

Charlotte County Public Schools

Liberty Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	17
Budget to Support Goals	17

Liberty Elementary School

370 ATWATER ST, Port Charlotte, FL 33954

<http://www.yourcharlotteschools.net/les>

Demographics

Principal: Sheila Brown

Start Date for this Principal: 9/15/2014

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
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (57%) 2017-18: C (47%) 2016-17: B (56%) 2015-16: C (49%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Charlotte County School Board on 10/13/2020.

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.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement

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

Provide the school's vision statement

Where the freedom to learn prevails.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Brown, Sheila	Principal	Co-Chair of Performance Partnership Committee (PPC) , School Advisory Council (SAC), Literacy Council and member of PTO. Responsible for scheduling Professional Development activities requested by the staff. Assist with student discipline interventions and parent conferences. Work with the CORE team to review grade level data monthly and provide support in the MTSS process.
Whaley, Carolyn	Assistant Principal	Co-Chair of the Support Performance Partnership Committee (SPPC), member of the Literacy Council, Leadership Team and PTO. Assist with student discipline interventions and parent conferences. Work with the CORE team to review grade level data monthly and provide support in the MTSS process.
Guerra, Julio	Guidance Counselor	Assist teachers in implementing interventions and attend MTSS meetings every Tuesday. Communicate information with our families. Chairs PBIS for the school.
Booher, Jodi	Instructional Coach	Provides professional development sessions in curricular and instructional areas; provides coaching and mentoring assistance; facilitates data team meetings and assists with data analysis and necessary follow up with teachers regarding interpretation and graphing; works with *Guidance Counselor, Social Worker, and School Psychologist to assist teachers in implementing interventions.
Schnulle, Gretchen	Instructional Coach	Provides professional development sessions in curricular and instructional areas; provides coaching and mentoring assistance; facilitates data team meetings and assists with data analysis and necessary follow up with teachers regarding interpretation and graphing; works with *Guidance Counselor, Social Worker, and School Psychologist to assist teachers in implementing interventions.
Willingham, Sarah	Instructional Coach	Trains teachers in the Reading Recovery Process, works with individual students to close achievement gaps.
Herndon, Erin	Instructional Coach	Provides professional development sessions in curricular and instructional areas; provides coaching and mentoring assistance; facilitates data team meetings and assists with data analysis and necessary follow up with teachers regarding interpretation and graphing; works with *Guidance Counselor,

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		Social Worker, and School Psychologist to assist teachers in implementing interventions.
Dilena, Teresa	Instructional Coach	Provides professional development sessions in curricular and instructional areas; provides coaching and mentoring assistance; facilitates data team meetings and assists with data analysis and necessary follow up with teachers regarding interpretation and graphing; works with *Guidance Counselor, Social Worker, and School Psychologist to assist teachers in implementing interventions.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 9/15/2014, Sheila Brown

Number of teachers with a 2019 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.*

1

Number of teachers with a 2019 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.*

2

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

28

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners

	Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (57%) 2017-18: C (47%) 2016-17: B (56%) 2015-16: C (49%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

The number of students by 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	64	62	56	64	76	71	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	393
Attendance below 90 percent	7	10	8	8	9	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55
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 ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	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	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	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 9/9/2020

Prior Year - As Reported**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	72	91	83	86	102	91	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	525
Attendance below 90 percent	2	7	4	6	13	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	0	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	7	32	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67

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	2	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9

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	12	16	11	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Prior Year - Updated**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	72	91	83	86	102	91	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	525
Attendance below 90 percent	2	7	4	6	13	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	0	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	7	32	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67

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	2	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9

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	12	16	11	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41
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

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	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	59%	62%	57%	54%	59%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	59%	57%	58%	44%	52%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	59%	50%	53%	45%	41%	48%
Math Achievement	67%	63%	63%	63%	65%	62%
Math Learning Gains	58%	54%	62%	41%	54%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	50%	42%	51%	18%	39%	47%
Science Achievement	45%	54%	53%	61%	66%	55%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data

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
03	2019	76%	69%	7%	58%	18%
	2018	55%	63%	-8%	57%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		21%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	51%	57%	-6%	58%	-7%
	2018	46%	54%	-8%	56%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				
05	2019	47%	56%	-9%	56%	-9%
	2018	55%	56%	-1%	55%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	85%	70%	15%	62%	23%
	2018	68%	69%	-1%	62%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		17%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	63%	60%	3%	64%	-1%
	2018	59%	61%	-2%	62%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				
05	2019	48%	56%	-8%	60%	-12%
	2018	53%	62%	-9%	61%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		-11%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	43%	52%	-9%	53%	-10%
	2018	60%	63%	-3%	55%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		-17%				
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	34	43	45	37	40	45	4				
ELL	50	54		67	55						
BLK	52	40		48	36						
HSP	59	63	55	72	59		38				
MUL	45	81		41	38		27				
WHT	62	57	60	72	63	57	54				
FRL	54	58	58	66	55	52	40				

2018 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 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	38	22	32	36	16	7	24				
ELL	36			36							
BLK	61			53	40						
HSP	46	30		54	31		38				
MUL	50	56		75	38						
WHT	56	43	41	65	44	14	66				
FRL	52	42	38	59	35	16	57				

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index - All Students	60
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	86
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	483
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	35
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	62
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	44
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	63
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	46
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students 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
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	61
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

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

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

Our lowest performance data component was Science. This group of students struggled with ELA proficiency which made the academic vocabulary in Science difficult to understand. We also had two teachers that hadn't taught Fifth grade Science so their content knowledge was not as strong as my veteran teacher.

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

Our greatest data component decline was Science. This group of students struggled with ELA proficiency which made the academic vocabulary in Science difficult to understand. We also had two teachers that hadn't taught Fifth grade Science so their content knowledge was not as strong as my veteran teacher.

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

Our greatest gap when compared to the state average was Science. This group of students struggled with ELA proficiency which made the academic vocabulary in Science difficult to understand. We also had two teachers that hadn't taught Fifth grade Science so their content knowledge was not as strong as my veteran teacher. We have noticed a strong correlation between our ELA proficiency and our Science proficiency so our trend fluctuates depending on the ELA proficiency of our grade levels.

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

The component with the most improvement was math bottom quartile gains. We made sure to place our most struggling math students with our most proficient math teachers, we created a math intervention room so our bottom quartile students could receive small group instruction daily for 30 minutes and we hired an intervention specialist to oversee our intervention room and our MTSS process.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

We are concerned about the number of students we have that are scoring a level 1 on FSA, attendance is also a concern but it has improved over the previous year.

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

1. Increase learning gains for all students.
2. Increase Science Proficiency
3. Increase ELA Proficiency
4. Close the Achievement Gap for Students with Disabilities
5. Increase learning gains for bottom quartile students

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: To increase our percent of students who make their learning gain in ELA and Math, with a specific focus on increasing our learning gains for our students in the bottom quartile and our students with disabilities. If students increase their learning gain in ELA and Math it will increase overall proficiency for the school.

Measurable Outcome: Gain 34 overall school grade component points in the following areas: 3 points in ELA achievement, 3 points in ELA gains, 3 points in ELA bottom quartile gains, 4 points in math gains, 10 points in math bottom quartile gains and 10 points in science gains.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Sheila Brown (sheila.brown@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Liberty Elementary will increase student achievement through standards based instruction, with a focus on the critical concepts for grades 3-5. We will continue to use collaborative planning time to monitor student performance on our common assessments and ClearSight/Star assessments. We will also continue our weekly professional development discussing high effect size Marzano strategies, guided reading techniques aligned with Reading Recovery, and providing strong interventions through our MTSS process.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Liberty Elementary gained 71 points in 2018-19 while implementing these strategies, for the 2020-21 school year we will refine these strategies and add a specific focus on students with disabilities.

Action Steps to Implement

Train all 3-5 teachers on the Critical Concepts and ClearSight testing platform for their grade level before the school year starts and then provide monthly professional development on implementation of the concepts and discussing student data.

Person Responsible Teresa Dilena (teresa.dilena@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Use Renaissance assessment program to better monitor progress of learning gains and increase reading proficiency. Use Renaissance reading programs to set reading goals and targets for all students including students with disabilities.

Person Responsible Teresa Dilena (teresa.dilena@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Continue MTSS monitoring and planning during monthly team meetings and biweekly CORE meetings to monitor interventions & formative assessments.

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

Continue the use of the intervention classroom with ESE coach and paraprofessionals with a focus on students with disabilities and bottom quartile students.

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

Continue to implement the Reading Recovery program in 1st grade, provide professional development in K-2 in guided reading using Reading Recovery research.

Person Responsible Erin Herndon (erin.herndon@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

We will use Reflex to increase math fact fluency for all students. We will focus on Freckle Science in all grade levels to increase science background knowledge.

Part IV: 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 to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. 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.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

Liberty elementary strives to build positive relationships with parents and families and community stakeholders by asking for feedback on our school improvement goals. We share the school improvement plan with our Parent Teacher Organization and our School Advisory Committee and ask for their feedback and input. The LES administrative team sends out a survey to staff every year to assess our progress on building a positive environment. LES partners with Chick-Fil-A, and New Day Christian Church to make sure we can better meet the needs of all of our students and to celebrate successes with our families outside of school. Our student leadership team supports several local agencies through volunteering and fundraising.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Part V: Budget

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00