

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Legacy Preparatory Academy



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	20
Positive Culture & Environment	22
Budget to Support Goals	22

Legacy Preparatory Academy

302 E. LINEBAUGH AVE, Tampa, FL 33612

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Yolonda Capers

Start Date for this Principal: 1/3/2006

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-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: B (58%) 2017-18: C (47%) 2016-17: C (48%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
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 Hillsborough 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	9
Planning for Improvement	20
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	22

Legacy Preparatory Academy

302 E. LINEBAUGH AVE, Tampa, FL 33612

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p>Combination School KG-8</p>	<p>2020-21 Title I School</p> <p>Yes</p>	<p>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>100%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p>Yes</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>94%</p>

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hillsborough 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 a dedicated, unified learning environment with passionate and committed educators fostering lifelong learning in every generation.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Educating scholars for life.

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
Capers, Yolonda	Principal	Oversee the daily activities and all operations of the school.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 1/3/2006, Yolonda Capers

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.*

0

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.*

0

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

12

Total number of students enrolled at the school

156

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

4

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

3

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	14	17	14	10	14	16	21	26	23	0	0	0	0	155
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	1	2	6	4	2	0	0	0	0	15
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	4	3	1	13	8	7	0	0	0	0	36
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	2	1	3	0	0	0	3	2	3	0	0	0	0	14

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	4	3	19	14	12	0	0	0	0	52

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	2	2	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
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

Sunday 10/3/2021

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 ELA assessment		
Level 1 on 2019 statewide 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	20	23	16	15	25	26	30	35	37	0	0	0	0	227
Attendance below 90 percent	3	4	3	1	3	5	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	25
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4	2	0	0	0	0	15
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	4	3	1	13	8	7	0	0	0	0	36

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	5	5	8	21	16	9	0	0	0	0	64

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	2	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				52%	57%	61%	54%	59%	60%
ELA Learning Gains				58%	56%	59%	63%	56%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				71%	52%	54%	73%	49%	52%
Math Achievement				42%	55%	62%	36%	57%	61%
Math Learning Gains				59%	57%	59%	44%	53%	58%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				65%	49%	52%	32%	47%	52%
Science Achievement				30%	50%	56%	22%	51%	57%
Social Studies Achievement				97%	77%	78%	85%	79%	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	91%	52%	39%	58%	33%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	57%	55%	2%	58%	-1%
Cohort Comparison		-91%				
05	2021					
	2019	40%	54%	-14%	56%	-16%
Cohort Comparison		-57%				
06	2021					
	2019	43%	53%	-10%	54%	-11%
Cohort Comparison		-40%				
07	2021					
	2019	40%	54%	-14%	52%	-12%
Cohort Comparison		-43%				
08	2021					
	2019	58%	53%	5%	56%	2%
Cohort Comparison		-40%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	36%	54%	-18%	62%	-26%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	43%	57%	-14%	64%	-21%
Cohort Comparison		-36%				
05	2021					
	2019	55%	54%	1%	60%	-5%
Cohort Comparison		-43%				
06	2021					
	2019	23%	49%	-26%	55%	-32%
Cohort Comparison		-55%				
07	2021					
	2019	43%	62%	-19%	54%	-11%
Cohort Comparison		-23%				
08	2021					
	2019	39%	31%	8%	46%	-7%
Cohort Comparison		-43%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	30%	51%	-21%	53%	-23%
Cohort Comparison						
08	2021					
	2019	27%	47%	-20%	48%	-21%
Cohort Comparison		-30%				

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	94%	67%	27%	71%	23%

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	73%	63%	10%	61%	12%
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.

Legacy Preparatory Academy opened its doors Fall 2021 with just under half the student population attending classes in the brick and mortar instructional setting, which negatively impacted the school’s ability to collect reliable progress monitoring data in the fall. However, scholars instructional teams administered progress monitoring assessments to scholars using EasyCBM, iReady and Florida standards based formative and unit assessments.

Teachers and administrators use progress monitoring to track individual academic student growth as well as schoolwide student growth. Progress monitoring assists teachers with planning and delivering effective instruction and to evaluate the effectiveness of that instruction.

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	N/A	33%	40%
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	33%	40%
	Students With Disabilities	N/A	0%	0%
	English Language Learners	N/A	12%	8%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	N/A	39%	45%
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	39%	45%
	Students With Disabilities	N/A	0%	0%
	English Language Learners	N/A	8%	5%
Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	N/A	25%	32%
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	25%	32%
	Students With Disabilities	N/A	0%	0%
	English Language Learners	N/A	10%	12%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	N/A	8%	20%
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	8%	20%
	Students With Disabilities	N/A	0%	0%
	English Language Learners	N/A	5%	7.3%

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	N/A	63%	90%
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	63%	90%
	Students With Disabilities	N/A	0%	0%
	English Language Learners	N/A	51%	70%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	N/A	32%	29%
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	32%	29%
	Students With Disabilities	N/A	0%	0%
	English Language Learners	N/A	26%	13%
Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	N/A	19%	25%
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	19%	25%
	Students With Disabilities	N/A	0%	0%
	English Language Learners	N/A	12%	15%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	N/A	18%	21%
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	18%	21%
	Students With Disabilities	N/A	0%	0%
	English Language Learners	N/A	7%	9%

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	N/A	10%	18%
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	10%	18%
	Students With Disabilities	N/A	0%	0%
	English Language Learners	N/A	5%	7%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	N/A	10%	20%
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	10%	20%
	Students With Disabilities	N/A	0%	0%
	English Language Learners	N/A	6%	10%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	N/A	1.2%	5%
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	1.2%	5%
	Students With Disabilities	N/A	0.00	0.00
	English Language Learners	N/A	2#	3%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

Grade 6				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	N/A	15%	23%
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	15%	23%
	Students With Disabilities	N/A	2%	2%
	English Language Learners	N/A	5%	8%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	N/A	12%	16%
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	12%	16%
	Students With Disabilities	N/A	3%	3%
	English Language Learners	N/A	6%	10%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

Grade 7				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	N/A	23%	32%
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	23%	32%
	Students With Disabilities	N/A	3%	5%
	English Language Learners	N/A	5%	10%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	N/A	10%	23%
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	10%	23%
	Students With Disabilities	N/A	2%	5%
	English Language Learners	N/A	3%	10%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Civics	All Students	N/A	25%	38%
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	25%	38%
	Students With Disabilities	N/A	2%	5%
	English Language Learners	N/A	6%	10%

Grade 8				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	N/A	41%	35%
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	41%	35%
	Students With Disabilities	N/A	3%	1%
	English Language Learners	N/A	27%	20%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	N/A	14%	25%
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	14%	25%
	Students With Disabilities	N/A	3%	5%
	English Language Learners	N/A	7%	10%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	N/A	21%	30%
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	21%	30%
	Students With Disabilities	N/A	5%	5%
	English Language Learners	N/A	10%	15%

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	15	27			9						
ELL	18	23			23						
BLK	32	29	26	11	14	5	20	28			
HSP	38	25		8	21		14				
FRL	34	30	36	11	16	9	19	44			
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
ELL	42	44		37	69						
BLK	54	58	74	37	61	76	21	100	47		
HSP	47	57		58	62			100			
MUL	50			40							
FRL	52	58	71	43	59	63	31	97	50		

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	15	50		23	36						
ELL	73	88		33	41						
BLK	51	60	68	33	41	27	21	85	21		
HSP	74	85		52	54						
MUL	31	54		23	46						
FRL	54	63	73	36	44	32	22	85	15		

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	25
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	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	199
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	96%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	13
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	16
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	21
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	21
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	25
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?

An analysis of progress monitoring data and state assessment data for the years 2018-2020, yielded the conclusion that with consistent, brick and mortar attendance, students in all grade levels and subgroups made adequate learning gains and proficiency in core content areas.

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

Comparing progress monitoring data and 2019 state assessments, Math and Science demonstrates the greatest needs for improvement. In 2019, FSA assessments showed there were significant learning gains in these content across grade levels. However, progress monitoring data compared to 2019 assessments show a significant decline in these areas.

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

It is clearly evident that Covid-19, school closures, quarantined students and the lack of face to face instruction adversely impacted the momentum of learning gains in these areas, and all core content areas.

Accelerated learning, strategic and targeted instructional practices and increased individualized interventions, will be implemented to address this need for improvement.

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

Based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, 3rd grade ELA showed the most improvement with no Level 1's in this component.

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

Small class size, additional instructional minutes and increased small groups and one on one interventions, were contributing factors to this improvement.

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

Accelerated learning will be achieved by:

1. All students returning to brick and mortar.
2. Small group instruction/differentiation
3. Implement Project Based Learning opportunities
4. Biweekly PLC's for data analysis and instructional planning
5. Full utilization of I-Ready interventions

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 that will be provided:

1. Effective use of the I-Ready toolkit, which every teacher has access
2. Weekly to bi-weekly PD from the instructional coaches regarding best instructional practices,

- effective lesson planning and modeling.
- 3. Ongoing unpacking of the standards

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

Additional services to ensure sustainability:

- 1. Continue utilization of AVID to increase proficiency in writing, inquiry, critical thinking, organization and rigor
- 2. SEL partnership with Frameworks
- 3. Increase access to tutoring

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: The 2021 FSA data showed a significant decline in Math across all grade levels. Only 15% of students showed proficiency in Math compared to 53% in 2019. The learning gains of the lowest 25% decreased from 58 points to 36 points.

Measurable Outcome: The school plans to use the 2022 FSA data as the specific measurable outcome and the school's progress monitoring data.

Monitoring: This area of focus will be monitored with school interim assessments, Unit assessments and I-Ready and Easy CBM assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Yolonda Capers (yolonda.capers@charter.hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

- 1, Students will be provided targeted small group differentiated instruction
- 2, Identified students will be provided supplemental and intensive intervention with the use of evidence-based programs such as IXL and I-Ready tools for instruction, instructional strategies for math application
3. After school tutoring

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The 2021 FSA assessment results. The I-Ready curriculum and teacher toolkit has been identified by FDOE as an effective instructional strategy to increase student academic achievement and close gaps in learning.

Action Steps to Implement

1. All teachers will receive ongoing training and coaching on the effective use of the IReady toolkit and how to fully utilize the progress monitoring data from I-Ready.
2. Use of school interim assessments
3. Weekly PLC's
4. Increased modeling from the instructional coaches and one on one bi-weekly data meetings with the teachers

Person Responsible Yolonda Capers (yolonda.capers@charter.hcps.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	There was a significant decline in ELA learning gains decreasing from 58 points in 2019 to 36 points in 2021. The number of Level 1 students on the 2019 FSA was 21 and increased to 42 on the 2021 FSA.
Measurable Outcome:	On the 2022 FSA ELA, the learning gains of our lowest 25% will increase from 36% to 45% and our proficiency points will increase from 34% to 44%.
Monitoring:	Small groups will be monitored and adjusted to meet the individual needs of the students. PLC's will meet bi-weekly to analyze student data to adjust lesson plans and share instructional practices.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Lillia Stroud (009142@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1, Students will be provided targeted small group differentiated instruction 2, Identified students will be provided supplemental and intensive intervention with the use of evidence-based programs such as IXL and I-Ready tools for instruction, instructional strategies for guided reading 3. After school tutoring
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	<p>The 2021 FSA assessment results.</p> <p>The I-Ready curriculum and teacher toolkit has been identified by FDOE as an effective instructional strategy to increase student academic achievement and close gaps in learning.</p>

Action Steps to Implement

1. All teachers will receive ongoing training and coaching on the effective use of the IReady toolkit and how to fully utilize the progress monitoring data from I-Ready.
2. Use of school interim assessments
3. Weekly PLC's
4. Increased modeling from the instructional coaches and one on one bi-weekly data meetings with the teachers

Person Responsible Yolonda Capers (yolonda.capers@charter.hcps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.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.

Legacy has no areas of concern in this area.

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.

Legacy continues to maintain a positive culture and environment by building a nurturing rapport with all of our students and families. As this is our 19th year, we have established an environment of mutual trust with our parents and students. This has led to many of their extended family members attending Legacy. Parents are provided an opportunity to be involved through

1. Parent workshops to teach parents how to help their child with academic content
2. All Pro Dads to foster and build positive relationships between students and their dads
- 3 FSA Informational Meeting, to explain what, where, when and how.
- 4 SEL Workshops for Parents - to help parents understand the emotional needs of their children and to help parents with their emotional needs as well.
5. Participation in fundraising opportunities that allows for interaction and collaboration between the staff and parents
6. Parent intramurals that encourages positive interaction between families
7. Parent and student talent show
9. Multicultural diversity is taught through the curriculum and celebrated with various multicultural activities throughout the school year.
10. SEL curriculum and workshops for our staff and students
11. Students learn about art and music across all cultures

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

Legacy's board works hand in hand with the administration to make policies that promote a positive and nurturing culture and environment.

Individuals and businesses that provide pro bono services for school pictures, gardening, athletic coaching for our students.

Partnership with Frameworks to provide SEL instruction

Parents participate in PTSO and SAC

The University of Tampa's education cohorts who work with Legacy students

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math				\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				\$19,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	5100	529-Technology-Related Textbooks	6621 - Legacy Preparatory Academy	Title, I Part A		\$19,000.00
			<i>Notes: To purchase I-Ready Diagnostic and Curriculum</i>			
					Total:	\$38,000.00