

Volusia County Schools

Legacy Scholars Academy



2022-23 Ungraded Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the Ungraded SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	8
Planning for Improvement	12
R.A.I.S.E	0
Positive Culture & Environment	17

Legacy Scholars Academy

51 CHILDRENS WAY, Enterprise, FL 32725

<http://www.flumc.org/newsdetail/1731144>

Demographics

Principal: Albert Chandler B

Start Date for this Principal: 1/16/2019

2021-22 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Function (per accountability file)	Alternative
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Alternative Education
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	85%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Improvement Rating History	2021-22: Commendable 2020-21: No Rating 2018-19: Maintaining 2017-18: Maintaining 2016-17: Maintaining
DJJ Accountability Rating	2023-24: No Rating

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Volusia County School Board.

SIP Authority

A Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) is a requirement for Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI) ungraded schools pursuant to 1001.42 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) and for DJJ schools

receiving a rating of Unsatisfactory pursuant to Sections 1003.51 and 1003.52, F.S. and Rule 6A-1.099813, F.A.C.

CSI schools can be designated as such in 2 ways:

1. Have a graduation of 67% or lower; or
2. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

DJJ Unsatisfactory Ratings are based on percentages by program type:

- Prevention and Intervention: 0%-50%
- Nonsecure Programs: 0%-59%
- Secure Programs: 0%-53%

SIP Plans for Ungraded CSI schools and DJJ schools receiving an Unsatisfactory rating must be approved by the district and reviewed by the state.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The School Improvement Plan (SIP) provides schools and Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) the opportunity to identify the academic and priority goals along with strategies for each school. School leadership teams may refine their SIP annually to define their school's academic and priority goals to increase student achievement.

Schools and LEAs are strongly encouraged to collaborate in the development and implementation of this plan.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Legacy Scholars Academy is committed to ensuring that all students have a comprehensive support system that will ultimately foster emotional and academic success.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The Legacy Scholars Academy Family envisions a climate of nurturing and trust where all students will have the opportunity for a high-quality, 21st-century education and graduate prepared for college, career and life.

Briefly discuss the population unique to your school and the specific supports provided to meet the mission and vision.

Our students are residents of the Florida United Methodist Children's Home and in the state foster care system. Our students have significant social and emotional issues and most are below grade level academically. Our school partners with the children's home to support our students academically, socially and emotionally.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Chandler, Al	Principal	Administrator for school
Stilwell, Melissa	Teacher, Adult	Elective Teacher
George, Tracy	Paraprofessional	Para 4, support students and teachers
McAdams, Claire	Administrative Support	OS 3, clerical support

Is education provided through contract for educational services?

No

If yes, name of the contracted education provider.

N/A

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 1/16/2019, Albert Chandler B

Total number of students enrolled at the school.

34

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school.

8

Number of teachers with professional teaching certificates?

7

Number of teachers with temporary teaching certificates?

0

Number of teachers with ESE certification?

4

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

1

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

1

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2022-23

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	6	8	7	3	6	0	36	
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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	3	
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	2	5	2	2	0	19	
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	3	0	2	0	1	0	11	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	1	0	0	0	5

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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 8/3/2022

2021-22 - Updated**The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:**

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	6	8	7	3	6	0	36
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	2	5	2	2	0	19
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	2	2	3	1	2	0	15
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	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	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	3	0	3	0	10

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement		49%	55%					54%	61%
ELA Learning Gains								53%	59%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile								44%	54%
Math Achievement		32%	42%					55%	62%
Math Learning Gains								52%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile								45%	52%
Science Achievement		45%	54%					61%	56%
Social Studies Achievement		52%	59%					72%	78%

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					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2022					
	2019	0%	50%	-50%	54%	-54%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2022					
	2019	0%	47%	-47%	52%	-52%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019	0%	50%	-50%	56%	-56%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

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					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2022					
	2019	0%	48%	-48%	55%	-55%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2022					
	2019	0%	47%	-47%	54%	-54%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019	0%	29%	-29%	46%	-46%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019	0%	57%	-57%	48%	-48%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	50%	72%	-22%	67%	-17%
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	0%	68%	-68%	71%	-71%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	0%	63%	-63%	70%	-70%
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	20%	54%	-34%	61%	-41%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	0%	55%	-55%	57%	-57%

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
FRL	7	42		25	60						
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
WHT	17			17							
FRL	15	47		14	14		33				
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
WHT	17			17							
FRL	15	47		14	14		33				

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	33
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	131
Total Components for the Federal Index	4
Percent Tested	86%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	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	
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	34
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.

Reflect on the Areas of Focus from the previous school year. What progress monitoring was in place related to the Areas of Focus?

Two areas of focus from 21/22 were Culture & Environment (relating to SEL) and Instructional Practices related to Math. We assess students when they start at LSA, mid year and end of year in Reading and Math. We monitor referrals and guidance requests for SEL. Fifty-five students were enrolled at LSA last year. Of the 55, 22 were there for a majority of the year (enrolling prior to October and W/D after April). The mobility (46% year to year) of our students and low numbers make it difficult to see trends with our data.

Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

Math proficiency; 8 of the 22 students score level 3 or higher on their math assessment last year. Our ESE support teacher last year was certified in Math creating an opportunity for on campus collaboration. Due to a resignation and FLMA, collaboration in Math was minimal.

What area is in the greatest need of improvement? What specific component of this area is most problematic? What is your basis (data, progress monitoring) for this conclusion?

Our students are in the foster care system and referred to the children's home due to concerns socially, emotionally and/or academically. We work with our students on Social/Emotional Learning to help them feel safe and supported so they can focus more on academics. A majority of students come to us with attendance, behavioral and academic issues. The areas in greatest need of improvement are ELA Proficiency (18%), Math Proficiency(36%) and FRL ELA Proficiency (7%).

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

The small numbers in each subgroup and the mobility (46% year to year) at our school make it difficult to identify trends. A large percentage of the students that enroll each year are below grade level in both ELA (18% proficient) and Math (36% proficient) and typically have fewer credits/course completions than typical peers along with attendance issues.

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

There is a need for Teacher Clarity, B.E.S.T. practices in the classroom and instruction in Social/Emotional Learning

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided to support teachers and leaders.

There are 8 sessions scheduled for professional development opportunities to include: Teacher Clarity, B.E.S.T. practices, Social/Emotional Learning (RULER approach), MTSS and PBIS.

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to B.E.S.T. Standards**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Our Area of Focus is aligned to the District Strategic Plan Goal 1: Engage all students in high levels of learning. As a result of our Needs Assessment and Analysis, it revealed that only 18% of our students in ELA and 36% of our students in Math were proficient.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Increase proficiency in ELA to 25% and Math to 41%. By February 2023, teachers will provide students benchmark-aligned tasks evidenced by walkthrough data.

Monitoring:

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

This Area of Focus will be monitored through classroom observations using a walkthrough tool with specific instructional look fors; classroom, district and state assessment data; and monthly PLCs focused on assessment data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Melissa Stilwell
(mstilwel@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Multi-tiered System of Supports will be implemented to ensure tiered support is provided.

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

ELA and Math will utilize resources from the district's curriculum map and pacing guide to differentiate instruction and provide Tier 1 foundational instructional practices aligned to the English Language Arts and Math B.E.S.T standards.

Reading will utilize Achieve 3000/ REWARDS which provides differentiated instructional content that targets individual students' area of need.

MTSS is grounded in careful analysis of data collected through Progress Monitoring and Data-Based Decision Making. The power of a tiered system of supports rests in the fact that it is based on prevention. MTSS is not a "wait to fail" model for students who are in need of additional supports. The

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

potential benefits of a Multi-Tiered System of Supports were outlined in John Hattie's work and can yield an effect size of 1.29, when implemented with fidelity.

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.

Implementation of PL of MTSS strategies following the District ERPLs.

- Decision Rules guidance and ICEL Strategy; Tier 1 – 100% of students should receive Tier 1 and at least 80% of students should be meeting proficiency to indicate good quality core instruction. Tier 2 – 15% of students receive targeted level of prevention; Tier 3 – 3-5% of students receive intensive level of prevention; All students receive these supports in a stacked manner, including Students with Disabilities

Monthly PLC to determine progress of lowest quartile, including ESSA subgroup, making progress towards 70% proficiency on Unit/Chapter Assessments in ELA and Math.

- Bi-weekly checkpoints of targeted students - make adjustments to the intervention, as needed, through data analysis, while considering ICEL.
- Monitoring fidelity of Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions of LQ students through walkthroughs.
- Students that continue to need further supports/intervention would be identified in order to move them to Tier 3.

Person Responsible

Al Chandler
(abchandler@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Monitoring ESSA Impact:

If this Area of Focus is not related to one or more ESSA subgroups, please describe the process for progress monitoring the impact of the Area of Focus as it relates to all ESSA subgroups not meeting the 41% threshold according to the Federal Index.

Our ESSA subgroup is included in this area, we are at 78% FRL so they are included in this area.

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Economically Disadvantaged**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

This Area of Focus aligns to Strategic Plan Goal 1: Engage all students in high levels of learning EVERY day. As a result of the Needs Assessment and Analysis it revealed that students in the subgroup are under the federal index. ELA and Math proficiency continues to be under 41% for this subgroup.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Increase ELA proficiency 17% and Math proficiency to 39%.

Monitoring:

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

This Area of Focus will be monitored through classroom observations using a walkthrough tool with specific instructional looks for, data analyses and chats to determine instructional adjustments needed to impact student growth.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Melissa Stilwell (mstilwel@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

The evidence based strategy being implemented for this area is Teacher Clarity. Fendick (1990) defines teacher clarity as “a measure of the clarity of communication between teachers and students in both directions. Teacher clarity relates to organization, explanation, examples and guided practice, and assessment of student learning. It can involve clearly communicating the intentions of the lessons and the success criteria. Clear learning intentions describe the skills, knowledge, attitudes, and values that the student needs to learn.

Teacher Clarity has an effect size of 0.75 (Hattie, 2009). Hattie describes Teacher Clarity and excellent teachers as those who:

- have appropriately high expectations
- share their notions of success criteria with their students
- ensure that there is constructive alignment between the lesson, the task, and the assignment
- ensure that the delivery of the lesson is relevant, accurate, and comprehensible to students
- provide welcome feedback about where to move to next

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

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.

Review data with staff that was used to determine the need to for PL in Teacher Clarity

Responsible person: Al Chandler (abchandler@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Provide ongoing professional learning in Teacher Clarity during ERPLs and Teacher duty day.

Responsible person: Al Chandler (abchandler@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Collaborative Planning that includes planning for alignment between the standard/benchmark, the lesson, and the tasks.

Responsible person: Al Chandler (abchandler@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Focused PLCs to identify learning targets/intentions, discuss ideas for instruction, review student work and identify students who need additional instruction or intervention to be successful.

Responsible person: Al Chandler (abchandler@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Person Responsible

Al Chandler (abchandler@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Monitoring ESSA Impact:

If this Area of Focus is not related to one or more ESSA subgroups, please describe the process for progress monitoring the impact of the Area of Focus as it relates to all ESSA subgroups not meeting the 41% threshold according to the Federal Index.

Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment is critical in supporting sustainable schoolwide improvement initiatives. When schools implement a shared focus on improving school culture and environment, students are more likely to engage academically. A positive school culture and environment can also increase staff satisfaction and retention.

Select a targeted element from the menu to develop a system or process to be implemented for schoolwide improvement related to positive culture and environment.

Parent Engagement

Describe how data will be collected and analyzed to guide decision making related to the selected target.

Survey on school climate.

Describe how the target area, related data and resulting action steps will be communicated to stakeholders.

News letter and email.

Describe how implementation will be progress monitored.

Pre and Post event surveys will be utilized to monitor.

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.

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
Family Math, Science or STEM night to promote parent engagement	Stilwell, Melissa, mstilwel@volusia.k12.fl.us