Freedom Elementary School

2021-22 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
2020-21 Title I School	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	87%
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 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%)
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	

> * 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.](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

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)	**2020-21 Title I School**	**2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	No	56%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	47%

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 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	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Boyd-Walker, Joy	Principal	Oversee school functions and budget; evaluate instructional staff and school leadership team; steer school vision, mission and School Improvement Plan.
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.
Hoover, Leigh	Instructional Coach	Schedule and provide professional development for teachers; facilitate grade level PLCs; lead coaching cycles with individual teachers.
Land, Tanya	Teacher, ESE	Provide Exceptional Student Education input (ESE support facilitation teacher).
Flesch, Melissa	Teacher, K-12	Provide primary instructional input and technology leadership role.
Allen, Heather	Teacher, K-12	Provide intermediate instructional input.
Kruszeski, Tracy	Teacher, K-12	Provide primary instructional input (kindergarten).
Haske, Barbara	Teacher, K-12	Provide primary instructional input (second grade).
Scott, Gwendolyn	Teacher, K-12	Provide primary instructional input (kindergarten).
Stephanie, Urso	Teacher, K-12	Provide intermediate instructional input.

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
53

Total number of students enrolled at the school

732

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

2

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

14

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	101	129	117	127	111	124	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	709
Attendance below 90 percent	11	16	11	8	11	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	68
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	3	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	13	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	3	23	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	3	13	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36

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	3	7	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

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	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 8/27/2021

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	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	

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	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	

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				69%	56%	57%	61%	55%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				63%	56%	58%	45%	51%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				53%	46%	53%	24%	39%	48%
Math Achievement				68%	59%	63%	68%	60%	62%
Math Learning Gains				55%	56%	62%	55%	54%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				48%	43%	51%	35%	40%	47%
Science Achievement				74%	57%	53%	51%	58%	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	70%	58%	12%	58%	12%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	65%	54%	11%	58%	7%
Cohort Comparison		-70%				
05	2021					
	2019	66%	54%	12%	56%	10%
Cohort Comparison		-65%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	68%	60%	8%	62%	6%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					

MATH							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	69%	59%	10%	64%	5%
Cohort Comparison		-68%				
05	2021					
	2019	60%	54%	6%	60%	0%
Cohort Comparison		-69%				

SCIENCE							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	70%	56%	14%	53%	17%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

2020-2021 iReady Diagnostic Assessments 1, 2 and 3
5th Grade Science Standards Monitoring Test (SMT) and Volusia Science Test (VST)

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	94/20.21%	101/40.59%	102/61.76%
	Economically Disadvantaged	59/16.95%	66/43.94%	64/64.06%
	Students With Disabilities	14/7.14%	18/16.67%	17/35.29%
	English Language Learners	12/16.67%	12/25.00%	13/38.46%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	94/11.70%	100/27.00%	103/62.14%
	Economically Disadvantaged	59/8.47%	65/18.46%	65/60.00%
	Students With Disabilities	14/14.29%	16/6.25%	17/41.18%
	English Language Learners	12/.8.33%	12/25.00%	14/41.41%

Grade 2				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	109/34.86%	120/50.00%	124/66.13%
	Economically Disadvantaged	62/29.03%	67/43.28%	67/56.72%
	Students With Disabilities	21/0%	23/17.39%	22/31.82%
	English Language Learners	17/23.53%	21/23.81%	21/57.14%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	107/14.02%	118/38.14%	118/61.86%
	Economically Disadvantaged	61/11.48%	66/30.30%	65/49.23%
	Students With Disabilities	21/0%	23/8.70%	21/23.81%
	English Language Learners	16/18.75%	20/20.00%	20/50.00%

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	106/54.72%	112/75.89%	116/82.76%
	Economically Disadvantaged	59/42.37%	63/68.25%	66/77.27%
	Students With Disabilities	29/10.34%	30/46.67%	32/59.38%
	English Language Learners	16/31.25%	17/70.59%	18/72.22%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	105/13.33%	113/34.51%	110/64.55%
	Economically Disadvantaged	58/5.17%	64/17.19%	61/52.46%
	Students With Disabilities	29/3.45%	31/16.13%	29/44.83%
	English Language Learners	15/0.00%	17/5.88%	17/47.06%

Grade 4				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	101/39.60%	104/50.00%	107/54.21%
	Economically Disadvantaged	67/37.31%	69/39.13%	71/46.48%
	Students With Disabilities	23/17.39%	24/12.50%	24/16.67%
	English Language Learners	15/33.33%	16/37.50%	16/37.50%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	100/18.00%	104/42.31%	108/67.59%
	Economically Disadvantaged	66/10.61%	70/28.57%	71/59.15%
	Students With Disabilities	22/9.09%	24/8.33%	24/25.00%
	English Language Learners	15/13.33%	16/25.00%	16/68.75%

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	113/41.59%	114/50.88%	114/57.89%
	Economically Disadvantaged	67/40.30%	68/36.76%	68/47.06%
	Students With Disabilities	25/8.00%	25/12.00%	23/17.39%
	English Language Learners	22/27.27%	22/31.82%	22/50.00%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	112/31.25%	109/41.28%	108/61.11%
	Economically Disadvantaged	67/22.39%	63/33.33%	62/56.45%
	Students With Disabilities	25/0%	25/16.00%	22/31.82%
	English Language Learners	22/22.73%	22/31.82%	20/45.00%
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	496/50%	363/66%	274/83%
	Economically Disadvantaged	280/37%	214/60%	163/77%
	Students With Disabilities	96/21%	66/40%	48/70%
	English Language Learners	93/25%	70/35%	53/79%

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	25	30	21	27	22	27	18				
ELL	56	68		40	21		55				
BLK	42	38		35	29		38				
HSP	63	56		44	24	10	52				
WHT	74	70	42	69	51		74				
FRL	54	48	32	45	32	24	47				

| | **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				

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	48
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	48
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	387

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	27
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	48
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
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	42
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A

Multiracial Students	
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	63
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	41
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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?

One of our subgroups that have shown a declining trend in math achievement levels is our students with disabilities; in 2018 41% were proficient, in 2019 39% were proficient and in 2021 only 27% were proficient. Our African American students also declined in their math achievement levels from 48% in 2019 to 35% in 2021.
There was also a downward trend across grade levels in math proficiency levels from 2019 to 2021. In 3rd grade our proficiency level went down from 68% in 2019 to 62% in 2021, our 4th grade math proficiency levels went down from 69% in 2019 to 55% in 2021, and our 5th grade proficiency level went down from 60% in 2019 to 45% in 2021.

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

Our students identified in the lowest quartile in math had a decreased proficiency level from 48% proficient in the 2018-19 school year to 19% proficient in 2020-21 school year.

Our students identified in the lowest quartile in English Language Arts had a decreased proficiency level from 53% proficient in the 2018-19 school year to 37% proficient in 2020-21 school year.

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 were related to the COVID-19 pandemic, specifically frequent and unpredictable quarantines and absences. Online learning also presented challenges to our teachers and students.

While we cannot control the pandemic, there are actions within our school we can take including consistency with math small group instruction, and specific progress monitoring for the students in the lowest quartile in math and reading.

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

There were no data components from state assessments that showed an improvement from 2019 to 2021.

We did maintain proficiency in ELA from 2019 to 2021, from a proficiency rate of 69% in 2019 to a proficiency rate of 66% in 2021.

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

The contributing factor was the continued focus on small group instruction. The new action our school took was to have structured and data driven PLCs.

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

Classroom teachers will be provided clarification on structured and purposeful math intervention through professional development and PLCs.
Utilizing our Reading Intervention Teacher in grades 3-5 for targeted small group instruction.
We will implement a modified walk-to intervention.
Our STEM teacher will increase the emphasis on math content and collaborate with teachers to align standards.

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.

Teachers will receive training on the new ELA curriculum.
Academic Coach will provide training on the difference between intervention vs. small group and provide strategies and structures.
The STEM teacher will be given time to collaborate with classroom teachers during PLC on math instruction.

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

Classroom teachers will collaborate during PLC to discuss math intervention services and make plans for future groups and improvement to instruction.
Academic Coach will provide training on the difference between intervention vs. small group and provide strategies and structures during PLC.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	This Area of Focus aligns to Strategic Plan Goal 1: Engage all students in high levels of learning every day. As a result of our Needs Assessment and Analysis it revealed that our Math Proficiency was at 57%, Math Learning Gains were 40% and the Lowest Quartile performed at 19%.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase Math overall proficiency from 57% to 62%. Increase Math LQ learning gains from 40% to 54%.
Monitoring:	This Area of Focus will be monitored through daily classroom observations using a walkthrough tool with a specific focus on Math. The academic coach and administration will attend PLCs where data chats will have a strong focus on math intervention strategies.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Leigh Hoover (lahoover@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teacher Clarity will be the evidence based strategy we utilize. We will monitor it through frequent walkthroughs by school-based administrations, coaches, and the district support team. Specific and timely feedback will be provided to teachers. Grade level teams and individual teachers will receive feedback to guide them in planning and instructing for input on students' learning and determining next steps.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Teacher Clarity has an effect size of 0.75 (Hattie, 2009). The average affect size is 0.40, which is equal to approximately one year of learning. At 0.75, it is likely that the impact on students is significantly greater than average when teacher clarity is implemented with fidelity. John Hattie describes teacher clarity and excellent teachers as those who: • have appropriately high expectations. • share their notions of success criteria with their students. • ensure that there is constructive alignment between the lesson, the task, and the assignment. • ensure that the delivery of the lesson is relevant, accurate, and comprehensible to students; and provide welcome feedback about where to move to next.

Action Steps to Implement

Establish baseline data utilizing iReady diagnostic assessment.

Person Responsible	Leigh Hoover (lahoover@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Continue professional learning on Teacher Clarity (book study, ERPL, PLCs)

Person Responsible	Leigh Hoover (lahoover@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Conduct monthly PLCs focusing on math intervention data and instruction.

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

Conduct coaching cycles to support mathematics instruction.

Person Responsible	Leigh Hoover (lahoover@volusia.k12.fl.us)

STEM and classroom teachers collaborate to design standards-based hands-on math instruction that target math standards below 70% proficiency.

Person Responsible   William Goldsmith (wbgoldsm@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Utilize Learning Intentions and Success Criteria to ensure students know what they are learning.

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

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	This Area of Focus aligns to Strategic Plan Goal 1: Engage all students in high levels of learning every day. As a result of our Needs Assessment and Analysis it revealed that our ELA Lowest Quartile proficiency rate was at 37% and Math Lowest Quartile proficiency rate was at 19%. Our ESSA Subgroups that performed below 41% in ELA were SWD at 21% and AA at 0%. Our ESSA Subgroups that performed below 41% in Math were SWD at 27% and AA at 22%.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase our math achievement level for students with disabilities from 27% to 41%. Increase our math achievement level for African American students from 35% to 41%.
Monitoring:	This area of focus will be monitored through analyzing student's academic data, including iReady and district assessments, during PLCs and ensuring the implementation of daily academic interventions/enrichment by regular classroom visits.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Joy Boyd-Walker (jrboyd1@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The evidence-based strategy we will utilize is response to intervention. This will be monitored through frequent walk-throughs, coaching cycles and PLCs with a focus on our ESSA subgroups.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Students within these subgroups will participate in small group intervention 5 days a week in math and ELA. The effect size of response to intervention is 1.29 (Hattie).

Action Steps to Implement

Establish baseline data in math and ELA for our ESSA subgroups to guide instruction in intervention groups.

Person Responsible	Leigh Hoover (lahoover@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Obtain monthly support from District math department to collaborate with administration and teachers to assist with data analysis with ESSA subgroups and create an action plan.

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

PLCs meet bi-weekly to continually monitor the data and make adjustments as needed for response to intervention.

Person Responsible	William Goldsmith (wbgoldsm@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Academic coach provides coaching cycles for teachers with a specific focus on response to intervention.

Person Responsible	Leigh Hoover (lahoover@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Training on resources and strategies for effective response to intervention.

Person Responsible	Leigh Hoover (lahoover@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Record model lessons of best practices during intervention.

Person Responsible William Goldsmith (wbgoldsm@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Target use of technology to differentiate standards-aligned instruction using teacher assigned lessons to meet the needs of students.

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

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	As a result of our Needs Assessment and Analysis it revealed that our ELA proficiency for the lowest quartile was at 37 %, which was substantially lower than our overall proficiency rate of 66 %. The 37 % proficiency rate for our lowest quartile was a decrease from 2018-19 proficiency rate of 53%.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase the ELA lowest quartile proficiency rate from 37 % to 53%.
Monitoring:	This Area of Focus will be monitored through daily classroom observations using a walkthrough tool with a specific focus on ELA. The academic coach and administration will facilitate PLCs where data chats will have a strong focus on ELA intervention strategies.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Joy Boyd-Walker (jrboyd1@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Response to intervention will be utilized to provide students in our lowest ELA quartile with focused small group instruction. Specific and timely feedback will be provided to teachers. Grade level teams and individual teachers will receive feedback to guide them in planning and instructing for input on students' learning and determining next steps.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Students identified as being in the lowest quartile in ELA will participate in small group intervention 5 days a week. The effect size of response to intervention is 1.29 (Hattie).

Action Steps to Implement

Analyze I-Ready diagnostic, District recommended Diagnostic Assessments and Ongoing Progress Monitoring data to tier students for intervention.

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

Provide ongoing professional learning on the new ELA series to support small group instruction.

Person Responsible	Leigh Hoover (lahoover@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Create Coaching Cycles that focus on ELA standards and FSA content areas where our LQ students struggled with meeting proficiency.

Person Responsible	Leigh Hoover (lahoover@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Create highly effective PLCs for ELA data chats that focus on student grouping and differentiated instruction.

Person Responsible	Leigh Hoover (lahoover@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the 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.

According to the school safety dashboard Freedom Elementary ranked 366 out of 1,395 elementary schools for discipline referrals. Last year a majority of our referrals came from male students in grades K - 2nd. We will utilize our two school counselors for Social Emotional Learning throughout the school and to take proactive measures including but not limited to monthly discipline meetings; SEL classrooms lessons; student mentors and action plans based on school wide discipline data.

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.

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
• Social Emotional Learning integrated into daily instruction
• Annual FSA pep rally
• 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
• Peer mentors for new teachers

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

• Joy Boyd-Walker, Principal and William Goldsmith, Assistant Principal – Coordinate with all stakeholders to implement school events and initiatives with the goal of building on and maintaining a positive school culture and environment
• Amy Espinoza and Kathryn Clay – Serve as leaders of Social Emotional Learning at Freedom, including coordinating events and working closely with teachers on helping to create positive classroom environments
• School Advisory Committee – Assists with making important decisions for our school, including school-wide events and initiatives
• Parent Teacher Association – Host family and community events, including fundraisers and our Winter Holiday Shop
• Sunshine Committee – Host monthly celebrations for teachers and staff to help build morale and a positive school climate

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: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	$0.00
		Total:	**$0.00**