# Liberty Elementary School



# 2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

## Table of Contents

# Liberty Elementary School

### 370 ATWATER ST, Port Charlotte, FL 33954

### http://www.yourcharlotteschools.net/les

## Demographics

## Principal: Carolyn Whaley

Start Date for this Principal: 9/15/2014

| | |
|---|---|
| **2019-20 Status**<br>(per MSID File) | Active |
| **School Type and Grades Served**<br>(per MSID File) | Elementary School<br>PK-5 |
| **Primary Service Type**<br>(per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| **2021-22 Title I School** | Yes |
| **2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate**<br>(as reported on Survey 3) | 100% |
| **2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented**<br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities<br>English Language Learners<br>Black/African American Students*<br>Hispanic Students<br>Multiracial Students<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| **School Grades History** | 2021-22: B (58%)<br><br>2018-19: B (57%)<br><br>2017-18: C (47%) |
| **2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*** | |
| **SI Region** | Southwest |
| **Regional Executive Director** | |
| **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 Charlotte County School Board.

## SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

## Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

## Table of Contents

# Liberty Elementary School

### 370 ATWATER ST, Port Charlotte, FL 33954

### http://www.yourcharlotteschools.net/les

## School Demographics

| **School Type and Grades Served** (per MSID File) | **2021-22 Title I School** | **2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3) |
|---|---|---|
| Elementary School PK-5 | Yes | 100% |

| **Primary Service Type** (per MSID File) | **Charter School** | **2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
|---|---|---|
| K-12 General Education | No | 42% |

## 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 Charlotte County School Board.

## SIP Authority

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

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

## Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

## Part I: School Information

### School Mission and Vision

**Provide the school's mission statement.**

The mission of Liberty Elementary School is to ensure that the freedom to learn prevails because: We provide standards based instruction
We focus on helping each child achieve his or her personal best in an inclusive setting
We create unique interventions, based on data, to support each child
We work together to ensure our students are ready to progress to the next grade level
We maintain a positive, safe, and engaging environment for our students to grow into responsible, respectful citizens.

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

Where the freedom to learn prevails.

### School Leadership Team

**Membership**
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 |
|---|---|---|
| Brown, Sheila | Principal | Co-Chair of Performance Partnership Committee (PPC) , School Advisory Council (SAC), Literacy Leadership Team and member of PTO. Responsible for scheduling Professional Development activities requested by the staff. Assist with student discipline interventions and parent conferences. Work with the CORE team to review grade level data monthly and provide support in the MTSS process. |
| Whaley, Carolyn | Assistant Principal | Co-Chair of the Support Performance Partnership Committee (SPPC), member of the Literacy Leadership Team, and PTO. Assist with student discipline interventions and parent conferences. Work with the CORE team to review grade level data monthly and provide support in the MTSS process. |
| Guerra, Julio | School Counselor | Assist teachers in implementing interventions and attend MTSS meetings every Tuesday. Communicate information with our families. Chairs PBIS for the school. Assists parents/teachers/students in creating and following 504 and ELL plans. |
| Hill, Katina | Curriculum Resource Teacher | Provides professional development sessions in curricular and instructional areas; provides coaching and mentoring assistance; facilitates data team meetings and assists with data analysis and necessary follow up with teachers regarding interpretation and graphing; works with *Guidance Counselor, Social Worker, and School Psychologist to assist teachers in implementing interventions. |
| Booher, Jodi | Reading Coach | Provides professional development sessions in curricular and instructional areas; provides coaching and mentoring assistance; facilitates data team meetings and assists with data analysis and necessary follow up with teachers regarding interpretation and graphing |
| Herndon, Erin | Reading Coach | Provides professional development sessions in curricular and instructional areas; provides coaching and mentoring assistance; facilitates data team meetings and assists with data analysis and necessary follow up with teachers regarding interpretation and graphing |
| McQueen, Robyn | Reading Coach | Provides professional development sessions in curricular and instructional areas; provides coaching and mentoring assistance; facilitates data team meetings and assists with data analysis and necessary follow up with teachers regarding interpretation and graphing |

## Demographic Information

**Principal start date**
Monday 9/15/2014, Carolyn Whaley

**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.*

1

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

43

**Total number of students enrolled at the school**

619

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

10

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

11

**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 | 98 | 96 | 108 | 102 | 81 | 98 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 583 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 2 | 31 | 28 | 26 | 18 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 131 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 37 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33 |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 7 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 35 |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 6 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 27 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 1 | 12 | 12 | 9 | 3 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 45 |

**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 | 3 | 1 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 |

**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 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 |
| 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**

Tuesday 8/16/2022

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

**The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:**

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

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

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

**The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:**

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

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

# 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 | 60% | 59% | 56% | | | | 59% | 62% | 57% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 64% | | | | | | 59% | 57% | 58% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 50% | | | | | | 59% | 50% | 53% |
| Math Achievement | 62% | 48% | 50% | | | | 67% | 63% | 63% |
| Math Learning Gains | 61% | | | | | | 58% | 54% | 62% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 51% | | | | | | 50% | 42% | 51% |
| Science Achievement | 59% | 65% | 59% | | | | 45% | 54% | 53% |

**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 |
| 01 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 02 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 03 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 76% | 69% | 7% | 58% | 18% |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 04 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 51% | 57% | -6% | 58% | -7% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -76% | | | | |
| 05 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 47% | 56% | -9% | 56% | -9% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -51% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 01 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 02 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 03 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 85% | 70% | 15% | 62% | 23% |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 04 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 63% | 60% | 3% | 64% | -1% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -85% | | | | |
| 05 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 48% | 56% | -8% | 60% | -12% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -63% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 43% | 52% | -9% | 53% | -10% |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |

## 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 | 26 | 44 | 53 | 34 | 45 | 44 | 33 | | | | |
| ELL | 41 | 57 | | 32 | 36 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 58 | 67 | | 37 | 60 | | | | | | |
| HSP | 56 | 77 | 54 | 56 | 56 | 54 | 58 | | | | |
| MUL | 69 | 85 | | 73 | 77 | | 64 | | | | |
| WHT | 60 | 56 | 41 | 66 | 61 | 41 | 60 | | | | |
| FRL | 57 | 63 | 52 | 60 | 57 | 52 | 57 | | | | |

### 2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2019-20 | C & C Accel 2019-20 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| SWD | 38 | 15 | | 32 | 31 | | 15 | | | | |
| ELL | 68 | | | 63 | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 43 | 43 | | 32 | 29 | | 31 | | | | |
| HSP | 62 | 43 | | 58 | 43 | | 50 | | | | |
| MUL | 43 | | | 64 | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 60 | 49 | 14 | 59 | 38 | 38 | 38 | | | | |
| FRL | 52 | 39 | 24 | 48 | 35 | 35 | 34 | | | | |

### 2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2017-18 | C & C Accel 2017-18 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| SWD | 34 | 43 | 45 | 37 | 40 | 45 | 4 | | | | |
| ELL | 50 | 54 | | 67 | 55 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 52 | 40 | | 48 | 36 | | | | | | |
| HSP | 59 | 63 | 55 | 72 | 59 | | 38 | | | | |
| MUL | 45 | 81 | | 41 | 38 | | 27 | | | | |
| WHT | 62 | 57 | 60 | 72 | 63 | 57 | 54 | | | | |
| FRL | 54 | 58 | 58 | 66 | 55 | 52 | 40 | | | | |

## 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 | 56 |

| ESSA Federal Index | |
|---|---|
| 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 | 44 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 451 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 |
| Percent Tested | 99% |

| Subgroup Data | |
|---|---|
| **Students With Disabilities** | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 40 |
| 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 | 42 |
| 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 | |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| **Black/African American Students** | |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students | 56 |
| 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 | 56 |
| 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 | 74 |
| 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 | 55 |
| 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 | 57 |
| 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?**

We made gains in proficiency and growth for all areas. We are still in TS&I status for Students with Disabilities, and we are a RAISE school because our third grade ELA proficiency was at 49%.

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

Third grade ELA, bottom quartile students in ELA and Math, and Students with Disabilities.

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

The contributing factors for this year is that we have four new teachers in third grade. We need more intervention support for our bottom quartile students and our students with disabilities. Our Lead teacher will be focusing her coaching time in third grade, we are going to hire a Literacy Lessons teacher to work with our students with disabilities in the upper grades, and we will add a paraprofessional to target our bottom quartile students in fourth and fifth grade.

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

We showed the most improvement in our Math gains and our ELA bottom quartile gains.

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

The contributing factors for the improvement was the diligence of our fourth and fifth grade teams. We hand picked teachers to teach this grade level. We strengthened our interventions for Tier 2 and Tier 3 ELA students and we moved some of our highest achieving teachers to fourth and fifth grade. We continue to have the same teachers in that grade levels with the addition of a new fourth grade teacher. She will be mentored by a strong seasoned teacher. We will incorporate BPIE strategies when instructing all students. In addition we had BPIE in mind when scheduling students.

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

We need to focus on coaching our new teachers in using Benchmark and Reveal. We need to make sure our teachers are implementing their interventions with fidelity and we need to increase our math intervention time. Whole group instruction time needs to stay on pace with the district guidelines, remediation will occur during intervention time.

**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.**

Our new teachers will meet with our Lead teacher bi-weekly to make sure they are on pace and providing evidence based interventions, the district will provide on going training for Benchmark and Reveal, our Literacy Leadership team will provide KEY PD on reading strategies, and our intervention specialist and ESE liaison will provide ongoing PD on building effective interventions.

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

We are adding an additional teacher and paraprofessional in the upper grades to focus on interventions for ELA and Math.

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

:

| | |
|---|---|
| **#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to B.E.S.T. Standards** | |
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.** | To increase our percent of students who are proficient, in ELA, Science, and Math. We will have a specific focus on increasing proficiency for our students in the bottom quartile and our students with disabilities. |
| **Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.** | We will increase student proficiency in third, fourth, and fifth grade by 2% which correlates 6 overall school grade component points in the following areas:<br>ELA Achievement: 2<br>Math Achievement:1<br>Science: 3 |
| **Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.** | The area of focus will be monitored using our school based assessments (FAST, Benchmark, Reveal, and Mastery Connect). We will be discussing the data at collaborative planning. We will continue to progress monitor individual students via our MTSS team during TST meetings and at IEP meetings. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Sheila Brown (sheila.brown@yourcharlotteschools.net) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being** | Liberty Elementary School will increase student achievement through standards based instruction, with a focus on implementing our new Benchmark and Reveal series for Tier 1 instruction. We will continue to use our collaborative planning time to monitor student performance on common assessments and Benchmark/Reveal assessments. We will continue to discuss high effect size strategies during our weekly Pow Wow staff meetings. We will continue to implement guided reading techniques to include professional development, Reading recovery, and strong interventions using Leveled Literacy Materials and our MTSS process when necessary. We will continue the use of our intervention |

| | |
|---|---|
| **implemented for this Area of Focus.** | classroom (SOAR) to provide Tier 2 instruction utilizing Literacy Footprints for ELA and Do the Math for math for acceleration to our bottom quartile and ESE students.<br>In addition, we will add a Literacy Lessons teacher and paraprofessional to service our upper grade students. Lastly we will continue to implement our schoolwide science plan. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.** | Last year, Liberty Elementary gained 109 points while implementing these strategies. We have refined the strategies we saw great benefit from and have added new strategies such as adding a Literacy Lessons teacher and paraprofessional for the upper grades, adding a new B.E.S.T aligned math series, and further refining our intervention process and materials. |

### 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.

Implement Tier 1 (Benchmark and Reveal), and Tier 2 and 3 (LLI and Do the Math) evidence based instruction for on grade level learning and acceleration.

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

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

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

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

| **Person Responsible** | Robyn McQueen (robyn.mcqueen@yourcharlotteschools.net) |
|---|---|

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

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

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

| **Person Responsible** | Katina Hill (katina.hill@yourcharlotteschools.net) |
|---|---|

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

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

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

**Person Responsible** Carolyn Whaley (carolyn.whaley@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Add a Literacy Lessons teacher and a Paraprofessional in the upper grades to support our bottom quartile and ESE students.

**Person Responsible** Katina Hill (katina.hill@yourcharlotteschools.net)

## RAISE
The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale**
Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

### Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

We did not have any grade levels in K-2 with less than 50% proficiency on our progress monitoring.

### Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

Liberty Elementary School will increase student achievement through standards based instruction, with a focus on implementing the Benchmark reading series for Tier 1 instruction. We will continue to use our collaborative planning time to monitor student performance on FAST and Benchmark assessments. We will continue to discuss Marzano high effect size strategies for ELA during our weekly Pow Wow staff meetings. In addition, we will continue to implement guided reading techniques to include KEY PD, Reading Recovery, and evidence based interventions using Leveled Literacy Materials and our MTSS process when necessary. We will continue the use of our intervention classroom (SOAR) to provide Tier 2 instruction utilizing Literacy Footprints and LLI for ELA for acceleration with our bottom quartile students. Lastly, we are adding a Literacy Lessons teacher and a paraprofessional in 3-5 to provide additional one on one and small group support.

**Measurable Outcomes:**
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.

- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and

- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

**Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)**

Our goal is to reach 80% proficiency on the FAST for grades K-2.

**Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)**

Our goal is to reach 70% proficiency on the FAST for grades 3-5.

**Monitoring:**
Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

We will use FAST assessment to progress monitor three times per year during data days, and we will use our Benchmark assessments to progress monitor weekly during collaborative planning.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Brown, Sheila, sheila.brown@yourcharlotteschools.net

**Evidence-based Practices/Programs:**
Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. Â§7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

Reading Recovery/Literacy Lessons will be used as interventions in first grade and with our ESE population. LLI will be used in K-5 for Tier 2 and 3 interventions and progress will be checked weekly using DIBELS and Benchmark. These programs are all evidence based and follow our district CERP.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:**
Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?

- Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

We have used these programs for several years and they have proven effective in our lower grades, so we are going to begin using them in the upper grades with a specific focus on our third grade students.

**Action Steps to Implement:**
List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership

- Literacy Coaching

- Assessment

- Professional Learning

| Action Step | Person Responsible for Monitoring |
| --- | --- |
| Literacy Coaching-We will use our Reading Recovery/Literacy Lessons teachers to provide specific guided reading PD to our new and struggling teachers. | Hill, Katina, katina.hill@yourcharlotteschools.net |
| Literacy Leadership-We will continue use the learning walk model with our Literacy Leadership Team to identify areas of strength and weakness in our classrooms. We will meet monthly to discuss areas of concerns and plan specific PD to address the concerns. | Brown, Sheila, sheila.brown@yourcharlotteschools.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.**

Liberty Elementary strives to build positive relationships with parents and families and community stakeholders by asking for feedback on our school improvement goals. We share the school improvement

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

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

Administrative Team: provide support to staff, students and families through out the school year.
Instructional Leaders: provide supports to staff including mentoring and assisting new teachers.
PPC Committee: provides feedback to school administration and problem solves when necessary
PTO and SAC meeting: provides parent feedback to the school on SIP, PFEP, and partners with the school to ensure collaborative communication
New Day Christian Church: provides a year long partnership to the school for our students