Literacy/Leadership/ Technology Academy

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Literacy/Leadership/Technology Academy

6771 MADISON AVE, Tampa, FL 33619

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Carrie Johnson

Start Date for this Principal: 10/8/2021

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	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	17%
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 Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (60%) 2017-18: A (63%) 2016-17: A (63%)
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

Literacy/Leadership/Technology Academy

6771 MADISON AVE, Tampa, FL 33619

[no web address on file]

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 KG-8	No	13%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	Yes	50%

School Grades History

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

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 empower a community of lifelong learners to lead the way in Literacy, Leadership, and Technology.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Literacy Leadership Technology Academy will provide a safe, well maintained environment for both the students and staff. Our facilities team working in conjunction with our Leader In (LIM) Me Green Team Action Committee and LIM Environmental committee will keep the school clean and green. Security will be a priority in following HB7069 regulations and systems will be monitored and maintained to keep our students, staff and school safe. The culture of LLT will be one of warmth and mutual respect between students, staff, and parents. The administration will foster positive relationships amongst all stakeholders to make the school a place where everyone wants to be involved and has a high sense of ownership. We fully believe all students can reach a level of academic success and social emotional well-being with a qualified, trained and caring staff. Success will be determined through measuring individual student gains during learning in the classroom curriculum, as well as gains made on standardized assessments. SEL outcomes will be monitored through our Mental Health Plan. Data will be kept in both areas of learning (Academic and Social/Emotional), analyzed, disaggregated by administration and instructional staff in order to make well informed decisions regarding students' progress. Regularly scheduled meetings will be held to discuss data results amongst stakeholders allowing for open discussion regarding policy, curriculum, instruction, programming, and desired outcomes in order to implement any changes needed for the benefit of the students served. All curriculum and programming will be research-based and in accordance with State Standards to give students the best opportunity to succeed both academically and socially emotionally. All staff will continue to grow in their professional development through training, self-assessment, and evaluation in order to offer the best education to the students and feel a sense of accomplishment within themselves. Parents will be a key factor in the progress of their child. Literacy Leadership Technology Academy will provide multiple avenues for parents to receive all information pertinent to their child's educational success. We will encourage and provide resources for families to partner with the school staff to ensure positive student outcomes. Parent involvement through volunteering opportunities with LLT's PTSO, The Family Leader In Me Action Team, as well as our School Advisory Council, will be valued and appreciated by school staff as an indicator of commitment to their child's education. The school will use the Franklin Covey Leader in Me program to promote student well-being and positive academic outcomes. This is a top down, all stakeholder immersion into what leadership means, how to lead oneself and then others, how to effectively communicate, set and accomplish goals and serve the community. The LLT culture in conjunction with LIM aids in a paradigm shift in one's thinking to understand how ultimately take ownership and create opportunities in one's life to better self, community and society. The school is a one to one device school and technology is used in all LLT learning through curricula, Google Classroom, subject area coursework, electives and beyond. The school will combine all the pieces together to achieve long term success for not only the students, but the also the staff. Consistent growth and not becoming comfortable with the status quo will ensure best practice is at the forefront of the school's philosophy for success.

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
Logan, Lesley	Chief Education Officer	To provide strategic direction, program design and implementation, oversee and have input into budgeting, marketing and public relations, school growth, facilities oversight, data analysis, performance accountability planning, creating vision and a pathway for success for all stakeholders.
Rutherford, Joanne		Lead instructional staff, cultivate a culture of leadership and inclusivity, monitor school data and processes, provide instructional professional development, improve instruction and student achievement/social emotional well-being, monitor instructional fidelity and accountability, work with CEO on implementation plans, data driven changes and staffing.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 10/8/2021, Carrie Johnson

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.*

8

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

33

Total number of students enrolled at the school

564

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

5

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

5

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	41	35	39	48	48	86	102	0	0	0	0	0	435
Attendance below 90 percent	8	10	5	10	13	10	21	26	0	0	0	0	0	103
One or more suspensions	2	0	3	2	0	0	3	4	5	0	0	0	0	19
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	5	11	11	13	18	27	0	0	0	0	85
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	8	25	31	15	18	16	0	0	0	0	113
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	8	11	9	8	7	7	11	8	14	0	0	0	0	83

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	2	5	3	6	6	9	12	9	14	0	0	0	0	66

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	3	1	1	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	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 10/8/2021

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	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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 ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math 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	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data 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				59%	57%	61%	58%	59%	60%
ELA Learning Gains				50%	56%	59%	56%	56%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				46%	52%	54%	55%	49%	52%
Math Achievement				63%	55%	62%	61%	57%	61%
Math Learning Gains				58%	57%	59%	57%	53%	58%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				53%	49%	52%	57%	47%	52%

School Grade Component	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement				45%	50%	56%	55%	51%	57%
Social Studies Achievement				89%	77%	78%	86%	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	71%	52%	19%	58%	13%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	64%	55%	9%	58%	6%
Cohort Comparison		-71%				
05	2021					
	2019	59%	54%	5%	56%	3%
Cohort Comparison		-64%				
06	2021					
	2019	57%	53%	4%	54%	3%
Cohort Comparison		-59%				
07	2021					
	2019	59%	54%	5%	52%	7%
Cohort Comparison		-57%				
08	2021					
	2019	52%	53%	-1%	56%	-4%
Cohort Comparison		-59%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	68%	54%	14%	62%	6%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	70%	57%	13%	64%	6%
Cohort Comparison		-68%				
05	2021					
	2019	56%	54%	2%	60%	-4%
Cohort Comparison		-70%				
06	2021					
	2019	40%	49%	-9%	55%	-15%
Cohort Comparison		-56%				
07	2021					
	2019	72%	62%	10%	54%	18%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		-40%				
08	2021					
	2019	41%	31%	10%	46%	-5%
Cohort Comparison		-72%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	49%	51%	-2%	53%	-4%
Cohort Comparison						
08	2021					
	2019	44%	47%	-3%	48%	-4%
Cohort Comparison		-49%				

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	89%	67%	22%	71%	18%
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	79%	63%	16%	61%	18%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	100%	57%	43%	57%	43%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

LLT Academy uses NWEA MAP (Measure of Academic Progress) for its progress monitoring. We all progress monitor with iReady. Each of these is standardized assessments are given in the fall, winter and Spring. The MAP listed here does not currently have the 3 subgroups extrapolated, but this data will be input into this living document by 10/30/21. There is not time to do it correctly by the due date of 10/8/21.

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	69	58	68
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	63	58	69
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 2				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	68	58	71
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	80	76	88
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	81	70	78
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	64	50	72
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	67	64	66
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	55	59	50
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	73	51	55
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	36	47	38
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	69	61	66
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 6				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	74	56	74
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	53	61	59
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 7				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	73	64	68
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	61	76	71
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Civics	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 8				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	69	64	47
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	65	70	73
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	72	76	69
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

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	17	40	38	23	42	50	26	45			
ELL	15	25	26	16	33	44	8				
BLK	32	38	28	23	29	38	35	54			
HSP	35	36	27	35	42	40	33	54	71		
MUL	59	58		50	52						
WHT	59	45	33	57	46	42	47	88	75		
FRL	38	49	42	34	41	47	30				
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	27	30	30	31	34	32	13				
ELL	26	35	36	32	50	43					
BLK	37	43	42	46	57	64	13	71	55		

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
HSP	51	43	32	52	57	43	31	83	75		
MUL	63	52		59	41						
WHT	66	54	53	70	60	54	59	95	86		
FRL	46	43	50	54	63	67	9				

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	27	55	58	43	61	68	33	64			
ELL	30	67	75	15	33	33					
BLK	31	44	46	44	61	62	33	76			
HSP	53	64	69	50	53	55	44	87	68		
MUL	59	46		41	23						
WHT	66	56	51	69	59	58	64	90	82		
FRL	47	53	60	46	38	48	50	89			

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	51
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	55
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	506
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	35
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	28
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES

English Language Learners	
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	35
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	43
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	55
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	55
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	40
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?

After reviewing the data, it is clear that our following subgroup needs to extra support beyond the ESE accommodations and tiered MTSS support they are currently receiving; Students with Disabilities have been in the underperforming category in both 2021 and 2019 at 35% and 28% respectively so this while this subgroup has shown an overall 7% growth, they are still below the ESSA threshold of above 40%. There as been additional subgroups who have fallen below the ESSA 40% threshold in 2021 and the learning loss is evident. Black, ELL, and Economically Disadvantaged are those subgroups.

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

In the 2019 assessments, the following subgroup as mentioned above was below the 40% threshold; Students with disabilities. Our 2020 progress monitoring data shows the biggest need for improvement is in the area of Reading.

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

The biggest factors are the following: COVID and learning loss as our students who have been with the school for more than the last two years were performing much higher in all areas. Teacher retention, which has always been high at LLT Academy also became an issue in the last two years, some of our experienced teachers moved to our new school, some retired and some left teaching. Our school systems, which accounted for our success also suffered under the stress of COVID. We are focusing on getting all systems back on track for all students through regular round table meetings with all staff to discuss and problem solve issues. We are spending time and funding on supplemental learning, tutoring, and looking at innovation to get our parents more involved in the learning process for their children. We also putting professional development and training programs through Leader in Me and Marzano back into play as they had to be curtailed during the Covid school year of 2019-20202.

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

Reading and Math in grades K, second and third grade, Algebra 1 and Geometry for 7th and 8th grade and reading, math and science in grade 6 - MAP progress monitoring. We were down in every category in the 2021 state assessments versus the 2019 so no improvement there.

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

In the MAP progress monitoring, guided reading was big focus in the focus in the primary grades. The Algebra and Geometry teachers are both highly effective and their teaching methods accounted for the increase in this areas. 6th Grade was also positively affected by their teachers.

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

The Art and Science of Teaching domains and elements will be reintroduced to all veteran staff as a refresher and introduced to all new LLT teaching staff. These domains constitute a strong teaching methodology, which has led to prior successes for all subgroups of students. They include; providing and communicating clear learning goals, using assessments - formal and informal to drive instruction, conducting meaningful direct instruction lessons, practicing and deepening lessons including errors in reasoning, similarities and differences, planning and implications for change, also conducting knowledge application lessons involving cognitively complex lessons, using engagement strategies.

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 professional development is ongoing throughout the year with Leader in Me coaching in which we set academic goals with staff and students. The Learning Sciences Marzano is also ongoing with regular teacher training based on years in education with both our on-site Marzano coach and Learning Sciences training consultants.

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

Additional services will include teacher support through on-site classroom management training, culture mentorship with the on-site LLT mentor, Leader in Me support through the LIM Lighthouse adult coordinator and Lighthouse team, who focuses on Leadership, Culture and Academics. PLCs in grade level and subject area will be regularly conducted. Also, administration will meet regularly with instructors to discuss data using the STAT (Student Alignment Tracker) and what changes need to be implemented based on the data and also to celebrate data improvements.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Leadership specifically relating to Instructional Leadership Team	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	As a Franklin Covey Leader In Me School, leadership skills among both the staff and students is a key component to our program. Professional development and training throughout the year for teachers to understand the LIM program as it relates to student achievement and well-being. Students learn to understand through the LIM paradigms, that they themselves own their achievement and are taught first, to be a leader of themselves and then others. This instills confidence and a belief in their own abilities. This school year, we focus on the 4DX process with the staff and students, which is a specific goal setting practice focusing on the needed area of improvement, both academic and personal. This strategic focus will allow the students to prioritize their needs and have a plan for how to achieve the need. This same strategy is also used by the whole staff to increase the achievements of the overall school.
Measurable Outcome:	The school through its LIM program sets a WIG (Widely Important Goal), which is an academic goal based on academic data from the previous year. This year our WIG is LLT Academy will be increase its Overall Reading achievement on the FSA by 9 points by May 2022. Each classroom sets a WIG also in their respective subjects. The elective teachers also set WIGs for their students based on vocabulary.
Monitoring:	As the FSA is only given once per year, we will use our MAP data and classroom wigs to gauge the outcomes in growth for our students. A WIG board will be created in a public space in the school for student grade levels to see their growth levels. This board is updated by the student leaders monthly per their classroom WIGS and after each MAP testing session in Fall, Winter and Spring. The students' achievements are celebrated by the staff and students when growth is reached.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Joanne Rutherford (joanne.rutherford@charter.hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The strategy used will be the Franklin Covey 4 Disciplines of Execution (4DX Model) designed by Dr. Stephen Covey.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Franklin Covey Leader in Me is an Evidence-based program, which is built around the Seven Habits of Highly Effective People, a program used throughout the world in successful corporations, and is highly recognized for positive transformation in student achievement. Our school went from a C to an A in one year using the data driven program and was on track to repeat this outcome prior to Covid-19's interruption. It is also a CASEL approved program focusing on the social emotional well-being of students. The resources used are the Franklin Covey Leader In Me program complete with in-person multi-visit annual trainings, LIM student and staff materials, LIM website resources and a book study for staff beyond their seven habits training titled, The 4 Disciplines of Execution for Educators Achieving Your Wildly Important Goals

Action Steps to Implement

Action Step One: August 2021- All new staff were trained by a Franklin Covey Consultant in the "Seven Habits of Highly Effective People". A.S. TWO: All Staff had Leader In Me training during 2021 In-Service. A.S. Three: The adult student Lighthouse team was formed in June 2021 to meet over the summer and ongoing through out the school year to set success goals in the three areas of LIM focus; Leadership, Culture and Academic Learning. This included the Academic Learning Team (Part of the Light House

Team) who set the Reading WIG based on the 20-21 FSA and MAP data for the 2021-2022 School Year. A.S. Five: share the school WIG with the staff and students and help teachers set their classroom WIGS for their students working in each subject area. A.S. Six: Teachers and students, together, Progress monitor the classroom WIG and success toward reaching each goal points and build in celebrations for achievement. A.S. Seven: Students set personal academic goals in their leadership notebook to work on the area they individually need to strengthen. Students use I-Ready and have a set daily morning class (Class is called Goal Time and all students are scheduled into this 50 minute class) to work on their individual goals of Math or Reading. A.S. Eight: The Academic Team progress monitors the total outcomes quarterly of the School wide WIG and meets with core teachers in assessing their classroom WIG outcomes.

Person Responsible Joanne Rutherford (joanne.rutherford@charter.hcps.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Instructional Coaching	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	This area of focus will be specifically on the teachers to help them use Evidence-based strategies in the classroom. It is evident from the data that all teachers need to understand and employ excellent classroom management in order to provide clear learning goals to their students, conduct knowledge application lessons, utilize scaffolding techniques, communicate high expectations, build relationships and understand the art of engaging students.
Measurable Outcome:	The successful implementation of this focus will ensure an increase in student learning for all students in the teacher's classroom. This, is turn, will produce increased student achievement as measured in focus one, Leadership and the Wildly Important Goals. There will also be an increase in teacher efficacy as seen through MAP growth scores and FSA VAM.
Monitoring:	This area of focus will be monitored through the Marzano Evaluation System with Highly Effective past teachers, now Assistant Principals and the Principal performing informal and formal evaluations. Evaluations will be entered into the iObservation System. Teachers will meet with Evaluators to discuss the outcomes of the classroom observations to discuss growth and set strategy for areas of improvement.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Joanne Rutherford (joanne.rutherford@charter.hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The Art and Science of Teaching by Dr. Robert J Marzano through Learning Sciences will be the evidence-based program used for this area of focus.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The Marzano methodology for teaching is a success proven program leading to better student outcomes and more highly effective building teachers.

Action Steps to Implement

Action Step One: On-going Training and Professional Development provided to teachers through our Marzano trained site-based coach.
Action Step Two: Data chats with teachers based on their data outcomes in conjunction with their classroom observations and coaching teachers to understand the relationship between the two.

Person Responsible	Joanne Rutherford (joanne.rutherford@charter.hcps.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.

The comparable data for combination schools in Hillsborough county showed LLT Academy in the middle of the number of schools listed with 13 total incidents listed giving us a rating of 2.0 on SESIR. There were 15 schools out of the 31 listed with higher a incident report than LLT. While not in the top ten for out of school suspensions, the formula rating based on enrollment put us in the top ten for the rate at 5.0. When this same data is compared with the number of combination schools in the state, many schools have much higher ratings in both the suspension category all the way to 22.2 and also the total incidents up to 19.9.
The areas of concern are a) the number of property incidents, in which LLT Academy ranks very high at .16 incidents per 100 students. This area has been and continues to be a struggle for the school as vandalism continues in our school bathrooms, which leads to our of school suspension for those identified. This is an issue the school leadership continues to talk with students about and reach out to parents and b) the number of out of school suspensions. The Leader In Me program was not as effective in the past year due to Covid as it is a very student/ family engagement program and our campus was locked down. All of our leadership events and action teams were not able to function and this became evident in our data. When we stated the LIM program in our school in 2016, we saw a sharp drop in these occurrences from the previous year. Last year the rate rose back up to the 2015 number of 2.0. The environment and culture is being monitored through our PBIS system, Learn 2 Earn for grades 3-8 and Class DOJO for the primary grades. The data is also being presented in quarterly STAT (LLT's Student Alignment Tracker) meetings with administration, instructional staff and the ESE Specialist where all student data (academic/behavior/social emotional) is viewed in one place for each of our students. From these meetings plans are put into place for those students requiring more support. I want to note that LLT Academy continues to have a reputation of being a safe learning environment for students from their parents because they know the administration will handle discipline in a swift timely manner leaving the classrooms free to be good learning environments. Our board has instituted zero tolerance in several areas and new students to us learn very quickly what the expectations are. We also look at repeated discipline incidents in our school to examine if a student needs further support in the way of accommodations, counseling or both.

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.

Our school culture is built around a staff and student leadership mode, Franklin Covey's Leader In Me (LIM). This is a top down, all stakeholder immersion into what leadership means, how to lead oneself and then
others, how to effectively communicate, set and accomplish goals and serve the
community. The LLT culture in conjunction with LIM aids in a paradigm shift in one's
thinking to understand how to ultimately take ownership and create opportunities in
one's life to better self, community, and society. The leadership model in our school has promoted self confidence in our students to know that they matter and they have ownership in their own education. They are learning that they have an important place not only in our school, but in their community. Our students have initiated community creek cleanups, donations for many non -profit organizations and have consistently been at Silver or Gold level in our district areas's Relay for Life. These drives were totally student driven and organized. Their sense of accomplishment was inspiring to our staff and parents. It is important to the school leadership and our governing board that our students and staff are happy and have a sense of wanting to be here, to contribute to the overall well-being of our school. With that in mind, we all work as one to have an inviting, relational, and productive school community.

The culture of our school is measured twice per year through the Franklin Covey Measurable Results Assessment. This assessment is given to all students, staff and parents. Scores are a culmination of all 3 sets of stakeholders. There are three main areas assessed; Leadership, Culture, and Academics. Within those three areas, they are further broken down as follows:

Leadership; Family Involvement, Staff Social/Emotional Teaching Readiness, and Student Leadership.
Culture: Supportive Environment, Student Engagement and Staff Satisfaction
Academics: Teacher Efficacy and Student-Led Achievement

The scoring mechanism is based on a percentile. Our school scored 72nd percentile in Leadership, 72nd % in Culture and 69th % in Academics. These are very good scores for the stressful learning environment all schools were under and we were praised by the Covey folks. We intend to build on the momentum this school year as we work to improve our student's academic achievement. It is known that positive academic achievement can only exist when both staff and students feel cared for and heard and those are priorities in our school culture.

We also have a LIM family Engagement Team - this team trains and plans leadership events for our families so they too can be engaged in LIM with their children at home. It also provides a thorough understanding of the LIM program and how it can help their student own their education and have higher academic achievement and social/emotional well-being.

The physical environment of the school is clean, spacious and modern with flexible seating/learning options and collaboration spaces for flexibility, leadership, camaraderie and project-based learning.

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

The stakeholders responsible for promoting a positive culture at our school are the following:
LLT Academy, Inc. Governing Board
Lesley Logan - CEO/Principal
Joanne Rutherford - Site Principal
Daniel Brennick - Assistant Principal
Tina Wood - Corporate LIM Lighthouse Team Coordinator
Shana Flores - Assistant Principal and MTSS and ELL Coordinator
ALL Support Staff - to support the infra-structure of our school for efficiency and

ESE Specialist and ESE Teachers - to manage our ESE program including all IEP/504 compliance and see that our SWD students are receiving their accommodations and best practices for student achievement.
ALL Instructional Staff - to increase student learning and academic achievement with fidelity for all children
Mike Clemmer - Facilities Supervisor - to keep a safe and clean physical environment for all
Diane Larue - Cafe Supervisor - to offer nutritious and delicious food choices to our School family
Shannon Kanahan - School Nurse - To keep a healthy school environment and see to our students health needs
LLT PTSO - to support the school through fundraising and event planning
Parents - our families are our number one stakeholder as they choose to send their students to our school and we service their needs. They have a voice through the MRA (above) and the My Voice Matters Form on our website to provide feedback and get help for their students.
All LLT students - Their interactions with each other, their teachers and our staff dictate our daily school culture

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Leadership: Instructional Leadership Team				$31,009.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	6400	311-Subagreements up to $25,000	6625 - Literacy/Leadership/ Technology Academy	Other Federal	564.0	$15,000.00
			Notes: NOTE: This program's funding source for school year 2021-22 is the ESSER II Grant. Coaching subscription and consultant daily rate during training sessions.			
	6400	311-Subagreements up to $25,000	6625 - Literacy/Leadership/ Technology Academy	General Fund	564.0	$6,000.00
			Notes: Coaching subscription and consultant daily rate during training sessions.			
	6400	510-Supplies	6625 - Literacy/Leadership/ Technology Academy	Other Federal	564.0	$1,440.00
			Notes: Training books for use during coaching sessions			
	6400	730-Dues and Fees	6625 - Literacy/Leadership/ Technology Academy	Other Federal	564.0	$5,000.00
			Notes: Annual Membership - Program licensing and website resources			
	5100	510-Supplies	6625 - Literacy/Leadership/ Technology Academy	Other Federal	564.0	$1,094.00
			Notes: Student Materials - Consumable instructional print materials			
	5100	510-Supplies	6625 - Literacy/Leadership/ Technology Academy	General Fund	564.0	$2,475.00
			Notes: Family Engagement Materials - Seven Habits of Highly Effective Families consumable guides for parents.			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Instructional Coaching				$1,375.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	6400	730-Dues and Fees	6625 - Literacy/Leadership/ Technology Academy	General Fund	564.0	$1,375.00
			Notes: Learning Sciences - licensing full package protocol and library for instructional professional development and evaluation.			

Total:	**$32,384.00**