Legacy Middle School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Legacy Middle

11398 LAKE UNDERHILL RD, Orlando, FL 32825

https://legacyms.ocps.net/s.net/

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), https://www.floridacims.org, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

With the support of families and the community, we create enriching and diverse pathways that lead our students to success

Provide the school's vision statement.

To ensure every student has a promising and successful future

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team
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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Jimenez, Jason	Principal	Our leadership team consists of administrators and resource personnel. The administrative team includes our principal and our two assistant principals. The resource personnel include our Media Specialist, our SAFE Coordinator, an Intervention Specialist, our lead counselor and our Placement Specialist. The administrative team members are responsible for the overall organization and management of our school and its programs as well as the evaluation of our personnel and programs. The resource team members provide support to the instructional staff through coaching and professional development. The entire team meets once a week at a minimum before school to monitor and discuss student achievement and teacher observation data. The data is used to evaluate our programs and make changes as needed. Each member of the leadership team is assigned a department / Professional Learning Community (PLC) group. The resource team also meets weekly with the principal to discuss curriculum and teacher support. Once a week the leadership team members meet with their PLC groups to provide support. During these weekly meetings they monitor student achievement on the Florida standards especially the mastery of standards by our ESE, ELL and lowest 25% students. In addition, the leadership team meets with PLC lead teachers once a month and meets with the entire faculty once a month. During these meetings curriculum mapping takes place as well as collaboration on common assessments, data analysis and intervention strategies. Information from these PLC meetings is also discussed at the weekly leadership team meetings and used to make decisions about our instructional programs
Torres, Jessica	Assistant Principal	
Knight, Jay	Dean	
Milliman, Sheri	Dean	
Thomas, Carla	Assistant Principal	Supports with school operations, student discipline, facilities, field trips and oversees our Science department.

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development
Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

Legacy Middle School provides all stakeholders with the opportunity to provide and offer feedback through surveys, conversations, and action plans. Through our monthly SAC meetings during the year, it

was suggested that SAC have more input and involvement with the creation of the SY24 School Improvement Plan (SIP). SY24 SAC Chair, Mr. Balthazar, provided feedback on stakeholder involvement and SIP development.

SIP Monitoring
Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The SIP is regularly monitored at our monthly SAC meetings. School administration reviews quarterly assessment results and compares said results with previous scores. Assessment results are broken down by subgroups. Currently, Legacy Middle School is working to improve our most fragile subgroup, Students with Disabilities (SWD). The SIP will be adjusted, as necessary, to reflect the needs of students. The SIP will be revised by SAC feedback and counsel.

Demographic Data	
Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024	
2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	82%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	99%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	TSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL)* Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK)* Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: B
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	51	62	74	187
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	23	28	64
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	2	31
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	6	11
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	67	83	86	236
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	77	69	69	215
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	65	79	78	222

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	58	78	61	197
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	5	12
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5	6	20
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	5	9
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	46	57	80	183
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	55	62	73	190
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	43	67	76	186

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)
Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	58	78	61	197
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	5	12
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5	6	20
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	5	9
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	46	57	80	183
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	55	62	73	190
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	43	67	76	186

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	40	48	49	46	49	50	47		
ELA Learning Gains				48			43		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				38			29		
Math Achievement*	46	57	56	47	36	36	39		
Math Learning Gains				52			24		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				49			27		
Science Achievement*	44	53	49	48	55	53	42		
Social Studies Achievement*	57	64	68	64	61	58	56		
Middle School Acceleration	72	77	73	48	52	49	60		
Graduation Rate					51	49			
College and Career Acceleration					69	70			
ELP Progress	42	43	40	48	79	76	39		

In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings.

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	50
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	301
Total Components for the Federal Index	6

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	49
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	488
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	18	Yes	4	4
ELL	29	Yes	2	1
AMI				
ASN	82			
BLK	41			
HSP	46			
MUL	50			
PAC				
WHT	64			
FRL	45			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	26	Yes	3	3
ELL	38	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN	74			
BLK	39	Yes	1	
HSP	46			
MUL	52			
PAC				
WHT	59			
FRL	46			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	40			46			44	57	72			42
SWD	10			19			17	27			4	
ELL	20			33			21	31			5	42
AMI												
ASN	69			82			76	83	100		5	
BLK	37			37			31	59			4	
HSP	34			40			38	51	65		6	45
MUL	50			50							2	
PAC												
WHT	53			59			62	69	79		5	
FRL	35			39			36	51	69		6	38

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	46	48	38	47	52	49	48	64	48			48
SWD	9	29	29	13	40	41	17	30				
ELL	30	40	36	29	43	45	39	38	35			48
AMI												
ASN	74	56		81	73		86	78	72			
BLK	37	39	32	32	44	48	28	54				
HSP	40	47	40	43	50	47	41	61	45			41
MUL	64	64		45	36							
PAC												
WHT	57	52		61	56	58	69	74	43			
FRL	41	45	37	41	50	49	36	58	46			57

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	47	43	29	39	24	27	42	56	60			39
SWD	7	19	16	10	24	25	7	24				
ELL	23	39	36	20	24	25	6	40	33			39
AMI												
ASN	75	66		75	30		71	95	88			
BLK	40	37	29	26	29	42	37	58	32			
HSP	38	39	27	32	20	22	32	44	54			39
MUL	53	60		60	40							
PAC												
WHT	66	51	21	54	26		62	77	68			
FRL	34	37	30	29	22	29	28	48	48			39

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)
The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.
The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2023 - Spring	36%	45%	-9%	47%	-11%
08	2023 - Spring	36%	46%	-10%	47%	-11%
06	2023 - Spring	40%	44%	-4%	47%	-7%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	48%	53%	-5%	54%	-6%
07	2023 - Spring	27%	38%	-11%	48%	-21%
08	2023 - Spring	45%	58%	-13%	55%	-10%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	42%	50%	-8%	44%	-2%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	77%	47%	30%	50%	27%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	*	45%	*	48%	*

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	59%	61%	-2%	66%	-7%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection
Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

Non-accelerated Math showed the lowest performance data component with 39% in 2023 compared to 47% in 2022. 50 students in 8th grade math were transitioned to Algebra I one day prior to the start of the school year where ultimately, 78% of all Algebra I students, through the use of Tier I instruction and Tier I interventionist support successfully passed their Algebra I End of Course assessment. Additionally, due to declining enrollment in SY23, Legacy collapsed both intensive reading and intensive math to reflect the realities of student enrollment. As enrollment continues to increase in SY24, we will create new opportunities for students with course offerings

Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline.

At the time of this writing without definitely knowing state FLDOE scores, Science 8 showed the greatest decline from SY22 to SY23. A possible factor for this decline was in finishing quarter 1 content while trying to start quarter 2 content in the wake of Hurricane Nicole. During this time we had a long term substitute while our Science 8 teacher was out on FMLA leave.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

Response will be generated once FLDOE releases scores later this year.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was in Acceleration. Four sections of Algebra, one section of Geometry, and two sections of Digital Information Technology. All students passed their Geometry EOC and 15 students sat for, and passed, the CompTIA industry certification.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

Students with under 90% attendance. 197 out 710 students showed deficits with attendance.

Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for school improvement in the upcoming school year.

Vocabulary instruction in all content areas, focus on SWD instruction and support, multiple opportunities for students

Area of Focus
(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Several years past the global pandemic that had adverse effects on the development of the whole child, we will continue to create positive environments for students to to feel welcome and attend school more frequently so that they enjoy the equity and access of their peers who regularly attend school have as a result of a positive learning environment. To this end, we are promoting positive behavior through a classical conditioning approach through the use of a token economy system that tracks positive student behavior and rewards students for their efforts through rewards and access to extracurricular experiences. Additionally, we want to promote a positive work environment for our staff members and students. As a result, we have created a Cheer committee to support staff with a variety of recognitions and celebrations to boost the esprit de corps of our campus. We also are utilizing a 'token economy' system connected positive student behavior where students can earn and track points towards rewards and activities.

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

Our objective is to improve our Panorama survey data by 7% with relation to positive culture and environment. With recent changes to personnel, we believe that there will be a default setting of improvements simply by this action alone. We want to ensure that our staff and our students are supported. When staff is supported, student outcomes are likely to improve.

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

Staff will be surveyed once a quarter to determine school pulse and mood. Legacy Middle School will participate in the Fall 2023 Stakeholder Feedback surveys/exchanges. The goal is that at the end of the surveys/exchanges we have actionable items to address leading into the official Panorama survey window.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Jason Jimenez (jason.jimenez@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Legacy has sought guidance and support by our district mental health support staff to help create opportunities for staff to learn about healthy self-care and self-regulation of emotions such as self-care day. Legacy has also partnered up with approved partners like Harbour House and DBT of Orlando to provide professional development workshops (optional) to conduct self-management and self-regulation techniques.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

In this current climate, staff and students members are feeling extremely overwhelmed and stressed by the multi-faceted demands of the profession while working to serve and meet the diverse needs of our students.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Collaboration with students services and district mental health department to train our new staff members and provide workshops for our staff.

Person Responsible: Jessica Torres (jessica.torres@ocps.net)

By When: throughout the year

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Legacy Middle School's SWD subgroup has woefully underperformed for 3 consecutive years. In order to meet the needs of our students with disabilities and cultivate a positive and nurturing environment of growth we sought instructional support from our district ESE department. Allison Kanji and Heather Wright began last Spring with the team to help us tailored our professional development during pre-planning based on the EOY feedback and the data. We utilized this information to create the support facilitators schedule, place students in cohorts and had the entire faculty and staff attend the Presuming Competency and Person First Language. In addition, we we had our entire ELA, and Math PLCs and some Social Studies and Science PLCs attend the FDLRS- Frame routine and our new teachers and support faciliatory attend the UDL courses. By including all Legacy staff members in the SIP growth plan fosters a sense of unity and community that all parties are involved in making a difference in the academic, social and emotional growth of our students with disabilities . This in turn, empowers our staff and all students with these effective instructional practices.

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

After a thorough examination of our support for SWD, Legacy partnered with the Florida Inclusion Network to make a case for an additional allocation for support facilitation. As a result of this partnership, OCPS granted Legacy Middle School with an additional allocation, which will be deployed through the use of a cultural exchange teacher to support our SWD population.

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

SWD will be provided with a structured planning and support facilitation schedule to support our SWD. Support facilitators will monitor student IEPs, track accommodation logs, and service students in Learning Strategies classes, as applicable. Support Facilitators will have common planning with general education teachers and align their instructional practices with the professional learning provided to them by district support staff.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jason Jimenez (jason.jimenez@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Utilizing data from FAST ELA , FAST Math and SBUAs to determine the needs of the students and developing stations in classrooms for small group instruction (every WEed. Flight hour), providing early remediation, tutoring opportunities, using multiple forms of communication to keep parents informed about their child's progress and include them in the tailored plan for academic growth.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

SWD subgroup at Legacy has underperformed for 3 consecutive years.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Teachers will have multiple opportunities of professional development to assist them in closing the achievement gap with our students with disabilities

Person Responsible: Jason Jimenez (jason.jimenez@ocps.net)

By When: throughout the year

Our first self-care challenge that will contain stations to model the instructional practices admin expects to see in classroom rotation. There will be station such as journaling, and coloring.

Person Responsible: Angira Draggon (angira.kapadiadraggon@ocps.net)

By When: ith be in October after first marking period.

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

From 2021 to 2022, our English Language Learners improved in their overall proficiency rating from 27% to 37%. While this was a welcomed improvement that this subgroup experienced, it is still underperforming based on current federal guidelines. Our Black student subgroup also improved from 37% to 39% rom 2021 to 2022; however, the overall proficiency rating of this subgroup is underperforming current federal guidelines as well.

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

Our aim is to improve ELL proficiency by 10% from the 2023 school year. We plan to accomplish this increase through district support from our Multilingual Services department, customized professional developments for staff, and instructing students identified with less than two year in the US and supporting their language development through a focused English Language Development (ELD) class that is supported by an ESOL endorsed teacher with paraprofessional support. Additionally, our aim is to improve Black student subgroup proficiency by 10%.

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

Students in the English Language Development class will be instructed using research based practices, and monitored for understanding through local and state assessments. Student data analysis, academic vocabulary supports, classroom walks with Multilingual Services to ensure that strategies are being implemented with fidelity will be the ways that this subgroup is monitored for improvement. For our Black student subgroup, students will be provided with small groups instruction aimed at supporting their resiliency, social and interpersonal skills as aligned with the initiatives of the Office of Access & Opportunity to improve instructional outcomes.

An additional support that will be offered to our Black student subgroup is through the support of our Partner in Education, DBT Orlando. DBT Orlando is an agency that provides a problem-solving skills program. DBT Orlando teaches adolescents effective critical thinking, responsible decision making, and problem-solving skills.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Per Hattie's research, Explicit Vocabulary Instruction has an Effect Size.97SD is the signature component of supporting our ELL students. Through the use of academic vocabulary supports, classroom walks with Multilingual Services to ensure that strategies are being implemented with fidelity, ELL students will be provided with Tier I instruction that places an emphasis on language acquisition. Through appropriate and strategic scheduling, we will implement a similar approach for our Black student subgroup that emphasizes academic vocabulary, Tier I instruction, as well as small group instruction on underperforming standards.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Longitudinal data suggests that reading scores across the state and the nation are flat. To support improving this phenomenon, Legacy MIddle School will align its instructional delivery with research based practices. Hiring and retaining Black teachers is one key to improving educator diversity and enhancing student outcomes. Research has shown that Black students who are taught by Black teachers are more likely to graduate from high school and to enroll in college compared to their peers who are taught by non-Black teachers. In addition, white students show improved problem-solving, critical thinking, and creativity when they have diverse teachers.

Adolescents may face numerous social, developmental, and academic pressures, such as peer rejection, low self-confidence, impulsive behavior, and involvement in drugs and alcohol. DBT Orlando's mission is to support our community and be proactive in helping build skills and effectiveness in all areas of life. Working with OCPS schools is part of fulfilling that mission.
DBT Skills Training for Emotional Problem Solving for Adolescents (DBT STEPS-A) is a program for developing interpersonal and decision-making skills for middle school students. One of the major aims in developing DBT STEPS-A has been to help adolescents develop their own toolboxes of effective behavioral strategies, or what we call "life enhancement" strategies. We use the term "life enhancement" because the timely and appropriate use of these skills can have a significant impact on individual students beyond simply enabling them to solve current problems.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review
Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

Continue to provide support facilitation with proper scaffolds in place. Use data to determine where students are, meet them where they are academically, and through support facilitation/small group instruction bring them to where they need to be.
Utilize these tools by following all accommodations in place per the students IEP/504.