

Orange County Public Schools

Freedom Middle



2022-23 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	15
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Freedom Middle

2850 TAFT VINELAND RD, Orlando, FL 32837

<https://freedomms.ocps.net/>

Demographics

Principal: Robert Walker

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2015

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2021-22 Title I School	No
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	92%
2021-22 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	2021-22: B (59%) 2018-19: B (55%) 2017-18: 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	ATSI
* 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 Orange 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	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Freedom Middle

2850 TAFT VINELAND RD, Orlando, FL 32837

<https://freedomms.ocps.net/>

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2021-22 Title I School	2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 6-8	No	92%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	86%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	B		B	B

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at

<https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

To ensure every student has a promising and successful future.

Provide the school's vision statement.

With the support of families and the community, we create an enriching and diverse pathways that lead our students to success.

School Leadership Team

Membership

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Leavitt, Cheri	Principal	Responsible for academic needs and learning, social and emotional needs, and safety of all on campus.
Hurst, Toby	Assistant Principal	To assist the principal with academic needs and learning, social and emotional needs, and safety of all on campus.
Josephs Richardson, Alicia	Assistant Principal	To assist the principal with academic needs and learning, social and emotional needs, and safety of all on campus.
Leach, Renee	Instructional Coach	Responsible for assisting teachers in the area of English/Language Arts Florida Standards implementation, lesson planning, common assessment, and differentiation of instruction.
Rodriguez, Yarin	Staffing Specialist	Responsible for all federal, state, and district mandates governing the education of Students with Disabilities.
Storms, Jacqueline	Other	Responsible for implementing Threat Response Protocols, serves and mental health designee, and serves as community resource liaison.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/1/2015, Robert Walker

Number of teachers with a 2022 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 2022 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.*

29

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

73

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,178

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

15

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

26

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current 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	0	0	0	0	0	0	393	365	370	0	0	0	0	1128
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	102	101	111	0	0	0	0	314
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	29	29	0	0	0	0	68
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	11	13	0	0	0	0	38
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	4	21	0	0	0	0	31
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	102	128	155	0	0	0	0	385
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	133	102	130	0	0	0	0	365
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	111	114	131	0	0	0	0	356

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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	110	111	142	0	0	0	0	363

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 8/17/2022

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	345	365	362	0	0	0	0	1072
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	62	96	97	0	0	0	0	255
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	17	20	0	0	0	0	43
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	13	24	0	0	0	0	51
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	15	55	0	0	0	0	86
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	91	66	0	0	0	0	217
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	51	81	65	0	0	0	0	197
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	94	141	118	0	0	0	0	353
	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	44	93	89	0	0	0	0	226

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	345	365	362	0	0	0	0	1072
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	62	96	97	0	0	0	0	255
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	17	20	0	0	0	0	43
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	13	24	0	0	0	0	51
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	15	55	0	0	0	0	86
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	91	66	0	0	0	0	217
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	51	81	65	0	0	0	0	197
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	94	141	118	0	0	0	0	353
	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	44	93	89	0	0	0	0	226

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	45%	49%	50%				47%	52%	54%
ELA Learning Gains	47%						48%	52%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	38%						39%	45%	47%
Math Achievement	56%	36%	36%				53%	55%	58%
Math Learning Gains	68%						54%	55%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	65%						56%	50%	51%
Science Achievement	48%	55%	53%				53%	51%	51%
Social Studies Achievement	72%	61%	58%				61%	67%	72%

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
06	2022					
	2019	40%	52%	-12%	54%	-14%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	35%	48%	-13%	52%	-17%
Cohort Comparison		-40%				
08	2022					
	2019	42%	54%	-12%	56%	-14%
Cohort Comparison		-35%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2022					
	2019	39%	43%	-4%	55%	-16%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	40%	49%	-9%	54%	-14%
Cohort Comparison		-39%				
08	2022					
	2019	21%	36%	-15%	46%	-25%
Cohort Comparison		-40%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019	43%	49%	-6%	48%	-5%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	54%	66%	-12%	71%	-17%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	74%	63%	11%	61%	13%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	94%	53%	41%	57%	37%

Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	20	37	32	29	56	56	26	27			
ELL	26	43	38	42	60	60	32	58	84		
ASN	58	54		80	76		62	90	93		
BLK	40	41		45	68	63	45	72	83		
HSP	37	45	39	50	66	62	42	67	90		
MUL	85	71		80	67						
WHT	64	48	60	71	72	70	61	82	95		
FRL	43	42	30	54	67	62	46	72	87		
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	19	36	39	23	28	31	29	20			
ELL	21	49	53	29	43	46	22	44	70		

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
ASN	70	59		72	60		83	61	90		
BLK	36	38	47	36	32	35	13	62	60		
HSP	42	52	50	41	40	48	43	57	74		
MUL	62	46		54	50						
WHT	57	59	55	62	39	45	54	68	87		
FRL	46	46	38	42	33	41	39	53	74		
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	16	29	17	21	43	38	25	38			
ELL	30	47	41	40	52	51	33	45	72		
ASN	78	62		70	55		72	88	84		
BLK	40	44	28	46	48	57	33	57	84		
HSP	42	47	41	49	54	55	49	59	76		
MUL	45	36		64	55						
WHT	56	48	35	66	57	68	68	69	88		
FRL	43	45	36	50	52	55	48	54	79		

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	58
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	45
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	575
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	35
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	49
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	73
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	51
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	54
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	76
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	69
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	53
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

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 data, the percentage of student achievement in ELA has declined over the past three school years by 1%. There was a 4% increase in ELA learning gains between the 2019 and 2021 school years. Learning gains in ELA then showed a decline of 5% between the 2021 and 2022 school years. Among the lowest quartile in ELA, students made an 11% improvement from 2019 to 2021; however, between 2021 and 2022 there was a decrease in student growth for the lowest quartile by 12 percentage points.

In Math, student achievement decreased by 7 percentage points between 2019 and 2021. There was a 10% increase in 2022. Math learning gains between 2019 and 2021 showed a significant decrease of 13%, but rebounded by 27% in 2022. The lowest quartile in math also showed a decrease of 9% between 2019 and 2021, but increased by 18 percentage points in 2022.

Science achievement showed a 7% increase from 2019 to 2021 and a 2% increase from 2021 to 2022.

Social Studies achievement remained the same at 61% 2019 and 2021 before making a significant increase of 11% in 2022.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Based on progress monitoring and 2022 state assessment data, ELA lowest quartile demonstrates the greatest need for improvement with a 12% decline between 2021 and 2022.

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

Based on the data, the mid-year departures of two ELA teachers - including the Literacy Lead, a shift in support, as well as the lack of ongoing and consistent data-based support for teachers - all contributed to the 12% decline in the ELA lowest quartile scores.

A new action this year is we are combining the reading and math intensive teachers into one PLC to support greater teacher collaboration of best practices for addressing the needs of lowest quartile students, given the significant overlap of students enrolled in both curriculum areas. Additionally, coaches and administrators can better facilitate ongoing and consistent monitoring of the curriculum implementation, instructional needs, and assessment data. As a result of this change, data-based decisions can be made to determine where additional teacher and/or student support is needed.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Based on progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, the lowest 25th percentile in Math showed the greatest improvement of 18 percentage points.

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

Ongoing and consistent coaching, monitoring and support for curriculum implementation, including the rotational model, instructional practices and formative and summative assessment data all contributed to the gains. Department-wide incentives were added and progress monitoring tools were put in place. Model teaching was done by coaches and other teachers. Focused peer observations were completed, and the coaching cycle was implemented as appropriate.

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

Administrators and coaches will ensure that there is equitable distribution of resources and support across all content areas.

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.

Professional development offered this year will focus on parallel teaching, teaching within a rotational model, and data literacy.

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

To ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond, we will evaluate what worked and use the data to create redundancy of effective teaching practices.

Areas of Focus

Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**Area of Focus
Description and
Rationale:****Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**

Our area of most critical need was identified as our students with disabilities. SWD students had very minimal success in making academic achievement as measured by 2021-2022 progress monitoring data as well as 2022 state assessment data.

**Measurable Outcome:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**

Students with disabilities will increase by 7 percentage points in proficiency, across all grade levels in reading and math as evidenced by progress monitoring data, by the end of the 2022-2023 school year.

**Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**

This area of focus will be monitored through the analysis of progress monitoring data in ELA and Math instruction. Teachers, coaches, and administrators will analyze data and make adjustments to instruction to meet the needs of students.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Cheri Leavitt (cheri.godek@ocps.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:
Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**

ESE Support facilitation teachers will provide parallel teaching in ELA and Math. Teachers will use a rotational model to explicitly teach/reteach both current and trailing standards each day. Teachers will be able to closely monitor student progress through frequent formative assessment and provide early intervention within each unit of instruction. Teachers will adjust instruction based on the needs of the students.

Intensive instruction will involve working with students with similar needs on a small number of high priority, clearly defined skills or concepts critical to academic success. Teachers will group students based on common learning needs and use systematic, explicit and well-paced instruction. Frequent monitoring of students' progress will be done within the intensive instruction classroom and instruction will be adjusted as needed, based on student data. In the Intensive instruction classrooms, students will have many opportunities to respond to and receive immediate, corrective feedback from teachers and peers.

Rationale for Evidence-based

By using parallel teaching and rotational model in the regular core classes, and focusing on front loading essential upcoming standards and reteaching trailing standards using a

Strategy:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

rotational model in the intensive classes teachers will be able to better monitor student progress based on frequent formative assessment and provide adjustment in instruction/grouping as needed.

Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

1. Provide professional development on the use of parallel teaching, rotational model and data literacy to teachers.
2. Teachers and coaches will work closely to monitor student progress and make adjustments to instruction frequently.
3. The leadership team will meet weekly to monitor progress of student data, share progress reports, observations, commendations, and recommendations as observed by visiting classrooms and attending content collaboration meetings.
4. Follow-up coaching will be provided to individual teachers or departments as needed.

Person

Responsible

Cheri Leavitt (cheri.godek@ocps.net)

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and 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.

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

The guidance department provides comprehensive guidance services to all students at Freedom Middle School via a needs assessment completed by every student during the first grading period of each school year. The guidance counselors provide small group and one-on-one counseling for a variety of student needs based on the results of the needs assessment. Services identified from the needs assessment may include but are not limited

to: grief, divorce, depression, and social skills. The guidance department partners with SEDNET agencies to provide support in the home environment as well as at school. Additional school resource personnel such as the school social worker, school psychologist, and school resource officer are all part of the school team which addresses the social and emotional needs of all students.