data, with staff and families.	Connects to Identity-Affirming Environments Goal (REJ Framework).

SECTION 5: MONITORING THE WHOLE

LEAD INDICATORS

We don't just measure the test score (Lagging). We measure the health of the change (Leading).

Metric Type	Indicator Description	Frequency of Review
The Process Metric <i>(Are we doing it?)</i>	% of ELA and content-area classrooms observed using explicit claim-evidence-reasoning (CER) writing instruction. % of ELA and content-area classrooms observed using explicit Sign Posts from Notice and Notes.	Monthly walkthroughs
The Experience Metric <i>(How does it feel?)</i>	Student exit-ticket/survey confidence in "I can find evidence in what I read to support my ideas," disaggregated by ELL, SPED, and Hispanic/Latino status.	Quarterly
The Outcome Metric <i>(Did it work?)</i>	- i-Ready Comprehension: Informational Text placement (% on/above grade level), disaggregated by subgroup. - SBAC Evidence/Elaboration + Organization/Purpose average scores. - District AOP 3.1.a/b, 3.2.a, 3.4.a, 4.1.c, 4.2.a: % of all students, and % of Hispanic/Latino students, reading on grade level by the end of 8th grade.	- i-Ready: Fall/Winter/Spring - SBAC: Spring / Semester review

Summary of the Changes

(How has the work articulated in the SAP changed the learning experience for your focus population? What are the next logical steps to address your learning problem?)

To be completed at mid-year and end-of-year review, once Fall/Winter/Spring i-Ready and classroom walkthrough data are in.