Orange County Public Schools

Freedom Middle School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Freedom Middle

2850 TAFT VINELAND RD, Orlando, FL 32837

https://freedomms.ocps.net/

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)
A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)
A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)
A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways: 1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%; 2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%; 3. Have a school grade of D or F; or 4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), https://www.floridacims.org, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

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

Provide the school's vision statement.

To ensure every student has a promising and successful future.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team
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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Walker, Robert	Principal	Mr. Robert Walker serves as primary building level administrator. Mr. Walker provides a common vision; with a focus on standards-based instruction, data-based decision making, and providing systems of support for instructional staff to ensure the success and well-being of all students.
Hurst, Toby	Assistant Principal	Mr. Toby Hurst serves as building level administrator and assistant principal of instruction. Mr. Hurst assists in supporting the principal with established common vision and all initiatives relative to this focus.
Mack, Taylirre	Assistant Principal	Ms. Taylirre Mack support serves as building level administrator, specifically assistant principal overseeing operations and facilities. Ms. Mack assists in supporting the principal with established common vision and all initiatives relative to this focus. Ms. Mack oversees school-wide procedures and facilities, and supports the instructional focus of the school.
Storms, Jacqueline	Other	Ms. Jacqueline Storms is the school's SAFE Coordinator. In that role, Ms. Storms oversees the school's threat assessment protocol and providing support to the McKinny Vento Programing student mental health Threat Response Protocols, serves and mental health designee, and serves as community resource liaison.
Brower, Kimberly	School Counselor	Kim Brower is the school's Guidance Counselor, grades 7 (A-L) and 8. Her primary role is to implement and maintain a comprehensive, schoolwide counseling program. In addition, Mrs. Brower monitors student academic data for the purpose of scheduling student coursework. Mr. Brower works with feeder pattern school for articulation, and supports various mental health initiatives.
Bynes, Ingrid	School Counselor	Ingrid Bynes is the school's Guidance Counselor, grades 6 and 7 (M-Z). Her primary role is to implement and maintain a comprehensive, schoolwide counseling program. In addition, Dr. Bynes oversee the school's MTSS and 504 processes. Dr. Bynes monitors student academic data for the purpose of these processes, and facilitates meetings to ensure individual student needs are met based on eligibility.
Clark, Ryan	Dean	Ryan Clark maintains student behavior expectations and behavior support for all students in Grade 6. Mr. Clark supports teachers with their in-class behavior plans, is primary role for any student discipline initiatives such as investigations into student-on-student infractions, and Title IX. Mr. Clark also supports the schools positive behavior support plan.
Leach, Renee	Dean	Renee Leach maintains student behavior expectations and behavior support for all students in Grade 8. Mrs. Leach supports teachers with their in-class behavior plans, is primary role for any student discipline initiatives such as

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		investigations into student-on-student infractions, and Title IX. Mrs. Leach also supports the schools positive behavior support plan.
Pagan Sanchez, Marisol	Dean	Marisol Pagan maintains student behavior expectations and behavior support for all students in Grade 7. Ms. Pagan supports teachers with their in-class behavior plans, is primary role for any student discipline initiatives such as investigations into student-on-student infractions, and Title IX. Ms. Pagan also supports the schools positive behavior support plan.
Espinosa, Sam	Curriculum Resource Teacher	Sam Espinosa is the school's Testing Coordinator/Curriculum Resource Teacher (CRT). Mr. Espinosa supports teachers in implementing and monitoring assessments such as Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (FAST), Standards-based Unit Assessments (SBUAs), Florida Standards Assessment, ACCESS testing, and EOC exams. In addition, Mr. Espinosa provides support to our school-wide curriculum resources.
Estrada, Solana	Behavior Specialist	Solana Estrada oversees the schools development and implementation of Functional Behavior Assessments and Behavior Intervention Plan that address students' behavioral needs and provide a means to help the students become more academically successful. Mrs. Estrada also supports our ESSA Subgroup SWD within the more restrictive placement.
Miranda, Eileen	Staffing Specialist	Eileen Miranda assists the MTSS team in identifying at-risk students and developing appropriate Tier II and Tier III interventions. Ms. Miranda facilitates the IEP process, assists with properly matching interventions or strategies to support student achievement via IEP team.
Payne, Tiffany	Instructional Coach	Tiffany Payne leads planning for ELA, Reading, and Social Studies. Ms. Payne provides professional development, locates resources for teams, develops standards based scales with student evidence, meets weekly with PLC's during common planning meetings, and coaches teachers on effective instructional strategies.
Savino, Elisa	Instructional Coach	Elisa Savino leads planning for Math and Science. Ms. Savino provides professional development, locates resources for teams, develops standards based scales with student evidence, meets weekly with PLC's during common planning meetings, and coaches teachers on effective instructional strategies.

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development
Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

The School Advisory Council is involved in providing input for the development process. This includes school principal, nominated teacher, nominated classified, vice chair, and appointed community business member.

SIP Monitoring
Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The school improvement plan areas of focus, as identified by school-wide student data- is regularly monitored through the PLC process as well as weekly leadership team meetings. Data relative to the SIP goals is reviewed after each Standards-based Unit Assessment (SBUAs). Tier II data applicable to the SIP goals is also monitored via this process. Respective SIP data is analyzed at the leadership level and adjustments based on this data are conducted no less than quarterly.

Demographic Data Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024	
2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	86%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	92%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History	2021-22: B

*2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2019-20: B
	2018-19: B
	2017-18: B
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	69	78	105	252
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	65	109	198
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	41	52
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	111	127	157	395
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	134	80	101	315
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	111	127	157	395

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	112	101	151	364

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	102	101	111	314
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	29	29	68
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	11	13	38
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	4	21	31
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	102	128	155	385
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	133	102	130	365
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	111	114	131	356

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	110	111	142	363

The number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)
Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	102	101	111	314
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	29	29	68
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	11	13	38
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	4	21	31
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	102	128	155	385
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	133	102	130	365
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	111	114	131	356

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	110	111	142	363

The number of students identified retained:

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

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	48	48	49	45	49	50	46		
ELA Learning Gains				47			52		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				38			50		
Math Achievement*	53	57	56	56	36	36	46		
Math Learning Gains				68			41		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				65			47		
Science Achievement*	50	53	49	48	55	53	46		
Social Studies Achievement*	70	64	68	72	61	58	61		
Middle School Acceleration	80	77	73	91	52	49	78		
Graduation Rate					51	49			
College and Career Acceleration					69	70			
ELP Progress	56	43	40	45	79	76	34		

In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	60
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	357
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	58
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	575
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	22	Yes	4	1
ELL	51			
AMI				
ASN	81			
BLK	54			
HSP	55			
MUL	82			
PAC				
WHT	72			

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
FRL	55			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	35	Yes	3	
ELL	49			
AMI				
ASN	73			
BLK	51			
HSP	54			
MUL	76			
PAC				
WHT	69			
FRL	53			

Accountability Components by Subgroup
Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	48			53			50	70	80			56
SWD	18			21			20	29			4	
ELL	36			43			32	68	69		6	56
AMI												
ASN	77			78			79	78	91		5	
BLK	38			41			43	57	93		5	
HSP	43			48			42	70	73		6	56
MUL	70			75				100			3	

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
PAC												
WHT	61			68			73	75	85		5	
FRL	43			46			44	64	78		6	52

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	45	47	38	56	68	65	48	72	91			45
SWD	20	37	32	29	56	56	26	27				
ELL	26	43	38	42	60	60	32	58	84			45
AMI												
ASN	58	54		80	76		62	90	93			
BLK	40	41	0	45	68	63	45	72	83			
HSP	37	45	39	50	66	62	42	67	90			46
MUL	85	71		80	67							
PAC												
WHT	64	48	60	71	72	70	61	82	95			
FRL	43	42	30	54	67	62	46	72	87			23

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	46	52	50	46	41	47	46	61	78			34
SWD	19	36	39	23	28	31	29	20				
ELL	21	49	53	29	43	46	22	44	70			34
AMI												
ASN	70	59		72	60		83	61	90			
BLK	36	38	47	36	32	35	13	62	60			
HSP	42	52	50	41	40	48	43	57	74			34
MUL	62	46		54	50							
PAC												
WHT	57	59	55	62	39	45	54	68	87			
FRL	46	46	38	42	33	41	39	53	74			21

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)
The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2023 - Spring	37%	45%	-8%	47%	-10%
08	2023 - Spring	39%	46%	-7%	47%	-8%
06	2023 - Spring	39%	44%	-5%	47%	-8%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	35%	53%	-18%	54%	-19%
07	2023 - Spring	21%	38%	-17%	48%	-27%
08	2023 - Spring	58%	58%	0%	55%	3%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	41%	50%	-9%	44%	-3%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	88%	47%	41%	50%	38%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	100%	45%	55%	48%	52%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	58%	61%	-3%	66%	-8%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection
Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

FY23 Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (FAST) English Language Arts (ELA) achievement equalled 46%. The ELA achievement level during FY22 Florida Standards Assessment (FSA) equalled 45%. In addition, overall learning gains and learning gains 25% during FY22 equalled 47% and 38% respectively. A possible contributing factor may be the challenge of language acquisition. Total enrollment of English Language Learners (ELL) at Freedom Middle School during FY23 equals 300 students.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline.

2023 NGSS Civics overall data shows a decrease of 3%, from 71% achievement to 68% achievement. Possible contributing factors may be directly related to proficiency levels in English Language Arts (ELA), whereas only 45% of students were able to demonstrate proficiency.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

The most significant gap experienced at Freedom Middle Schools is between our English Language Learners (ELL) and their counterparts. Although overall ELA achievement at Freedom Middle School equalled 46%, our English Language Learners ELA achievement equalled 8%.

Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

As the 2022-2023 school year was a baseline for the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking, there was a notable increase in overall Math achievement compared to prior year in the Florida Standards Assessment. This year' FAST Math achievement reached 60% whereas last year's FSA achievement equalled 56%. This result was a result of realigning resources to support core Math instruction. Instructional coach attended weekly Math PLCs, aligned professional development, conducted classroom walk throughs and provided actionable feedback.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

The most significant area of concern in reflecting on Freedom Middle School's Early Warning Systems data is the total amount of students with over 10% absences. This number equalled 252 students.

Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for school improvement in the upcoming school year.

Based on most recent data, areas of improvement for Freedom Middle School are identified as overall English Language Arts (ELA) achievement and ELL achievement gap.

Area of Focus
(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Our ESSA Subgroup ELL experience an achievement gap of approximately 34% as measured by preliminary data from the 2023 ELA Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (FAST).

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

The anticipated measurable outcome for this area of focus is an increase of 22% over prior year. Our ELL population demonstrated an overall achievement of 8%. Our goal is to increase to 30% this year, equally a total of 100 students as measured by the 2024 Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (FAST).

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

This area of focus will be monitored by triangulating student progress data. These data points include Standards-Based Unit Assessments (SBUAs), FAST progress monitoring assessments, Read 180/ Reading Plus, and Lexia.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tiffany Payne (tiffany.payne@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Interventions to be used will include data-driven grouping in Tier II Reading courses, bilingual paraprofessional support to push-in to respective courses,SIPPS/Read180/Reading Plus/Lexia Intervention and a comprehensive approach to ESOL strategies within core content classes. Teachers will use the data-driven rotational model to give direct instruction to students based on student individual needs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Research shows these identified interventions, when implemented with fidelity, contribute positively to student achievement.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

2022-2023 comprehensive data shows 252 students accumulated 10% or more absences within the school year. This represents approximately 22% of our student population.

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

Freedom Middle School's measurable outcome is to reduce this percentage from 22% to 10%. Based on projected enrollment, a 12% reduction would represent approximately 112 students with 10% or more absences.

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

This area of focus will be monitored on a weekly basis by school administration, in collaboration with the school's attendance clerk and social worker. The attendance team will maintain a living document, used to monitor attendance of students and truancy proceedings.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Robert Walker (robert.walker3@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Freedom Middle School has recently staffed a dedicated Attendance Clerk. Ongoing professional development will occur to support this employee. Weekly meetings will focus on the use of Skyward student management system. Using this data, the school will follow school district truancy protocol and use all resources available to support families and their child's attendance needs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

By establishing a consistent action plan, we can work collaboratively with families to ensure students meet compulsory attendance requirements.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review
Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

The school principal is responsible for informing the School Advisory Committee (SAC) of current school improvement funds balance. During the school year, the principal, in collaboration with SAC, will review the School Improvement Plan (SIP) to identify resources in which funds can be allocated. Currently, Freedom Middle School's most significant lack of resource is staffing. The school is experiencing a teacher shortage in Math, ELA, Reading, and Staffing. This equals a total of 6 positions. The school continues to seek out qualified candidates for these positions through the district's talent acquisition procedures, as well as partnering with third party sourcing organizations.

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

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

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: English Language Learners	$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

No