

Marion County Public Schools

# Legacy Elementary School



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# 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

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2021-22 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
<b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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
<b>School Grades History</b>	2021-22: C (41%) 2018-19: C (46%) 2017-18: D (40%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Northeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Cassandra Brusca</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	ATSI
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

## 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](http://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

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

## Legacy Elementary School

8496 JUNIPER RD, Ocala, FL 34480

[ no web address on file ]

### School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2021-22 Title I School	2021-22 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	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	C		C	C

### 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**

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Murphy, Shameka	Principal	<p>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.</p>
Curty, Marie-Elena	Assistant Principal	<p>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.</p>
Fowler, Dedra	Assistant Principal	<p>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.</p>
Epps, Tonya	Instructional Coach	<p>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.</p>
Bryant, Charnee	Math Coach	<p>The content area specialist assists teachers with the interpretation and implementation of the Florida Standards for Math. She provides instructional support to include preparation of lesson plans, content alignment and delivery methods while modeling for teachers.</p>
Cox, Mariela	Dean	<p>The student services manager (Dean/SSM) 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. The student services manager</p>



Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		coordinates efforts to use positive reinforcements to encourage more positive behavior choices by students. She 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.
Donnell, Ariadne	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 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.

### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Sunday 7/1/2018, Shameka Murphy

**Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

2

**Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

5

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

47

**Total number of students enrolled at the school**

748

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

6

**Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.**

8

#### Demographic Data

### Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current 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	113	113	113	134	107	147	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	727	
Attendance below 90 percent	51	47	40	60	37	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	276	
One or more suspensions	10	5	13	22	15	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	98	
Course failure in ELA	22	37	37	26	14	55	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	191	
Course failure in Math	19	41	35	7	30	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	146	
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	66	35	74	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	175	
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	57	27	71	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	155	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	3	0	1	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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	21	36	37	25	27	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	183	

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	39	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
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

Thursday 8/4/2022

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	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	

**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	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	39	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40
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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	32%	47%	56%				43%	47%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	49%	56%	61%				51%	56%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	48%	51%	52%				46%	52%	53%
Math Achievement	41%	54%	60%				45%	51%	63%
Math Learning Gains	52%	62%	64%				55%	58%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	37%	52%	55%				45%	49%	51%
Science Achievement	25%	42%	51%				39%	47%	53%

**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
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	43%	44%	-1%	58%	-15%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	44%	49%	-5%	58%	-14%
Cohort Comparison		-43%				
05	2022					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	39%	45%	-6%	56%	-17%
Cohort Comparison		-44%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	42%	49%	-7%	62%	-20%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	51%	54%	-3%	64%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		-42%				
05	2022					
	2019	33%	45%	-12%	60%	-27%
Cohort Comparison		-51%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	40%	44%	-4%	53%	-13%
Cohort Comparison						

### Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	23	39	40	30	48	25	19				
ELL	21	45	31	36	67	57	17				
BLK	21	48	61	27	48	43	12				
HSP	27	49	43	40	57	41	19				
MUL	37	38		61	75						
WHT	43	51	40	47	48	20	40				
FRL	27	46	47	34	47	33	18				

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				
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				

### ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	43
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	57
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	341
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	32
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	41
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
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%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	37
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	42
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
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%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	41
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	39
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### 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?

When comparing 2021 to 2022 school year data, the number of students proficient in 3rd and 5th grade FSA Math results decreased. The number of students proficient in 4th grade FSA Math results increased. The number of students proficient in 3rd and 5th grade FSA ELA decreased. The number of students proficient in 4th grade FSA ELA results decreased.

Students proficient in the following in FSA Math assessment are the following:

3rd grade decreased by 7% from 2021 (43%) to 2022 (36%)

4th grade increased by 32% from 2021 (31%) to 2022 (63%)

5th grade decreased by 6% from 2021 (31%) to 2022 (25%)

Students proficient in FSA ELA assessment are the following:

3rd grade decreased by 11% from 2021 (41%) to 2022 (30%)

4th grade increased by 17% from 2021 (27%) to 2022 (44%)

5th grade decreased by 14% from 2021 (37%) to 2022 (23%)

Students proficient in FSA Math in the African American subgroup for 2022 are the following:

3rd grade (21%)

4th grade (37%)

5th grade (19%)

Students proficient in FSA Math in the Student with Disabilities subgroup for 2022 are the following:

3rd grade (17%)

4th grade (33%)

5th grade (7%)

Students proficient in FSA ELA in the African American subgroup for 2022 are the following:

3rd grade (28%)

4th grade (42%)

5th grade (14%)

Students proficient in FSA ELA in the Student with Disabilities subgroup for 2022 are the following:

3rd grade (13%)

4th grade (43%)

5th grade (14%)



**What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?**

Based on AP3 iReady diagnostic progress monitoring data the greatest need for improvement is ELA. The number of students below grade level in 3rd and 5th grade iReady reading increased from 2021 to 2022. The grade level iReady progress monitoring data reflects the following when comparing the 2021 to 2022 results:

3rd Grade decreased 6% from 2021 (44%) to 2022 (52%)  
4th Grade remained the same from 2021 (74%) to 2022 (44%)  
5th Grade decreased 16% from 2021 (57%) to 2022 (83%)

Based on the school grade components by subgroups the greatest need for improvement are all subject areas for Student with Disabilities subgroup and Black/African American subgroup. The school grade components data reflects the following when comparing 2021 results to 2022 results:

Students with Disabilities subgroup  
ELA Achievement decreased 7% from 2021 (14%) to 2022 (22%)  
Math Achievement decreased 6% from 2021 (20%) to 2022 (23%)

Black/African subgroup  
ELA Achievement decreased 4% from 2021 (32%) to 2022 (26%)  
Math Achievement decreased 4% from 2021 (32%) to 2022 (28%)

**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 providing teachers with a scripted lesson plan to use for instruction.

**What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?**

Based on the 2022 FSA results, Math data showed the most improvement. The number of students proficient in Math increased by 5% from 2021 (36%) to 2022 (41%).

Based on AP3 iReady diagnostic progress monitoring data the most improvement in Math was 4th grade results. The number of students below grade level 4th grade iReady math decreased from 2021 to 2022. The grade level iReady progress monitoring data reflects the following when comparing the 2021 to 2022 results:

4th Grade remained the same from 2021 (51%) to 2022 (45%)

**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 4th grade 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 to continue to build 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 and implementing scripted lessons in classroom setting and identifying 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 is restructuring of collaboration meeting. The restructuring of collaboration meeting is the following:

BEFORE:

- Review upcoming:  
KG - 2nd: UFLI Foundational skill(s)  
3rd - 5th: Benchmark(s)
- Identify the CFU or Standards Check to be used
- Review upcoming lesson plans:  
KG - 2nd: UFLI Foundational lesson plans  
3rd - 5th: District scripted lesson plans
- Read/preview all text/material/lesson and “mark-up” your TE/teacher resources.
- Review potential tasks and activities from the District Adopted Core Curriculum Materials (My View, Saavas Math, Stemscores, Studies Weekly)

DURING:

- Review one agreed upon CFU or formative assessment data from the week before
- Based on data, how will this standard be retaught
- Discuss the tasks/activities within the scripted lesson plan - how will instruction unfold?
- Discuss pacing? How long does it take to complete the tasks/activities
- What do teachers do or say; What do students do or say

### Areas of Focus

Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Collaborative Planning**

**Area of Focus**  
**Description and**  
**Rationale:**  
**Include a rationale that**  
**explains how it was**  
**identified as a critical**  
**need from the data**  
**reviewed.**

During a debriefing of school data, the team identified a need to improve instructional practice through Tier I instruction. The data reflected the following:

The number of students proficient in the following in FSA Math assessment are the following:

3rd grade decreased by 7% from 2021 (43%) to 2022 (36%)

4th grade increased by 32% from 2021 (31%) to 2022 (63%)

5th grade decreased by 6% from 2021 (31%) to 2022 (25%)

The number of students proficient in FSA ELA assessment are the following:

3rd grade decreased by 11% from 2021 (41%) to 2022 (30%)

4th grade increased by 17% from 2021 (27%) to 2022 (44%)

5th grade decreased by 14% from 2021 (37%) to 2022 (23%)

The number of students proficient in FSA Math in the African American subgroup for 2022 are the following:

3rd grade (21%)

4th grade (37%)

5th grade (19%)

The number of students proficient in FSA Math in the Student with Disabilities subgroup for 2022 are the following:

3rd grade (17%)

4th grade (33%)

5th grade (7%)

The number of students proficient in FSA ELA in the African American subgroup for 2022 are the following:

3rd grade (28%)

4th grade (42%)

5th grade (14%)

The number of students proficient in FSA ELA in the Student with Disabilities subgroup for 2022 are the following:

3rd grade (13%)

4th grade (43%)

5th grade (14%)

During collaboration all assignments and tasks were not discussed fully reached resulted in some teachers using materials not properly aligning to the standards and teaching practice. This ultimately affected student academic engagement and performance across all subject areas.

**Measurable Outcome:**  
**State the specific**  
**measurable outcome the**  
**school plans to achieve.**  
**This should be a data**  
**based, objective**  
**outcome.**

If teachers were provided with supported collaboration opportunities focusing on scripted standards based lesson plans in ELA and Math (emphasis on what teachers and students do and say during the lesson) then the following will improve on the state assessments:

ELA student proficiency from 32% to 42%

Math student proficiency from 41% to 51%

Science student proficiency from 25% to 42%

**Monitoring:**

**Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**

To monitor the desired outcome, district assessments 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:**

**Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**

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:**

**Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this 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**

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Provide collaboration opportunities every Wednesdays and Fridays of the week for teachers to focus on the following:

- Review one agreed upon CFU or formative assessment data from the week before
- Based on data, how will this standard be retaught
- Discuss the tasks/activities within the scripted lesson plan - how will instruction unfold?
- Discuss pacing? How long does it take to complete the tasks/activities
- What do teachers do or say; What do students do or say

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

**Person Responsible**

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

**RAISE**

The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale**

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

**Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA**

The 2022 i-Ready AP3 Diagnostic data show the following percent of students below grade level:

Kindergarten - 38%

1st grade - 54%

2nd grade - 63%

**Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA**

Our 2021 ELA FSA data show the following percent of grades 3-5 students scored below a level 3:

3rd grade - 70%

4th grade - 66%

5th grade - 77%

**Measurable Outcomes:**

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

**Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)**

On the 2023 district progress monitoring tool the following grade levels will be on or above grade level:

Kindergarten - 67%

1st grade - 50%

2nd grade - 50%

### **Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)**

The 2022 ELA FSA data will show the following percent of grades 3-5 students scoring level 3 or higher:

3rd grade - 40%

4th grade - 54%

5th grade - 40%

#### **Monitoring:**

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

K-5: Progress Monitoring throughout the year

3-5: District quarterly assessments

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:**

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Murphy, Shameka , shameka.murphy@marion.k12.fl.us

#### **Evidence-based Practices/Programs:**

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. Â§7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

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 Practices/Programs:**

Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

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:

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
Professional learning will be provided to teachers in the area of scaffolding. During collaboration meetings which will be held on Wednesdays and Fridays, the school literacy coach will model and discuss how direct explicit whole group instruction look and sounds like using scripted lesson plans.	Epps, Tonya, tonya.epps@marion.k12.fl.us
The Literacy Leadership team will evaluate and implement literacy school wide. The Literacy Leadership team will meet monthly to discuss upcoming quarterly literacy themes/events along with evaluating the impact of the events.	Curty, Marie-Elena, marie-elena.curty@marion.k12.fl.us

## 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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

### 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 school culture and environment.

Legacy Elementary School values and encourages all stakeholders including students, parents, teachers, business partner, 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.