

Manatee County Public Schools

Freedom Elementary School



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	14
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Freedom Elementary School

9515 E STATE ROAD 64, Bradenton, FL 34212

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

Demographics

Principal: Guy Grimes

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2016

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2021-22 Title I School	No
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	44%
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 Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: A (70%) 2018-19: B (58%) 2017-18: B (54%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

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

Freedom Elementary School

9515 E STATE ROAD 64, Bradenton, FL 34212

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

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	No	44%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	39%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

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

Provide the school's vision statement.

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

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 7/1/2016, Guy Grimes

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.*

0

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

46

Total number of students enrolled at the school

567

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

4

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

5

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	75	89	101	75	95	79	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	514
Attendance below 90 percent	0	10	15	11	19	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	7	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	7	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	9	10	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	8	7	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
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	1	3	5	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15

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	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/15/2022

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

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	79	96	73	95	76	101	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	520
Attendance below 90 percent	11	14	10	19	7	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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	72%	55%	56%				61%	52%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	65%						66%	57%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	64%						48%	55%	53%
Math Achievement	84%	50%	50%				59%	63%	63%
Math Learning Gains	74%						66%	68%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	55%						44%	53%	51%
Science Achievement	73%	65%	59%				62%	48%	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	52%	51%	1%	58%	-6%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	64%	56%	8%	58%	6%
Cohort Comparison		-52%				
05	2022					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	64%	52%	12%	56%	8%
Cohort Comparison		-64%				

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	45%	60%	-15%	62%	-17%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	66%	65%	1%	64%	2%
Cohort Comparison		-45%				
05	2022					
	2019	67%	60%	7%	60%	7%
Cohort Comparison		-66%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	61%	48%	13%	53%	8%
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	50	47		62	63						
ELL	52	55		78	73						
ASN	57	55		79	73						
BLK	57			57							
HSP	63	61	80	79	71		65				
MUL	57			71							
WHT	78	66	52	89	76	52	83				
FRL	57	58	57	71	67	54	51				

2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	38	10		51	50		17				
ELL	55			68							
ASN	82			88							
BLK	39			61							
HSP	53	43		71	71		44				
WHT	72	54		83	70	38	66				
FRL	55	42		72	69		55				
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	18	38	37	21	51	47	20				
ELL	27	43	32	23	58	52	23				
ASN	100			100							
BLK	43	46	38	36	46	30	40				
HSP	41	56	44	39	61	45	46				
MUL	55			55							
WHT	76	74	69	75	72		81				
FRL	42	58	44	43	60	43	44				

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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	68
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	58
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	545
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	56
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	63
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	66
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	57
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	68
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	64
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	71
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	59
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?

Our data shows growth across all grade levels, subgroups and core content areas. The largest growth was evident in our ELA lowest quartile gains by a total of 54 points.

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

The area that demonstrates the greatest need for improvement is our Math lowest quartile. This group showed the minimal growth of 14 points.

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 lack of staffing which took away additional time for supporting these students. This year we are fully staffed and have initiated ability grouping as well as implementing Acaletics with fidelity.

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

The areas showing the most improvement was our Math proficiency (3rd scored 83% proficient, 4th scored 89% proficient and 5th grade scored 82% proficient).

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

The use of Acaletics with fidelity.

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

Ability grouping in the areas of ELA and mathematics.

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.

We will be providing guided lesson planning to our teachers throughout the year.

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

Specific professional development throughout the year to assist with learning new standards.

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 Collaborative Planning

Area of Focus Description and

Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Based upon the implementation of new curriculum, updated standards, new state assessment and the complete digitalization of student records instructional staff will work and plan cooperatively to improve instructional practices school wide.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By the end of the 22-23 school year, instructional staff will document effective instructional practices in 100 percent of lesson plans submitted to administration.

Monitoring:

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

Administration will review and provide feedback on instructional plans weekly.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Guy Grimes (grimesg@manateeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Instructional staff will implement CHAMPS (Conversation, Help, Activity, Movement, Participation and Success) throughout the school year.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Besides being a district initiative, CHAMPS is proven to assist classroom teachers to develop a proactive and positive environment so that learning can be maximized. Resources being used are from the CHAMPS book third edition and support from the district.

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. Monthly team meeting - Team Leader & Admin
2. Frequent Fidelity Checks - Admin
3. Quarterly Assemblies - Counselor
4. Monthly Accountability Partner Checks - Accountability Partners & Admin
5. Weekly Lesson Plan reviews and feedback - Teachers & Admin

Person Responsible

Guy Grimes (grimesg@manateeschools.net)

#2. 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.

Even though our current data showed an increase of proficiency of our SWD students, the students in self contained VE classrooms showed inadequate progress.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By the end of the 22-23 school year, the SWD students will increase from 56% to 65% proficiency in ELA. Specifically, we are looking for our self contained SWD students to reach a proficiency of 50% in ELA.

Monitoring:

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

Individual student data, FAST progresses monitoring, district benchmarks and classroom performance will be monitored and adapted based on student needs. Teachers and administrators will be monitoring student data and making necessary adjustments in instructional delivery as needed.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Michele Danowski (danowskm@manateeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

KAGAN based strategies (collaborative learning, pair share, show not tell) will be implemented to support our SWD students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

The rationale of using this specific strategy is that research shows this improves thinking skills, processing information, decision making and knowledge building for the students.

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. Document strategies in lesson plans - Teacher and Admin
2. Fidelity walks - Admin
3. Review progress monitoring monthly - Admin
4. Professional development on strategies - Admin

Person Responsible

Guy Grimes (grimesg@manateeschools.net)

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to classroom behavior

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

When reviewing discipline data, it showed that we had a high volume of referrals generated from the classroom. The data indicated that we had 118 referrals written by classroom teachers.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By the end of the 22-23 school year, the number of referrals generated in the classroom with be reduced by 25 percent.

Monitoring:

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

This will be monitored by walkthroughs, behavior tracking forms and the number of referrals entered into FOCUS.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kenzie Cleveland (clevelak@manateeschools.net)

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

CHAMPS is compilation of how to strategies that supports teachers with skills that are associated with student success. CHAMPS is a systematic prevention orientated approach that guides teachers and staff in providing universal supports that will promote positive behavior in the school environment.

SPARKS helps develop positive relationships among all stakeholders along with engagement for academic and social activities.

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

CHAMPS creates an orderly learning environment allowing all stakeholders to flourish.

CHAMPS classroom management plan
CHAMPS classroom activities
CHAMPS daily rating scales
CHAMPS self assessment checklist

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.

CHAMPS walkthrough checklist will be review with the teachers and conducted by administration
CHAMPS record log will be completed by the leadership team and provide feedback to the teachers.
CHAMPS rating scales will be completed by the leadership team and provide feedback to the teachers.

Person Responsible

Guy Grimes (grimesg@manateeschools.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.

All students who enter Freedom are welcomed to S.O.A.R. throughout their school career by integrating self control, on task behavior, achievement and showing respect for themselves and others. Freedom is also implementing the SPARKS initiative which will incorporate our S.O.A.R. along with CHAMPS. School counselor, SSS and school support staff collaborate with staff and families to meet individual student needs in the areas of academics and life skills. School leaders incorporate an open door policy and provide a comprehensive classroom problem solving curriculum preK - 5. Positive behaviors are reinforced and celebrated regularly with the community and families. Virtual communication is enhanced via Facebook, Instagram, TEAMS, Schoology and Freedom's webpage. Intensive support team members provide crisis intervention, data analysis, and consultation. A certified therapist works weekly with individual students referred for support with parental consent.

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

Administration - ensure communication is fluid, actively encourage student involvement in the SOAR program and ensure teachers are following the SOAR expectations.

Support staff (counselor/SSS) - highlight the SOAR program through interactive assemblies and actively encourage involvement in the SOAR program

Teachers - actively encourage student involvement in the SOAR program.