Volusia County Schools

Freedom Elementary School

2020-21 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: 7/1/2018

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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	87%
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: B (61%) 2017-18: C (48%) 2016-17: B (56%) 2015-16: B (57%)
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)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	No	60%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	44%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	B	B	C	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, position title, and job duties/responsibilities 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	Provide intermediate instructional input (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	Provide primary instrucitonal input and technology leadership role
Land, Tanya	Teacher, K-12	Provide Exceptional Student Education input (ESE support facilitation teacher).

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Sunday 7/1/2018, Paul Nehrig M

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.*

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.*

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
55

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	87%
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: B (61%) 2017-18: C (48%) 2016-17: B (56%) 2015-16: B (57%)
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.	

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	115	145	115	133	121	106	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	735
Attendance below 90 percent	21	21	17	17	13	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	110
One or more suspensions	1	1	1	1	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	4	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 1/20/2020

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	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	

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	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	

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	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	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%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	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				
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
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%	0
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%	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	79
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	49
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	53
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	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	69
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	54
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.

Math was our lowest performing subject area for FSA 2018-2019, in particular the lowest 25th percentile
scored at a 48% proficiency level. That was well below our overall proficiency level average of 68%. 2019-2020 iReady math median percent towards typical growth from Window 1 to Window 2 continued to be below the reading median percent towards typical growth. One contributing factor could have been the need for increase in small group math and interventions.

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 was a lack of curriculum resources for math interventions. In addition to this, out of our seven teachers in 3rd grade, only three 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 being unable to attend grade-level PLCs for collaboration on instruction and strategies. iReady Diagnostic math data from Window 1 (August 2019) to Window 2 (December 2019) showed decline in median percent towards typical growth in grades 1, 3 and 4. One factor that may have contributed to the lack of growth in math is the content that had not been taught yet in the sequence of the curriculum for those grades (all content is tested in the iReady Math Diagnostic.

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%). One factor that may have contributed to this gap is a lack of curriculum resources for math interventions. Another factor that may have contributed was scheduling conflict, 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%.
*There was an increased focus on 5th grade PLCs-teachers, administrators and the academic coach regularly analyzed SMT (State Mandated Test science assessment data) and planned standards-based instruction.
*After school formal science tutoring in the Spring of 2019 took place based on specific need as shown by SMT data and class performance.
*Technology teacher integrated science lessons based on needs shown by SMT data.
*FSA school-wide pep rally was held.

IReady Diagnostic median percent towards typical growth from Window 1 (August 2019) to Window 2 (December 2019) showed large gains in ELA. New actions that may have contributed are:
*ESE schedules allowed for the ESE teachers to regularly participate and collaborate in PLCs (data and instruction strategies).
*Wonders textbook resources were integrated into the curriculum and regular support was provided

by the district and academic coach.
*The master schedule allowed for ESE students to participate in daily small group instruction with the general education teacher and with their ESE teacher.

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

There was a total of 67 students with attendance below 90%. Tardies were also a concern during the 19-20 school year.

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

1. Increase overall math achievement.
2. Improve and increase math small group instruction/differentiation.
3. Increase appropriate SEL strategies used in the classroom.
4. Maintain and/or improve our science achievement.
5. Target students for academic coaching using EWS data.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Test scores from 2018-2019 showed math as the only subject area without gains in achievement. iReady Diagnostic scores from 2019-2020 showed math growth was noticeably lower than reading growth in most of the grade levels.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase the overall rate of math achievement proficiency levels from 68% (2018-2019) to 72%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Joy Boyd-Walker (jrboyd1@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will increase student engagement by ensuring that math activities and assignments promote learning by requiring student thinking, emphasize depth, and may enable some choice (Danielson 3C/Element: Activities and Assignments).
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Research by Charlotte Danielson has shown that engaging students in learning positively affects student achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teachers will participate in professional development to increase engagement by ensuring that math activities and assignments promote learning. "Deeper Dive into Math Strategies to Support Equitable Instruction" professional learning was chosen for pre-service professional learning. Follow up support/ professional learning for implementation from the math department will be planned. Leigh Hoover-Academic Coach
2. PLCs will focus on collaborative planning to increase engagement by ensuring that math activities and assignments promote learning by requiring students to think, emphasize depth and may enable some choice. Data will be used to analyze effectiveness. These PLCs will include district support as needed. Leigh Hoover-Academic Coach
3. Leadership team will conduct walk-throughs with feedback about levels of student engagement, with follow-up coaching as needed. Joy Boyd-Walker-Principal, Bill Goldsmith-Assistant Principal, and Leigh Hoover-Academic Coach
4. First and second semester progress monitoring meetings with the Principal Leadership Team and teachers to discuss math progress. Joy Boyd-Walker-Principal

Person Responsible	Joy Boyd-Walker (jrboyd1@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Our SWD had a 31% ELA proficiency level in 2018-2019, which is substantially lower than the 69% proficiency level of our general population. Furthermore, math achievement was 39% for SWD, and the achievement for the general population was 68%. This data shows students with disabilities (SWD) as a subgroup with below 41% proficiency and the identified ESSA subgroup.
Measurable Outcome:	This year we hope to increase the reading and math achievement of SWD to 41% or higher.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Joy Boyd-Walker (jrboyd1@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	1. Teachers will use small group core ELA and math instruction to increase proficiency levels for our students with disabilities.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	If we increase and ensure the percentage of teachers effectively teaching ELA and math in small group, students with disabilities will benefit from this core instruction. In addition, these students will receive IEP driven support instruction. John Hattie has found that small group intervention instruction for students with disabilities has had a .77 effect size on student achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

1. ESE teachers regularly conference and collaborate with general education teacher to review reading and IEP goals and accommodations (designated time). Tanya Land, ESE Team Lead/SLT Team Member
2. ESE teachers and classroom teachers will collaborate (PLC) to plan math and reading differentiated small group instruction utilizing data. Leigh Hoover, Academic Coach
3. Administer iReady Reading and Math Diagnostic and review 2019 FSA data to establish baseline data and student instructional needs. Leigh Hoover, Academic Coach
4. Coaching cycles to support teacher success with small group instruction and differentiation in ELA and math with emphasis on SWD. Leigh Hoover, Academic Coach
5. First and second semester progress monitoring meetings with the Principal Leadership Team and each teacher to discuss ELA and math progress for SWD. Joy Boyd-Walker, Principal
6. Professional learning provided by the ESE teachers to share effective instructional strategies for SWD. Tanya Land, ESE Team Lead/SLT Team Member

Person Responsible	Joy Boyd-Walker (jrboyd1@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	If students acquire and effectively apply the knowledge, attitudes and skills necessary to understand and manage emotions, set and achieve positive goals, feel and show empathy for others, establish and maintain positive relationships, and make responsible decisions, then the likelihood for students to reach their full academic potential is increased. Social Emotional Learning (SEL) is identified as a critical need due to the affects of the current pandemic and students being away from school for almost six months.
Measurable Outcome:	This school year we plan to decrease the number of discipline referrals to less than 100 (33 per quarter) during the first 3 quarters of the school year. This will be due to an intentional focus on Social Emotional Learning (SEL).
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	William Goldsmith (wbgoldsm@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will implement Social Emotional Learning (SEL) instruction regularly in the classroom.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Instruction in Social Emotional Learning will help students develop skills for regulating their emotions, setting goals, creating positive relationships and making responsible decisions. SEL will ensure an inclusive classroom environment where all students can reach their full potential. CASEL (included in the SEL Canvas Course) provided evidence-based research on SEL (Social Emotional Learning) as a cornerstone of effective instruction and learning.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Social Emotional Learning (SEL) instruction and/or activities will be integrated into the curriculum during the school day as appropriate. Joy Boyd-Walker, Principal and Stacy Wycuff, Guidance Counselor
2. All teachers will attend formal Youth Mental Health Training. Bill Goldsmith, Assistant Principal
3. First and second semester progress monitoring meetings with Principal's Leadership Team and each classroom teacher will happen to discuss academic progress and behavior/social emotional growth. Joy Boyd-Walker, Principal
4. All teachers will receive a Sanford Harmony Kit with SEL curriculum resources to use in the classroom (training will be provided for new teachers). Stacy Wycuff, Guidance Counselor

Person Responsible	Joy Boyd-Walker (jrboyd1@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

***The SLT will address maintaining/improving science achievement by continuing to dedicate PLC time for Scinece SMT data review and planning with support from the district science department. Emphasis will also be put on continuing and refining the annual science fair to engage students in the nature of science. Leigh Hoover-Academic Coach**
***The SLT will identify and support academic coaching using EWS data. That means specific students will be identified with the data and supported with teacher mentors as needed for academic and social growth. Bill Goldsmith-Assistant Principal**

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.

The school mission statement includes building a strong foundation for social growth to support students. This mission connects with a positive school environment. Freedom has an active SAC and PTA that are very involved in decision making, school-wide events, and providing support for learning. The School Leadership Team meets monthly and is involved in driving the school towards a positive, productive environment. Some examples of building a positive school culture include:
*monthly school newsletter, Falcon Flyer
*Fall literacy night/bookfair
*SEL/Social Emotional Learning integrated into daily instruction
*annual FSA pep rally (not 2020 due to school closure)
*Staff Sunshine Committee (monthly activities to boost positive school climate)
*annual Freedom Walkathon
*SOAR (Student On A Roll) weekly student awards submitted by staff
*quarterly recognition for student grades/attendance
*variety of after school interest clubs for students (Run Club, Chess Club, Art Club, Chorus, Harry Potter Club, etc.)
*mentors for specific students in need (second quarter)
*peer mentors for new teachers

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**	**$0.00**
2	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities**	**$0.00**
3	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning**	**$0.00**
		Total:	**$0.00**