

School District of Indian River County

# Liberty Magnet School



## 2019-20 School Improvement Plan

---

## **Table of Contents**

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>15</b>

# Liberty Magnet School

6850 81ST ST, Vero Beach, FL 32967

www.indianriverschools.org

## Demographics

**Principal: Takeisha Harris**

Start Date for this Principal: 8/23/2019

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2018-19 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	47%
<b>2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Asian Students Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students <b>Students With Disabilities</b> White Students
<b>School Grade</b>	2018-19: A
<b>School Grades History</b>	2017-18: A 2016-17: B 2015-16: A 2014-15: A 2013-14: C
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Diane Leinenbach</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	NOT IN DA

ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

## School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Indian River County School Board.

## SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Liberty Magnet, an International Baccalaureate School, is committed to assisting all students in becoming compassionate, responsible, lifelong learners dedicated to productivity in a global society.

#### Provide the school's vision statement

The desired outcome of any IB programme is to develop in students the attributes of the IB learner profile. Our students strive to be:

- Inquirers ~ To ask questions and not be satisfied with the easy answer
- Knowledgeable ~ To show interest in many things and be confident to share information
- Thinkers ~ To solve problems and make sound decisions
- Communicators ~ To express oneself in a variety of ways
- Principled ~ To work to be fair, honest, and trustworthy
- Open-minded ~ To listen to others and respect their ideas
- Caring ~ To show sensitivity to the needs of others
- Risk-takers ~ To have the courage to try new things
- Balanced ~ To participate in a variety of activities and live a healthy lifestyle
- Reflective ~ To think honestly about one's actions and abilities in order to improve

### School Leadership Team

#### Membership

Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Harris, Takeisha	Principal	
Good, Christine	Assistant Principal	
Tomas, Jennifer	Instructional Coach	
Morrow, Kimberly	Teacher, K-12	
Drisdorn, Vanessa	Teacher, K-12	
Getchell, Amy	Teacher, K-12	
Daulby, William	Teacher, K-12	
Hicks, Angela	Teacher, K-12	
Hoag, Elizabeth	Teacher, K-12	
Seaman, Courtney	Teacher, K-12	

### 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	92	91	91	93	89	89	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	545
Attendance below 90 percent	0	3	9	9	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	5	16	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	5	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	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	1	3	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

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

**FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)**

40

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Friday 8/23/2019

**Prior Year - As Reported**

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Attendance below 90 percent		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in ELA or Math		
Level 1 on statewide assessment		

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

**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
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
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	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

**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	78%	58%	57%	75%	57%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	65%	57%	58%	61%	55%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	42%	54%	53%	48%	49%	48%
Math Achievement	80%	63%	63%	79%	63%	62%
Math Learning Gains	70%	60%	62%	72%	61%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	40%	48%	51%	63%	52%	47%
Science Achievement	69%	54%	53%	69%	55%	55%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey							
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
Number of students enrolled	92 (0)	91 (0)	91 (0)	93 (0)	89 (0)	89 (0)	545 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	0 ( )	3 ( )	9 ( )	9 ( )	0 ( )	9 ( )	30 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 ( )	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	1 (0)	2 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 ( )	5 (0)	16 (0)	11 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	32 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 ( )	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	5 (0)	13 (0)	18 (0)
	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	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.

NOTE: 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.

<b>ELA</b>						
<b>Grade</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School-District Comparison</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School-State Comparison</b>
03	2019	80%	60%	20%	58%	22%
	2018	80%	56%	24%	57%	23%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	84%	61%	23%	58%	26%
	2018	77%	56%	21%	56%	21%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				
05	2019	73%	54%	19%	56%	17%
	2018	72%	52%	20%	55%	17%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				

<b>MATH</b>						
<b>Grade</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School-District Comparison</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School-State Comparison</b>
03	2019	80%	64%	16%	62%	18%
	2018	74%	60%	14%	62%	12%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	80%	64%	16%	64%	16%
	2018	84%	63%	21%	62%	22%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				
05	2019	83%	57%	26%	60%	23%
	2018	84%	58%	26%	61%	23%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				

<b>SCIENCE</b>						
<b>Grade</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School-District Comparison</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School-State Comparison</b>
05	2019	69%	53%	16%	53%	16%
	2018	70%	54%	16%	55%	15%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison						



**Subgroup Data**

<b>2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS</b>											
<b>Subgroups</b>	<b>ELA Ach.</b>	<b>ELA LG</b>	<b>ELA LG L25%</b>	<b>Math Ach.</b>	<b>Math LG</b>	<b>Math LG L25%</b>	<b>Sci Ach.</b>	<b>SS Ach.</b>	<b>MS Accel.</b>	<b>Grad Rate 2016-17</b>	<b>C &amp; C Accel 2016-17</b>
SWD	24	19	20	24	23	11					
ELL	36			55							
ASN	92			92							
BLK	63	60		66	60		40				
HSP	56	62	43	67	65	50	56				
WHT	86	66	42	86	72	40	77				
FRL	70	59	38	70	62	38	55				

<b>2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS</b>											
<b>Subgroups</b>	<b>ELA Ach.</b>	<b>ELA LG</b>	<b>ELA LG L25%</b>	<b>Math Ach.</b>	<b>Math LG</b>	<b>Math LG L25%</b>	<b>Sci Ach.</b>	<b>SS Ach.</b>	<b>MS Accel.</b>	<b>Grad Rate 2015-16</b>	<b>C &amp; C Accel 2015-16</b>
SWD	29	43	53	33	50	50	27				
ELL	45			64							
BLK	53	50	40	70	61	60					
HSP	66	71	64	70	76	69	71				
WHT	81	59	43	84	71	60	73				
FRL	68	66	54	71	69	61	65				

**ESSA Data**

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

<b>ESSA Federal Index</b>	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index - All Students	61
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	46
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	490
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

**Subgroup Data**

<b>Students With Disabilities</b>	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	17
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1

<b>English Language Learners</b>	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	46
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Asian Students</b>	
Federal Index - Asian Students	92
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Black/African American Students</b>	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	58
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Hispanic Students</b>	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	54
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Multiracial Students</b>	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Native American Students</b>	
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
<b>Pacific Islander Students</b>	
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
<b>White Students</b>	
Federal Index - White Students	67
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	54
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**

Students With Disabilities

Contributing Factors: Attendance, Alignment of Interventions with Tier 1 instruction, Progress Monitoring

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

Math Learning Gains of Lowest Quartile Students

Contributing Factors: Attendance, Alignment of Interventions with Tier 1 instruction, Progress Monitoring

#### **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**

Math Learning Gains of Lowest Quartile Students

Contributing Factors: Attendance, Alignment of Interventions with Tier 1 instruction, Progress Monitoring

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

Black students ELA Achievement and Learning Gains

Contributing Factors: Targeted Small Group Instruction aligned with Tier 1 Instruction

#### **Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)**

Attendance

Level 1 or ELA/Math Course Failure

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

1. Course Failure in ELA or Math and Level 1 on statewide assessment
2. SWD: ELA and Math Achievement and Learning Gains
3. Attendance below 90%
4. Maintain school grade-A
- 5.

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:

<b>#1</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Course Failure (Spring iReady and FSA Level 1)
<b>Rationale</b>	9% or 50 students are scored more than one year below grade level or a Level 1 on Reading or Math FSA..
<b>State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	The percent of students identified as having a course failure will decrease from 9% to 5%.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Takeisha Harris (takeisha.harris@indianriverschools.org)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	-Early Identification -RTI (data based) -Weekly Progress Monitoring with specific goals identified
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	The students were identified using the early warning system data. The early warning system data is generated from the Florida Standards Assessments (reading and math), and the Spring iReady diagnostic assessment. These students scored below grade level on one of these assessments. Criteria: -Students with warnings
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	1. Compile list of students identified with early warnings. 2. Identify students with multiple warnings to be monitored through Tier 3 MTSS Committee meetings. 3. Identify students with warnings that will be monitored through Tier 2 data meetings. 4. 5.
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Takeisha Harris (takeisha.harris@indianriverschools.org)

<b>#2</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Learning Gains for all students-FOCUS: Students with Disabilities (SWD)
<b>Rationale</b>	Students with Disabilities Subgroup proficiency below 41% during 2018-19 school year. Of the 24 Liberty Magnet School students in this category, only 17% of these students performed at or above grade level on the 2019-19 Florida State Assessments for Reading.
<b>State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	Increase SWD student learning gains for reading and math from 29% to 50%.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Takeisha Harris (takeisha.harris@indianriverschools.org)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Intensive Small group instruction on a daily basis promotes small targeted set of skills.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Focused small group intervention provides opportunities to review, practice, and reinforce skills.
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Create Master Schedule/Classroom schedule that incorporates small group instruction daily.</li> <li>2. Identify and group students according to focus skill</li> <li>3. Assign staff to meet with students outside of Resource teacher schedule</li> <li>4. Resource teacher coordinate instruction with classroom teacher.</li> <li>5.</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	[no one identified]

**#3**

<b>Title</b>	Learner Profile Traits in the Learning Environment
<b>Rationale</b>	During the 2018-19 school year, Liberty recorded 19 days of In School Suspension, and 10 days of Out of School Suspension.
<b>State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	During the 2019-20 school year, we would like to reduce these numbers by 20%.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Takeisha Harris (takeisha.harris@indianriverschools.org)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	We are entering our second year of the Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports program. With deeper knowledge and understanding of the program, teachers will be equipped with methods to extinguish behaviors before they reach a level where more intensive interventions are needed.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	PBIS is a research based program that improves the social, emotional, and academic outcomes for all students, including students with disabilities and students from underrepresented groups.

**Action Step**

<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Regularly review student and teacher expectations for clarity and practice.</li> <li>2. Closely monitor minor classroom infractions to determine appropriate interventions.</li> <li>3. PD: Schoolwide Book Study-The Curious Classroom to increase inquiry and student engagement.</li> <li>4.</li> <li>5.</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	[no one identified]

**Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)**

**After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information)**

**Part IV: Title I Requirements**

**Additional Title I Requirements**  
 This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Pilot SIP to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

**Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students**

N/A

**PFEP Link**

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

**Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services**

N/A

**Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another**

N/A

**Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact**

N/A

**Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations**

N/A

**Part V: Budget**

1	III.A	Areas of Focus: Course Failure (Spring iReady and FSA Level 1)				\$1,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
			0301 - Liberty Magnet School	General Fund		\$1,000.00
<i>Notes: Substitutes for teacher to attend Math Coach meetings</i>						
2	III.A	Areas of Focus: Learning Gains for all students-FOCUS: Students with Disabilities (SWD)				\$600.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
			0301 - Liberty Magnet School	General Fund		\$600.00

						<i>Notes: Purchase ESGI Assessment system to track learning gains for Kindergarten.</i>
<b>3</b>	<b>III.A</b>	<b>Areas of Focus: Learner Profile Traits in the Learning Environment</b>				<b>\$2,000.00</b>
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
			0301 - Liberty Magnet School	General Fund		\$2,000.00
						<i>Notes: Purchase of 2-way radios which allow teachers to call for support if needed.</i>
<b>Total:</b>						<b>\$3,600.00</b>