

Charlotte County Public Schools

Liberty Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	10
III. Planning for Improvement	13
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	18
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	18
VI. Title I Requirements	20
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	22

Liberty Elementary School

370 ATWATER ST, Port Charlotte, FL 33954

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

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.

To ensure academic achievement for all students by creating a culture of community, collaboration, and coaching, focusing on student motivation, high expectations, and leadership development.

Provide the school's vision statement.

A school family that is committed to ensuring academic achievement.

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
Brown, Sheila	Principal	Co-Chair of Performance Partnership Committee (PPC) , School Advisory Council (SAC), Literacy Leadership Team 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 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.
Hill, Katina	Other	PD Coordinator, Member of the Literacy Leadership Team, Member of the Core team, Academic Coach, Gifted Liaison, Reading/Math Intervention specialist.
Booher, Jodi	Other	Provides Reading Recovery Lessons, Member of the Literacy Leadership Team, Member of the CORE team, Academic Coach, PD Presenter.
McQueen, Robyn	Other	Provides Reading Recovery Lessons, Member of the Literacy Leadership Team, Member of the CORE team, Academic Coach, PD Presenter.
Schnulle, Gretchen	Other	Member of Literacy Leadership Team, Member of CORE Team, Co-Chair of MTSS, PD presenter, Academic Coach.

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.

1. Review the data with Core team members-Principal, Assistant Principal, ESE Liaison, Intervention Specialist, Reading Recovery Teachers, Academic Coach and Lead Teacher. Choose our area(s) of focus and action steps.
2. Meet with our PPC/SAC teams to share our area(s) of focus and action steps. Allow time for collaboration and feedback. Make adjustments as needed.
3. Debrief with our CORE team and create next steps around implementation and impact of actions.
4. Share our plan with parents and community members and solicit feedback via PTO meetings, Back to School Bash, Facebook and our school website.
5. Debrief with our CORE team to finalize the plan based on feedback from our stakeholders.

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))

We will monitor our action steps weekly during CORE team meetings. We are going to use a 20 day system to visit classrooms and monitor implementation. We will use walk through checklists from these visits, and scores from our unit assessments to provide coaching and guiding questions for the teachers to use during collaborative planning to improve teaching and learning. At the end of each 20 day cycle, we will check progress and update our action steps as needed.

Demographic Data	
2023-24 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
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	42%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
2021-22 ESSA Identification	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)	
School Grades History	2021-22: B 2019-20: B 2018-19: B

	2017-18: C
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	1	33	29	28	23	22	0	0	0	136
One or more suspensions	0	1	2	2	4	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	1	8	0	0	0	9
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	2	15	0	0	0	17
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	3	11	0	0	0	14
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	16	0	0	0	19
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	17	17	15	8	10	0	0	0	67

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	1	0	4	23	15	0	0	0	43

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	5	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	8
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	2	31	28	26	18	26	0	0	0	131
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	19	18	0	0	0	37
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	18	15	0	0	0	33
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	8	7	20	0	0	0	35
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	5	6	16	0	0	0	27
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	1	12	12	9	3	8	0	0	0	45

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	3	1	12	0	0	0	16

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	1	2	9	0	0	0	0	0	13
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	2	31	28	26	18	26	0	0	0	131
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	19	18	0	0	0	37
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	18	15	0	0	0	33
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	8	7	20	0	0	0	35
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	5	6	16	0	0	0	27
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	1	12	12	9	3	8	0	0	0	45

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	3	1	12	0	0	0	16

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	1	2	9	0	0	0	0	0	13
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.

District and State data will be uploaded when available.

Accountability Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	60			57			59		
ELA Learning Gains	64			45			59		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	50			26			59		
Math Achievement*	62			57			67		
Math Learning Gains	61			36			58		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	51			38			50		
Science Achievement*	59			39			45		
Social Studies Achievement*									
Middle School Acceleration									
Graduation Rate									
College and Career Acceleration									
ELP Progress	44			58			86		

* 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

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	56
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	451
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

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	40	Yes	3	
ELL	42			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	56			
HSP	56			
MUL	74			
PAC				
WHT	55			
FRL	57			

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)

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	60	64	50	62	61	51	59					44
SWD	26	44	53	34	45	44	33					

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
ELL	41	57		32	36							44
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	58	67		37	60							
HSP	56	77	54	56	56	54	58					36
MUL	69	85		73	77		64					
PAC												
WHT	60	56	41	66	61	41	60					
FRL	57	63	52	60	57	52	57					

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	57	45	26	57	36	38	39					58
SWD	38	15		32	31		15					
ELL	68			63								58
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	43	43		32	29		31					
HSP	62	43		58	43		50					
MUL	43			64								
PAC												
WHT	60	49	14	59	38	38	38					
FRL	52	39	24	48	35	35	34					

2018-19 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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18	ELP Progress
All Students	59	59	59	67	58	50	45					86
SWD	34	43	45	37	40	45	4					
ELL	50	54		67	55							86
AMI												
ASN												

2018-19 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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18	ELP Progress
BLK	52	40		48	36							
HSP	59	63	55	72	59		38					93
MUL	45	81		41	38		27					
PAC												
WHT	62	57	60	72	63	57	54					
FRL	54	58	58	66	55	52	40					88

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.

School, District and State data will be uploaded when available.

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.

Liberty Elementary Science performance was our lowest performing area with only 50% of students proficient. When analyzing the data, there was significant discrepancies between classrooms showing the Tier 1 instruction needed to be stronger.

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

LES Science proficiency dropped 8 points making it the greatest decline. We believe the contributing factors for this were test fatigue during testing and some teachers did not implement our Tier 1 instruction in Science effectively. For example we had a teacher at 89% proficient, but another teacher was 29% proficient.

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.

We scored higher than the state average in all three areas (Science, Math, and ELA). We believe this is because we have had strong Tier 1 instruction with materials that align to the standards.

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

We grew by 1 point in ELA achievement. During the 22-23 school year we implemented a strong Tier 1 curriculum and followed the district pacing guide. We used this pacing guide in addition to progress monitoring with the FAST to ensure our students were on track to master the standards.

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

Attendance is a critical concern for Liberty. We will continue to emphasize the importance of being at school all day every day. We will continue to utilize our School Social Worker to assist in monitoring attendance.

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

Our highest priority for the 23-24 school year is coaching and professional learning.

Area of Focus

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

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Retention and Recruitment**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.

During the 23-24 school year we have hired 10 new teachers at Liberty Elementary. It is critical that we provide professional development, coaching opportunities, and time for collaboration with peers for our teachers so that we can strengthen Tier 1 instruction in every classroom.

Measurable Outcome:

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

100% of new teachers will complete the NET Harry Wong Management training with the Assistant Principal and the Educational Impact Courses with the Lead Teacher. This course is designed to support teachers and aide in retention.

Monitoring:

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

The area of focus will be monitored with meeting notes and sign in sheets. The NET teachers will complete the first training on their first day back at school. They will then be provided with a schedule for the additional meetings.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Carolyn Whaley (carolyn.whaley@yourcharlotteschools.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.)

Assistant Principal will lead our new teachers through a year long PLC using Harry Wong's classroom management book.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

New teachers will be more successful in the classroom if they have strong classroom management from the first day of school. Setting their classroom up with routines and procedures in mind will allow them to be more successful therefore impacting retention.

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.

AP will attend the District Meeting to learn the program

Person Responsible: Carolyn Whaley (carolyn.whaley@yourcharlotteschools.net)

By When: June 2023

Collaborate with NET teachers weekly for the first 8 weeks of school

Person Responsible: Carolyn Whaley (carolyn.whaley@yourcharlotteschools.net)

By When: October 2023

AP will meet monthly for the remainder of the school year

Person Responsible: Carolyn Whaley (carolyn.whaley@yourcharlotteschools.net)

By When: May 2024

#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 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.

We are an ATSI school for SWD. We have been close to the target of 41% proficiency, but we need to create a more deliberate plan for our coaches, and their work with teachers, to ensure that all students, including our SWD's have stronger Tier 1 instruction.

Measurable Outcome:

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

A reduction in the proficiency gap between teachers from 52 points to 20 points in ELA and from 60 points to 20 points in Math on Unit (Benchmark and Reveal), and FAST assessments between classrooms and or grade levels.

Monitoring:

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

The CORE team will collaborate on Friday mornings to discuss classroom walkthrough data (starting with routines and procedures), create specific coaching plans for areas of need and create guiding questions for each team to discuss during their weekly collaborative planning meetings. After following the plans for two weeks, we will complete another round of walkthroughs to see if we have met our goals. If yes, we will move on to subject area walkthroughs. If no, administration will schedule formal observations for teachers that are still struggling.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Sheila Brown (sheila.brown@yourcharlotteschools.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.)

LES will be using job-embedded professional learning, walkthrough tools that align with the FEAPS, and coaching strategies from Marzano and The Instructional Coaching Group.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

There was a signification gap between our teachers scores on their FAST assessment scores. By completing targeted classroom walk throughs and opportunity for discussion at collaborative planning and 1-1 with coaches we will be able to close the gap between classrooms.

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.

Create a walkthrough tool designed to look for aligned instruction with high effect size strategies and grade level benchmarks

Person Responsible: Sheila Brown (sheila.brown@yourcharlotteschools.net)

By When: July 2023

Schedule weekly observations in classrooms to collect data. (20-day cycles beginning with routines, procedures and learner qualities.)

Person Responsible: Sheila Brown (sheila.brown@yourcharlotteschools.net)

By When: July 2023

Schedule weekly CORE team meetings with all coaches to discuss walkthrough data, assign coaching sessions based on observations, and create guiding questions for each grade level team and coach to use during collaborative planning.

Person Responsible: Sheila Brown (sheila.brown@yourcharlotteschools.net)

By When: August 2023

Create new routines and procedures for collaborative planning. (Start with guiding questions, then move to assessment and instruction.)

Person Responsible: Katina Hill (katina.hill@yourcharlotteschools.net)

By When: Ongoing

Share data monthly with the Literacy Leadership Team and use that data to create a plan for the next 20 day cycle.

Person Responsible: Sheila Brown (sheila.brown@yourcharlotteschools.net)

By When: On going

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).

Schoolwide Improvement funds are allocated to schools annually as a per pupil allocation based on Survey 3 FTE data. Supplemental federal funds are allocated to schools as requested by school leadership and based on need. Schools complete the Federal Programs Consultation Survey to request funds needed to support their school improvement areas of focus. The federal programs team reviews each request and approves on an individual basis giving priority to schools designated as CSI, TSI and ATSI respectively. Liberty Elementary is going to use the Schoolwide Improvement funds to pay for a part time intervention teacher to run small group reading and math lessons with our bottom quartile and ESE students.

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically related to Reading/ELA

Measurable Outcomes

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data-based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K -3, using the coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment;
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a Level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment; and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2 Measurable Outcomes

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

Monitoring

Monitoring

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term “evidence-based” means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. §7801(21)(A)(i). Florida’s definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida’s definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district’s K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

Rationale:

Explain the rationale for selecting practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school’s Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step

Person Responsible for Monitoring

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))
 List the school’s webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

We will share our plan with parents and community members via PTO meetings, Back to School Bash, Facebook and our school website. We will send a one page overview in Spanish that highlights our planning for improvement. We will share our plan with students and staff during our back to school meetings.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.

List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

We hold family engagement activities monthly. These activities are posted on our website, advertised on social media and phone calls are sent via our parent connect system. Teachers use conferences, TST meetings, Focus, and the Remind app to keep parents updated on student progress.

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part II of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii))

We are going to use classroom walkthroughs to identify teachers in need of coaching, and students in need of interventions. We will then meet as a team weekly to schedule the coaching and interventions. Students in need of enrichment and acceleration, will be identified and the Lead Teacher will work with the classroom teachers to make sure this happens. She will meet with teachers weekly to discuss progress.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

This plan was developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State and local services who are resources to our students at Liberty. Our partnerships include:

Ya Ya Backpacks - This organization provides backpacks of food for students needing extra food for the weekend.

Champs Café- Our cafeteria follow federal guidelines to provide free lunches to all of our students

United Way- Works with families to provide assistance for housing and expenses and free tax services
Boys and Girls Club- They provide families with mentoring programs for students on campus during the day, and child care assistance for before and after school based on income.

Shoes for Kids - This non-profit provides tennis shoes to students needing assistance.

The Patterson Foundation - Provides funding for reading initiatives including activity bags for Kinders, attendance contests, and professional development opportunities.

Tax Collector's Office - Each year our 5th grade students are challenged with designing a personalized license tag for the county. These are sold to parents and community members as vanity tags for the front of the car.

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

We have a full time social worker, behavior specialist, guidance counselor, and school psychologist on campus. We meet with these individuals to discuss students in need as events happen. We also meet monthly to discuss any concerns that are not related to a specific event.

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

N/A

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

We have an intervention specialist that works in collaboration with our ESE Liaison, ESE Academic Coach, Behavior Specialist and Administration to make sure that we create interventions for behavior and academics that fit the needs of each student.

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

We will follow a 20 day plan for classroom walkthroughs, coaching and collaborative meetings. We will start with a focus on the learning environment and culture and then work through each academic area. Based on the data from our walkthroughs, we will assign our coaches, peer teachers and district specialists to provide targeted P.D. for all teachers.

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

We hold a kindergarten screening before the school year begins. Based on the screening results we provide our parents with specific tools to help their child learn over the summer. We also begin visiting Kindergarten classrooms with our Headstart and ESE PreK students before the school year ends.

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: Positive Culture and Environment: Teacher Retention and Recruitment	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$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.

Yes