

Brevard Public Schools

Legacy Academy Charter



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	8
Planning for Improvement	13
Title I Requirements	16
Budget to Support Goals	16

Legacy Academy Charter

1923 KNOX MCRAE DR, Titusville, FL 32780

<http://www.legacyacademytitusville.com>

Demographics

Principal: Charlene Montford

Start Date for this Principal: 7/31/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Closed: 2020-08-18
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-6
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	0%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	
School Grades History	2018-19: D (34%) 2017-18: C (48%) 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade 2014-15: No Grade
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	CS&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 Brevard 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.

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	8
Planning for Improvement	13
Title I Requirements	16
Budget to Support Goals	16

Legacy Academy Charter

1923 KNOX MCRAE DR, Titusville, FL 32780

<http://www.legacyacademytitusville.com>

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2018-19 Title I School	2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School KG-6	No	39%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	Yes	42%

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18
Grade	D	C

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Brevard County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

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 (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at

<https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The mission of Legacy Academy Charter is to prepare students to become confident, competent, responsible and successful individuals in our global and technology-based society by providing a rigorous academic program, school-family-community partnerships, and strong teacher-student relationships. Using an interdisciplinary science, technology, engineering and math (STEM) curriculum aligned with Florida State Standards, the purpose of the School is to improve student learning, increase learning opportunities for students and to encourage the use of innovative teaching methods. Students attending the School will develop critical thinking and problem-solving skills that will equip them to learn and to contribute to the 21st century economy.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Legacy Academy Charter is to be a leader in STEM education locally, in Florida and nationally, by developing a community of students with a desire to learn. Our students will be well educated, socially aware, scientifically literate and respectful. These attributes will help our students be successful in middle and high school, college, in their careers, and in their communities.

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
Montford, Charlene	Principal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Administers the development, coordination, maintenance, and evaluation of the education programs - Supervises methods of teaching, supervision, and administration - Monitors programs and activities for improvement and assesses effectiveness, weaknesses, and progress - Keeps the Governing Board informed - Assumes responsibility for financial planning - Establishes and maintains efficient procedures and effective controls - Maintains adequate records for the school - Assumes responsibility for the use of buildings and grounds - Oversees the processing and submission of required reports
Budds, Selana	Administrative Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Administrative support to the Principal, teachers and staff - Answer general questions - Data entry; AS400, attendance, tardies, absences, grades, etc. - Manage sign in/sign out - Assist with fire and safety drills - Creates fliers and correspondence - Maintains school calendar - Manage incoming and outgoing mail

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	51	37	39	35	23	24	39	0	0	0	0	0	0	248
Attendance below 90 percent	3	7	5	5	4	3	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
One or more suspensions	0	0	3	4	3	7	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on ELA FSA	0	0	0	3	3	11	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
Level 1 on MATH FSA	0	0	0	3	7	10	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	44

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	2	4	4	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	20

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	4	5	0	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
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)

16

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 9/18/2019

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	
One or more suspensions	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	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	43%	62%	57%	0%	63%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	31%	60%	58%	0%	60%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	33%	57%	53%	0%	52%	52%
Math Achievement	27%	63%	63%	0%	64%	61%
Math Learning Gains	40%	65%	62%	0%	62%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	50%	53%	51%	0%	52%	51%
Science Achievement	13%	57%	53%	0%	56%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)							Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	
Number of students enrolled	51 (0)	37 (0)	39 (0)	35 (0)	23 (0)	24 (0)	39 (0)	248 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	3 ()	7 ()	5 ()	5 ()	4 ()	3 ()	9 ()	36 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 ()	0 (0)	3 (0)	4 (0)	3 (0)	7 (0)	4 (0)	21 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	2 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Level 1 on ELA FSA	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	3 (0)	3 (0)	11 (0)	18 (0)	35 (0)
Level 1 on MATH FSA	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	3 (0)	7 (0)	10 (0)	24 (0)	44 (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.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	55%	64%	-9%	58%	-3%
	2018	62%	63%	-1%	57%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	36%	61%	-25%	58%	-22%
	2018	56%	57%	-1%	56%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		-20%				
Cohort Comparison		-26%				
05	2019	35%	60%	-25%	56%	-21%
	2018	56%	54%	2%	55%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		-21%				
Cohort Comparison		-21%				
06	2019	44%	60%	-16%	54%	-10%
	2018	0%	63%	-63%	52%	-52%
Same Grade Comparison		44%				
Cohort Comparison		-12%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	25%	61%	-36%	62%	-37%
	2018	59%	62%	-3%	62%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		-34%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	14%	64%	-50%	64%	-50%
	2018	31%	59%	-28%	62%	-31%
Same Grade Comparison		-17%				
Cohort Comparison		-45%				
05	2019	19%	60%	-41%	60%	-41%
	2018	33%	58%	-25%	61%	-28%
Same Grade Comparison		-14%				
Cohort Comparison		-12%				
06	2019	61%	67%	-6%	55%	6%
	2018	0%	68%	-68%	52%	-52%
Same Grade Comparison		61%				
Cohort Comparison		28%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	21%	56%	-35%	53%	-32%
	2018	44%	57%	-13%	55%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		-23%				
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	21	18		16	36						
BLK	31	24		11	40		9				
WHT	49	36		34	37		20				
FRL	49	35		30	32		18				
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
BLK	30			20							
WHT	61	67		35	50						
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

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)	CS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	34
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	237
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	23
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	23
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
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%	

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	35
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	33
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

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.

Science Achievement and ELA Learning Gains (mention students dropping levels on FSA in intermediate Contributing factors to last year's low performance include:

-- Changes in classroom practices- such as, are teachers dumbing down instruction, is content on grade level.

-- A significant number of students dropped one and sometimes two levels on FSA in the 4th and 5th grades

-- Changes in the frequency and manner in which administrators monitor instruction and teachers' practice

-- Changes in classroom instruction, and changes in how we assess student learning, in the sense that we make

sure that teachers' assessments reflect standards-based assessments.

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

Science Achievement and ELA Lowest 25%

- Changes in classroom practices and instruction, the frequency and manner in which administrators monitored

instruction and teacher practice, and changes in how we assess student learning.

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.

ELA Learning Gains (34 point gap) and Science (32 point gap)

Changes in classroom practices and instruction, the frequency and manner in which administrators monitored instruction and teacher practice, and changes in how we assess student learning.

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

Math L25% Learning Gains at 50% (last year no data in this cell)

Last summer all Legacy teachers received professional development training in Project MIND - Math is Not Difficult, over a two day training during Pre-Planning. They used the math strategies learned in this training to provide math enhancements to their students.

Project MIND is a research-based, PreK-12 mathematics enhancement program designed to improve student achievement through creative learning strategies that promote cognitive thinking and reasoning. Gains in standardized test scores are consistently high for students participating in Project MIND.

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

1. Level 1 scores on the FSA in 4th and 5th grade
2. School attendance

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

1. ELA Instruction
2. Science Instruction

Academic Review, to include curriculum alignment, alignment of standards and assessments, professional development, and systems and practices.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Standards aligned instruction in ELA and Science. ELA Learning Gains and Science Proficiency
Rationale	<p>Two years of FSA data shows that Legacy Academy students tested below the district and state in all grade levels in 2019. During 2018, Legacy student scores for ELA Learning Gains was 65%, district 54%, and state 55%. In 2019, ELA Learning Gains was -31%. This is a difference of 34 points.</p> <p>Level I scores on the ELA FSA in grade 5 was particularly high at 18 out of 35 students.</p> <p>Science Proficiency for 2018 was at 45% and for 2019 it was at 13%. This is a difference of 32 points. and the lowest area for the school.</p>
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	<p>ELA proficiency will increase from 43% to 60%. ELA Learning Gains will increase from 31% to 60% and ELA Lowest 25% will increase from 33% to 50%.</p> <p>Science Achievement will increase from 13% to 40%, an increase of 27%.</p>
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Charlene Montford (cmontford@legacyac.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	<p>School-wide writing across the content areas and text-based writing with complex text in ELA courses</p> <p>PLC's with a concentration on language arts</p> <p>Job embedded coaching</p> <p>Writing in the content areas</p> <p>Model of Inquiry and Differentiation</p> <p>Hands on science activities in Project Lead the Way and the JASON Project</p>
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	<p>Misalignment of the level of the state standard and task complexity. When task alignment occurs, with text-based writing incorporated into task, learning gains will increase.</p> <p>When students participate in hands-on activities such as Project Lead the Way (PLTW) and the JASON Project actually doing science and writing about science, science proficiency scores will increase</p>
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Design a PLC agenda, at least two per month, for consistency of PLC's in all content areas. 2. Provide teachers with professional development on reading strategies. 3. Create an instructional focus calendar for ELA in all grade levels. 4. Principal will conduct monthly walk thru focused on the PLC evidence of implementation to inform next steps for building teacher capacity. 5. Instructional monitoring, feedback and coaching will occur based on student data trends and observational data.

6. All teachers are trained in PLTW and JASON and all students will receive instruction in these two science based programs
7. Clear expectations on science instruction, use of the science block and instruction in PLTW and JASON
8. Unpacking and understanding standards
9. Assessments aligned with state standards
10. Planning for content

Person Responsible Charlene Montford (cmontford@legacyac.org)

#2

Title Math Learning Gains for the Lowest 25%

Rationale Math Learning Gains for L25%
Math Learning Gains for the lowest 25% was at 50% in 2019. There was no data for 2018.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve During the 2019-2020 school year, the math learning gains for our lowest 25% will increase from 50% to 65%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome Charlene Montford (cmontford@legacyac.org)

Evidence-based Strategy Differentiation
High Yield Instructional Strategies
Project MIND - Math is Not Difficult
PLCs

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy Teacher knowledge and expectations of students. PLCs and differentiation will assist in changing this. Coaching in the use of high yield instructional strategies will also benefit math students, including those in the lowest 25%.

Action Step

Description

1. Identification of the lowest 25% by teachers to ensure awareness of students' specific academic needs to better plan and provide instruction that support student needs
2. PLC training will be provided and strategies implemented to support standards-based instruction
3. High yield instructional practices will be focused and instilled into the school instructional model
4. Monthly professional development on math differentiation will be offered for teachers based on teacher and student needs
5. ESE teachers will participate in math PLCs

Person Responsible Charlene Montford (cmontford@legacyac.org)

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 Schoolwide Improvement Plan to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, Â§ 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.

NA

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.

NA

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

NA

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.

NA

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

NA

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Standards aligned instruction in ELA and Science.	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Math Learning Gains for the Lowest 25%	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00