

Volusia County Schools

# Freedom Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>SIP Authority and Purpose</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>I. School Information</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>II. Needs Assessment/Data Review</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>III. Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>VI. Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus</b>	<b>0</b>

# Freedom Elementary School

1395 S BLUE LAKE AVE, Deland, FL 32724

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

## School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Volusia County School Board on 10/31/2023.

## 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.**

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.**

Freedom Elementary strives to create life-long learners prepared for an ever-changing global society.

## 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
Nehrig, Paul	Principal	
Murray, Julie	Assistant Principal	
Willard, Michelle	Instructional Coach	
Sabatini, Elissa	Teacher, ESE	

**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 SLT conducts an initial review of school data during the summer prior to the start of the school year. The draft SIP Areas of Focus and Action Plan are presented to the entire faculty during pre-planning and to the SAC during the first meeting of the year. Throughout the year during monthly SLT and SAC meetings, ongoing progress monitoring data is shared and reviewed, and input is gathered on any adjustments to the Action Plan that may be needed.

**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 SIP will be monitored through data chats, Stocktake meetings, leadership meetings, PLCs, and walk through data.

## Demographic Data

Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

<b>2023-24 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>2022-23 Title I School Status</b>	No
<b>2022-23 Minority Rate</b>	50%
<b>2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b>	87%
<b>Charter School</b>	No
<b>RAISE School</b>	No
<b>ESSA Identification</b> *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
<b>Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)</b>	No
<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 (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Black/African American Students (BLK)* Hispanic Students (HSP) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
<b>School Grades History</b> *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: C
<b>School Improvement Rating History</b>	
<b>DJJ Accountability Rating History</b>	

**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	5	31	19	27	20	37	0	0	0	139
One or more suspensions	0	3	5	7	2	4	0	0	0	21
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	2	1	2	0	0	0	5
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	3	0	1	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	41	40	34	0	0	0	115
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	3	29	28	0	0	0	60
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	7	14	25	21	17	19	0	0	0	103

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	4	8	11	15	21	21	0	0	0	80

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	3	5	0	0	0	0	8
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	3

**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	22	32	29	28	24	24	0	0	0	159
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	8	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	5	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	25	29	0	0	0	57
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	2	29	26	0	0	0	57
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	2	18	17	0	0	0	37

The number of students identified retained:

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

**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	22	32	29	28	24	24	0	0	0	159
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	8	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	5	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	25	29	0	0	0	57
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	2	29	26	0	0	0	57
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

**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	2	18	17	0	0	0	37

**The number of students identified retained:**

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

**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*	54	52	53	56	53	56	66		
ELA Learning Gains				49			59		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				18			37		
Math Achievement*	53	55	59	57	42	50	57		
Math Learning Gains				53			40		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				37			19		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*	63	62	54	62	55	59	61		
Social Studies Achievement*					59	64			
Middle School Acceleration					45	52			
Graduation Rate					58	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	61	60	59	57			48		

\* 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	59
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	293
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	49
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	389
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

**ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)**

<b>2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY</b>				
<b>ESSA Subgroup</b>	<b>Federal Percent of Points Index</b>	<b>Subgroup Below 41%</b>	<b>Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%</b>	<b>Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%</b>
SWD	37	Yes	4	
ELL	51			
AMI				
ASN	95			
BLK	37	Yes	2	
HSP	51			
MUL	63			
PAC				
WHT	66			
FRL	50			

<b>2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY</b>				
<b>ESSA Subgroup</b>	<b>Federal Percent of Points Index</b>	<b>Subgroup Below 41%</b>	<b>Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%</b>	<b>Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%</b>
SWD	26	Yes	3	1
ELL	48			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	32	Yes	1	
HSP	47			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	51			
FRL	43			

**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	54			53			63					61
SWD	23			27			39				5	56
ELL	47			41			58				5	61
AMI												
ASN	100			90							2	
BLK	38			37			39				4	
HSP	43			47			63				5	56
MUL	58			67							2	
PAC												
WHT	62			58			69				4	
FRL	43			42			55				5	57

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	56	49	18	57	53	37	62					57
SWD	18	24	6	21	36	28	21					55
ELL	45	47	10	44	68	60	53					57
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	36	32	21	39	37	31	30					
HSP	53	51	14	47	57	50	44					61
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	63	52	16	67	57	24	78					
FRL	44	40	18	47	48	38	54					56

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	66	59	37	57	40	19	61					48
SWD	25	30	21	27	22	27	18					44
ELL	56	68		40	21		55					48

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
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	42	38		35	29		38					
HSP	63	56		44	24	10	52					42
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	74	70	42	69	51		74					
FRL	54	48	32	45	32	24	47					47

**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
05	2023 - Spring	54%	53%	1%	54%	0%
04	2023 - Spring	52%	57%	-5%	58%	-6%
03	2023 - Spring	55%	53%	2%	50%	5%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	56%	57%	-1%	59%	-3%
04	2023 - Spring	56%	59%	-3%	61%	-5%
05	2023 - Spring	50%	55%	-5%	55%	-5%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	61%	61%	0%	51%	10%

### 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.**

4th gr ELA / SWD - 6.1% proficient. (34 Ss)

Contributing factors: Teachers not yet completely familiar with the FL benchmarks and the planning protocol for designing instruction aligned to the benchmarks. Historical trends of staff turnover impacting this cohort of students, current year loss of SF, Ss divided among remaining SFs, lack of consistent teacher in 1 classroom for 1st semester leading to roster being divided among other teachers on team, (utilization of support staff for test administration reducing contact time with SWDs on caseload)

In the current school year, focusing on collaborative planning process during PLC time and school-based ERPLs utilizing planning protocol designed in conjunction with the focused four VCS look-fors, aligning instruction to the benchmarks. Providing support via coaching cycles and professional learning opportunities for teachers to increase their depth of knowledge of the benchmarks and how they transfer to instruction.

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

ELL - ELA 45% proficient to 13.2% proficient.

Contributing factors: Teachers not yet completely familiar with the FL benchmarks and the planning protocol for designing instruction aligned to the benchmarks. Influx of student enrollments of students from out of country during course of school year. (review reports of NES students vs overall ELL population, wait for 'scrubbed' data reports)

In the current school year, focusing on collaborative planning process during PLC time and school-based ERPLs utilizing planning protocol designed in conjunction with the focused four VCS look-fors, aligning instruction to the benchmarks. Providing support via coaching cycles and professional learning opportunities for teachers to increase their depth of knowledge of the benchmarks and how they transfer to instruction.

**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 biggest data component with the biggest gap was 4th grade ELA. 4th grade ELA at Freedom had a proficiency rate of 52% and the State was 58% proficient.

Contributing factors: Teachers not yet completely familiar with the FL benchmarks and the planning protocol for designing instruction aligned to the benchmarks. Historical trends of staff turnover impacting this cohort of students, current year loss of SF, Ss divided among remaining SFs, lack of consistent teacher in 1 classroom for 1st semester leading to roster being divided among other teachers on team, (utilization of support staff for test administration reducing contact time with SWDs on caseload)

In the current school year, focusing on collaborative planning process during PLC time and school-based ERPLs utilizing planning protocol designed in conjunction with the focused four VCS look-fors, aligning instruction to the benchmarks. Providing support via coaching cycles and professional learning

opportunities for teachers to increase their depth of knowledge of the benchmarks and how they transfer to instruction.

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

ELA performance increased by 1% from 56% to 57% and Science Achievement improved from 62% to 63%.

- Tutoring through IAWA & ESSER II grant funding
- Purchase of Penda Science with regular Penda Science 'Challenges'
- Systematic targeting of interventions for 'Bubble'/'Silo' students in small group instruction, identifying lowest-performing benchmarks and utilizing benchmark-aligned resources

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

- ELA level 1 (especially among ESSA Subgroups)
- Discipline / suspension data

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

1. ESSA Subgroup achievement (SWD / ELL / Black, African-American)
2. Reduce disciplinary referrals/suspensions (PBIS)

**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 Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups****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.

Benchmark-aligned instruction to meet the needs of all students.

Overall proficiency remained consistent and comparable to state and district averages from 21-22 to 22-23. However, gaps in proficiency were observed in the SWD, Black/African American, and ELL ESSA Subgroups, with 4th grade SWD achieving 6.1% proficiency on PM3 ELA.

Inconsistencies in implementation of grade-level planning process during PLC time. Collaborative planning time was provided to teachers mid-year, but inconsistently implemented across grade levels. Planning protocols were provided to teachers and reviewed.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

Student Practice: PM1/PM2 ELA growth in proficiency for 3rd, 4th, and 5th grade students in identified ESSA Subgroups will be consistent w/ school, district and state trends, and meet or exceed 30% proficiency by January 2024. In addition, 50% of students in identified ESSA Subgroups in the lowest 25% (LQ) of achievement on the 2023 PM3 ELA will demonstrate a Learning Gain on the 2024 PM3 ELA.

Teacher Practice: By April 2024, 80% of classroom teachers will provide students with benchmark-aligned tasks as evidenced in walkthroughs, PLC, and ERPL.

Coaching Practice: By April 2024, the number of teachers receiving Tier 2-3 support will decrease by 80%.

**Monitoring:**

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

Data chats to review student progress on common assessments, interventions, and small group instruction. Teachers will use planning protocol developed to align instruction to benchmarks and incorporate instructional look-fors, to collaboratively plan as a grade level during PLC and ERPLs for small group interventions (using only materials listed on Decision Tree) based on the 5 lowest performing benchmarks from Data Dashboard or Benchmark assessments. Grade levels will share with Coach and Administration their intervention plan every nine weeks, or more often if mastery of benchmark is achieved.

PLC meeting minutes - aligned to planning protocols

Classroom walkthrough data trends utilizing look-fors instrument.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

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

**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.)

Teachers will collaboratively plan as a grade level during PLC and ERPLs for small group interventions (using only materials listed on Decision Tree) based on the 5 lowest performing benchmarks from Data Dashboard or Benchmark assessments. Grade levels will share with Coach and Administration their intervention plan every nine weeks, or more often if mastery of benchmark is achieved.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

By monitoring the implementation of the research based interventions aligned to the lowest performing benchmarks, students will show an increase in benchmark mastery.



**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.

Grade levels identifying lowest performing benchmarks. Grade levels will come up with an intervention plan utilizing the decision tree based on lowest benchmarks. Teachers will share plan with Academic Coach and Administration. Teachers will implement intervention plan and monitor instruction, mastery of benchmark. Admin and Academic Coach monitor implementation through classroom walk throughs, PLC, and ERPLs and providing feedback to teachers based on observaions and studetn performance. The proficiency will be monitored, discussed, and will adjust quarterly.

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

**By When:** This data will be monitored quarterly.

## #2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other

### 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.

Based on discipline data, our referrals increased by 65% compared to prior year. Analysis of the data revealed over 90% of students received 0-1 referrals for the whole school year. However, a small group of students, most of whom have an IEP, received the majority of discipline referrals.

### Measurable Outcome:

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

By May 2024, the number of discipline referrals for those students identified as receiving the majority of referrals in 22-23 will decrease by 65%.

### Monitoring:

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

We will monitor discipline data for the school as a whole, and for the identified group of students, monthly through our MTSS SLT & PBIS Team, providing results and recommendations as appropriate to our Behavior Leadership Team to support individual students as needed.

### Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

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

### 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.)

1. Continue school-wide PBIS program. Revise discipline referral flowchart to provide teachers with guidance regarding which situations require a disciplinary referral and which are appropriate to address with alternate interventions.
2. Through school-based MTSS SLT, ensure teachers are aware of students in their classes with a history of behavioral challenges and are implementing their behavior plans with fidelity.
3. Through Behavior Leadership Team, support teachers with strategies to respond effectively to student behavior and assist students with demonstrating positive behaviors.

### Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The rationale is to help teachers understand why a referral should/should not be written, and giving teachers tools to help change the behaviors.

### 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.

Refining PBIS and updated flow chart, training teachers to understand during faculty or PLCs. Building relationships and creating a plan for student success.

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

**By When:** Quarterly

### **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)).

Freedom's school improvement funding allocation is managed by the School Advisory Council. To obtain funding for a needed project or resource, teachers complete a form requesting funds from the SAC. Each month, funding requests are presented to SAC and reviewed for alignment with the School Improvement Plan. The SAC then votes to approve or reject the request based on whether the need was demonstrated and if the proposal aligns with the School Improvement Plan or not.