Freedom Elementary School

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Freedom Elementary School

1395 S BLUE LAKE AVE, Deland, FL 32724

http://myvolusiaschools.org/school/freedom/pages/default.aspx

Demographics

Principal: Paul Nehrig M

Start Date for this Principal: 6/28/2019

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	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	87%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (61%) 2017-18: C (48%) 2016-17: B (56%) 2015-16: B (57%) 2014-15: A (69%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	

ESSA Status	TS&I
* 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 Volusia 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.

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.

Table of Contents

Freedom Elementary School

1395 S BLUE LAKE AVE, Deland, FL 32724

http://myvolusiaschools.org/school/freedom/pages/default.aspx

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2018-19 Title I School**	**2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	No	57%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	45%

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	B	C	B	B

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

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 (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at https://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 Freedom community will provide a strong foundation for academic and social growth to support our students in achieving their personal best.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Through the individual commitment of all, our students will graduate with the knowledge, skills, and values necessary to be successful contributors to our democratic society.

School Leadership Team

Membership
Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Wycuff, Stacy	School Counselor	Schedule and meet with small groups of students for counseling; liaison for outside counseling & support; leads Social Emotional Learning for Freedom Elementary.
Boyd-Walker, Joy	Principal	Oversee school functions and budget; evaluate instructional staff and school leadership team; steer school vision, mission and School Improvement Plan
Hoover, Leigh	Instructional Coach	Schedule and provide professional development for teachers; facilitate grade level PLCs; lead coaching cycles with individual teachers
Ross, Lauren	Instructional Media	Oversee Media Center, including meeting with classes, leading school news and facilitating book clubs.
Richling, Lisa	Teacher, K-12	3rd Grade Teacher
Goldsmith, William	Assistant Principal	Oversee facilities and safety & security for school campus; evaluate instructional staff and paraprofessionals; assist with steering the school's vision, mission and School Improvement Plan.
Flesch, Melissa	Teacher, K-12	Kindergarten Teacher
Ratcliff, Paul	Teacher, K-12	4th Grade Teacher
Land, Tanya	Teacher, K-12	Exceptional Student Education Teacher

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	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	8	16	13	13	9	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	69
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	4	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	4	12	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42

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	3	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14

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	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)

54

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/26/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Attendance below 90 percent		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in ELA or Math		
Level 1 on statewide assessment		

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

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	
Attendance below 90 percent	9	17	11	13	7	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67
One or more suspensions	0	3	1	2	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	4	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	5	12	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43

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	1	4	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17

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	69%	56%	57%	66%	55%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	63%	56%	58%	53%	53%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	53%	46%	53%	47%	44%	52%
Math Achievement	68%	59%	63%	68%	62%	61%
Math Learning Gains	55%	56%	62%	50%	58%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	48%	43%	51%	42%	47%	51%
Science Achievement	74%	57%	53%	69%	59%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
Number of students enrolled	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	8 ()	16 ()	13 ()	13 ()	9 ()	10 ()	69 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	0 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	4 ()	7 ()	11 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	4 ()	12 ()	26 ()	42 (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.

NOTE: 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	
03	2019	70%	58%	12%	58%	12%	
	2018	67%	56%	11%	57%	10%	
Same Grade Comparison		3%					
Cohort Comparison							
04	2019	65%	54%	11%	58%	7%	
	2018	61%	54%	7%	56%	5%	
Same Grade Comparison		4%					
Cohort Comparison		-2%					
05	2019	66%	54%	12%	56%	10%	
	2018	49%	51%	-2%	55%	-6%	
Same Grade Comparison		17%					
Cohort Comparison		5%					

MATH							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison	
03	2019	68%	60%	8%	62%	6%	
	2018	75%	58%	17%	62%	13%	
Same Grade Comparison		-7%					
Cohort Comparison							
04	2019	69%	59%	10%	64%	5%	
	2018	69%	60%	9%	62%	7%	
Same Grade Comparison		0%					
Cohort Comparison		-6%					
05	2019	60%	54%	6%	60%	0%	
	2018	55%	57%	-2%	61%	-6%	
Same Grade Comparison		5%					
Cohort Comparison		-9%					

SCIENCE							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison	
05	2019	70%	56%	14%	53%	17%	
	2018	49%	56%	-7%	55%	-6%	
Same Grade Comparison		21%					
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	31	35	34	39	37	35	39				

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
ELL	51	47	45	57	50	46	75				
ASN	67	77		93	77						
BLK	57	59	40	48	41	53	45				
HSP	62	51	38	58	45	36	78				
WHT	77	68	76	76	59	44	83				
FRL	57	56	53	55	52	45	61				

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	24	20	17	41	32	37	14				
ELL	43	39	36	49	48	50					
ASN	72	55		83	73						
BLK	28	33	29	41	37	24	5				
HSP	57	46	39	57	48	38	36				
MUL	36			64							
WHT	73	48	5	79	61	45	69				
FRL	47	40	28	56	46	35	34				

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	28	36	48	49	42	50	52				
ELL	50	44	47	69	63	58					
ASN	88			94							
BLK	46	43	43	57	56	58	41				
HSP	54	46	42	54	40	38	53				
MUL	58			50							
WHT	75	61	58	75	52	36	82				
FRL	55	46	47	57	46	45	58				

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)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	61
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	55
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	485
Total Components for the Federal Index	8

ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	36
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	53
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	79
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	49
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	53
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	

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%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	69
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	54
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

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.

Math was our lowest performing subject area, in particular the lowest 25th percentile scored at a 48% proficiency level, which was well below our overall average of 68%.

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

Our math scores plateaued from 68% in 2018 to 68% in 2019. One factor that may have contributed to our proficiency levels in math plateauing was a lack of curriculum resources for math interventions. In addition to this, out of our 7 teachers in 3rd grade, only 3 were able to stay for the duration of the school year, this turnover rate likely had an adverse impact on student achievement. Another factor may have been scheduling conflicts, which resulted in ESE support facilitation teachers unable to attend grade-level PLCs to collaborate on instruction.

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.

The greatest gap when compared to the state average was our math learning gains, there was a 7% difference when compared to the state (Freedom Elementary scored 55%, while the state average score was 62%).
Factors that may have contributed to this gap include a lack of curriculum resources for math interventions and scheduling conflicts, which prevented ESE support facilitation teachers from attending grade-level PLCs to collaborate on instruction.

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

Science showed the greatest improvement going from 51% proficiency levels to 74%.
A new action that contributed to this improvement was an increased focus on 5th grade PLCs. Within the 5th grade PLCs teachers and administrators analyzed state mandated science assessments and planned standards-based instruction. Additional factors that may have contributed to improvement include:
- Science after school tutoring in the Spring of 2019
- Technology teacher integrated science lessons based on needs

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

There was a total of 67 students with attendance below 90%.

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

1. Increase overall math achievement
2. Increase overall achievement for our students with disabilities in math (39%) and reading (31%)
3. Maintain and/or improve our science achievement
4. Decrease our student absences - with a focus on tardies.
5. Target students for academic coaching, based on early warning signs.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Math Lowest Quartile
Rationale	The students in our lowest 25% scored at a proficiency level of 48%. This was below the state average of 51 % and is also well below our school average 68 % math proficiency.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Increase rate of math proficiency for lowest quartile students from 48 % to 53 %.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Joy Boyd-Walker (jrboyd1@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Increase teacher-led small group intervention for lowest quartile of students using district approved and/or research-based resources.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Research has demonstrated that response to intervention has proven to be an effective method to increase student learning and achievement. John Hattie found that this had an effect size effect of 1.29 on student achievement.

Action Step	
Description	1. Vertical team meetings at the beginning of the year to get instructional input from previous teachers. 2. Identify and communicate available math intervention resources in writing and coordinate professional learning for implementation. 3. Administer i-Ready Diagnostic and review 2019 Spring FSA data to establish baseline data and needs. 4. Monthly PLCs for data analysis and planning for student groupings and appropriate math interventions-ESE teacher schedules will allow for them to attend regularly. 5. Teachers will document in lesson plans specific math interventions used during small group instruction and learning target. 6. Coaching cycles to support teacher success with math small group intervention. 7. Quarterly learning walks with coaches, teachers and administration during small group math intervention. 8. Monitor math intervention instruction through ongoing administrative walk throughs with feedback. 9. First and second semester progress monitoring meetings with Principal's Leadership Team and each classroom teacher to discuss lowest quartile progress and needs. 10. SEL will be implented at the beginning of each day, as built into the master schedule, to ensure an inclusive classroom environment where all students can reach their full potential in math.
Person Responsible	Joy Boyd-Walker (jrboyd1@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#2	
Title	ELA Students With Disabilities
Rationale	After completing the Needs Assessment and Analysis it was evident that Students with Disabilities (SWD) were one of our lowest performing sub groups in English Language Arts. Our SWD had a 31 % achievement level, which is substantially lower than the 69 % proficiency level of our general population.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	This school year we hope to increase the ELA proficiency levels of our students with disabilities from 31 % to 36 %.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Joy Boyd-Walker (jrboyd1@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Teachers will utilize small group core ELA instruction to increase proficiency levels for our students with disabilities.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	If we increase the percentage of teachers effectively teaching ELA in small group, students with disabilities will benefit from this core instruction, as well as their IEP driven support facilitation instruction. John Hattie has found that small group intervention instruction for students with disabilities has had a .77 effect size on student achievement.
Action Step	
Description	1. ESE teachers regularly conference with general education teacher to review reading IEP goals and accommodations. 2. Vertical team meetings at the beginning of the year to get instructional input from previous teachers. 3. Administer i-Ready Diagnostic and review 2019 Spring FSA data to establish baseline data and needs. 4. Monthly PLCs for ELA data analysis and planning for ELA small group instruction. 5. Ensure the PLC schedule and ESE and ELL teachers' schedules allow for ESE teachers to be present during PLCs, so collaboration can take place between general education and support facilitation teachers. 6. Coaching cycles to support teacher success with ELA small group instruction. 7. Quarterly learning walks with coaches, teachers and administration during small group ELA instruction. 8. Monitor ELA small group instruction through ongoing administrative walk throughs with feedback. 9. First and second semester progress monitoring meetings with Principal's Leadership Team and each classroom teacher to discuss ELA progress for SWD. 10. SEL will be implemented at the beginning of each day as built into the master schedule to ensure an inclusive classroom environment where all students can reach full potential in reading.
Person Responsible	Joy Boyd-Walker (jrboyd1@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).

NA

Part IV: Title I Requirements

Additional Title I Requirements
This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Schoolwide Improvement Plan to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, §§ 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

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

NA

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

Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services.

NA

Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another.

NA

Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact.

NA

Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations.

NA