

Marion County Public Schools

Legacy Elementary School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	20
Positive Culture & Environment	24
Budget to Support Goals	24

Legacy Elementary School

8496 JUNIPER RD, Ocala, FL 34480

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Shameka Murphy

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2018

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
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 Multiracial Students* White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (46%) 2017-18: D (40%) 2016-17: C (48%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
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 Marion 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	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	20
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	24

Legacy Elementary School

8496 JUNIPER RD, Ocala, FL 34480

[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)
Elementary School KG-5	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	No	64%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Marion 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.

Positive caring educators will provide a rigorous curriculum incorporating high expectations with emphasis on character education. Legacy Elementary students will be responsible and respectful members of the community who take pride in all they do.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Learning with Pride...Leaving a Legacy.

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
Murphy, Shameka	Principal	The principal is the driving force and instructional leader of the school. She provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making, models the problem solving process. She supervises the development of a strong infrastructure while conducting an assessment of the skills of school staff. The principal ensures implementation of high yield instructional strategies, collaborative learning, intervention support and documentation while providing adequate professional learning opportunities that develops a culture of high expectation with the school staff. She also ensures resources are assigned to those areas of most need and communicates with parents as necessary.
Curty, Marie-Elena	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal assists the principal in providing a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making. She assists in the development of a strong infrastructure of resources for the implementation of high yield instructional strategies, further assists the principal in the assessment of school staff. She helps with the monitoring and implementation of intervention and necessary documentation. The assistant principal assists with the delivery of professional development for effective instructional deliver and monitors the additional academic support schedule to ensure all personnel are serving in their specified areas.
Swain, Angela	Assistant Principal	The principal is the driving force and instructional leader of the school. She provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making, models the problem solving process. She supervises the development of a strong infrastructure while conducting an assessment of the skills of school staff. The principal ensures implementation of high yield instructional strategies, collaborative learning, intervention support and documentation while providing adequate professional learning opportunities that develops a culture of high expectation with the school staff. She also ensures resources are assigned to those areas of most need and communicates with parents as necessary.
Epps, Tonya	Instructional Coach	The content area specialist assists teachers with the interpretation and implementation of the Florida Standards for Language Arts and Writing. She provides instructional support to include preparation of lesson plans, content alignment, content delivery methods and instructional modeling.
Bryant, Charnee	Math Coach	The content area specialist assists teachers with the interpretation and implementation of the Florida Standards for Math/Science. She provides instructional support to include preparation of lesson plans, content alignment and delivery methods while modeling for teachers.
Brown, Te'lor	School Counselor	The guidance counselor participates in collection, interpretation, and analysis of data; facilitates development of intervention plans; provides support for intervention fidelity and documentation; assists with professional development for behavior concerns; assists in facilitation data-based decision making

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		activities. She also provides quality services and expertise on issues ranging from IEP development to intervention with individual students. She communicates with child-serving community agencies to support the students' academic, emotional, behavioral, and social success.
Cox, Mariela	Dean	The student services m(Dean) provides teachers with classroom support and feedback to ensure a safe, cooperative environment for learning to take place. Resources, such as behavior contracts, for at-risk students are carefully considered and shared by the SSM. He coordinates efforts to use positive reinforcements to encourage more positive behavior choices by students. He also monitors and shares disciplinary/attendance data, and serves on the PBIS/Safety committee. In addition, the SSM may act as a liaison with outside agencies that offer support to students and families.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Sunday 7/1/2018, Shameka Murphy

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

51

Total number of students enrolled at the school

657

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

9

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

7

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	97	98	121	130	145	126	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	717
Attendance below 90 percent	46	42	46	50	55	47	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	286
One or more suspensions	2	0	6	11	25	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48
Course failure in ELA	12	20	36	25	15	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	141
Course failure in Math	12	29	31	16	14	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	140
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	19	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	17	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	13	1	2	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24

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	16	26	31	28	35	43	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	179

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Wednesday 6/30/2021

2020-21 - As Reported

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	62	102	112	130	156	118	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	680
Attendance below 90 percent	11	25	35	36	40	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	173
One or more suspensions	3	3	9	37	12	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	87
Course failure in ELA	0	6	9	5	9	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41
Course failure in Math	0	6	9	5	9	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	22	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	18	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47

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	15	30	51	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	131

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	1	2	9	23	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	61
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

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	62	102	112	130	156	118	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	680
Attendance below 90 percent	11	25	35	36	40	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	173
One or more suspensions	3	3	9	37	12	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	87
Course failure in ELA	0	6	9	5	9	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41
Course failure in Math	0	6	9	5	9	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	22	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	18	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47

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	15	30	51	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	131

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	1	2	9	23	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	61
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

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				43%	47%	57%	38%	46%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				51%	56%	58%	37%	44%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				46%	52%	53%	27%	37%	48%
Math Achievement				45%	51%	63%	48%	49%	62%
Math Learning Gains				55%	58%	62%	54%	46%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				45%	49%	51%	38%	35%	47%
Science Achievement				39%	47%	53%	39%	51%	55%

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	43%	44%	-1%	58%	-15%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	44%	49%	-5%	58%	-14%
Cohort Comparison		-43%				
05	2021					
	2019	39%	45%	-6%	56%	-17%
Cohort Comparison		-44%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	42%	49%	-7%	62%	-20%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	51%	54%	-3%	64%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		-42%				
05	2021					
	2019	33%	45%	-12%	60%	-27%
Cohort Comparison		-51%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	40%	44%	-4%	53%	-13%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

The progress monitoring tools used by grade level to compile the data below are:

- English Language Arts, Grades 1-5: iReady Diagnostic-Reading Overall Placement AP1, AP2, and AP3
- Mathematics, Grades 1-5: iReady Diagnostic-Math Overall Placement AP1, AP2, and AP3
- Science, Grade 5: Grade 5 Science Quarters 1, 2, and 3 Quarterly Standards Mastery Assessment (QSMA)

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	17 / 20%	13 / 14%	28 / 30%
	Economically Disadvantaged	12 / 17%	9 / 13%	19 / 26%
	Students With Disabilities	1 / 11%	1 / 11%	0 / 0%
	English Language Learners	2 / 100%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	10 / 12%	10 / 11%	28 / 30%
	Economically Disadvantaged	8 / 11%	6 / 8%	20 / 26%
	Students With Disabilities	1 / 11%	1 / 11%	2 / 25%
	English Language Learners	1 / 50%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	19 / 17%	22 / 19%	29 / 26%
	Economically Disadvantaged	12 / 14%	15 / 17%	15 / 18%
	Students With Disabilities	2 / 15%	1 / 7%	2 / 15%
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	8 / 7%	5 / 4%	13 / 12%
	Economically Disadvantaged	5 / 6%	4 / 4%	7 / 8%
	Students With Disabilities	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	1 / 7%
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	38 / 32%	28 / 22%	33 / 26%
	Economically Disadvantaged	25 / 30%	17 / 19%	20 / 22%
	Students With Disabilities	7 / 26%	3 / 11%	2 / 7%
	English Language Learners	1 / 8%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	4 / 3%	12 / 9%	29 / 24%
	Economically Disadvantaged	1 / 1%	4 / 5%	16 / 19%
	Students With Disabilities	0 / 0%	2 / 7%	4 / 17%
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	21 / 15%	20 / 14%	19 / 15%
	Economically Disadvantaged	8 / 8%	8 / 8%	7 / 8%
	Students With Disabilities	0 / 0%	2 / 7%	1 / 5%
	English Language Learners	1 / 15%	1 / 20%	1 / 20%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	13 / 9%	13 / 9%	28 / 21%
	Economically Disadvantaged	5 / 5%	5 / 5%	12 / 13%
	Students With Disabilities	1 / 4%	0 / 0%	2 / 8%
	English Language Learners	1 / 25%	2 / 40%	2 / 40%

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	39 / 33%	14 / 11%	19 / 17%
	Economically Disadvantaged	18 / 23%	5 / 6%	7 / 10%
	Students With Disabilities	1 / 7%	1 / 6%	2 / 17%
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	16 / 14%	12 / 10%	21 / 19%
	Economically Disadvantaged	6 / 8%	3 / 4%	8 / 12%
	Students With Disabilities	1 / 7%	1 / 7%	2 / 15%
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	52 / 50%	32 / 28%	30 / 29%
	Economically Disadvantaged	26 / 39%	11 / 14%	9 / 13%
	Students With Disabilities	1 / 9%	1 / 7%	1 / 9%
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%

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	19	30	38	19	11	7	8				
ELL	25	23		21			20				
BLK	21	31		22	21	17	14				
HSP	37	44	47	28	22	18	19				
MUL	48			57							
WHT	44	42		52	52		48				
FRL	26	30	50	28	22	20	17				
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	14	40	30	20	44	43	24				
ELL	21	36		30	57	73	42				
BLK	34	53	54	32	46	26	28				

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	36	51	47	39	54	67	36				
MUL	47	17		53	67						
WHT	53	53	45	56	60	45	49				
FRL	38	52	53	38	52	40	38				
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	21	33	30	26	52	46	26				
ELL	20	18		32	35						
BLK	25	33	37	36	47	33	21				
HSP	33	32	25	52	49		13				
MUL	38	40		58	47		50				
WHT	50	42	8	53	63	48	60				
FRL	36	36	29	44	53	34	37				

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	33
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	26
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	267
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	19
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	19
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	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	30
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	53
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	48
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	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?

The number of students proficient in 3rd, 4th, and 5th grade iReady Math increased from Fall to Spring across the subgroups. The number of students proficient in 4th grade Math and ELA iReady results shows no growth in proficiency. The number of students proficient in 3rd, 4th, and 5th grade iReady Reading remained the same or decreased from Fall to Spring. The subgroups that did not meet the ESSA federal index target were the African American and Student with Disabilities subgroups.

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

Based on iReady progress monitoring data the greatest need for improvement is ELA. The number of students proficient in 3rd, 4th, and 5th grade iReady Reading remained the same or decreased from Fall to Spring. The grade level iReady progress monitoring data reflects the following when comparing the Fall results to Spring results:

3rd Grade decreased 6% from Fall (32%) to Spring (26%)
 4th Grade remained the same from Fall (15%) to Spring (15%)
 5th Grade decreased 16% from Fall (33%) to Spring (17%)

Based on the school grade components by subgroups the greatest need for improvement are all subject areas for Student with Disabilities subgroup and Math for Black/African American subgroup. The school grade components data reflects the following when comparing 2018 results to 2021 results:

Students with Disabilities subgroup
 ELA Achievement decreased 7% from 2018 (21%) to 2021 (14%)
 Math Achievement decreased 6% from 2018 (26%) to 2021 (20%)
 Science Achievement decreased 2% from 2018 (26%) to 2021 (24%)

Black/African subgroup
 Math Achievement decreased 4% from 2018 (36%) to 2021 (32%)

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 need to build the capacity of the teachers and understanding the depth of the standard and progression of the standards contributes to the need of improvement in ELA. To address this need, the focus will be on placing a greater emphasis in Tier I instruction and structured collaboration.

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

Based on iReady progress monitoring Math data showed the most improvement . The number of students proficient in 3rd, 4th, and 5th grade iReady Math increased from Fall to Spring. The grade level iReady progress monitoring data reflects the following when comparing the Fall results to Spring results:

3rd Grade increased 21% from Fall (3%) to Spring (24%)
 4th Grade increased 12% from Fall (9%) to Spring (21%)
 5th Grade increased 5% from Fall (14%) to Spring (19%)

Based on the school grade components by subgroups the Black/African American showed improvement in ELA and Science. The school grade components data reflects the following when comparing 2018 results to 2021 results:

Black/African subgroup
 ELA Achievement increased 9% from 2018 (25%) to 2021 (34%)
 Science Achievement increased 7% from 2018 (21%) to 2021 (28%)

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

The contributing factor to the improvement in the increase of students being proficient based on the iReady Math diagnostic results are Math teachers capacity of understanding the depth of the standards.

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

The strategy that will be implemented to accelerate learning is building teacher capacity of the progression of the standard and pre-requisite skills.

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 opportunity that will be provided to support teachers and leaders will focus on reviewing Quarterly Standard Mastery Assessments (QSMA) and identifying areas of concerns/skills to address along with instructional resources to use for small group instruction.

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

The additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement are the following:

standard study meetings and restructuring of collaboration meeting. The standard study meetings will focus on reviewing the upcoming standard(s), reviewing the test item specification for that standard(s), and unwrapping the standard(s) covered during the meeting. The restructuring of collaboration meeting is the following:

BEFORE:

- Review the upcoming standard(s)
- Review the test item specs for that standard(s)
- Identify the test assessment that will be used as the culminating assessment
- Review potential tasks and activities (whole group, small group, center activities, independent activities)
- As a grade level team, post potential tasks and activities to Teams/CANVAS

- Read the text and mark the TE

DURING:

- Review one agreed upon CFU or formative assessment data from the week before
- Based on data, how will this standard be retaught
- Discuss each task and how the instruction will occur
- What do teachers do or say
- What students do or say

AFTER:

- CAS/Admin support and provide specific feedback on instruction through coaching

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Collaborative Planning**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

During a debriefing of school data, the team identified a need to improve instructional practice through collaborative planning. The data reflected that the number of students proficient in 3rd, 4th, and 5th grade iReady Math increased from Fall to Spring across the subgroups but the percentage of the each grade level is below 50%. The number of students proficient in 3rd, 4th, and 5th grade iReady Reading remained the same or decreased from Fall to Spring. It was evident that there is a disconnect of what is being planned for instruction compared to what is required for students to show mastery of the standard. Some teachers were not familiar or did not have a deep understanding of their content area standards thus preventing them from properly aligning instructional materials to the standards and teaching practice. This ultimately affected student academic engagement and performance across all subject areas.

If we provide teachers with supported collaboration opportunities focusing on standards based lesson planning (emphasis on what students are required to do to demonstrate mastery of the standard versus what teachers are doing during instruction) then the following will improve on the state assessments:

Measurable Outcome:

ELA student learning gains from 51% to 56%
 ELA lowest 25% percentile from 46% to 51%
 ELA student proficiency from 43% to 48%
 Math student learning gains from 55% to 60%
 Math lowest 25% percentile from 45% to 50%
 Math student proficiency from 45% to 50%
 Science student proficiency from 39% to 44%

Monitoring:

To monitor the desired outcome, Quarterly Standard Mastery Assessments (QSMA), will be conducted quarterly to assess students mastery throughout the school year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Shameka Murphy (shameka.murphy@marion.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:

The evidence based strategy being implemented to achieve the measurable outcome of improving instructional practice is collaborative planning focused on understanding the standards emphasis on what students are required to do to demonstrate mastery of the standard versus what teachers are doing during instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

When teachers work collectively to deepen their knowledge of the curriculum, it has a positive impact on improving student achievement. Sharing best practices and utilizing instructional materials that align to the depth of the standards also has a positive impact on student achievement. The article written by Carla Thomas McClure "The benefits of teacher collaboration" it states, "to determine the relationship between teacher collaboration and student achievement, the researchers used reading and math achievements scores for 2, 536 fourth-graders, controlling for school context and student characteristics such as prior achievement. They found a positive relationship between teacher collaboration and differences among schools in mathematics and reading achievement."

Action Steps to Implement

Provide collaboration opportunities every Tuesdays and Thursdays of the week for teachers to focus on the following:

- Review one agreed upon Check For Understanding question(s) or formative assessment data from the

week before

- Based on data, how will this standard be retaught
- Discuss each task and how the instruction will occur
- What do teachers do or say
- What students do or say

(Math/ELA - K-2 alternate Tuesday ELA /Thursday Math and 3-5 departmentalized meet every Tuesday and Thursday of the week)

Person Responsible Angela Swain (angela.swain@marion.k12.fl.us)

Provide opportunities for standard study meetings to focus on the following:

- Review the upcoming standard(s)
- Review the test item specs for that standard(s)
- Unwrapping the standard(s)

Person Responsible Shameka Murphy (shameka.murphy@marion.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Our 2021 ELA progress monitoring data show the following percent of grades K-2 students not on track to secure a level 3 are: 83 % of Kindergarten, 69% of 1st grade, 88% of 2nd grade.
Our 2021 ELA FSA data show the following percent of grades 3-5 students scored below a level 3: 59% of 3rd grade, 73% of 4th grade, 63% of 5th grade.

Measurable Outcome: On the 2021 i-Ready Diagnostic-Reading Overall Placement, 17% of our kindergarten students were proficient, 31% of our 1st grade students were proficient, and 12% of our 2nd grade students were proficient. On the 2022 i-Ready Diagnostic-Reading Overall Placement 22% of kindergarten, 36% of 1st grade, and 17% of 2nd grade students will be proficient.
On the 2021 ELA FSA, 41% of our 3rd grade students scored 3 or higher, 27% of our 4th grade students scored 3 or higher, and 37% of our 5th grade students scored 3 or higher. On the 2022 ELA FSA, 46% of 3rd grade, 32% of 4th grade, and 22% of 5th grade will score a 3 or higher.

Monitoring: In addition to our formative assessments, the following assessments will be used to monitor student progress:
K-5: i-Ready Diagnostic AP1 August 2021, AP2 January 2022, and AP3 May 2022
K-5: i-Ready Growth Monitoring November 2021 and March 2022
3-5: District QSMAs Q1 October 2021, Q2 December 2021, Q3 March 2022
Teachers will participate in data meetings with the leadership team after each testing cycle to determine progress and develop action steps in response to the assessment results.
During classroom walk throughs levels of student engagement will be noted by administration and feedback will be provide to teachers.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Shameka Murphy (shameka.murphy@marion.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Scaffolding: Teachers build support for students in learning and gradually take away supports as needed. Teachers model, offer feedback and coaching as students are learning.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Hattie's Index of Teaching and Learning Strategies presents "scaffolding has a 0.82 effect size". Typically, the four steps include: I do, We do, You do together, and then You do alone. This scaffolds the learning process and supports students through guided practice.

Action Steps to Implement

K-5 teachers will collaborate each week to plan phonics and vocabulary instruction and use of scaffolding reading strategies within the ELA block. Teachers should show evidence of scaffolding at the beginning of a learning task and as needed when students need support. Classrooms will be monitored regularly to ensure that ELA instruction is consistently administered with fidelity.

Person Responsible Shameka Murphy (shameka.murphy@marion.k12.fl.us)

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.

N/A

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 Elementary will provide opportunities for parents, families, and other community stakeholders to participate in events that will build positive relationships and assist in fulfilling the school's mission and support the needs of students. The parents, families, and other community stakeholders will have opportunities to make suggestions and give feedback about the programs currently being utilized at the school.

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

Legacy Elementary School values and encourages all stakeholders including students, parents, teachers and staff to participation in programs such as School Advisory Council , parent trainings, parent teacher conferences, and family events.

Teachers will be using a new social emotional curriculum (Caring School Community) which will also help to promoting a positive school culture and environment with the support of our School Counselor helping to oversee the implementation of the program.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Collaborative Planning	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00