

School District of Indian River County

Liberty Magnet 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	14
Positive Culture & Environment	18
Budget to Support Goals	19

Liberty Magnet School

6850 81ST ST, Vero Beach, FL 32967

www.indianriverschools.org

Demographics

Principal: Takeisha Harris

Start Date for this Principal: 7/21/2013

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	36%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (63%) 2017-18: A (67%) 2016-17: B (60%) 2015-16: A (62%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
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 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.

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 students will become active, compassionate, and lifelong learners.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Through it's inquiry-led, transdisciplinary IB framework, Liberty challenges students to think for themselves and take responsibility for their learning as the explore local and global issues and opportunities in real-life contexts.

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
Harris, Takeisha	Principal	As the school's principal, Mrs. Harris, provides a mission and shapes a vision for academic success for all students. Data is utilized to drive decision-making, building relationships with students is a priority. Mrs. Harris establishes high expectations for all students.
Esposito, Tabettha	Assistant Principal	As the assistant principal, Ms. Esposito works in collaboration with the principal in implementing the vision and mission for the school. Ms. Esposito ensures the fidelity of MTSS by monitoring the following: instructional staff's implementation of tiered instruction, process of administering assessments, and monitoring student achievement.
Tomas, Jennifer	Instructional Coach	As the reading coach, Mrs. Tomas provides direct instructional services related to improving and supporting classroom instruction. Mrs. Tomas utilizes the coaching model to support teachers in effective evidenced-based instructional strategies that will improve students' academic success.
Morrow, Kimberly	Teacher, K-12	As Kindergarten Chair, Mrs. Morrow participates in curriculum planning for core instruction; plan and collaborate with administration in identifying Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 students and monitoring progress.
Drisdorn, Vanessa	Teacher, K-12	As 2nd Grade Chair, Mrs. Drisdorn participates in curriculum planning for core instruction; plan and collaborate with administration in identifying Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 students and monitoring progress.
Getchell, Amy	Teacher, K-12	As 5th Grade Chair, Mrs. Getchell participates in curriculum planning for core instruction; plan and collaborate with administration in identifying Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 students and monitoring progress.
Daulby, William	Teacher, K-12	As 4th Grade Chair, Mr. Daulby participates in curriculum planning for core instruction; plan and collaborate with administration in identifying Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 students and monitoring progress.
Hicks, Angela	Teacher, K-12	As Cultural Arts Chair, Mrs. Hicks participates in curriculum planning for core instruction; plan and collaborate with administration in identifying Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 students and monitoring progress.
Hoag, Elizabeth	Teacher, K-12	As 3rd Grade Chair, Mrs. Hoag participates in curriculum planning for core instruction; plan and collaborate with administration in identifying Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 students and monitoring progress.
Seaman, Courtney	Teacher, K-12	As 1st Grade Chair, Mrs. Seaman participates in curriculum planning for core instruction; plan and collaborate with administration in identifying Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 students and monitoring progress.

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Lunsford, Jamie	Other	The IB PYP Coordinator is responsible for IB throughout the school (K-5). The role of this coordinator is to mentor and coach teachers to help infuse IB strategies within the instructional blocks.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Sunday 7/21/2013, Takeisha Harris

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.*

33

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.*

6

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

39

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	36%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (63%) 2017-18: A (67%)

	2016-17: B (60%) 2015-16: A (62%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
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	86	90	89	86	88	88	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	527
Attendance below 90 percent	1	2	1	2	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

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	2	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

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	1	0	0	0	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/31/2020

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	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

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	

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	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

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	

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%	73%	54%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	65%	57%	58%	54%	53%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	42%	54%	53%	36%	52%	52%
Math Achievement	80%	63%	63%	78%	60%	61%
Math Learning Gains	70%	60%	62%	69%	62%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	40%	48%	51%	52%	51%	51%
Science Achievement	69%	54%	53%	55%	48%	51%

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	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%				

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		-4%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
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%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	69%	53%	16%	53%	16%
	2018	70%	54%	16%	55%	15%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
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				
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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	29	43	53	33	50	50	27				

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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
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				
2017 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	31	39	32	38	55	50	25				
BLK	45	40	33	47	40	23	8				
HSP	62	48	45	62	74	55	45				
WHT	80	57	36	87	71	64	67				
FRL	62	53	40	67	62	52	41				

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	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	
Students With Disabilities	
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
English Language Learners	
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

Asian Students	
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
Black/African American Students	
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
Hispanic Students	
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
Multiracial Students	
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
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	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.

When looking at subgroup data across the board, our SWD population has the lowest achievement in ELA with a 18.75% proficiency. The contributing factors were ineffective Tier 1 and 2 instruction.

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

When looking at overall data components, our Math Lowest 25th percentile learning gains has the greatest decline (63% to 40%). The contributing factors were the lack of rigor in the classroom and depth of knowledge.

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 Math Lowest 25th percentile learning gains has the greatest gap falling 11 percentage points from the state average. The contributing factors were the lack of rigor in the classroom and depth of knowledge.

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

ELA Achievement showed the most improvement overall with an increase of 3 percentage points. This was attributed to increased use of standards based questioning and student engagement in ELA.

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

When looking at EWS, one concern is the number of students with 2 or more indicators.

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

1. SWD proficiency and learning gains in ELA.
2. SWD proficiency and learning gains in Math.
3. Rigor and depth of knowledge across content areas.
4. Instruction delivered to the full intent of the standard.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	We are focusing on the math proficiency of our students with disabilities. This area of focus was selected based on our 2018-19 FSA Math data. According to this data, 24% of our SWD in grades 3-5 were proficient (scoring a level 3 or above in Math).
Measurable Outcome:	The percent of students with disabilities scoring at or above 60% on district unit assessments and state assessments will increase to at least 50%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Tabetha Esposito (tabetha.esposito@indianriverschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The implementation of individualized instruction incorporating lesson planning, lesson delivery, as well as lesson effectiveness through instructional coaching.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Individualized instruction increases student achievement. Instruction is on student's instructional level, assignments are engaging and provide the appropriate support to the student, and data is available to track his or her progress throughout school year, using unit assessments. The following article was used for the evidence-based strategy: https://thejournal.com/Articles/2004/02/01/Individualized-Instruction-forImproved-Student-Achievement--Educations-Holy-Grail.aspx

Action Steps to Implement

Participate in curriculum planning for core instruction; plan and collaborate with administration.

Person Responsible Takeisha Harris (takeisha.harris@indianriverschools.org)

Administration and instructional coach meet with individual teachers to analyze data, identifying Tier 1, 2, and 3 students and progress monitoring tool. Discuss plans on how to improve in specific academic areas.

Person Responsible Takeisha Harris (takeisha.harris@indianriverschools.org)

Begin conducting cycles of instructional monitoring and feedback.

Person Responsible Tabetha Esposito (tabetha.esposito@indianriverschools.org)

Conduct student data chats with Tier 2 and Tier 3 students to review their data and have them create their goals for the school year.

Person Responsible Tabetha Esposito (tabetha.esposito@indianriverschools.org)

Close of subject Exit Slip/Closing: Connect back to the learning objective, so they know they achieved mastery or will need remediation on a skill, etc. Mix of formal and Informal assessments/checks for understanding throughout the lesson.

Person Responsible Takeisha Harris (takeisha.harris@indianriverschools.org)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: We are focusing on the language arts proficiency of our students with disabilities. This area of focus was selected based on our 2018-19 FSA ELA data. According to this data, 18.75% of our SWD in grades 3-5 were proficient (scoring a level 3 or above in ELA).

Measurable Outcome: The percent of students with disabilities scoring at or above 60% on district unit assessments and state assessments will increase to at least 50%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Takeisha Harris (takeisha.harris@indianriverschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: The implementation of individualized instruction incorporating lesson planning, lesson delivery, as well as lesson effectiveness through instructional coaching.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Individualized instruction increases student achievement. Instruction is on student's instructional level, assignments are engaging and provide the appropriate support to the student, and data is available to track his or her progress throughout school year, using unit assessments. The following article was used for the evidence-based strategy:
<https://thejournal.com/Articles/2004/02/01/Individualized-Instruction-forImproved-Student-Achievement--Educations-Holy-Grail.aspx>

Action Steps to Implement

Participate in curriculum planning for core instruction; plan and collaborate with administration to incorporate standards based and text dependent questions.

Person Responsible: Takeisha Harris (takeisha.harris@indianriverschools.org)

Admin and instructional coach meet with individual teachers to analyze data, identifying Tier 1, 2, and 3 students and progress monitoring tool. Discuss strategies to improve in specific academic areas. Provide a reading interventionist in primary grades to assist with intensive intervention.

Person Responsible: Takeisha Harris (takeisha.harris@indianriverschools.org)

Start cycle of conducting classroom walk throughs with feedback.

Person Responsible: Tabetha Esposito (tabetha.esposito@indianriverschools.org)

Conduct student data chats with Tier 2 and Tier 3 students to review their data and have them create their goals for the school year.

Person Responsible: Tabetha Esposito (tabetha.esposito@indianriverschools.org)

The Instructional Coach will gather information regarding training opportunities and a training calendar for specific teachers and for teachers in all academic areas.

Person Responsible: Jennifer Tomas (jennifer.tomas@indianriverschools.org)

Close of subject Exit Slip/Closing: Connect back to the learning objective, so they know they achieved mastery or will need remediation on a skill, etc. Mix of formal and Informal assessments/checks for understanding throughout the lesson.

Person Responsible Takeisha Harris (takeisha.harris@indianriverschools.org)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to School Theme

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: We are focusing on increasing the performance of our higher achieving students. This area of focus was selected based on our 2018-19 FSA data. According to this data, 49% of students scored at a level 4 or 5 in English Language Arts, and 56% scored at a level 4 or 5 in Math.

Measurable Outcome: Strengthening the use of inquiry through writing will increase students scoring at level 4 or 5 on state assessments, and 80% or above on district unit assessments by 10%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Takeisha Harris (takeisha.harris@indianriverschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Through inquiry within the IB programme, students deepen their learning by developing their conceptual understandings; strengthening their knowledge and skills across and beyond subject areas.
<https://www.ibo.org/programmes/primary-years-programme/>

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Through its inquiry-led, transdisciplinary framework, the PYP challenges students to think for themselves and take responsibility for their learning as they explore local and global issues and opportunities in real-life contexts.

Action Steps to Implement

Teachers will participate in collaborative planning to create inquiry based units to increase student engagement. The instruction will include enrichment and above level differentiation.

Person Responsible Jamie Lunsford (jamie.lunsford@indianriverschools.org)

Classroom walkthroughs include "look fors" regarding inquiry within the current unit of inquiry.

Person Responsible Takeisha Harris (takeisha.harris@indianriverschools.org)

Provide feedback regarding the use of real-life experiences to connect school learning to students' real-life experiences and asking higher order questions of all students.

Person Responsible Jamie Lunsford (jamie.lunsford@indianriverschools.org)

Final products of student work will be collected to build student portfolios and document inquiry.

Person Responsible Takeisha Harris (takeisha.harris@indianriverschools.org)

#4. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Equity & Diversity

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	We are focusing on increasing the proficiency of our African American students. This area of focus was selected based on our 2018-19 FSA data. According to this data, 50% of our African American students scored a level 3,4 or 5 in ELA, and 52% scored a level 3,4,or 5 in Math.
Measurable Outcome:	By implementing data chats with our African American students, we will reduce regression, and increase the percent of students scoring at or above a level 3 on state assessments and at or above 80% on district unit assessments by 10%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Takeisha Harris (takeisha.harris@indianriverschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Data chats will be used to monitor students progress and initiate problem solving when necessary as referenced at: https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Docs/PracticeGuide/dddm_pg_092909.pdf
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The SDIRC African-American plan (1.17) our teachers need to participate in Data Chats to identify, monitor, and increase the number of students achieving and maintaining levels of 3,4,5 on the FSA.

Action Steps to Implement

Create a system for monitoring progress of students using ELA, Math, and Science (5th grade).

Person Responsible Tabetha Esposito (tabetha.esposito@indianriverschools.org)

Administration and Interventionist will meet with each student monthly to discuss individual student goals for the year.

Person Responsible Tabetha Esposito (tabetha.esposito@indianriverschools.org)

Progress monitoring meeting to discuss progress towards goals, additional supports, or resources.

Person Responsible Takeisha Harris (takeisha.harris@indianriverschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

To address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities, the school leadership team will provide feedback during classroom visits regarding rigor and teaching to the full intent of the standard.

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.

The faculty and staff at Liberty Magnet School works to keep parents informed of their child's academic progress. Parents are provided quarterly progress reports, report cards and participate in parent/teacher conferences. We encourage our parents to volunteer and join the Parent Teacher Association. Additionally, all stakeholders are invited to attend our monthly School Advisory Council meetings for data and budget updates, school program information, African American Achievement Plan, and other pertinent topics that directly impact student achievement.

Liberty Magnet School has created a Focus Area in Section III which addresses Positive Culture and Climate in greater depth than required in this section, please reference that section of the plan for this information.

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: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities					\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities					\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: School Theme					\$1,200.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21	
			0301 - Liberty Magnet School	School Improvement Funds		\$1,200.00	
			Notes: FL Ready Books for 3rd grade				
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Equity & Diversity					\$0.00
Total:							\$1,200.00