

Charlotte County Public Schools

Liberty Elementary School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	19
Positive Culture & Environment	23
Budget to Support Goals	24

Liberty Elementary School

370 ATWATER ST, Port Charlotte, FL 33954

<http://www.yourcharlotteschools.net/les>

Demographics

Principal: Carolyn Whaley

Start Date for this Principal: 9/15/2014

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
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2020-21 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 Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (57%) 2017-18: C (47%) 2016-17: B (56%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	

* 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 Charlotte 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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	19
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	24

Liberty Elementary School

370 ATWATER ST, Port Charlotte, FL 33954

<http://www.yourcharlotteschools.net/les>

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	96%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	41%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		B	B	C

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Charlotte 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 mission of Liberty Elementary School is to ensure that the freedom to learn prevails because: We provide standards based instruction

We focus on helping each child achieve his or her personal best in an inclusive setting

We create unique interventions, based on data, to support each child

We work together to ensure our students are ready to progress to the next grade level

We maintain a positive, safe, and engaging environment for our students to grow into responsible, respectful citizens.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Where the freedom to learn prevails.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Brown, Sheila	Principal	Co-Chair of Performance Partnership Committee (PPC) , School Advisory Council (SAC), Literacy Council and member of PTO. Responsible for scheduling Professional Development activities requested by the staff. Assist with student discipline interventions and parent conferences. Work with the CORE team to review grade level data monthly and provide support in the MTSS process.
Whaley, Carolyn	Assistant Principal	Co-Chair of the Support Performance Partnership Committee (SPPC), member of the Literacy Council, Leadership Team and PTO. Assist with student discipline interventions and parent conferences. Work with the CORE team to review grade level data monthly and provide support in the MTSS process.
Guerra, Julio	School Counselor	Assist teachers in implementing interventions and attend MTSS meetings every Tuesday. Communicate information with our families. Chairs PBIS for the school.
Dilena, Teresa	Instructional Coach	Provides professional development sessions in curricular and instructional areas; provides coaching and mentoring assistance; facilitates data team meetings and assists with data analysis and necessary follow up with teachers regarding interpretation and graphing; works with *Guidance Counselor, Social Worker, and School Psychologist to assist teachers in implementing interventions.
Booher, Jodi	Reading Coach	Provides professional development sessions in curricular and instructional areas; provides coaching and mentoring assistance; facilitates data team meetings and assists with data analysis and necessary follow up with teachers regarding interpretation and graphing
Herndon, Erin	Reading Coach	Provides professional development sessions in curricular and instructional areas; provides coaching and mentoring assistance; facilitates data team meetings and assists with data analysis and necessary follow up with teachers regarding interpretation and graphing
McQueen, Robyn	Reading Coach	Trains teachers in the Reading Recovery Process, works with individual students to close achievement gaps.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 9/15/2014, Carolyn Whaley

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.*

3

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

36

Total number of students enrolled at the school

561

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

6

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.

9

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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	91	90	81	85	88	101	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	536
Attendance below 90 percent	2	14	13	19	18	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	86
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	6	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	8	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	9	9	8	9	6	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55
	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	1	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

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	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
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 8/23/2021

2020-21 - 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	64	62	56	64	76	71	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	393
Attendance below 90 percent	7	10	8	8	9	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55
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	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	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	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

2020-21 - 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	64	62	56	64	76	71	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	393
Attendance below 90 percent	7	10	8	8	9	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55
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	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	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	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
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 Review

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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				59%	62%	57%	54%	59%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				59%	57%	58%	44%	52%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				59%	50%	53%	45%	41%	48%
Math Achievement				67%	63%	63%	63%	65%	62%
Math Learning Gains				58%	54%	62%	41%	54%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				50%	42%	51%	18%	39%	47%
Science Achievement				45%	54%	53%	61%	66%	55%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

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	2021					
	2019	76%	69%	7%	58%	18%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	51%	57%	-6%	58%	-7%
Cohort Comparison		-76%				
05	2021					
	2019	47%	56%	-9%	56%	-9%
Cohort Comparison		-51%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	85%	70%	15%	62%	23%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	63%	60%	3%	64%	-1%
Cohort Comparison		-85%				
05	2021					
	2019	48%	56%	-8%	60%	-12%
Cohort Comparison		-63%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	43%	52%	-9%	53%	-10%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

Progress monitoring tools used includes:

Kindergarten- FLKRS, STAR Early Literacy, DRA

First Grade and Second Grade- STAR Reading, STAR Math, DRA

Third, Fourth and Fifth Grade- STAR Reading, STAR Math, APM (Reading and Math),

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	22/33%	29/47%	44/60%
	Economically Disadvantaged	16/34%	19/34%	31/61%
	Students With Disabilities	9/41%	8/38%	12/55%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	0/0%	2/50%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	24/35%	34/58%	34/47%
	Economically Disadvantaged	16/34%	21/50%	25/50%
	Students With Disabilities	9/41%	11/55%	13/59%
	English Language Learners	2/50%	1/33%	0/0%
Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	32/44%	39/57%	41/50%
	Economically Disadvantaged	23/46%	26/58%	30/53%
	Students With Disabilities	4/19%	8/42%	6/35%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	2/67%	0/0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	17/23%	27/40%	41/51%
	Economically Disadvantaged	16/26%	20/44%	30/54%
	Students With Disabilities	2/10%	2/11%	8/33%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	0/0%	1/25%

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	33/45%	50/66%	45/60%
	Economically Disadvantaged	13/33%	24/62%	20/50%
	Students With Disabilities	2/11%	9/47%	7/35%
	English Language Learners	1/25%	2/40%	1/17%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	28/38%	43/57%	42/55%
	Economically Disadvantaged	11/28%	20/51%	19/46%
	Students With Disabilities	2/11%	6/32%	5/26%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	0/0%	1/20%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	39/42%	40/54%	39/43%
	Economically Disadvantaged	18/36%	25/47%	20/38%
	Students With Disabilities	5/28%	7/37%	5/28%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	1/20%	1/20%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	29/32%	41/46%	41/45%
	Economically Disadvantaged	15/30%	25/48%	30/38%
	Students With Disabilities	3/17%	8/44%	7/41%
	English Language Learners	2/40%	1/20%	3/60%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	29/35%	32/37%	36/38%
	Economically Disadvantaged	16/27%	20/32%	21/33%
	Students With Disabilities	0/0%	3/23%	2/14%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	14/18%	41/46%	35/88%
	Economically Disadvantaged	8/14%	24/40%	17/27%
	Students With Disabilities	1/7%	3/25%	3/21%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	1/20%	1/33%
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	41/53%	58/66%	
	Economically Disadvantaged	26/47%	36/59%	
	Students With Disabilities	2/17%	7/50%	
	English Language Learners	1/50%	1/50%	

Subgroup Data Review

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	38	15		32	31		15				
ELL	68			63							
BLK	43	43		32	29		31				
HSP	62	43		58	43		50				
MUL	43			64							
WHT	60	49	14	59	38	38	38				
FRL	52	39	24	48	35	35	34				
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	34	43	45	37	40	45	4				
ELL	50	54		67	55						
BLK	52	40		48	36						

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
HSP	59	63	55	72	59		38				
MUL	45	81		41	38		27				
WHT	62	57	60	72	63	57	54				
FRL	54	58	58	66	55	52	40				
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	38	22	32	36	16	7	24				
ELL	36			36							
BLK	61			53	40						
HSP	46	30		54	31		38				
MUL	50	56		75	38						
WHT	56	43	41	65	44	14	66				
FRL	52	42	38	59	35	16	57				

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	45
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	58
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	356
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	26
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	63
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

English Language Learners	
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	36
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	51
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	54
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	42
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	38
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

Based on the 2020-21 school year data, the lowest data component was Science. This group of students struggled with ELA proficiency which made science content proficiency very difficult. In addition, since our proficiency scores were low in both ELA and Math achievement for fifth grade, our growth and bottom quartile scores were also lower.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

There was a great need for improvement with the fifth grade students in the area of science with a proficiency score at 37%. In addition students in the bottom quartiles of both reading and math struggled to make their learning gain from third to fifth grade.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

The contributing factors for this need for improvement was the dynamics on the fifth grade team 2020-21 school year. We had individuals who were new to the grade level or new to the subject areas they were teaching. The action steps talked to address this was to interview and select from our staff a team of individuals who was more familiar with fifth grade curriculum, standards and expectations.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

When looking at the scores we did not have an overall area of improvement. However our third students kept their proficiency in the A range for ELA and Math.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

In third grade we have teachers who have been in the grade level and have a high level of teacher clarity when providing instruction.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

In order to accelerate learning during the 2021-22 school year we will be implementing high quality instruction using the Benchmark series for Tier 1 instruction. In addition, we will be implementing high quality researched based interventions for Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions. Implementing high quality instruction during all three tiers of instruction will accelerate learning for all students.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

We will be providing teachers and staff professional development activities on the following items:

- KEY (Keep Education Yourself) Reading Professional development for second grade team
- Science Professional Development specifically targeting fifth grade
- Benchmark Professional Development for all Kinder-Fifth grade classroom teachers
- Level Literacy Interventions (LLI) Professional Development for k-5 teachers and paraprofessionals
- Positive Alignment of BPIE indicator training for paraprofessionals
- Do the Math

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

When our SOAR and ELL paraprofessionals are not covering in classrooms, they will be used to provide high quality interventions to accelerate the learning of our Tier 2 kids.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	To increase our percent of students who make their learning gain in ELA and Math, with a specific focus on increasing our learning gains for our students in the bottom quartile and our students with disabilities. If students increase their learning gain in ELA and Math it increase overall proficiency for the school.
Measurable Outcome:	Gain 77 overall school grade component points in the following areas: ELA Achievement: 6 ELA Gains: 8 ELA Bottom Quartile Gains: 18 Math Achievement: 8 Math Gains: 17 Math Bottom Quartile Gains: 6 Science: 14
Monitoring:	The area of focus will be monitored based using our school based assessments (APM, USA Test Prep, STAR). We will be discussing the data at collaborative planning. We will continue to progress monitor individual students via our MTSS team during TST meetings and at IEP meetings.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Sheila Brown (sheila.brown@yourcharlotteschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Liberty Elementary School will increase student achievement through standards based instruction, with a focus on implementing our new Benchmark reading series for Tier 1 instruction. We will continue to use our collaborative planning time to monitor student performance on common assessments and Benchmark assessments. We will continue to discuss high effect size strategies during our weekly Pow Wow staff meetings. In addition we will continue to implement guided reading techniques to include professional development, Reading recovery, and strong interventions using Leveled Literacy Materials and our MTSS process when necessary. Lastly, we will continue the use of our intervention classroom (SOAR) to provide Tier 2 instruction utilizing Literacy Footprints for ELA and Do the Math for math for acceleration to our bottom quartile students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	In a previous year Liberty Elementary gained 71 points while implementing some of these strategies. We have refined the strategies we saw great benefit from and have added new strategies such as providing each teacher a research based program for Tier 2 instruction (LLI and Benchmark) and additionally implementing the Benchmark reading series.
Action Steps to Implement	
	Implement Tier 1 (Benchmark), and Tier 2 and 3 (LLI) research based instruction for on grade level learning and acceleration.
Person Responsible	Sheila Brown (sheila.brown@yourcharlotteschools.net)
	Provide specific Professional Development for Guided Reading time to continue the Reading Recovery model in second grade and with new teachers.
Person Responsible	Teresa Dilena (teresa.dilena@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Continue implementation of the Reading Recovery program for our Bottom Quartile first graders to provide acceleration in reading.

Person Responsible Jodi Booher (jodi.booher@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Monitor students at all tiers of instruction using Renaissance and Benchmark with monthly child talk meetings with a specific focus on Tier 3 students and Students with Disabilities.

Person Responsible Gretchen Schnulle (gretchen.schnulle@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Implement school wide Science plan to include each grade levels specific focus on Professional Development opportunities with our Science Curriculum and Instruction Specialist.

Person Responsible Teresa Dilena (teresa.dilena@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Continue the use of the intervention classroom with ESE coach and paraprofessionals with a focus on acceleration utilizing Literacy Footprint and Do the Math for students with disabilities and bottom quartile students.

Person Responsible Gretchen Schnulle (gretchen.schnulle@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Continue the use of grade level paraprofessionals to provide interventions to support acceleration to students with disabilities at each grade level.

Person Responsible Sheila Brown (sheila.brown@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Using our Literacy Leadership Team and Learning Walks, we will set goals and utilize personnel from our County Office to provide feedback and coaching.

Person Responsible Sheila Brown (sheila.brown@yourcharlotteschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Using last years school FSA data Liberty Elementary School had 43% of our students were below proficiency on ELA FSA for third, fourth and fifth grade students. In addition last years kindergarten, first, and second grade students shows 35% of our students are not on grade level using the STAR data.
Measurable Outcome:	In kindergarten, first and second grade Liberty Elementary will increase our reading proficiency to 80%. In addition, Liberty Elementary will increase third grade FSA reading proficiency score 70%, fourth grade proficiency to 60% and fifth grade proficiency to 59%; with an overall proficiency on FSA totaling 63%.
Monitoring:	The area of focus will be monitored based using our school based assessments (APM, and STAR). We will be discussing the data at collaborative planning. We will continue to progress monitor individual students via our MTSS team during TST meetings and at IEP meetings.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Sheila Brown (sheila.brown@yourcharlotteschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Liberty Elementary School will increase student achievement through standards based instruction, with a focus on implementing our new Benchmark reading series for Tier 1 instruction. We will continue to use our collaborative planning time to monitor student performance on common assessments and Benchmark assessments. We will continue to discuss Marzano high effect size strategies for ELA during our weekly Pow Wow staff meetings. In addition we will continue to implement guided reading techniques to include professional development, Reading recovery, and strong interventions using Leveled Literacy Materials and our MTSS process when necessary. Lastly, we will continue the use of our intervention classroom (SOAR) to provide Tier 2 instruction utilizing Literacy Footprints for ELA for acceleration to our bottom quartile students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	All programs above were chosen because the programs being used are evidence based demonstrating moderate to strong evidence as defined by ESSA and are included as B.E.S.T. aligned evidence-based strategies in Charlotte's K-12 CERP. The strategies we have chosen have proven effective in the past.

Action Steps to Implement

Implement Tier 1 (Benchmark), and Tier 2 and 3 (LLI) research based instruction for on grade level learning and acceleration.

Person Responsible Sheila Brown (sheila.brown@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Provide specific Professional Development for Guided Reading time to continue the Reading Recovery model in second grade and with new teachers.

Person Responsible Teresa Dilena (teresa.dilena@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Continue implementation of the Reading Recovery program for our Bottom Quartile first graders to provide acceleration in reading.

Person Responsible Jodi Booher (jodi.booher@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Using our Literacy Leadership Team and Learning Walks, we will set goals and utilize personnel from our County Office to provide feedback and coaching.

Person Responsible Sheila Brown (sheila.brown@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safeschoolsforalex.org), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

When comparing Liberty Elementary to the discipline data on Safe Schools for Alex, Liberty Elementary had very low suspensions and SESIR offenses. During the 2019 school year we had less than 10 suspensions reported.

We will continue to utilize our MTSS program to identify students who need assistance for behaviors. In addition we have identified areas of campus where students have the most difficulty behaving and the most referrals (lunch, recess and specials). We have created expectations for each of these areas and teach them at the beginning of the year. Throughout the school year we reteach these expectations as needed.

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.

Liberty Elementary strives to build positive relationships with parents and families and community stakeholders by asking for feedback on our school improvement goals. We share the school improvement plan with our Parent Teacher Organization and our School Advisory Committee and ask for their feedback and input. LES administrative team sends out a survey to staff each year to assess our progress in building a positive environment. LES partners with Chick Fil A and New Day Christian Church to make sure we can better meet the needs of all of our students and celebrate the successes with our families outside of school. Our student leadership team supports several local agencies through volunteering and fundraising.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

Administrative Team: provide support to staff, students and families through out the school year.

Instructional Leaders: provide supports to staff including mentoring and assisting new teachers.

PPC Committee: provides feedback to school administration and problem solves when necessary

PTO and SAC meeting: provides parent feedback to the school on SIP, PFEP, and partners with the school to ensure collaborative communication

New Day Christian Church: provides a year long partnership to the school for our students

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00