



---

## 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>8</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# Liberty Magnet School

6850 81ST ST, Vero Beach, FL 32967

www.indianriverschools.org

## Demographics

Principal: Takeisha Harris

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2013

<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>2021-22 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	36%
<b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2021-22: A (64%) 2020-21: (50%) 2018-19: A (63%) 2017-18: A (67%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">LaShawn Russ-Porterfield</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	TS&I

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

## School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Indian River County School Board on 10/24/2022.

## 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 students will become active, compassionate, and lifelong learners.

#### Provide the school's vision statement.

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

### School Leadership Team

#### Membership

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.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Harris, Takeisha	Principal	
Keaton, Jessica	Assistant Principal	
Bishop, Lisa	Reading Coach	
Jelfimow, Janexy	Other	K-3 Interventionist
Lunsford, Jamie	Other	IB PYP Coordinator

### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Monday 7/1/2013, Takeisha Harris

**Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

2

**Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

8

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

43

**Total number of students enrolled at the school**

552

**Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2021-22 school year.**

2

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

3

**Demographic Data**

**Early Warning Systems**

Using prior year's 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	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	49	67	47	57	48	60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	328
Attendance below 90 percent	4	13	9	15	15	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	3	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	3	11	12	12	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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	1	2	6	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	3	2	5	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
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**

Friday 10/21/2022

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Number of students enrolled		
Attendance below 90 percent		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in ELA		
Course failure in Math		
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment		
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment		
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency		

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Retained Students: Current Year		
Students retained two or more times		

**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	91	91	106	86	84	85	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	543
Attendance below 90 percent	3	10	3	4	7	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	6	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	13	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	6	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15

**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	1	4	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10

**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	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

**Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis**

**School Data Review**

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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	75%	58%	56%	74%			78%	58%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	68%	62%	61%	57%			65%	57%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	54%	55%	52%	19%			42%	54%	53%
Math Achievement	79%	61%	60%	70%			80%	63%	63%
Math Learning Gains	67%	60%	64%	39%			70%	60%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	43%	54%	55%	17%			40%	48%	51%
Science Achievement	62%	51%	51%	72%			69%	54%	53%

**Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments**

**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
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	80%	60%	20%	58%	22%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	84%	61%	23%	58%	26%
Cohort Comparison		-80%				
05	2022					
	2019	73%	54%	19%	56%	17%
Cohort Comparison		-84%				



MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	80%	64%	16%	62%	18%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	80%	64%	16%	64%	16%
Cohort Comparison		-80%				
05	2022					
	2019	83%	57%	26%	60%	23%
Cohort Comparison		-80%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	69%	53%	16%	53%	16%
Cohort Comparison						

**Subgroup Data Review**

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	27	38	29	41	37	25	25				
ELL	15			62							
BLK	59	71	67	67	61	70	38				
HSP	73	62		76	62		61				
MUL	69			77							
WHT	79	71	47	83	71	44	70				
FRL	69	65	47	76	62	31	50				

  

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	32	14	18	30			15				
ELL											
BLK	63	50		50	17		36				
HSP	60	10		75	20		40				
MUL	83			92							

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
WHT	79	67		72	48		85				
FRL	67	53		67	25	27	55				
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				

**ESSA Data Review**

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	66
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	79
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	527
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

**Subgroup Data**

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

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	52
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	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Black/African American Students</b>	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	62
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	67
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	73
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	68
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Economically Disadvantaged Students</b>	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	63
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

#### **What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?**

Liberty's achievement in ELA and Math are 70% or higher.  
Learning gains below 70%.  
Low 25% learning gains are an area for improvement.

#### **What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?**

Low 25% learning gains.

#### **What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?**

New Actions:  
Data notebooks  
A2 tutoring

#### **What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?**

Most improvement was our lowest 25% learning gains.

#### **What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?**

Students identified as low 25% were assigned adult mentors for check ins. These students were also invited to after school (A2) tutoring.

#### **What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?**

- Student engagement
- Monitoring
- Differentiation

#### **Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.**

Professional development will provided monthly on implementation of high yield strategies.

#### **Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.**

Follow up with classroom visits providing feedback and next steps

**Areas of Focus**

Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**  
 Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Engaging instruction will yield more consistent and successful student participation and learning.

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

80% of classrooms will implement strategies to monitor mastery of the learning target for all students as evidenced in our walkthrough feedback.

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

Monthly classroom visited with feedback and next steps

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Takeisha Harris  
 (takeisha.harris@indianriverschools.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**  
 Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Providing feedback will give teachers what they did while visiting and It will also provides teachers with a tangible understanding of:  
 What they did well  
 Where they are at  
 What to do to improve

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**  
 Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Providing timely actionable feedback allows teachers to make changes quickly to increase effectiveness.

**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.

Provide feedback to teachers visited during impact walks (and school feedback to all)

**Person Responsible**

Takeisha Harris  
 (takeisha.harris@indianriverschools.org)

During weekly collaborative planning, create lessons that all teachers are accountable to uphold and follow, with questions for monitoring(to added to engagement) that is intentionally planned for and then executed, as seen in walkthroughs

**Person Responsible**

Takeisha Harris  
 (takeisha.harris@indianriverschools.org)

During weekly collaborative planning, teachers should plan for trun and talk oppourtinites with a structure to have students accountable for not only adding to the conversation but for actively listening.

**Person Responsible**

Takeisha Harris  
 (takeisha.harris@indianriverschools.org)

During small group instruction ELA, have structure to insure students know the purpose of the lesson and what they are looking for.

**Person Responsible**

Takeisha Harris  
 (takeisha.harris@indianriverschools.org)

During whold group and small group instruction, continue to use white boards, and teachers must consistently check for accuracy.

**Person Responsible**

[no one identified]

**#2. -- Select below -- specifically relating to**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

**Monitoring:**

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

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

[no one identified]

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.

**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.

*No action steps were entered for this area of focus*

**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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

**Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.**

**Data and Findings:**

- School Cleanliness Score-3.3/5
- Hallway/Lunchroom/Assembly behavior 3.82/5

**Rationale for Selection of Data:**

- These concerns were shared by our parents and staff.

High Yield Strategy: Monitoring and Feedback

Goal: By the end of the 2022-23 school year, positive student behaviors within the hallways, lunchroom, and assembly will demonstrate an increase on the Climate Survey scores by at least .5 points.

**Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive school culture and environment.**

(Reignite Team)

- Create SOAR (PBIS) Expectations shared with teachers and students.

(Principal)

- Custodial Monthly Checklist
- Classroom Cleanliness Survey for Teachers