School District of Osceola County, FL

Liberty High School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Liberty High School

4250 PLEASANT HILL RD, Kissimmee, FL 34746

www.osceolaschools.net

Demographics

Principal: La Tonia Harris

Start Date for this Principal: 8/4/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School PK, 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 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: C (44%) 2017-18: C (49%) 2016-17: C (43%) 2015-16: C (45%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
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 Osceola 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

Liberty High School

4250 PLEASANT HILL RD, Kissimmee, FL 34746

www.osceolaschools.net

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2019-20 Title I School**	**2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
High School PK, 9-12	Yes	86%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	93%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	C	C	C	C

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Osceola 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.

Liberty High School will ensure that every student is successful in a safe and secure environment, with access to the necessary social and academic skills needed for post-secondary readiness and to be responsible citizens.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Liberty High School strives to be a school of community with pride for inclusion and safety for all students.

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
Cruz, Misty	Principal	Ms. Misty Cruz, Principal: Provides instructional leadership and support to the Math, World Languages, ROTC and Fine Arts Departments, develops, submits and implements the school budget and funds, builds and strengthens community relationships, provides regular updates and communication regarding school performance to all stakeholders, works collaboratively with the School Advisory Council, plans and executes weekly administrative leadership meetings. She also facilitates regular Stocktake meetings throughout the school year and develops and monitors the School Improvement Plan.
McCall, Juanita	Assistant Principal	Dr. Juanita Morrow, Assistant Principal of Curriculum: Provides instructional leadership and support to the Science and CTE Departments, coordinates and oversees Advanced Placement curriculum, acceleration, College & Career and AVID; conducts classroom walkthroughs and evaluations to provide teachers with focused feedback to strengthen instructional practices and ensure that high-probability strategies are embedded in instruction, analyzes formative/summative data and lesson plans to assist teachers with using data to drive instruction. Develops and monitors the School Improvement Plan.
Ramsey, Laurel	Assistant Principal	Mrs. Laurel Ramsey, Assistant Principal of Instruction: Provides instructional leadership and support to the ESE and Guidance Departments, serves as the MTSS lead, creates the master schedule, oversees FTE, conducts classroom walkthroughs and evaluations to provide teachers with focused feedback to strengthen instructional practices and ensures that high-probability strategies are embedded in instruction, analyzes formative/summative data and lesson plans to assist teachers with using data to drive instruction. She also facilitates regular Stocktake meetings throughout the school year and develops and monitors the School Improvement Plan.
Carr, Jack	Assistant Principal	Mr. Jack Carr, Assistant Principal: Provides instructional leadership and support to the English, Reading and Social Studies Departments, oversees Student Services, athletics, PBIS, attendance/truancy, conducts classroom walkthroughs and evaluations to provide teachers with focused feedback to strengthen instructional practices and ensure that high-probability strategies are embedded in instruction, analyzes formative/summative data and lesson plans to assist teachers with using data to drive instruction. He also develops and monitors the School Improvement Plan.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Sunday 8/4/2019, La Tonia Harris

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.*
2

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.*
26

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
125

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School PK, 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 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: C (44%) 2017-18: C (49%) 2016-17: C (43%) 2015-16: C (45%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
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](#).

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	473	544	455	390	1862
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53	64	69	52	238
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	8	85	43	26	162
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	52	62	39	164
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	163	157	90	73	483
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	168	209	12	4	393

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	100	180	121	106	507

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	5	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	7	6	8	31

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 8/4/2020

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	472	500	449	519	1940
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	1	1	1	3
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	169	107	123	71	470

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	0	0	0	

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	6	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64	68	49	79	260

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	472	500	449	519	1940
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	1	1	1	3
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	169	107	123	71	470

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	0	0	0	

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	6	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64	68	49	79	260

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	39%	57%	56%	37%	57%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	43%	48%	51%	37%	47%	49%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	37%	43%	42%	31%	41%	41%
Math Achievement	20%	46%	51%	19%	44%	49%
Math Learning Gains	31%	41%	48%	26%	42%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	39%	46%	45%	33%	38%	39%
Science Achievement	44%	69%	68%	59%	71%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	48%	70%	73%	61%	70%	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	33%	47%	-14%	55%	-22%
	2018	40%	47%	-7%	53%	-13%
Same Grade Comparison	-7%					
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	44%	47%	-3%	53%	-9%
	2018	39%	49%	-10%	53%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison	5%					
Cohort Comparison	4%					

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	44%	62%	-18%	67%	-23%	

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	54%	68%	-14%	65%	-11%
Compare		-10%			
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	47%	62%	-15%	70%	-23%
2018	48%	61%	-13%	68%	-20%
Compare		-1%			
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	18%	49%	-31%	61%	-43%
2018	17%	52%	-35%	62%	-45%
Compare		1%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	19%	44%	-25%	57%	-38%
2018	20%	39%	-19%	56%	-36%
Compare		-1%			

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	42	37	16	32	36	14	19		77	18
ELL	16	33	29	16	23	28	30	27		80	51
ASN	29	47		33	50						
BLK	39	44	40	14	30	46	40	49		93	26
HSP	40	44	36	22	32	35	44	44		89	52
MUL										100	38
WHT	42	38	10	32	38	45	56	63		92	46
FRL	35	38	34	19	30	36	44	46		91	43

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	22	38	38	21	43	52	26	16		75	36
ELL	11	41	45	12	32	39	45	24		77	67
ASN	73	53		43	50			80		100	64
BLK	40	51	34	18	35	52	51	53		91	47
HSP	43	53	48	21	33	44	54	45		88	56
MUL	67	80									
WHT	46	55	55	30	47	62	64	53		83	60
FRL	40	50	44	21	34	50	50	48		89	54

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	4	25	22	2	24	35	45	20		58	16
ELL	7	23	20	6	31	38	24	34		70	47
ASN	61	50		48	47						
BLK	38	37	36	17	18	23	55	64		86	52
HSP	33	35	27	18	28	37	59	56		81	51
MUL	70	40		14	22	33	38	69			
WHT	45	55	36	29	34		80			69	22
FRL	32	36	30	17	27	35	57	61		84	48

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	44
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	45
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	481
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	96%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	31
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	34
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners 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
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	40
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	42
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	44
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	46
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial 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	46
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	42
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 data component that showed the lowest performance is Algebra I EOC pass rate which was 17%, which is substantially less than the district and state average. The factors that contributed to this performance a lack of focus on all subgroups, such as ESE and ELL, a lack of continued instructional support, decreased student and classroom management issues as a result of double block Math classes, a lack of exposure to assessment items and a lack of rigorous instruction in which teachers continuously teach to the depth of the standards. The trends that are present in the data include non-ESE and non-ELL students out performing students in the ELL and ESE subgroups.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline from the prior year is Biology with a pass rate of 44% (-10). The factors that contributed to the decrease in performance in these areas was a lack of focus on various subgroups, such as ESE and a lack of continued instructional support. When analyzing data a trend that is present is the under performance of the ESE subgroup.

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 data component that had the greatest gap when compared to the state average is Algebra I (School=17%, State=45%). The factors that contributed to this performance a lack of focus on all subgroups, such as ESE and ELL, a lack of continued instructional support, decreased student and classroom management issues as a result of double block Math classes, a lack of exposure to assessment items and a lack of rigorous instruction in which teachers continuously teach to the depth of the standards.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was ESE ELA achievement. The actions that took place to improve the performance of these performance data of analyzed and these students were properly identified through the MTSS process, assigning additional classroom support and support through a school day intervention period.

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

Based on the data provided one potential areas of concern is attendance.

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

1. English
2. Math
3. Acceleration/Graduation
4. Science
5. PLCs

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Area of Focus: Ensure high levels of mathematics achievement for all students. Strengthen teacher instructional practice to improve student's performance in all subgroups on mathematics assessments.
Measurable Outcome:	1. Algebra I proficiency will increase by 3%. 2. Geometry proficiency will increase by 4%. 3. The achievement gap between non-subgroups students, ELL and ESE populations will decrease. 4. The achievement gap between subgroups and non-subgroup students will decrease, while overall achievement levels of all students will increase.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Juanita McCall (juanita.mccall@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Math is a core life skill that students need to thrive as productive citizens in today's society and workforce. Research from meta-analysis conducted revealed that the greatest effects on students taking math courses was from direct instruction and problem-solving (Hattie, 2009). The principal and leadership team will conduct daily walkthroughs to assist teachers with their instructional competency and ensure that they are utilizing research-based strategies to impact instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Math scores at Liberty High School have been below the State and District average for a few consecutive years. Through the use of targeted interventions, support and on-going professional development, teacher's instructional practice will strengthen which will ultimately impact student performance and increase math achievement scores (Hattie, 2009).

Action Steps to Implement

1. The MTSS Team and the ESE Resource Compliance Specialist, Dr. Lezlie Gollab, will monitor the process and achievement of students in the ELL/ESE subgroups and the lowest 25% of Math and provide targeted interventions for these identified students.
2. School administration, Math Coach and MTSS Coach will participate in monthly Stocktake meetings to monitor data, identify best practices and make data-driven decisions. Additionally, school administration will conduct walkthroughs, observations and calibrate details to provided targeted feedback to teachers.
3. School PLCs will meet 4 times each month to review student assessment data to drive instruction and ensure target alignment and overall standards-based instruction. Math support facilitators instructional support will be specific based on data reviewed in the monthly PLCs. The Math support facilitators will work collaboratively with teachers to provide structured on-going support.

Person Responsible	Juanita McCall (juanita.mccall@osceolaschools.net)

4. An intervention period throughout the school day, "Charge Up" is included in the bell schedule to support the efforts of the MTSS Team and to provide supplemental opportunities for teachers to meet the learning targets with individual students. The Match Coach and selected instructional staff will provide Tier 3 interventions for students during this time. Teachers will review data from formative assessments and SchoolCity to determine which standards need to be re-taught.
5. The Math Coach will provide on-going support, resources and professional development on standards based instruction, rigor and differentiation for the Math department. New teachers will be paired with a teacher mentor through the TSL Grant for support and to build teacher capacity. Representatives from

Carnegie Math and District Math Resource Teachers will visit campus monthly to provide teachers with structured instructional coaching and best practices. Teachers will participate in monthly district facilitated professional development.

Person Responsible Juanita McCall (juanita.mccall@osceolaschools.net)

6. School Stocktake will take place monthly to report progress to the Principal on the Area of Focus.
7. Principal will share and update the Chief of Staff and Assistant Superintendent during the half way point to check in on the progress of the Area of Focus through the School Stocktake Model.

Person Responsible Juanita McCall (juanita.mccall@osceolaschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Area of Focus: Ensure high levels of learning for all students in literacy.
Measurable Outcome:	1. ELA/Reading achievement will increase by 4%. 2. The achievement gap between non-subgroups students, ELL and ESE populations will decrease. 3. The achievement gap between subgroups and non-subgroup students will decrease, while overall achievement levels of all students will increase.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jack Carr (jack.carr@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	To strengthen the instructional practices of teachers through professional development and on-going coaching to improve student performance in ELA and improve students' ELA skills across all content areas. The Principal and leadership team will conduct weekly walkthroughs of PLC teams to ensure processes are being used in the analysis and planning for student achievement.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Historical achievement data indicates that ELA scores at Liberty High School have been below the district and state average the past few years. This decrease in achievement is due to teacher retention in the department and a lack of effective support for various subgroups. Research indicates that students who do not develop sufficient reading ability by the middle of elementary school, they are handicapped from learning other curricula (Hattie, 2009). Thus, making the focus on literacy key.

Action Steps to Implement

1. The MTSS Team and ELL Task Force will monitor the process and achievement of students in the ELL/ESE subgroups and the lowest 25% of ELA. Based on this data the MTSS Team and ELL Task Force will provide targeted intervention for these identified students.
2. School administration, Literacy Coach and ELL Task Force will participate in monthly Stocktake meetings to monitor data, identify best practices and make data-driven decisions. Additionally, school administration will conduct walkthroughs, observations and calibrate details to provide targeted feedback to teachers.
3. School PLCs will meet 4 times each month to review student assessment data to drive instruction and ensure target alignment and overall standards-based instruction. ELL paraprofessionals support will be specific based on data reviewed in the monthly PLCs.

Person Responsible	Jack Carr (jack.carr@osceolaschools.net)

4. An intervention period, "Charge Up" is included in the bell schedule to provide supplemental opportunities for teachers to meet the learning targets with students. The Literacy Coach and selected instructional staff will provide Tier 3 interventions for students during this time. Teachers will review data from formative assessments and NWEA to determine which standards need to be re-taught.
5. The Literacy Coach will provide on-going support, resources and professional development on standards based instruction, rigor and differentiation. New teachers will be paired with a teacher mentor through the TSL Grant for additional support.
6. School Stocktake will take place monthly to report progress to the Principal on the Area of Focus.

7. Principal will share and update the Chief of Staff and Assistant Superintendent during the half way point to check on the progress of the Area of Focus through the School Stocktake Model.

Person Responsible Jack Carr (jack.carr@osceolaschools.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Area of Focus: Ensure high levels of science achievement for all students. Throughout education there has been a big push to prepare students more in Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM) programs and to overall strengthen the curriculum in this area. Today's society is becoming more technology-based and by strengthening the focus on STEM students will be critical thinkers prepared for careers in this rapidly growing industry.
Measurable Outcome:	1.Increase the overall achievement on the Biology EOC by 4%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Juanita McCall (juanita.mccall@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	To improve the overall academic performance of students in Science curriculum, improve critical thinking skills and strengthen the instructional capacity of teachers through professional development and on-going coaching. Research conducted by Hattie (2009) reveals that inquiry-based and experimental activities yield the highest results in Science education. Therefore, it is extremely important for teachers to provide a variety of activities and experiences for students enrolled in Science classes. The principal and leadership team will conduct weekly walkthroughs of PLC teams to ensure processes are being used in the analysis and planning for student achievement.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Historical achievement data indicates that Science scores at Liberty High School have been decreasing over the past few years. This decrease in achievement is due to teacher retention in the department, unfilled vacancies and a lack of continued support. Teaching students to focus more on Science as not just an academic subject, but as to focus on observations of the natural world will improve students' overall performance (Shafer, 2015). By adjusting this focus and retaining more teachers, trends in historical Science data have a high probability of being positively impacted.

Action Steps to Implement

1. School administration, Science Coach and ELL Task Force will participate in monthly Stocktake meetings to monitor data, identify best practices and make data-driven decisions. Additionally, school administration will conduct walkthroughs, observations and calibrate details to provided targeted feedback to teachers.
2. School PLCs will meet 4 times each month to review student assessment data to drive instruction and ensure target alignment and overall standards-based instruction. ELL paraprofessionals support will be specific based on data reviewed in the monthly PLCs. The ELL paraprofessionals will work collaboratively with teachers to provide structured on-going support.
3. An intervention period throughout the school day, "Charge Up" is included in the bell schedule to support the efforts of the MTSS Team and to provide supplemental opportunities for teachers to meet the learning targets with individual students. Teachers will review data from formative assessments and NWEA to determine which standards need to be re-taught.

Person Responsible	Juanita McCall (juanita.mccall@osceolaschools.net)

4. The Science Coach, Mrs. Omaira Perez will provide on-going support, resources and professional development on standards based instruction, rigor and differentiation for the Science department. New teachers will be paired with a teacher mentor through the TSL Grant for additional support and to build teacher capacity.
5. School Stocktake will take place monthly to report progress to the Principal on the Area of Focus.

6. Principal will share and update the Chief of Staff and Assistant Superintendent during the half way point to check in on the progress of the Area of Focus through the School Stocktake Model.

Person Responsible   Juanita McCall (juanita.mccall@osceolaschools.net)

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning Communities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Area of Focus: Strengthen collaborative processes, through PLCs, to ensure that the learning needs of all students are met. Participation in high-quality collaboration among teachers results in better instruction, expansion of teaching resources, lesson consistency, timely progress monitoring and increased student achievement.
Measurable Outcome:	1. 100% of staff will participate in high-quality collaboration on a monthly basis. 2. Teachers will develop greater competence in rigorous, standards-based instruction and the use of the instructional framework to increase achievement in literacy across all content areas and all student subgroups. 3. Based on pre-planning self-assessment, each PLC will grow by 1 stage according to the stages outlined in The Seven Stages of Professional Learning Teams. 4. The achievement gap between non-subgroups students and our ELL and ESE populations will decrease. 5. The achievement gap between subgroups and non-subgroup students will decrease, while overall achievement levels of all students will increase.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jack Carr (jack.carr@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	To strengthen the schoolwide collaboration structure in an effort to meet the needs of all learners, improve teacher instructional practices, foster congeniality, warrant school improvement and remove barriers of learning. Hattie (2009) suggests that in-school discussions should be held to review how to invoke high expectations, understanding benchmarks and reviewing data. The format of weekly PLCs provide the opportunities for teachers to have these in-depth discussions and share best practices. The principal and leadership team will conduct weekly walkthroughs of PLC teams to ensure processes are being used in the analysis and planning for student achievement.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Research indicates that when teachers participate in professional learning that overall student achievement increases and that leadership at the school level shouldn't solely reside with one person (Marzano, 2013). PLCs are a method that provides every teacher the option to be a teacher leader and share their perspective. Additionally, participation in professional learning communities emphasizes the importance of collaboration among peers and allows teachers to focus on learning for all students and a commitment to continuous improvement.

Action Steps to Implement

1. School PLCs will meet 4 times each month to review student assessment data to drive instruction and ensure target alignment and overall standards-based instruction. Assistant Principals are responsible for monitoring the structure and planning for PLCs. This step will be ongoing throughout the school year until May 2021.
2. Each department PLC will utilize SchoolCity to analyze student performance and adjust lesson plans and activities to improve student performance. Lesson plans are to be submitted weekly to each Assistant Principal which will be checked for standards alignment and taxonomy level. Teachers are provided with common planning in an effort to develop lesson plans and common assessments. This step will be ongoing throughout the school year until May 2021.
3. Teachers will participate in focused professional development to strengthen collaborative teaming and increase knowledge of best practices. Teachers will attend SchoolCity training throughout the school year.

Person Responsible	Jack Carr (jack.carr@osceolaschools.net)

4. Formative assessments, Khan Academy, Naviance, Achieve 3000 and SchoolCity will be used to identify the individual support and instructional coaching for teachers in each department.

5. A Guiding Coalition will be formed to monitor the process and provide struggling teams with additional support and coaching to become a more effective team.

6. A PLC calendar with set dates and outlined deliverables is developed and provided to all PLC teams.

7. The performance of all subgroups will be closely monitored to identify targeted students and provide the supplemental multi-tiered support when needed.

8. The Principal's Leadership Team which consists of all administration, instructional coaches and department heads will meet monthly to determine the needs of the school.

Person Responsible   Jack Carr (jack.carr@osceolaschools.net)

#5. Other specifically relating to Schoolwide Post-Secondary Culture for All Students

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Areas of Focus: Ensure a schoolwide post-secondary culture for all students. Creating a post-secondary plan for high school students provides students exposure to various career fields and increases the possibly for success in the transition between high school and higher education, the work force and/or military. It is important for students to begin creating their post-secondary plan as early as middle school to ensure success and exposure to support such as scholarships and bridge programs. It also important to focus on at-risk students as it relates to post-secondary planning. Historical data has revealed that minority students, students with disabilities and limited English proficiency students are less likely than their peers to enroll in college (Feygin, Guarino & Pardo, 2019).
Measurable Outcome:	1. 80% or more of graduating seniors will have a confirmed post-secondary plan prior to graduating. 2. 100% of graduating seniors will complete a senior survey indicating their post-secondary plan. 3. 80% or more of the student body will access and utilize Xello. 4. 80% or more of all Juniors will have taken the SAT by the end of their Junior year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Juanita McCall (juanita.mccall@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Research indicates that students who participate in career exploration activities early in their academic career are more likely to successfully transition after high school. The Principal and leadership team will conduct weekly walkthroughs of PLC teams to ensure Xello is being used and planning for student achievement.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Graduation rates for Liberty High School has been gradually increasing over the past few years. However, confirmed post-secondary plans are not consistent with the graduation rates. There is a strong push to ensure that graduating seniors and underclassmen are knowledgeable of different paths and prepared to make the decision that fits their interests and will allow them to be productive citizens in today's society. Additionally, research shows that student's post-secondary success greatly depends on the high school expectations, curriculum a variety of experiences (Hearn, 2006).

Action Steps to Implement

1. Guidance counselors will meet with all students at least twice a year to discuss graduation status and post-secondary plan.
2. Guidance counselors will work collaboratively with the API to ensure that students are properly placed in the correct academic/career pathways and the master schedule provides adequate amount of courses for various pathways.
3. The College & Career Counselor will push into classes in all content areas to present college and career exploration lessons using the Xello platform.
4. Xello will be implemented schoolwide.
5. The AVID coordinator and the College & Career Counselor will work collaboratively to arrange both college and technical focused field trips for all students.
6. AVID strategies will be implemented schoolwide.

Person Responsible	Juanita McCall (juanita.mccall@osceolaschools.net)

7. Representatives from all branches of the military, trade fields and colleges will visit the campus to meet with students to discuss options.

8. Informational events such as FAFSA Night, College Fair and Scholarship Night will be held to assist students with post-secondary transitional activities.

Person Responsible	Juanita McCall (juanita.mccall@osceolaschools.net)

#6. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Social-Emotional Learning (SEL) opportunities provide students with access to resources that will allow them to excel beyond the classroom. Social-Emotional Learning (SEL) competencies include maintaining cooperative relationships, making responsible decisions, gaining self-awareness, displaying empathy for others and making responsible decisions. Research has shown that many of these social-emotional skills impact students growth more than academics. Marzano (2013) explained that the school may not be able to change the occupation and income of the adults in the home, but it can impact the atmosphere in the home. Providing students with opportunities to development these competencies will impact their lives well beyond the classroom.
Measurable Outcome:	The 2019-2020 SEL Climate Survey showed a 26% of students answered favorable for school belonging. In 2020-2021 answers to this question will increase by 10% to 36% favorable. The quality of the student-teacher relationship is the most critical aspect contributed to student learning (Hattie, 2009). Ensuring that students feel a sense of belonging will greatly increase students feelings towards school belonging.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Laurel Ramsey (jennifer.ramsey@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	It is important that both students and educators feel safe, valued and heard in the school environment. Providing guidance and resources in the Social-Emotional Learning (SEL) competencies will work to ensure physical and emotional safety for all.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Research has shown that students who participated in an Social-Emotional Learning (SEL) program experienced greater academic achievement, strong social-emotional skills, lower rates of depression/anxiety and lower rates of risky behaviors (Committee for Children, 2019). Additionally, teachers' social and emotional competence impacts student's social-emotional learning, promotes a positive school culture and healthy student-teachers, which are key to a students' growth.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teachers and staff will participate in school-wide Social-Emotional Learning and Kognito training.
2. Guidance counselors, social worker and the school psychologist will facilitate professional opportunities for teachers /staff to improve their social and emotional competence.
3. Teachers will build a trusting environment, which promotes belonging and individuality.
4. Teachers will utilize active learning strategies and research-based best practices to drive conversations, build into curriculum and to facilitate collaborative learning.
5. Staff and administrative team will work collaboratively to develop structures/systems that support students' social-emotional development.
6. SEL survey data will be used to make decisions, create interventions, monitor progress and celebrate growth.
7. The school's Leadership Team will review monthly behavior data for subgroups and develop interventions as required.

Person Responsible	Laurel Ramsey (jennifer.ramsey@osceolaschools.net)

#7. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	ESSA data showed in 2018-2019 the school had two subgroups below the ESSA level of 41%. These levels are English Language Learners (ELL) and Students with Disabilities (ESE). The school is in TS&I status.
Measurable Outcome:	2018-2019 ESSA data showed the following results for the selected subgroups: ELL-33% and ESE-31%. For the 2020-2021 school year these metrics will be increased to 41% in both subgroups.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Misty Cruz (misty.cruz@osceolaschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will create a academically diverse classroom and through differentiation and provide appropriately challenging learning experiences for all students. In addition to in-classroom interventions, school wide interventions will greatly impact the ability to truly provide individualized instruction and interventions. Utilizing the RTI tool is a perfect tool to provide interventions for targeted students and ensure success (Buffman, Mattos & Malone, 2018). The MTSS/RTI team will continuously will engage in continuous best practices to support the efforts of classroom teachers to meet the needs of all students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Hattie (2009) provided that teachers having skills in developing interpersonal relationship with students and feedback are among the most powerful influences on achievement. Incorporating strategic differentiate into the classroom provides teachers the opportunity to get to know students, build a diverse classroom and a classroom of inclusion.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teachers and staff will participate in school-wide data-driven training.
2. Teachers will build a trusting environment, which promotes belonging and individuality to ensure.
3. Teachers will utilize active learning strategies and research-based best practices to drive conversations, build into curriculum and facilitate collaborative learning.
4. Teachers and will participate in PLCs that focuses on instructional strategies for ELL and ESE subgroups.
5. The ESOL Compliance Specialist and Resource Compliance Specialist will work collaboratively with all content areas to utilize ELLEVATION and ensure compliance to student IEPs and ESE support strategies.
6. Students will participate in targeted interventions for Tier 1, 2, & 3.
7. The school's Leadership Team will review monthly data for subgroups and develop interventions as required.
8. School Stocktake will take place monthly to report progress to the Principal on the Area of Focus.

Person Responsible	Juanita McCall (juanita.mccall@osceolaschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

N/A

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.

Our school administration and staff understands the importance and impact of school culture. Striving to have a positive school culture and safe learning environment is top priority for the decision makers on our campus. Our PBIS team has done extensive work with creating various processing and procedures to highlight student and teacher success. The most recent addition was creating the 'Charger Affirmation', which is recited daily on the morning announcements. The affirmation was created in an effort to instill pride in our students and form solidarity. Understanding that parents are key stakeholders, our school strives to involve all parents in the planning, review, and improvement of Title I programs and our Parent & Family Engagement Plan. All parents are invited to attend meetings regarding the development of the required plan through flyers, school marquee and REMIND. Parents are asked for their input on activities and training provided by the school. The school uses the notes from the group discussions to guide writing the plan. Also, our school is committed to building strong partnerships with community stakeholders to provide more opportunities for students and their families. Partnerships with organizations such as Valencia College, has provided opportunities students to earn college credit at no cost. Lastly, community organization that we have collaborated the through our Partners in Education program has provided healthy food snacks for students and their parents.

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

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math				$1,200.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
			0842 - Liberty High School			$1,200.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				$4,500.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
			0842 - Liberty High School			$4,500.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science				$0.00

	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
			0842 - Liberty High School			$0.00
4	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Professional Learning Communities**				**$0.00**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
			0842 - Liberty High School			$0.00
5	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Other: Schoolwide Post-Secondary Culture for All Students**				**$5,000.00**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
			0842 - Liberty High School			$5,000.00
6	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning**				**$0.00**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
			0842 - Liberty High School			$0.00
7	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups**				**$0.00**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
			0842 - Liberty High School			$0.00
					Total:	**$10,700.00**