

Manatee County Public Schools

Freedom 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	10
Planning for Improvement	17
Positive Culture & Environment	20
Budget to Support Goals	20

Freedom Elementary School

9515 E STATE ROAD 64, Bradenton, FL 34212

<https://www.manateeschools.net/freedom>

Demographics

Principal: Guy Grimes

Start Date for this Principal: 9/8/2021

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)	44%
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 Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (58%) 2017-18: B (54%) 2016-17: C (50%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
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 Manatee 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	10
Planning for Improvement	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	20

Freedom Elementary School

9515 E STATE ROAD 64, Bradenton, FL 34212

<https://www.manateeschools.net/freedom>

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p>Elementary School PK-5</p>	<p>2020-21 Title I School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>39%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>37%</p>

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Manatee 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.

We, the family of Freedom Elementary, in order to form a more dynamic school, establish a community of innovative learners, empower all students to reach their individual potential, provide a safe and secure environment, promote cultural diversity in an ever-changing world, and inspire a spirit of life-long learning for our school community, establish this mission for Freedom Elementary School.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision at Freedom Elementary is to enhance our instructional delivery, with the purpose of increasing our students' academic achievement.

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
Grimes, Guy	Principal	Oversees the running of all aspects of the school.
Danowski, Michele	Assistant Principal	
Brunner, Sherri	School Counselor	
Cleveland, Kenzie	Dean	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 9/8/2021, Guy Grimes

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.*

0

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.*

0

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

45

Total number of students enrolled at the school

597

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

0

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

2

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	79	96	73	95	76	101	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	520
Attendance below 90 percent	11	14	10	19	7	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75
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 FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	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	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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

Wednesday 9/8/2021

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	79	62	85	83	87	104	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	500
Attendance below 90 percent	2	1	2	5	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
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	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
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	79	62	85	83	87	104	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	500
Attendance below 90 percent	2	1	2	5	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
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	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times	0	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				61%	52%	57%	58%	50%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				66%	57%	58%	54%	54%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				48%	55%	53%	44%	47%	48%
Math Achievement				59%	63%	63%	62%	60%	62%
Math Learning Gains				66%	68%	62%	62%	61%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				44%	53%	51%	39%	47%	47%
Science Achievement				62%	48%	53%	61%	49%	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	52%	51%	1%	58%	-6%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	64%	56%	8%	58%	6%
Cohort Comparison		-52%				
05	2021					
	2019	64%	52%	12%	56%	8%
Cohort Comparison		-64%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	45%	60%	-15%	62%	-17%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	66%	65%	1%	64%	2%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		-45%				
05	2021					
	2019	67%	60%	7%	60%	7%
Cohort Comparison		-66%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	61%	48%	13%	53%	8%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

iReady (k-5) FSA (5 science)

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	36	57	81
	Economically Disadvantaged	24	46	68
	Students With Disabilities	15	33	67
	English Language Learners	0	0	25
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	26	61	83
	Economically Disadvantaged	16	42	72
	Students With Disabilities	22	56	78
	English Language Learners	0	0	33

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	33	61	68
	Economically Disadvantaged	18	41	50
	Students With Disabilities	13	38	50
	English Language Learners	17	50	58
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	39	54	73
	Economically Disadvantaged	31	36	50
	Students With Disabilities	20	29	53
	English Language Learners	0	43	71

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	58	75	81
	Economically Disadvantaged	45	67	73
	Students With Disabilities	32	55	56
	English Language Learners	27	50	63
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	19	45	73
	Economically Disadvantaged	21	41	62
	Students With Disabilities	7	21	46
	English Language Learners	0	0	0

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	46	64	69
	Economically Disadvantaged	33	63	66
	Students With Disabilities	11	22	13
	English Language Learners	33	78	78
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	44	74	86
	Economically Disadvantaged	38	67	84
	Students With Disabilities	17	50	80
	English Language Learners	0	0	50
Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	40	49	54
	Economically Disadvantaged	23	37	43
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	6
	English Language Learners	0	29	18
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	41	62	71
	Economically Disadvantaged	42	53	63
	Students With Disabilities	0	27	31
	English Language Learners	17	0	50
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	53	58	88
	Economically Disadvantaged	42	31	47
	Students With Disabilities	18	13	7
	English Language Learners	20	17	17

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	10		51	50		17				
ELL	55			68							
ASN	82			88							
BLK	39			61							
HSP	53	43		71	71		44				
WHT	72	54		83	70	38	66				
FRL	55	42		72	69		55				
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	18	38	37	21	51	47	20				
ELL	27	43	32	23	58	52	23				
ASN	100			100							
BLK	43	46	38	36	46	30	40				
HSP	41	56	44	39	61	45	46				
MUL	55			55							
WHT	76	74	69	75	72		81				
FRL	42	58	44	43	60	43	44				
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	10	32	37	14	37	29	18				
ELL	35	53	45	33	43	29	9				
ASN	85			92							
BLK	35	39	33	35	50	33					
HSP	39	47	44	42	51	35	41				
MUL	67			60							
WHT	71	58	47	78	69	54	70				
FRL	40	43	42	44	53	35	40				

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	57
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	76

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	455
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	97%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	33
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	66
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	85
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	50
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	60
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	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	64
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	61
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?

We see an increase in proficiency across all grade levels, subgroups and core content areas.

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

Our greatest needs for improvement based on school data are our Students with Disabilities, English Language Learners and African American subgroups.

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

Lack of ability grouping due to extenuating circumstances. Strategies have been put in to place to overcome this factor. We are increasing the opportunities to group students and are monitoring their progress closely.

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

Mathematics proficiency in grades 3 & 4.

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

The implementation of Acaletics. We will continue the use of this strategy.

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

The implementation of researched based strategies such as iReady, Acaletics, and Standards Based Mastery Assessments.

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.

The teachers have already completed Professional Development on each of the strategies listed above. New teachers will be afforded the same Professional Development.

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

Professional Development, iReady Toolbox, additional Write Score Assessments, implementation of new curriculum to meet the BEST standards.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on the data (iReady, classroom assessments & FSA) collected throughout the school year this subgroup consistently had low proficiency scores in the content areas of ELA and Math.
Measurable Outcome:	By May of 2022, students in this subgroup with increase their proficiency from 35% to 45% as evident on iReady for students in grades K-2 and the FSA for students in grades 3-5.
Monitoring:	Student performance data will be collected monthly to monitor the growth of each student within this subgroup.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Guy Grimes (grimesg@manateeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The evidence based strategies being implemented for this area of focus will be iReady, Standard Mastery Assessments and district Benchmark Assessments.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The current state of proficiency in this subgroup has been identified in the ESSA indicators which affects individual student success as well as affecting the school grade.

Action Steps to Implement

Implement the SIPPS program for the area ELA. Administer iReady three times throughout the year and adjust instructional delivery as need. Administer Standard Mastery Assessments monthly throughout the school year and adjust instructional delivery as needed.

Person Responsible Guy Grimes (grimesg@manateeschools.net)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Based on the data (iReady, classroom assessments & FSA) collected throughout the school year this subgroup consistently had low proficiency scores in the content areas of ELA and Math.

Measurable Outcome: By May of 2022, students in this subgroup with increase their proficiency from 40% to 45% as evident on iReady for students in grades K-2 and the FSA for students in grades 3-5.

Monitoring: Student performance data will be collected monthly to monitor the growth of each student within this subgroup.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Michele Danowski (danowskm@manateeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: The evidence based strategies being implemented for this area of focus will be iReady, Standard Mastery Assessments and district Benchmark Assessments.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The current state of proficiency in this subgroup has been identified in the ESSA indicators which affects individual student success as well as affecting the school grade.

Action Steps to Implement

Implement the SIPPS program for the area ELA. Administer iReady three times throughout the year and adjust instructional delivery as need. Administer Standard Mastery Assessments monthly throughout the school year and adjust instructional delivery as needed.

Person Responsible Michele Danowski (danowskm@manateeschools.net)

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on the data (iReady, classroom assessments & FSA) collected throughout the school year this subgroup consistently had low proficiency scores in the content areas of ELA and Math.
Measurable Outcome:	By May of 2022, students in this subgroup with increase their proficiency from 40% to 45% as evident on iReady for students in grades K-2 and the FSA for students in grades 3-5.
Monitoring:	Student performance data will be collected monthly to monitor the growth of each student within this subgroup.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Guy Grimes (grimesg@manateeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The evidence based strategies being implemented for this area of focus will be iReady, Standard Mastery Assessments and district Benchmark Assessments.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The current state of proficiency in this subgroup has been identified in the ESSA indicators which affects individual student success as well as affecting the school grade.

Action Steps to Implement

Implement the SIPPS program for the area ELA. Administer iReady three times throughout the year and adjust instructional delivery as need. Administer Standard Mastery Assessments monthly throughout the school year and adjust instructional delivery as needed.

Person Responsible Guy Grimes (grimesg@manateeschools.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.

Comparing our school data with the state's discipline data, we are below the 1 per 100 student ratio. Our primary concern would be classroom disruption and our secondary concern is attendance. We monitor the school culture and environment through surveys, guidance classroom sessions, and administrative walk throughs.

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.

All students who enter Freedom are welcomed to S.O.A.R. throughout their school career by integrating self control, on task behavior, achievement, and showing respect for themselves and others. School counselors collaborate with staff and families to meeting individual student needs academically, socially, and emotionally. School leaders incorporate an open door policy and provide a comprehensive classroom problem solving curriculum k-5. Positive behaviors are reinforced and celebrated regularly with the community and families. Virtual communication is enhanced through Facebook, Freedoms we page, Instagram, TEAMS and Schoology. Intensive support team members provide crisis intervention, data analysis and consultation. A certified therapist works weekly with individual students referred for support. To help create a more positive school environment, teachers and administrators created and posted virtual welcomes and tours of the classroom and school.

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

Administration - ensure communication if fluid, actively encourage student involvement in the S.O.A.R. program, ensure teachers are following the S.O.A.R. expectations

Support Staff (counselors, student support specialist) - highlight the S.O.A.R. program through interactive assemblies, actively encourage student involvement in the S.O.A.R. program

Teachers - actively encourage student involvement in the S.O.A.R. program

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: English Language Learners	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Black/African-American	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00