

Brevard Public Schools

# Freedom 7 Elementary School Of International



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>26</b>

# Freedom 7 Elementary School Of International Studies

400 S 4TH ST, Cocoa Beach, FL 32931

<http://www.freedom.brevard.k12.fl.us>

## Demographics

Principal: Kathryn Lott C

Start Date for this Principal: 1/7/2019

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-6
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	12%
<b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities Asian Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: A (84%) 2017-18: A (90%) 2016-17: A (88%) 2015-16: A (89%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">LaShawn Russ-Porterfield</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

## School Board Approval

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

## SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

## Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>26</b>

# Freedom 7 Elementary School Of International Studies

400 S 4TH ST, Cocoa Beach, FL 32931

<http://www.freedom.brevard.k12.fl.us>

## School Demographics

<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School KG-6	No	13%
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	<b>Charter School</b>	<b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b> (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	28%

## School Grades History

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

## School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Brevard 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.**

To continue the International Baccalaureate Primary Years Programme, a concept based curriculum that empowers students to become inquirers who are responsible, globally-minded citizens and reflective lifelong learners.

(Revised 8/2018)

(Reviewed 9/2019)

(Reviewed 9/2020)

#### **Provide the school's vision statement.**

Freedom 7 Elementary School of International Studies, an International Baccalaureate Primary Years Programme School, provides a quality public education with a rigorous and relevant transdisciplinary curriculum. Students are encouraged to become critical and open-minded thinkers, lifelong learners and compassionate world citizens who respect cultural diversity and take action to better our world.

(Revised 8/2018)

(Reviewed 9/2019)

(Reviewed 9/2020)

### 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
Lott, Kathryn	Principal	The pedagogical leadership team meets weekly to discuss, reflect and plan for student instruction within the school. Data are used from multiple sources to determine instructional supports which may include ongoing professional development, pedagogical discourse within the 80 minute weekly PLC with grade levels, grouping strategies, programming needs and more. The Principal oversees instructional decision making at all levels. She collaborates with all classroom teachers through PLCs and MTSS meetings to support all learners.
Haddock, Lucy	Assistant Principal	The pedagogical leadership team meets weekly to discuss, reflect and plan for student instruction within the school. Data are used from multiple sources to determine instructional supports which may include ongoing professional development, pedagogical discourse within the 80 minute weekly PLC with grade levels, grouping strategies, programming needs and more. The Assistant Principal assists teachers with instructional support and coordinates the mentor program throughout the school. She oversees the MTSS process and coordinates additional supports for differentiation.
Noe, Jennifer	Instructional Coach	The pedagogical leadership team meets weekly to discuss, reflect and plan for student instruction within the school. Data are used from multiple sources to determine instructional supports which may include ongoing professional development, pedagogical discourse within the 80 minute weekly PLC with grade levels, grouping strategies, programming needs and more. The Instructional coach supports teachers through co-teaching and a collaborative teaching model. She works with teachers to implement instructional goals throughout the school. As the lead mentor, the instructional coach supports both teacher mentors and mentees. She is the iReady instructional leader and supports teachers through running small groups, monitoring small groups and providing resources for differentiation.
Enrique, Lisa	Instructional Media	The pedagogical leadership team meets weekly to discuss, reflect and plan for student instruction within the school. Data are used from multiple sources to determine instructional supports which may include ongoing professional development, pedagogical discourse within the 80 minute weekly PLC with grade levels, grouping strategies, programming needs and more. The Instructional Media Specialist supports new teachers as a mentor as well as helps to model lessons in the classroom. She is instrumental in curating information and resources to support conceptual learning within the classroom.

**Demographic Information**

**Principal start date**

Monday 1/7/2019, Kathryn Lott C



**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.*

4

**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.*

3

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

29

**Demographic Data**

<b>2020-21 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-6
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	12%
<b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities Asian Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: A (84%) 2017-18: A (90%) 2016-17: A (88%) 2015-16: A (89%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">LaShawn Russ-Porterfield</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	

<b>ESSA Status</b>	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

## Early Warning Systems

### Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	52	52	53	54	64	65	59	0	0	0	0	0	0	399
Attendance below 90 percent	0	3	1	5	1	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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

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

Tuesday 9/8/2020

### 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	51	54	54	55	67	59	67	0	0	0	0	0	0	407
Attendance below 90 percent	0	1	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

**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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

**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	51	54	54	55	67	59	67	0	0	0	0	0	0	407
Attendance below 90 percent	0	1	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

**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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

**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	95%	62%	57%	97%	63%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	83%	60%	58%	73%	60%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	80%	57%	53%	82%	52%	52%
Math Achievement	94%	63%	63%	98%	64%	61%
Math Learning Gains	77%	65%	62%	83%	62%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	68%	53%	51%	89%	52%	51%
Science Achievement	89%	57%	53%	94%	56%	51%

### EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)							Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	
	(0)	(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	96%	64%	32%	58%	38%
	2018	93%	63%	30%	57%	36%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	98%	61%	37%	58%	40%
	2018	97%	57%	40%	56%	41%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				
05	2019	95%	60%	35%	56%	39%
	2018	98%	54%	44%	55%	43%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				
06	2019	93%	60%	33%	54%	39%
	2018	98%	63%	35%	52%	46%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	94%	61%	33%	62%	32%
	2018	93%	62%	31%	62%	31%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	90%	64%	26%	64%	26%
	2018	95%	59%	36%	62%	33%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				
05	2019	94%	60%	34%	60%	34%
	2018	97%	58%	39%	61%	36%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				
06	2019	97%	67%	30%	55%	42%
	2018	100%	68%	32%	52%	48%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	89%	56%	33%	53%	36%
	2018	91%	57%	34%	55%	36%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
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	90	93		95	86						
ASN	96	73		96	80						
BLK	100	100		91	80						
HSP	95	77		95	85						
MUL	89	82		83	76						
WHT	96	83	89	95	76	78	91				
FRL	86	65		86	59		67				

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	90	58		85	75						
ASN	95	88		95	100						
HSP	100	92		100	69						

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
MUL	96	90		96	80						
WHT	97	78	88	96	82	89	85				
FRL	94	69		91	79	80					
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	88			100							
ASN	100	69		100	92						
HSP	100	74		95	83						
MUL	96	73		96	86						
WHT	96	73	76	99	81	86	95				
FRL	97	76		100	76						

**ESSA Data**

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	84
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	586
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%

**Subgroup Data**

**Students With Disabilities**

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	91
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0

**English Language Learners**

Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	86
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	93
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	88
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	83
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	87
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	73
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.**

Students in the lowest 25% for mathematics showed the most significant drop from 91% to 68% according to FSA data. In addition, this same group of students showed the smallest achievement growth in mathematics based on iReady data between diagnostic 1 and 2 in the 2019-2020 school year. In addition, last year was the first adoption year of Eureka, a more standards aligned curriculum. Due to COVID 19 shutdown in March, our students moved to using iReady exclusively. Coupled with a lack of a standardized assessment, we looked closely at the iReady diagnostic data available in the fall. When compared to the diagnostic from the previous year, our data was similar, however some of the grade level cohort comparisons were slightly lower. Walkthroughs from administration throughout the 2019-2020 and in discussions during Professional Learning Community meetings indicated continued concern as to the effectiveness of the newly adopted curriculum, due to the inaugural year.

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

For our students who are economically disadvantaged, the gap is growing larger. During the 2017-2018 school year, the gap in ELA for these students rose from 0% to 3% and increased to 11% in the 2018-2019 school year. Based on iReady data comparison of the diagnostic 1 to diagnostic 2, this group of students did not grow as other ESSA subgroups had grown. While the percentage of students is 9% of our student population, this constitutes the lowest rate of growth. This trend continues to decrease based on the iReady data for 2019-2020 school year. iReady Standards Mastery was used during the 2019-2020 school year to help monitor growth of all students in the identified focus standards of vocabulary. Due to the COVID shutdown, we were unable to analyze assessment data to determine growth of both diagnostic 3 and standards mastery assessments. Due to the nature of the 2020-2021 school year, whereby over 60% of the students at Freedom 7 have elected to be ELearners, challenges have been presented.

\*Why-where are they? % of ELearners

#### **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.**

Thankfully, all of our data shows a large gap, placing us above the state average. All stakeholders have accountability for the performance of the students at Freedom 7 Elementary. Teachers are dedicated to the pedagogical philosophy that is espoused with the International Baccalaureate framework, which allows for concept-based teaching of the standards through an inquiry approach. Parent Involvement, Community Support, translated communication between parent, teacher and student are what makes this school excel. The culture at Freedom 7 supports the idea that all students can learn and deserve the opportunity to grow in a safe environment as evidenced by multiple data points. Insight data (teacher data) indicate 9.0 on academic opportunity. An overwhelming 98% of families responding to the parent survey felt welcome and had attended events at the school. In addition, 77% felt they had been given opportunities to provide input and feedback about school decisions.

When compared to the district average for iReady diagnostic 1 in mathematics, 55% of the students at Freedom 7 were on grade level or above, compared to 27%. In ELA, 78% of the students at



Freedom 7 were on grade level or above, compared to 40% within the district on diagnostic 1. Students during the 2019-2020 school showed significant growth on iReady from diagnostic 1 to 2 in both ELA and mathematics, however less growth was shown in mathematics.

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

Mathematics achievement for students earning a level 5 in both academic areas, showed learning gains. In support of the highest achieving students, we have sustained a robust gifted program, serving about a fourth of the school. In addition, continued conversations through weekly PLCs have helped shape the rich, in-depth opportunities for children to expand deeper knowledge and to make connections in their learning. Small group was provided by the Gifted teacher to grade 5 students throughout the year, specifically in mathematics enrichment.

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

Students who have attendance concerns are an area of growth. These students are not necessarily below grade level, but may not be reaching their full potential when missing instruction. Further communication about the importance of attending school with families will help support greater growth. Quarterly communication from administration will support this effort more fully. The switch to virtual learning in the spring due to COVID provided a struggle for some families to attend. Support from both the classroom teachers and administration aided families in helping their children attend to school.

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

1. Increase the learning gains for the economically disadvantaged in both ELA and Math
2. Increase learning gains for all students in mathematics
3. Continue to increase vocabulary development for all students across all disciplines
4. Increase positive relationships within the school among all stakeholders (Based on YouthTruth Survey Data)

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

**Areas of Focus:**

**#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Economically Disadvantaged**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Learning gains for the 9% of the students classified as Free and Reduced Lunch were lower than the previous year; 69% in 2018; 65% in 2019 for ELA; 79% in 2018; 59% in 2019 for Math. In addition, the gap is growing between ED students and white students. During the 2017-2018 school year, the gap in ELA for these students rose from 0% to 3% and increased to 11% in the 2018-2019 school year. COVID, during the 2020-2021 school year, has allowed students to elect to remain at home for instruction as ELearners. Approximately 50% of the Free and Reduced Lunch students are ELearners. Since the historical data for this subgroup has shown a negative trend, and the shift to hybrid learning has presented many challenges, the students identified as free and reduced lunch will need to be supported.

**Measurable Outcome:** Learning gains for FRL population will increase from 65% to 70% in ELA and increase from 59% to 80% in mathematics. This will also reduce the gap by 2%.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Kathryn Lott (lott.kathryn@brevardschools.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** The disruption of the first year implementation of Eureka math, due to COVID 19 hindered the continuity of instruction for mathematics for the year. With improved supports for distant learning and year two of implementation of Eureka mathematics, all learners will be further supported. In addition, an increase of complex texts, aligned with the standards, within the units of inquiry will support greater gains in ELA.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** We believe greater knowledge of the Eureka materials and a greater knowledge by all teachers of how to support both in person and ELearners will impact positive gains for all learners. In addition, maintaining on-grade level, complex texts to support all units of inquiry will support all learners.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Teachers will disaggregate data of their students during the first six weeks of school. This will include a look at ESSA subgroups, previously not done by teachers.

**Person Responsible** Lucy Haddock (haddock.lucy@brevardschools.org)

2. Teachers will track students based on ESSA subgroups using iReady diagnostic results. This will be part of the MTSS process and reflected upon within these meetings. Coding will be used within the internal MTSS documents to assist in monitoring these students.

**Person Responsible** Lucy Haddock (haddock.lucy@brevardschools.org)

3. iReady Growth Monitoring will be used to monitor growth between diagnostic assessments.

**Person Responsible** Jennifer Noe (noe.jennifer@brevardschools.org)

4. Administration will monitor and support iReady data disaggregation through guiding questions and conversations. Additional support with professional development from iReady will assist teachers in understanding data and supporting student ownership in data.

**Person Responsible** Kathryn Lott (lott.kathryn@brevardschools.org)

5. Instructional coach will provide support to identified tier 2 and tier 3 students within small groups and through coaching of teachers with instructional strategies. Due the nature of hybrid learning, multiple tools will be used to support both ELearners and in person learners including tech tools.

**Person Responsible** Jennifer Noe (noe.jennifer@brevardschools.org)

6. Ongoing discourse in PLCs regarding student growth using triangulation of data to include, iReady, STAR, RI, classroom grades and district assessments where applicable.

**Person Responsible** Lucy Haddock (haddock.lucy@brevardschools.org)

7. Guidance counselor will provide social-emotional support groups as needed through lunch bunch and social groups.

**Person Responsible** Lucy Haddock (haddock.lucy@brevardschools.org)

**#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Analysis of the iReady diagnostic 1 from 2019 to 2020, showed a decline in mathematics. Grade 2 saw a decline in 3%, grade 4 11%, Grade 5 1% and grade 6 29%. However, with the exception of the Grades 1 and 2, the cohort comparisons all showed growth. This indicates that while specific groups of students did not fall significantly backwards due to the shift to virtual teaching in the spring, the grade level proficiency at the beginning of the year, overall did. In addition learning gains for the lowest 25% in mathematics were much lower than the overall learning gains for the school. (Grade 4, 45%, Grade 5 43%, Grade 6 67%).

Given these data in conjunction with a newly adopted standards aligned curriculum, Eureka as well has shifting to virtual teaching due to COVID, provide an opportunity for growth.

Learning gains for the lowest 25% in mathematics will increase in all grades. (Grade 4 from 40% to 60%, Grade 5 from 43% to 60%, Grade 6 from 67% to 75%.

**Measurable Outcome:**

iReady math diagnostic growth from diagnostic 1 to diagnostic 3 will show on or above 85% proficiency in all grades.

- Grade 1 59%
- Grade 2 45%
- Grade 3 48%
- Grade 4 49%
- Grade 5 66%
- Grade 6 63%

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Kathryn Lott (lott.kathryn@brevardschools.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

Small group instruction in all classrooms to support the lowest 25% in mathematics, using research based practices and standards aligned materials will support all learners more effectively.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

We believe the problem is occurring due to the lack of small group instruction across all grade levels consistently, through differentiated instruction. In addition, the previous curriculum was not standards aligned.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Partner with a parent who writes for CPALMs, to create an enrichment crosswalk to support our units of inquiry with implementation of lessons for the highest 25%.

**Person Responsible**

Kathryn Lott (lott.kathryn@brevardschools.org)

2. Instructional coach will attend the district professional development opportunity to support mathematics instruction and work with teachers to support small group instruction.

**Person Responsible**

Jennifer Noe (noe.jennifer@brevardschools.org)

3. Provide mathematics standards focus documents to teachers during PLCs and work to ensure teachers have resources to support instruction based on the documents.

**Person Responsible**

Jennifer Noe (noe.jennifer@brevardschools.org)

4. Host a virtual parent night for mathematics, sharing electronic tools to support mathematics learning at home.

**Person Responsible** Lucy Haddock (haddock.lucy@brevardschools.org)

5. Provide opportunities for enrichment through math olympiad and other enriching opportunities to include small group instruction from the gifted resource teacher.

**Person Responsible** Lucy Haddock (haddock.lucy@brevardschools.org)

6. Classroom walkthroughs by the leadership team will monitor small group instruction and provide feedback for necessary instructional supports.

**Person Responsible** Kathryn Lott (lott.kathryn@brevardschools.org)

7. Standards Mastery, through iReady will be utilized by teachers to support ongoing progress of weak standards every semester.

**Person Responsible** Lucy Haddock (haddock.lucy@brevardschools.org)

8. The CARES Act funds will be used to support after school programs during the month of February and March by the instructional coach and ESE teacher. Participating students will be selected from the tier 2 ESSA subgroup, economically disadvantaged, as well as consideration will be given to students who remain ELearners. The program will be offered both virtually and in person using iReady toolkit lessons.

**Person Responsible** [no one identified]

**#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** The results of the iReady data for fall, 2020, indicate a low proficiency in vocabulary, across all grades. Previous year's School Improvement Plan included a need to support growth in this area and we saw growth from the beginning of last year to the beginning of this year. Due to the nature of the switch to virtual learning in the 2019-2020 school year, we were unable to realize any real gains assessment data and would like to continue to improve.

**Measurable Outcome:** The percentage of students in each grade will increase by 5% proficience on iReady in vocabulary by the end of the year.  
 6th Grade 75% to 80%  
 5th Grade 71% to 76%  
 4th Grade 70% to 75%  
 3rd Grade 78% to 83%  
 2nd Grade 57% to 62%  
 1st Grade 43% to 48%

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Jennifer Noe (noe.jennifer@brevardschools.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** School-wide support with explicit vocabulary instruction across all subject areas using a variety of complex texts will support continued vocabulary growth for all students.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Having explicit conversations in PLCs regarding vocabulary development, along with support professional development and vertical conversations has supported observed learning engagements in this area from last year to this year. We would like to continue to support learners with broadening our knowledge in teaching and learning of best strategies in vocabulary development in context, to continue to make gains.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Purposeful conversations regarding explicit vocabulary teaching during PLCs and vertical team meeting and faculty meetings guided by the instructional coach. Teachers will document learning experiences within each unit of inquiry.

**Person Responsible** Jennifer Noe (noe.jennifer@brevardschools.org)

2. Collaborate and learn from other PYP schools to continue to build upon complex texts within the units of inquiry.

**Person Responsible** Lisa Enrique (enrique.lisa@brevardschools.org)

3. Utilize standards mastery assessments within iReady to guide explicit instruction within vocabulary development across grades 2-6. Analyze results within PLCs.

**Person Responsible** Lucy Haddock (haddock.lucy@brevardschools.org)

4. Code learning engagements within the units of inquiry that have explicit opportunities for vocabulary development and monitor impacts through formative assessments.

**Person Responsible** Jennifer Noe (noe.jennifer@brevardschools.org)

5. Data will be analyzed after each diagnostic through the MTSS process to foster vertical and horizontal discourse among teachers.

**Person Responsible** Lucy Haddock (haddock.lucy@brevardschools.org)

6. Walkthroughs / virtual observations by the leadership team will provide ongoing support to teachers in vocabulary instruction. Walk through "look fors" will be collaboratively created based on SIP goals, IBPYP action plans and individual grade level goals.

**Person Responsible** Lucy Haddock (haddock.lucy@brevardschools.org)

#### #4. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Equity & Diversity

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

In the Youth Truth student survey, one of the areas that was not as we expected was the area of relationships with teachers. As a school, we fell at the 66th percentile with variations among grade levels. Likewise, as a school, we were in the 67th percentile for a respectful classroom environment. While much higher than Brevard Schools, this does not reflect what the adult's typical perspectives represent in the area of relationships and culture anecdotally. Additionally, given the context of the cultural climate in the United States, we feel this is an area to improve. Finally, given the state of ELearning and in-person learning, where building relationships will be a challenge, we want to ensure that the school community has access to tools and strategies to support relationships within the new context.

**Measurable Outcome:** Student perceptions of both relationships among teachers and students will increase four percentile points to 70th percentile on the Youth Truth Survey. Respectful classroom environment will increase three percentile points to 70th percentile.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Lucy Haddock (haddock.lucy@brevardschools.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Providing developmentally appropriate, representative texts will help students increase a sense of identity and belonging within the school setting. Classroom meetings will also increase student-teacher relationships within all grade levels. Finally, the addition of tools that are social-emotional curriculum based materials will provide increased safety and security for all students.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Student data such as the Youth Truth survey has provided a window into the perceptions of students and the need for reviewed curriculum supports such as social-emotional curriculums that align with the IB Philosophy. Increased monitoring of the IB Learner Profile as evident in student learning and reflection, in conjunction with the adoption of two curriculum supports and conscious selection of representative texts, will increase positive relationship perceptions for all learners.

#### Action Steps to Implement

1. During pre-planning, the administration will provide a hands-on professional development experience to spur open-minded thinking of all teachers.

**Person Responsible** Lucy Haddock (haddock.lucy@brevardschools.org)

2. Youth Truth survey data will be disaggregated by teachers through PLCs to determine areas of growth and supports needed.

**Person Responsible** Lucy Haddock (haddock.lucy@brevardschools.org)

3. Social Justice Standards will be implemented within all units of inquiry. These will be reflected upon and documented.

**Person Responsible** Lucy Haddock (haddock.lucy@brevardschools.org)

4. Time will be scheduled for teachers to observe others during classroom meetings and time will be given to reflect upon learning during PLCs.

**Person Responsible** Kathryn Lott (lott.kathryn@brevardschools.org)



5. Adoption and implementation of both the Monique Burr Safety Schools' curriculum and the Life Skills curriculum will support all learners in building relationships. These lessons will be implemented by the guidance counselor and media specialist in collaboration with the classroom teachers.

**Person Responsible** Lucy Haddock (haddock.lucy@brevardschools.org)

6. Administration will monitor and guide continuous development through both PLCs and the MTSS process/provide support as needed. This may include additional professional development opportunities, guiding articles, information in the Weekly Soarin' (a publication to all faculty from the assistant principal), classroom observations and more.

**Person Responsible** Kathryn Lott (lott.kathryn@brevardschools.org)

7. Purposeful monitored growth in the IB learner profile through ongoing conversations within the PLCs, documented on the unit planners and indicated in discourse based on walkthroughs and observations.

**Person Responsible** Lucy Haddock (haddock.lucy@brevardschools.org)

### 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.

Due to COVID, volunteers are not permitted on campus during the 2019-2020 school year at the time of this plan. Freedom 7 Elementary typically registers over 10,000 hours each year of parent support. The limitations of this current environment present many challenges, including over 50% of the schools' population has selected ELearning as their method of learning. Efforts have been made by all of the faculty at Freedom 7 to include all learners; 60% ELearning and 40% in person learning in a hybrid model. However, community decision making remains a core value.

The Freedom 7 community recognizes all of the stakeholders in decision making and reflection including students, faculty, community members, and families. Through formal structures such as SAC, faculty meetings, Threat Assessment Team, committee meetings, the Action Ambassador Committee Team

(AACT) and more, participants are provided opportunities to share input, question decisions, reflect and take leadership roles in the organization. The parent organization, Aydar Parents and Teachers (APT) plays an essential role in the decision making at Freedom 7. 100% of the families participate in the organization in a variety of ways. Anecdotal, informal feedback on social media, emails and through discourse with all stakeholders, is ongoing, organic and supportive of a continued growth mindset at Freedom 7 Elementary. As a result of input from the SAC, "SIP Tips" will continue to be shared through the newsletter, website and this year, on social media, to continue to build capacity of all stakeholders.

The nature of belonging to a larger International Baccalaureate community provides extensive feedback opportunities. As a member of the Florida League of IB Schools, and through continued work with the IB, stakeholders at Freedom 7 are able to participate in continuous learning with like-minded schools from around the state and globally.

Survey data from parents indicates 77% of our families feel they have the opportunity for provide input. When asked how to improve, a majority of the families (50%) requested more convenient meeting times. In an effort to grow in this area, we have expanded our formats to include Zoom meetings with recorded links, Facebook live with recorded meetings, flexible virtual parent nights and more. An increase in our communication with the use of social media should continue to demonstrate growth in this area.

According to the insight survey, 95% of the teachers feel feedback is sought and valued within the school house. Overall, according to the Insight survey, teachers ranked Freedom 7 above the Brevard top quartile in all domains. Hiring, as an area of opportunity growth as lowest for teachers knowing next steps in the hiring process.

According to the Youth Truth Survey, engagement and instructional methods ranked the highest with the lowest rated themes represented as academic rigor and relationships. A closer look shows a disparity among some grade levels that will be thoughtfully discussed throughout the 2020-2021 school year. Continued efforts through the student organization, AACT, will help to ensure student voice and choice is part of the ongoing discourse at Freedom 7.

**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: ESSA Subgroup: Economically Disadvantaged	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Equity & Diversity	\$0.00
<b>Total:</b>			<b>\$0.00</b>