

Volusia County Schools

# Freedom Elementary School



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# Freedom Elementary School

1395 S BLUE LAKE AVE, Deland, FL 32724

<http://myvolusiaschools.org/school/freedom/pages/default.aspx>

## Demographics

**Principal: Paul Nehrig M**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2022

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2021-22 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	87%
<b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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
<b>School Grades History</b>	2021-22: C (47%) 2018-19: B (61%) 2017-18: C (48%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">LaShawn Russ-Porterfield</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	ATSI
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

## School Board Approval

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

## SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

## Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# Freedom Elementary School

1395 S BLUE LAKE AVE, Deland, FL 32724

<http://myvolusiaschools.org/school/freedom/pages/default.aspx>

## School Demographics

<p><b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)</p> <p>Elementary School PK-5</p>	<p><b>2021-22 Title I School</b></p> <p>No</p>	<p><b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>87%</p>
<p><b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p>	<p><b>Charter School</b></p> <p>No</p>	<p><b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b> (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>50%</p>

## School Grades History

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

## School Board Approval

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

## SIP Authority

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

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

## Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

## Part I: School Information

### School Mission and Vision

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

The Freedom community will provide a strong foundation for academic and social growth to support our students in achieving their personal best.

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

Through the individual commitment of all, our students will graduate with the knowledge, skills, and values necessary to be successful contributors to our democratic society.

### School Leadership Team

#### Membership

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
Nehrig, Paul	Principal	
Camacho, Widalis	Assistant Principal	
Willard, Michelle	Instructional Coach	
Sabatini, Elissa	Teacher, ESE	
Scott, Gwendolyn	Teacher, K-12	
Hansard, Lori	Teacher, K-12	

### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Friday 7/1/2022, Paul Nehrig M

**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.*

2

**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.*

22

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

58

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

735

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

9

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

12

**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	128	117	132	139	124	124	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	764
Attendance below 90 percent	22	32	29	28	24	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	159
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	25	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	2	29	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	2	18	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37

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	1	0	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Wednesday 9/7/2022

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	3	7	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

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

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

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	3	7	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

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

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

**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	56%	53%	56%				69%	56%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	49%						63%	56%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	18%						53%	46%	53%
Math Achievement	57%	42%	50%				68%	59%	63%
Math Learning Gains	53%						55%	56%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	37%						48%	43%	51%
Science Achievement	62%	55%	59%				74%	57%	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	70%	58%	12%	58%	12%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	65%	54%	11%	58%	7%
Cohort Comparison		-70%				
05	2022					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	66%	54%	12%	56%	10%
Cohort Comparison		-65%				

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	68%	60%	8%	62%	6%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	69%	59%	10%	64%	5%
Cohort Comparison		-68%				
05	2022					
	2019	60%	54%	6%	60%	0%
Cohort Comparison		-69%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	70%	56%	14%	53%	17%
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	18	24	6	21	36	28	21				
ELL	45	47	10	44	68	60	53				
BLK	36	32	21	39	37	31	30				
HSP	53	51	14	47	57	50	44				
WHT	63	52	16	67	57	24	78				
FRL	44	40	18	47	48	38	54				

2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	25	30	21	27	22	27	18				
ELL	56	68		40	21		55				
BLK	42	38		35	29		38				
HSP	63	56		44	24	10	52				
WHT	74	70	42	69	51		74				
FRL	54	48	32	45	32	24	47				

  

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	31	35	34	39	37	35	39				
ELL	51	47	45	57	50	46	75				
ASN	67	77		93	77						
BLK	57	59	40	48	41	53	45				
HSP	62	51	38	58	45	36	78				
WHT	77	68	76	76	59	44	83				
FRL	57	56	53	55	52	45	61				

**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	49
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	57
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	389
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

**Subgroup Data**

**Students With Disabilities**

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	26
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1

**English Language Learners**

Federal Index - English Language Learners	48
---	----

English Language Learners	
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	32
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	47
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	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	51
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	43
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?

The '22 FSA results indicated an overall drop in ELA, an improvement in Math, and a slight improvement in Science.

Overall ELA achievement was 56% (-10% from prior year), LG: 49% (-10% from prior year), LQ: 18% (-19% from prior year). By grade level, ELA achievement showed declines of 6% (3rd gr), 10% (4th gr), & 9% (5th gr). As a cohort, 4th grade declined 15% from '21 - '22.

Overall Math achievement remained the same from '21 - '22 at 57%, LG: 53% (+13% from prior year), LQ: 37% (+18 from prior year). By grade level, Math achievement showed improvement in 4th and 5th grade (+4% & + 1%, respectively) and decreased by 1% in 3rd grade. However, cohort analysis reveals a 3% drop for current 4th gr from '21 - '22 and a 9% drop for current 5th gr from '21 - '22.

Overall Science achievement improved by 3% from 58% in '21 to 61% in '22.

There are 2 ESSA Subgroups which are below the 41% overall proficiency target: SWD (22%) and African American (32%). Of particular concern are these subgroups' LQ learning gains, especially in ELA: SWD- 6%, AA- 16%.

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

ELA Achievement, Learning Gains, and LQ Learning Gains.  
Subgroup performance of SWD & AA in ELA, Math & Science.

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

Challenges in implementing new BEST standards in ELA and the corresponding curriculum resources. Pre-existing learning gaps that began during COVID due to inconsistent schooling experiences (online learning, frequent and/or unexpected absences, etc.) were not fully evident through prior diagnostic assessments, and interventions were only partially effective due to challenges to being able to consistently apply them.

School-wide, interventions were primarily focused on math achievement, due to low math performance in the prior year. In 4th grade, staff turnover contributed to challenges in maintaining instructional fidelity. Teachers will be supported in use of new curriculum resources through the updated district Canvas courses & Academic Coach through weekly PLC planning sessions.

Teachers will use new Progress Monitoring data to identify and properly place LQ students during small group instruction and intervention.

Provide training for teachers on MTSS and implement supports based on student need.

Utilize Coaching Cycles that focus on small group instruction/intervention

Professional Development on Dec 7 focusing on small group/intervention

Monitor use of intervention time via admin walkthroughs  
PLCs weekly (previously once or twice a month)  
Use of walk to intervention

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

The greatest improvement was seen in Math LG (+13%) and Math LQ LG (+18%).

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

In the prior year, the school's SIP focused on Math achievement. There was a school-wide emphasis on using the i-Ready platform with an expectation for all students to use the system for 45 minutes weekly in ELA and Math, teacher use of that data to adjust instruction & assign lessons for individual students for remediation or enrichment. Professional development was provided on teacher clarity (learning intentions, success criteria), hands-on math instruction was developed in collaboration with the STEM teacher to address standards below 70% proficiency, monthly PLCs were held to review math intervention data to adjust instruction and provide needed interventions as appropriate.

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

Support teachers in providing students enrichment/acceleration opportunities during intervention time and during small group classroom instruction. Use Reflex Math resource for building fluency. Provide opportunity for a book study on reciprocal teaching.

**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 opportunities that will be provided at our school to support teachers and leaders are:

Academic Coaching during PLC time and Coaching Cycles focused on small group instruction and intervention.

Training on MTSS, begun on 8/23 continuing throughout school year.

ERPL on small group instruction & intervention.

ERPL on the PST process.

ERPL on Math standards & digital tools.

Opportunity for book study on reciprocal teaching.

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

Structures are being put into place to support teachers in frequent (weekly), collaborative, and productive PLC work to ensure progress monitoring data is analyzed, instruction is modified and student interventions are designed based on that data, and instruction is delivered with fidelity to the standards. Support will be provided by the Academic Coach, district Curriculum Specialists, and administration. Frequent classroom visits and school-wide learning walks will be used to monitor the fidelity of implementing PLC-developed plans in actual classroom practice.

**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 ELA**

**Area of Focus**  
**Description and Rationale:** This area of focus aligns to Strategic Plan Goal 1: Engage all students in high levels of learning EVERY day. As a result of our Needs Assessment and Analysis it revealed that our ELA Proficiency was at 56%, ELA Learning Gains were 49% and the Lowest Quartile learning gains were 18%. ELA Achievement and ELA learning gains both decreased by 10% from the previous school year. In addition, ELA Lowest Quartile learning gains decreased by 19%.  
**Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**

**Measurable Outcome:**  
**State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**  
 40% of students in the lowest quartile will show sufficient growth from State Progress Monitoring 1 to State Progress Monitoring 3.  
 80% or more of teachers observed on learning walks are effectively utilizing Benchmark resources for small group instruction.

**Monitoring:**  
**Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**  
 This Area of Focus will be monitored through the 3 State Progress Monitoring checks, frequent classroom observations using a walkthrough tool with specific ELA small group instruction look-fors, and PLC data chats reviewing district assessment results to determine instructional adjustments needed to impact student growth.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**  
 Michelle Willard (cmwillard@volusia.k12.fl.us)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**  
**Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**  
 The evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus is targeted systematic response to intervention. Response to Intervention is an educational approach that provides early, systematic assistance to children who are struggling in one or many areas of learning.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**  
**Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**  
 Response to Intervention has a 1.29 effect size according to John Hattie. According to the Institute of Education Sciences, there is a strong level of evidence to support that instruction during the delivery of interventions should be explicit and systematic.

**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.

Administer and review Progress Monitoring ELA Data during PLCs to identify lowest quartile students and ensure proper placement of students for interventions with ESE and ELL support. (September, January, and May)



**Person Responsible** Michelle Willard (cmwillar@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Professional Learning will be provided to instructional staff on MTSS. (Aug 31, Nov 2, Jan 11, and Feb 22)

**Person Responsible** Michelle Willard (cmwillar@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Create Coaching Cycles to support teacher growth in small group instruction utilizing Benchmark resources.

**Person Responsible** Michelle Willard (cmwillar@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Professional Learning will be provided to instructional staff on small group and intervention on December 7.

**Person Responsible** Michelle Willard (cmwillar@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Monitor ELA interventions through ongoing Administrative Walkthroughs and feedback.

**Person Responsible** Paul Nehrig (pmnehrig@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Collaborative planning will take place weekly in PLCs in all grade levels.

**Person Responsible** Michelle Willard (cmwillar@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Implement walk to intervention in every grade level.

**Person Responsible** Michelle Willard (cmwillar@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Conduct a Reciprocal Teaching Book Study with Reading Intervention Teacher.

**Person Responsible** Michelle Willard (cmwillar@volusia.k12.fl.us)

**#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**

**Area of Focus**  
**Description and Rationale:**  
**Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**

This area of focus is aligned to the Strategic Plan Goal 1: Engage all students in high levels of learning every day. As a result of our Needs Assessment and Analysis it revealed that our Math Lowest Quartile learning gains were at 37%. In addition, we are implementing the new BEST standards, adopting a new textbook, and restructuring the math instructional block.

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

50% of students in the lowest quartile will show sufficient growth from State Progress Monitoring 1 to State Progress Monitoring 3.  
 80% or more of teachers observed on learning walks are effectively utilizing Teacher Clarity strategies (stating/restating the benchmark during instruction, aligning benchmark language with student learning activities, frequently checking for student understanding).

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

This Area of Focus will be monitored through the 3 State Progress Monitoring checks, frequent classroom observations using a walkthrough tool with specific Math look-fors, and data chats reviewing district assessment data to determine instructional adjustments needed to impact student growth. Also, coaching cycles based on teacher need as demonstrated through classroom observations and students' performance data.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Michelle Willard (cmwillar@volusia.k12.fl.us)

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

The evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus is Teacher Clarity. Teacher clarity is the way in which the purpose of the learning and goals for proficiency are clearly communicated to the student.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**  
**Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**

Teacher clarity has an effect size of .75 (Hattie, 2021). The average effect size is .40, which is equal to approximately one year of learning. At .75 it is likely the impact on students is significantly greater than the average when teacher clarity is implemented with fidelity.

**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.

Conduct PLC's monthly to ensure that teachers have a thorough understanding of the standards they are teaching and conduct data chats focused on student growth to drive instruction.

**Person Responsible** Michelle Willard (cmwillar@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Provide professional learning on the new B.E.S.T Standards and the new textbook adoption (August 23 and October 19).

**Person Responsible** Michelle Willard (cmwillar@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Monitor math instruction through ongoing Administrative Walkthroughs & Feedback.

**Person Responsible** Widalis Camacho (wcamacho@volusia.k12.fl.us)

**#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavioral Interventions and Support**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**  
**Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**

This area of focus aligns to Strategic Plan Goal 3: Provide a safe, healthy, and supportive environment. After reviewing the EWS report, discipline data, and surveying teachers, our SLT decided to focus on schoolwide Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports. By implementing PBIS, we will be able to improve our school culture, reduce discipline referrals, and increase instructional time, thus contributing to an optimal learning environment and an increase in student achievement.

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

100% of our teachers will implement our schoolwide PBIS expectations.

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

This area of focus will be monitored through frequent walk throughs, data chats to reflect on the achievement of the desired outcomes, and PBIS staff and student surveys.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Paul Nehrig (pmnehrig@volusia.k12.fl.us)

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

Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports is an evidence based, tiered framework for supporting students' behavioral academic, social, emotional, and mental health.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**  
**Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**

When implemented with fidelity PBIS improves social emotional competence, academic success, and school climate. It also improves teacher health and wellbeing. It is a way to create positive, predictable, equitable, and safe learning environments where everyone thrives.

**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.

Establish a PBIS Team to assist in creating schoolwide PBIS expectations (June, 2022).

**Person Responsible** Paul Nehrig (pmnehrig@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Provide PBIS training to share schoolwide expectations with teachers and staff (Preplanning, 2022).

**Person Responsible** Paul Nehrig (pmnehrig@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Conduct monthly PBIS meetings to discuss progress, determine areas for improvement, and establish next steps.

**Person Responsible** Paul Nehrig (pmnehrig@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Provide ongoing PBIS training throughout the school year during faculty meetings.

**Person Responsible** Paul Nehrig (pmnehrig@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Implement ongoing student recognition with weekly S.O.A.R. awards.

**Person Responsible** Paul Nehrig (pmnehrig@volusia.k12.fl.us)

### 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.

At Freedom Elementary we provide opportunities throughout the year where students, teachers, and families are able to build relationships. Some of these activities or events include: Back to School Breakfast, Meet the Teacher, Open House, after school clubs, High Five Friday, Dad Take you Kid to School Day, Teacher Appreciation week, Trunk or Treat, Big Blast Day, Food Drive, Winter Wonderland, Skate Night, Muffins with Mom, Kindergarten Round Up, etc.

In addition, our new Schoolwide PBIS implementation will help build a positive school culture at Freedom Elementary.

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

The stakeholders responsible for promoting a positive culture and environment will be our Principal and Assistant Principal, Academic Coach, School Counselor, PBIS Team, SAC members, and PTA. The role of these stakeholders will be to promote positivity, plan opportunities for relationship building, and monitor the implementation of the schoolwide PBIS plan.