Orange County Public Schools

Legends Academy Charter

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Legends Academy Charter

3032 MONTE CARLO TRL, Orlando, FL 32805

http://legendsacademy.org/

Demographics

Principal: Jennifer Porter Smith

Start Date for this Principal: 12/5/2005

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2020-21 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 Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (48%) 2017-18: C (48%) 2016-17: C (47%)
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	

* 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 Orange 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

Legends Academy Charter

3032 MONTE CARLO TRL, Orlando, FL 32805

http://legendsacademy.org/

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Combination School PK-8	Yes	100%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	Yes	100%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		C	C	C

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Orange 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.

To provide educational programs and services that foster academic success to empower scholars to maximize their potential to be successful members in their community.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Legends Academy believes all students can learn through a quality educational program, enrichment programs and services.

School Leadership Team

Membership
Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Porter-Smith, Jennifer	Executive Director	Responsible for ensuring the school meets its obligations to provide an innovative, specialized and unique education for the children and families served. Ensures the organization has the resources, partnerships and investments necessary to full its mission.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 12/5/2005, Jennifer Porter Smith

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.*
1

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
24

Total number of students enrolled at the school
347

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.
7

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.
6

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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	36	42	43	42	35	41	38	35	35	0	0	0	0	347
Attendance below 90 percent	2	14	11	5	6	8	5	2	1	0	0	0	0	54
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	1	0	5	13	8	4	9	25	0	0	0	0	65
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	6	10	9	5	6	15	0	0	0	0	51
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	2	4	7	6	4	0	0	0	0	23
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	5	3	5	8	1	0	0	0	0	22
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	36	34	27	30	30	39	30	23	20	0	0	0	0	269

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	0	13	24	22	15	11	9	0	0	0	0	95

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	5	1	1	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	11
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	7

Date this data was collected or last updated
Thursday 9/30/2021

2020-21 - As Reported

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		

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		

2020-21 - 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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	14	2	18	7	22	10	0	1	0	0	0	0	74
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	1	0	0	13	29	6	9	39	29	0	0	0	0	126
Course failure in Math	1	0	0	14	21	10	7	22	24	0	0	0	0	99
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	4	8	7	10	7	0	0	0	0	36
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	4	5	6	7	6	0	0	0	0	28

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	0	15	28	14	11	28	21	0	0	0	0	118

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	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	3

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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				46%	62%	61%	42%	60%	60%
ELA Learning Gains				60%	60%	59%	56%	57%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				56%	55%	54%	44%	54%	52%
Math Achievement				53%	61%	62%	52%	60%	61%
Math Learning Gains				75%	60%	59%	64%	60%	58%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				76%	54%	52%	52%	55%	52%
Science Achievement				37%	56%	56%	29%	56%	57%
Social Studies Achievement				26%	74%	78%		74%	77%

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
03	2021					
	2019	41%	55%	-14%	58%	-17%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	44%	57%	-13%	58%	-14%
Cohort Comparison		-41%				
05	2021					
	2019	57%	54%	3%	56%	1%
Cohort Comparison		-44%				
06	2021					
	2019	44%	52%	-8%	54%	-10%
Cohort Comparison		-57%				
07	2021					
	2019	36%	48%	-12%	52%	-16%
Cohort Comparison		-44%				
08	2021					
	2019	62%	54%	8%	56%	6%
Cohort Comparison		-36%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2021					
	2019	32%	62%	-30%	62%	-30%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	61%	63%	-2%	64%	-3%
Cohort Comparison		-32%				
05	2021					
	2019	57%	57%	0%	60%	-3%
Cohort Comparison		-61%				
06	2021					
	2019	56%	43%	13%	55%	1%
Cohort Comparison		-57%				
07	2021					
	2019	46%	49%	-3%	54%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		-56%				
08	2021					
	2019	69%	36%	33%	46%	23%
Cohort Comparison		-46%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2021					
	2019	48%	54%	-6%	53%	-5%
Cohort Comparison						
08	2021					
	2019	28%	49%	-21%	48%	-20%
Cohort Comparison		-48%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2021					
2019					

CIVICS EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2021					
2019	26%	66%	-40%	71%	-45%

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

The 2020-2021English Language Arts (ELA) and Mathematics progress monitoring tools used by grade-level are as follows:
1st -grade : ELA: I-Ready Diagnostic; Mathematics: I-Ready Diagnostic
2nd-grade : ELA: I-Ready Diagnostic; Mathematics: I-Ready Diagnostic
3rd-grade : ELA: I-Ready Diagnostic; Mathematics: I-Ready Diagnostic
4th-grade : ELA: I-Ready Diagnostic; Mathematics: I-Ready Diagnostic
5th-grade : ELA: I-Ready Diagnostic; Mathematics: I-Ready Diagnostic
6th-grade : ELA: I-Ready Diagnostic; Mathematics: I-Ready Diagnostic
7th-grade : ELA: I-Ready Diagnostic; Mathematics: I-Ready Diagnostic
8th-grade : ELA: I-Ready Diagnostic; Mathematics: I-Ready Diagnostic

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	46/37%	46/43%	46/56%
	Economically Disadvantaged	36/37%	36/37%	36/52%
	Students With Disabilities	3/0%	3/33%	3/33%
	English Language Learners	4/0%	4/25%	4/25%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	46/30%	46/30%	46/47%
	Economically Disadvantaged	36/28%	36/28%	36/47%
	Students With Disabilities	3/0%	3/33%	3/33%
	English Language Learners	4/25%	4/25%	4/50%

Grade 2				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	35/14%	35/28%	35/42%
	Economically Disadvantaged	32/25%	21/25%	21/42%
	Students With Disabilities	n/a	n/a	n/a
	English Language Learners	5/20%	5/20%	5/40%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	35/12%	35/17%	35/28%
	Economically Disadvantaged	21/14%	21/23%	21/28%
	Students With Disabilities	n/a	n/a	n/a
	English Language Learners	5/0%	5/0%	5/40%

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	41/38%	41/39%	41/49%
	Economically Disadvantaged	33/27%	33/36%	33/42%
	Students With Disabilities	4/0%	4/25%	4/0%
	English Language Learners	3/0%	3/0%	3/66%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	41/5%	41/24%	41/24%
	Economically Disadvantaged	33/5%	33/24%	33/24%
	Students With Disabilities	4/0%	4/0%	4/0%
	English Language Learners	3/0%	3/0%	3/33%

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	31/7%	31/19%	31/42%
	Economically Disadvantaged	21/3%	21/14%	21/28%
	Students With Disabilities	4/25%	4/50%	4/50%
	English Language Learners	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	31/19%	31/32%	31/41%
	Economically Disadvantaged	21/23/%	21/33%	21/43%
	Students With Disabilities	4/25%	4/25%	4/25%
	English Language Learners	n/a	n/a	n/a

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	31/19%	31/32%	31/25%
	Economically Disadvantaged	26/19%	26/27%	26/35%
	Students With Disabilities	4/0%	4/25%	4/25%
	English Language Learners	2/50%	2/50%	2/50%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	31/16%	31/35%	31/48%
	Economically Disadvantaged	26/19%	26/23%	26/42%
	Students With Disabilities	4/25%	4/25%	4/25%
	English Language Learners	2/50%	2/50%	2/100%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	31/6%	31/6%	31/16%
	Economically Disadvantaged	26/3%	26/6%	26/15%
	Students With Disabilities	4/0%	4/0%	4/0%
	English Language Learners	2/50%	2/50%	2/50%

Grade 6				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	30/33%	30/33%	30/46%
	Economically Disadvantaged	25/36%	25/48%	25/64%
	Students With Disabilities	2/0%	2/0%	2/50%
	English Language Learners	3/33%	3/33%	3/33%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	30/13%	30/30%	30/42%
	Economically Disadvantaged	25/12%	25/32%	25/44%
	Students With Disabilities	2/0%	2/0%	2/0%
	English Language Learners	3/0%	3/33%	3/33%

Grade 7				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	36/53%	36/47%	36/52%
	Economically Disadvantaged	31/39%	31/39%	45%
	Students With Disabilities	n/a	n/a	n/a
	English Language Learners	2/0%	2/100%	2/100%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	36/54%	36/47%	36/58%
	Economically Disadvantaged	31/52%	31/51%	31/55%
	Students With Disabilities	n/a	n/a	n/a
	English Language Learners	2/100%	2/100%	2/100%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Civics	All Students	36/0%	36/36%	36/ 63%
	Economically Disadvantaged	31/0%	31/29%	31/58%
	Students With Disabilities	n/a	n/a	n/a
	English Language Learners	2/0%	2/50%	2/50%

Grade 8				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	29/43%	29/23%	29/19%
	Economically Disadvantaged	26/34%	26/30%	26/11%
	Students With Disabilities	3/33%	3/33%	3/0%
	English Language Learners	2/0%	2/50%	2/0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	29/34%	29/42%	29/
	Economically Disadvantaged	26/	26/	26/
	Students With Disabilities	3/0%	3/0%	3/0%
	English Language Learners	2/0%	2/0%	2/0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	29/!0%	29/24%	29/24%
	Economically Disadvantaged	26/3%	26/19%	26/26%
	Students With Disabilities	3/0%	3/0%	3/0%
	English Language Learners	2/0%	2/50%	2/50%

Subgroup Data Review

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	26	30		11	40						
ELL	12	42		12	25						
BLK	32	37	41	27	30	22	18	49	52		
HSP	36			14							
FRL	32	35	48	26	27	22	18	50	50		

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	13	38	40	7	58						
ELL	33	58	50	48	71						
BLK	46	59	56	51	74	76	37	26			
HSP	53	77		71	85						
FRL	43	61	65	51	75	77	34	23			

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											
ELL	19	50	50	52	72						
BLK	41	54	38	52	64	46	32				
HSP	50	70		53	73						
FRL	42	56	43	49	67	52	22				

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	36
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	57
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	358
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	27
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	30
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	37
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	25
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

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

Analysis

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?

Schoolwide date trends revealed
• a regression in the rate of change in student growth from each progress monitor check-in. (i.e., Fall to Winter and Winter to Spring) in mathematics, ELA, and science.
• Inadequate progress in mathematics, ELA for students with English Language Learners (ELL) and Students with Disabilities (SWD).

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

On the most recent Florida Standards Assessment (FSA), 74% of students scored below a level 3 in Mathematics. An increase of 27 percentage points from the 2018-2019 school year. Mathematics also had the most significant regression in student learning gains with a decrease of 46 percentage points and 55 percentage points with students identified in the lowest 25 %.

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

Multiple factors contributed to the mathematics improvement need. An analysis of 2020-2021 progress monitor data revealed stagnant growth and slower rates of change in scholars' mathematical achievement. Student attendance and instructional strategies were identified as potential contributing factors.

• During 2020-2021, the average student rate was 94%. Attendance campaigns were launched to shift learning modes for scholars who were not performing well from home. Monthly grade-level parent meetings were held to support families in understanding effective strategies for learning from home and frequency parent conferences. However, the inconsistent effectiveness of these strategies impeded our opportunity to mitigate the adverse effects attendance had on student achievement.
• Teacher practice was also identified as a contributing factor in mathematics performance. Teacher's modification to 100% technology-infused mathematics instruction reduced students' hands-on learning opportunities, reduced practice frequency, and decreased collaborative learning opportunities. Educators were provided ongoing training to improve online learning instructional strategies. However, we were also unable to overcome the adverse effects these instructional shifts had on student achievement.

To address this issue, we will,
• focus on providing students hands-on learning experiences, adequate practice, and targeted small group instruction.
• leverage blending learning strategies to support the acquisition of mathematics skill gaps
• Have virtual articulation meetings and planning sessions for teachers to collaborate and plan cross-curricular lessons in mathematics.
• provide during and after school interventions to students identified through MTSS.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

On the most recent Florida Standards Assessment (FSA), 49% of students scored at l or above a level 3 in Civics. An increase of 26 percentage points from the 2018-2019 school year.

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

Analysis of 2020-2021 progress monitor data revealed greater growth rates in scholar growth on Civics progress monitor data. Cross-curricular teaching is contributed to an increase in student success. Virtual articulation meetings and planning allowed ELA and Civic teachers to collaborate and plan cross-curricular lessons in Civics.

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

To accelerate learning, investments in building teachers' expertise and capacity are critical. Educators must be able to make appropriate instructional decisions and implement strategies effectively. Strategies that yield greater than one year of growth (>0.40) will be needed to accelerate student achievement. Therefore, the following methods will be implemented to accelerate learning: Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS, 1.09), Deliberate practice (0.79), Small group instruction (0.47), and strategies to Integrate prior knowledge (0.93).

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.

The following professional development will be provided to support the development of teacher expertise and capacity in instructional decisions making and implementing high yield accelerating strategies effectively:

• Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS) has a potential effect size of 1.09, which provides the opportunity to accelerate scholars' achievement by two or more years. MTSS professional development will focus on building teachers' capacity to implenment high-quality tier 1 instruction, universal screener, and standard-based assessment to identify students' needs for differentiation and small group instruction.
• Deliberate practice has a potential effect size of 0.79, which provides the possibility of accelerating scholars' achievement by almost 2. As a part of teachers' professional practice, educators will engage in extensive training to improve their instructional practice in an area of need based on previous feedback and self-reflection.
• Small group instruction has a potential effect size of 0.47, which provides the opportunity to accelerate student achievement for more than one year. Small group instruction professional development will address teachers' ability to identify appropriate resources to support student's academic needs and address the unique needs of a small group of students.
• Strategies to integrate prior knowledge have a potential effect size of 0.93, which yields potential acceleration in scholar achievement by two or more years. Strategies to incorporate prior knowledge will address making scholar thinking visible and using techniques that activate student prior knowledge to concepts taught.

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

To ensure the sustainability of the strategies implemented Legends Academy seeks to strengthen teachers' opportunities to work collaboratively to share their pedagogical and content knowledge. Strong Professional Learning Communities (PLC's) foster collaborative learning, practice-based professional learning, and shared decision making. Therefore, PLC collaborative practices will be used to ensure the sustainability of improvement this year and beyond.

Collaborative practices will be continuous and systematic. Weekly teachers will engage in weekly cross-curricular planning working collaboratively to make decisions and share instructional practices. Monthly, teachers will participate in vertical data sharing and reflection where teachers and leadership

will evaluate classroom, grade-level, and cluster grade level trends (i.e. primary, intermediate, and secondary), and bi-weekly class-level data will be is analyzed with collaborative teams.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	On the most recent Florida Standards Assessment (FSA), 67% of students scored below a level 3 in English Language Arts (ELA), An increase of 13 percentage points from the 2018-2019 school year. ELA also a significant regression in student learning gains with a decrease of 23 percentage points and17 percentage points with students identified in the lowest 25 %.
Measurable Outcome:	The 2022 ELA FSA will show an increase of at least 13 percentage points from 33% to 46%. 3rd-grade 15 percentage points from 25 % to 40% 4th-grade 10 percentage points from 37 % to 47% 5th-grade 15 percentage points from 24 % to 39% 6th-grade 10 percentage points from 40 % to 50% 7th-grade 10 percentage points from 38 % to 48% 8th-grade 15 percentage points from 26 % to 40%
Monitoring:	Student ELA progress will be monitored using the following progress monitor resources: • I-Ready Diagnostics • NWEA Map • SIPPS Mastery Assessment • Standard-Based Assessments • Classroom walkthrough data
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jennifer Porter-Smith (jennifer.porter-smith@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Strengthen PLCs protocols for collaborative planning to promote discussion and shared practice in literacy.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The selected evidence-based strategies have a moderate level of effectiveness, as noted by IES Guide for Improving Reading Comprehension. Quasi-Experimental Studies have moderate evidence of randomly selected groups. Students are assigned to intervention groups by non-random process.

Action Steps to Implement

Teachers, Resources Teachers, and support personnel will meet during common planning to plan instruction and discuss content focus and assessment. Resources teachers and expert team members will monitor standard-based alignment activities and questioning alignment.

Person Responsible Jennifer Porter-Smith (jennifer.porter-smith@ocps.net)

Resources teachers and administration will conduct classroom walkthroughs and provide feedback on teacher instructional practice. Job embedded coaching will be offered to teachers who need coaching and support.

Person Responsible Jennifer Porter-Smith (jennifer.porter-smith@ocps.net)

Based on school-wide data trends, teachers will attend literacy workshops aligned with school-wide literacy need to be determined from classroom walk-through data.

Person Responsible Jennifer Porter-Smith (jennifer.porter-smith@ocps.net)

Teachers will receive coaching to improve literacy instruction based on classroom walkthrough data, progress monitoring data, and self-report.

Person Responsible Jennifer Porter-Smith (jennifer.porter-smith@ocps.net)

Teachers, Resources, teachers, and support personnel will meet frequently to:
• review student data
• monitor subgroups (i.e ELL and SWD)
• Identified student in need of intervention
• support identification if appropriate interventions and frequency

Person Responsible [no one identified]

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	On the most recent Florida Standards Assessment (FSA), 74% of students scored below a level 3 in Mathematics. An increase of 27 percentage points from the 2018-2019 school year. Mathematics also had the most significant regression in student learning gains with a decrease of 46 percentage points and 55 percentage points with students identified in the lowest 25 %.
Measurable Outcome:	The 2022 Mathematics FSA will show an increase of at least 20 percentage points from 23% to 43%. 3rd-grade 25 percentage points from 5 % to 30% 4th-grade 20 percentage points from 23 % to 43% 5th-grade 20 percentage points from 24 % to 44% 6th-grade 10 percentage points from 47 % to 57% 7th-grade 25 percentage points from 38 % to 63% 8th-grade 20 percentage points from 52% to 72%
Monitoring:	Student mathematics progress will be monitored using the following progress monitor resources: • I-Ready Diagnostics • NWEA Map • Standard-Based Assessments • Classroom walkthrough data
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jennifer Porter-Smith (jennifer.porter-smith@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Strengthen PLCs protocols for collaborative planning to promote discussion and shared practice in mathematics.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The selected evidence-based strategies have a moderate level of effectiveness for improve students achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

Teachers, Resources Teachers, and support personnel will meet during common planning to plan instruction and discuss content focus and assessment. Resources teachers and expert team members will monitor standard-based alignment activities and questioning alignment.

Person Responsible Jennifer Porter-Smith (jennifer.porter-smith@ocps.net)

Resources teachers and administration will conduct classroom walkthroughs and provide feedback on teacher instructional practice. Job embedded coaching will be offered to teachers who need coaching and support.

Person Responsible Jennifer Porter-Smith (jennifer.porter-smith@ocps.net)

Based on school-wide data trends, teachers will attend mathematics workshops aligned with school-wide mathematics need to be determined from classroom walk-through data.

Person Responsible Jennifer Porter-Smith (jennifer.porter-smith@ocps.net)

Based on classroom walkthrough data and self-report, teachers will receive coaching to improve mathematics instruction.

Person Responsible Jennifer Porter-Smith (jennifer.porter-smith@ocps.net)

Teachers, Resources Teachers, and support personnel will meet frequently to:
• review student data
• Identified student in need of intervention
• support identification if appropriate interventions and frequency

Person Responsible Jennifer Porter-Smith (jennifer.porter-smith@ocps.net)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Student Attendance	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Students who regularly attend school learn more, develop better study habits, and generally perform better than students who do not attend school regularly. During the 2021-2021 school, the average student attendance rate was 94%, an average absentee rate of more than ten days per school.
Measurable Outcome:	The 2022 Attendance report will show an increase of at least three percentage points from 94% to 97%.
Monitoring:	Student attendance progress will be monitored using the following progress monitor resources School-wide attendance rate report Daily absence reports Chronic attendance report absence range
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jennifer Porter-Smith (jennifer.porter-smith@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Targeting family's awareness about attendance and providing family supports.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	IES Guide noted the selected evidence-based strategies for improving chronic absenteeism.

Action Steps to Implement

The school administrator and child study team meet to identify at-risk students for chronic absenteeism based on previous attendance data trends. Studnet identified at risk for chronic absenteeism will be placed on a watch list for proactive intervention.

Person Responsible Jennifer Porter-Smith (jennifer.porter-smith@ocps.net)

Literacy on the effects of absenteeism on student performance. Family support for issues that may cause student absences(i.e., transportation, clothing, etc.). Students on the watch list families will receive proactive intervention families workshops, text messages, phone calls for daily absences, and check-in from the attendance clerk for consecutive absences.

Person Responsible Jennifer Porter-Smith (jennifer.porter-smith@ocps.net)

The attendance clerk will survey teachers weekly to identify students with poor attendance.

Person Responsible Jennifer Porter-Smith (jennifer.porter-smith@ocps.net)

Students identified with poor attendance families will be contacted to troubleshoot and find support to improve student attendance. As needed, workshops, text messages in addition to phone calls for daily absences, check-in from the attendance clerk for consecutive absences. Literacy on the effects of absenteeism on student performance will be provided to support families in improving student attendance.

Person Responsible Jennifer Porter-Smith (jennifer.porter-smith@ocps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the SafeSchoolsforAlex.org, compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

Legends Academy's historical discipline trends are comparable or below state-level incidents in combination schools across all three incident domains: violent, property and drug, and public order. Primary areas of concern include fighting triggered by after-hours social media interactions. Secondary areas of concern include physical attacks also related to after-hours social media interactions.

Legends Academy implements multiple measures to create a supportive, safe school community. Schoolwide social-emotional supports and behavior expectations are culturally embedded in teacher practices and monitored to ensure a safe learning environment, environmentally, psychologically, sociologically, and emotionally. Classroom cultures expectations are clear and outlined by the school cultural framework. Teachers receive ongoing professional development, support, and feedback on their classroom culture and schoolwide expectations for a safe and supportive learning environment. Classroom teachers and staff train and practice the schools' cultural expectations with students at the beginning of the school year and as needed to increase students' awareness and adherence to school guidelines for scholarly behavior. Celebrations for consistent demonstration of scholarly conduct at the individual and classroom community levels are common.

Legends Academy monitors its' cultural framework through classroom walkthrough data and tracking of students incidents. Schoolwide culture trends are coded and tracked through classroom walkthroughs. Data trends guide the identification of teachers and classroom and school culture professional development needs. Legends Academy also monitors student discipline referrals and incidents by location and staff members to determine professional development needs. Student incident tracking and monitoring support identification of students' needs (i.e., conflict resolution, mental health). A plan for re-entry into the school community is created, and strategies are implemented to reduce the likelihood of additional incidents. The plan is monitored and modified until the incident's root cause is identified and the action plan effectively mediates the behavior.

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.

Researchers have found when schools, families, and communities promote social and emotional learning (S.E.L.), students do better academically and are less likely to engage in risky behaviors. Therefore, Legends Academy has several culturally embedded schoolwide practices to promote students' social-emotional wellbeing.

The following social-emotional learning strategies are used to create a positive school culture and environment:

• K.I.N.D Community: The mnemonic K.I.N. D defines the school expectations for scholarly behavior. It explains how students and staff are to speak and interact with members of our school community which includes peers and adults. K.I.N.D. behaviors are acknowledged schoolwide with golden tickets and rewarded weekly through golden ticket prize drawing. Additionally, students are reward quarterly for meeting K.I.N. D community expectations by attending special K.I.N. D community events.
• Morning Meeting: Morning Meeting are held daily schoolwide. Students begin their day with Morning Meeting. Morning meeting help to build a school community and support social and academic success.
• Closing Circle: Closing Circles are held at the end of the day. It reinforces the school community and closes students' day, leaving them calm, component, and upbeat about their learning.
• Conscious Discipline Classroom Safe Place: All classroom has a safe place. A safe place is a center where students regulate their emotions. It is the centerpiece of Legends Academy's self-regulation process.
• Zones of regulation: School-wide students and staff use a common language to explain their emotional state. Students are taught strategies to use when they find themselves in zones not conducive to learning. Zones of regulation support students and staff's ability to understand their emotional state, use techniques to self-regulate their emotional state, and move to an emotional state where learning is possible. The use of zones of regulation helps create an environment where students and staff feel safe and supported to express and manage their feelings.

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

The mental health team attends district-wide professional development and provides staff and family professional development and support. School leadership engages in ongoing self-study and training in social-emotional supports and practices and collaborates with staff, families, and students to determine the next steps for schoolwide needs, supports, and implementation. Through these interactions, the following social-emotional learning strategies are used to create a positive school culture and environment:

• K.I.N.D Community
• Morning Meeting
• Closing Circle
• Conscious Discipline Classroom Safe Place
• Zones of regulation

Teachers and staff are provided ongoing training to support the social-emotional health of students, and social-emotional practices are infused into the daily routines of every classroom teacher. Teachers teach students social-emotional techniques to self-regulate their emotions and implement strategies to create classroom environments that build a sense of community and safety.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Student Attendance	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00