

Brevard Public Schools

Legacy Academy Charter



2019-20 School Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	8
Planning for Improvement	13
Title I Requirements	20
Budget to Support Goals	21

Legacy Academy Charter

1923 KNOX MCRAE DR, Titusville, FL 32780

<http://www.legacyacademytitusville.com>

Demographics

Principal: Charlene Montford

Start Date for this Principal: 7/31/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-6
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	39%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grade	2018-19: D
School Grades History	2017-18: C 2016-17: 2015-16: 2014-15: 2013-14:
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Dustin Sims
Turnaround Option/Cycle	
Year	
Support Tier	NOT IN DA
ESSA Status	CS&I

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement

The mission of Legacy Academy Charter is to prepare students to become confident, competent, responsible and successful individuals in our global and technology-based society by providing a rigorous academic program, school-family-community partnerships, and strong teacher-student relationships. Using an interdisciplinary science, technology, engineering, art and math (STEAM) curriculum aligned with Florida State Standards, the purpose of the School is to improve student learning, increase learning opportunities for students and to encourage the use of innovative teaching methods. Students attending the School will develop critical thinking and problem-solving skills that will equip them to learn and to contribute to the 21st century economy.

Provide the school's vision statement

The vision of Legacy Academy Charter is to be a leader in STEAM education locally, in Florida and nationally, by developing a community of students with a desire to learn. Our students will be well educated, socially aware, scientifically literate and respectful. These attributes will help our students be successful in middle and high school, college, in their careers, and in their communities.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Montford, Charlene	Principal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Administers the development, coordination, maintenance, and evaluation of the education programs - Supervises methods of teaching, supervision, and administration - Monitors programs and activities for improvement and assesses effectiveness, weaknesses, and progress - Keeps the Governing Board informed - Assumes responsibility for financial planning - Establishes and maintains efficient procedures and effective controls - Maintains adequate records for the school - Assumes responsibility for the use of buildings and grounds - Oversees the processing and submission of required reports
Budds, Selana	Administrative Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Administrative support to the Principal, teachers and staff - Answer general questions - Data entry; AS400, attendance, tardies, absences, grades, etc. - Manage sign in/sign out - Assist with fire and safety drills - Creates fliers and correspondence - Maintains school calendar - Manage incoming and outgoing mail
Shotzbarger, Melanie	Teacher, K-12	Lead Teacher Mentor Teacher

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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	51	37	39	35	23	24	39	0	0	0	0	0	0	248
Attendance below 90 percent	3	7	5	5	4	3	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
One or more suspensions	0	0	3	4	3	7	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on ELA FSA	0	0	0	3	3	11	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
Level 1 on MATH FSA	0	0	0	3	7	10	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	44

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	2	4	4	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	20

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	4	5	0	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)

16

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 9/18/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Attendance below 90 percent		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in ELA or Math		
Level 1 on statewide assessment		

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

Prior Year - 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	
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide assessment	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

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	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	43%	62%	57%	59%	60%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	31%	60%	58%	65%	54%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	33%	57%	53%	0%	46%	48%
Math Achievement	27%	63%	63%	32%	62%	62%
Math Learning Gains	40%	65%	62%	40%	59%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	50%	53%	51%	0%	49%	47%
Science Achievement	13%	57%	53%	45%	57%	55%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey								
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)							Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	
Number of students enrolled	51 (0)	37 (0)	39 (0)	35 (0)	23 (0)	24 (0)	39 (0)	248 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	3 ()	7 ()	5 ()	5 ()	4 ()	3 ()	9 ()	36 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 ()	0 (0)	3 (0)	4 (0)	3 (0)	7 (0)	4 (0)	21 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	2 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Level 1 on ELA FSA	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	3 (0)	3 (0)	11 (0)	18 (0)	35 (0)
Level 1 on MATH FSA	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	3 (0)	7 (0)	10 (0)	24 (0)	44 (0)

Grade Level Data

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

NOTE: 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
03	2019	55%	64%	-9%	58%	-3%
	2018	62%	63%	-1%	57%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	36%	61%	-25%	58%	-22%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	56%	57%	-1%	56%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		-20%				
Cohort Comparison		-26%				
05	2019	35%	60%	-25%	56%	-21%
	2018	56%	54%	2%	55%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		-21%				
Cohort Comparison		-21%				
06	2019	44%	60%	-16%	54%	-10%
	2018	0%	63%	-63%	52%	-52%
Same Grade Comparison		44%				
Cohort Comparison		-12%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	25%	61%	-36%	62%	-37%
	2018	59%	62%	-3%	62%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		-34%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	14%	64%	-50%	64%	-50%
	2018	31%	59%	-28%	62%	-31%
Same Grade Comparison		-17%				
Cohort Comparison		-45%				
05	2019	19%	60%	-41%	60%	-41%
	2018	33%	58%	-25%	61%	-28%
Same Grade Comparison		-14%				
Cohort Comparison		-12%				
06	2019	61%	67%	-6%	55%	6%
	2018	0%	68%	-68%	52%	-52%
Same Grade Comparison		61%				
Cohort Comparison		28%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	21%	56%	-35%	53%	-32%
	2018	44%	57%	-13%	55%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		-23%				
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	21	18		16	36						
BLK	31	24		11	40		9				
WHT	49	36		34	37		20				
FRL	49	35		30	32		18				

2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
BLK	30			20							
WHT	61	67		35	50						

ESSA Data

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)	CS&I
OVERALL Federal Index - All Students	34
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	237
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	23
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1

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

Asian Students

Federal Index - Asian Students	
--------------------------------	--

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	23
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	2
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
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
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	35
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	33
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

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

Fourth grade mathematics achievement, fifth grade science achievement, and the learning gains in ELA showed the lowest performances at Legacy. Only 14% of our fourth graders passed the mathematics assessment. This represented a decrease of more than 17 percentage points when compared against 2018 FSA mathematics scores when 31% of students passed the assessment.

Science scores reflected decreases also. Only 21% of our fifth graders passed the assessment, a decrease of 23 percentage points when compared against our 2018 scores. School grade component data notes that science achievement was at 13%, a decrease of 32 percentage points when compared with 2018 scores.

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

We experienced a -34 percent difference in the 2019 third grade scores in mathematics when compared against 2018 scores. In 2019, 25% of students passed the assessment; however, 59% of third graders passed the assessment in 2018, thus the -34 percent gap.

Factors that may have contributed to this decline include the following:

- Teachers not fully understanding the standards or teaching to the standards
- Teachers not using assessments that assessed students' mastery of skills'
- Teachers not using assessments to gauge student understanding and learning
- Administration not adequately monitoring instruction or teacher effectiveness

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

The greatest gap when compared to the state's average was in fourth grade mathematics. Fourteen (14%) percent of fourth graders were successful on the mathematics FSA, whereas the state's average was 64%, thus a -50 difference.

Most of our largest gaps, when compared to the state, were mostly in mathematics:

- In fifth grade, 19% of our students were successful, compared to a state average of 60%, thus a -41 difference.
- In third grade mathematics, 25% of our students were successful, compared to a state average of 62%, thus a -37 percent difference.
- The lack of achievement in science is prominent, with the pass rate at 13%, compared to a state average of 53%, thus a -40 percent difference.

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

Math L25% Learning Gains at 50% (last year no data in this cell)

Last summer all Legacy teachers received professional development training in Project

MIND - Math is Not Difficult, over a two day training during Pre-Planning. Teachers used the math strategies learned in this training to provide math enhancements to their students.

Project MIND is a research-based, PreK-12 mathematics enhancement program designed to improve student achievement through creative learning strategies that promote cognitive thinking and reasoning. Gains in standardized test scores are consistently high for students participating in Project MIND.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

Areas of concern include the following:

- Attendance below 90%. More than 14% (36 students) had attendance below 90%. Of this total, more than half (20 students) were in the lower grades, with 7 being in first grade. Nine (9) students were in sixth grade, a grade with low student achievement successes across the board on the state's assessment.

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

1. ELA, math and science instruction
2. Improving the achievement of African American students
3. Reduce the number of students with two or more EWS indicators
4. L25% in ELA and math

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Standards Aligned Instruction in ELA, Math and Science.
Rationale	<p>In general, the vast majority of our 2019 FSA data in ELA, mathematics, and science show decreases in performances when compared to performances in 2018. FSA performances in ELA, probably the subject with the best scores, noted 43% of students were successful, but that was also a decrease of 16 percentage points when compared to 2018 FSA scores. Also, only 14% of our fourth graders passed the mathematics assessment, a decrease of more than 17% in 2018 FSA scores when 31% of students passed the assessment. This was also our greatest gap, by -50%, when compared to district and state averages.</p> <p>Science scores also reflected decreases. Only 21% of our fifth graders passed the assessment, a decrease of 23 percentage points when compared against our 2018 scores. School grade component notes that science achievement was at 13%, a decrease of 32 points from the previous year's score.</p>
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	<p>ELA proficiency will increase from 43% to 60%. ELA Learning Gains will increase from 31% to 60% and ELA Lowest 25% will increase from 33% to 50%.</p> <p>Science Achievement will increase from 13% to 40%, an increase of 27%.</p>
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Charlene Montford (cmontford@legacyac.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	<p>School-wide writing across the content areas and text-based writing with complex text in ELA courses</p> <p>PLC's with a concentration on language arts</p> <p>Job embedded coaching</p> <p>Writing in the content areas</p> <p>Model of Inquiry and Differentiation</p> <p>Hands on science activities in Project Lead the Way and the JASON Project</p>
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	<p>Misalignment of the level of the state standard and task complexity. When task alignment occurs, with text-based writing incorporated into task, learning gains will increase.</p> <p>When students participate in hands-on activities such as Project Lead the Way (PLTW) and the JASON Project actually doing science and writing about science, science proficiency scores will increase.</p>
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Conduct Academic Review in core subjects, grades K-6, in order to determine the strengths and weaknesses of our instructional program. - (Fall 2019). 2. Review and analyze 2019 FSA data with PLC's and grade level teams in order to understand our proficiencies by standard and by skill mastery. (Fall 2019). 3. Provide professional development based on the analysis of 2019 FSA data, on teachers' needs for further knowledge and skills, and on students'

learning. - (Throughout the 2019-2020 school year).

4. Provide professional development in Math is Not Difficult (Project MIND) for the staff. - (Fall 2019).

5. Provide professional development that assists teachers in developing and using teacher-made assessments that gauge students' mastery of skills inherent in the standards, in how to use the FDOE practice test items in both ELA and math, writing prompts to drive instruction in writing and to assist their classroom performances in reading, particularly in phonics. - (Throughout the 2019-2020 school year).

6. Provide training for teachers in the procedures and uses of PLC's. - (Fall 2019).

7. Continue to implement professional learning communities (PLC's) for grade level teams, but require that PLC's:

- Focus discussions about student achievement, school culture, classroom instruction and/or specific barriers related to student learning.
- Be more intentional in monitoring students' progress, MTSS plans, and other support strategies.

- Emphasize the importance of lesson planning, with an acute focus on developing instructional routines, assessing students' learning, unpacking and teaching the state's standards, and developing assessments that reflect the standards.

- Provide meeting notes to the Principal after each meeting.

- Develop, implement, and/or adjust MTSS plans, as needed, for targeted students.

(Throughout the school year)

8. Amend daily schedule for intervention and enrichment periods at least two times per week for students whose FSA performances were Level I and/or Level II in FSA math. Targeted students will also attend before and after school tutoring. Teachers will determine if the intervention requires Tier II or Tier III, based on students' needs. (Daily)

**Person
Responsible**

Charlene Montford (cmontford@legacyac.org)

#2	
Title	Improving Performances and Achievement of African American Students
Rationale	<p>Over the past two years, there has been a significant gap in the achievement of African American and white students in both ELA and math. While the data from 2018 to 2019 show decreases in achievement for all subgroups, the decreases for African American students were the greatest. For example, ELA Learning Gains was 67% in 2018; it decreased to 24% in 2019.</p> <p>Math Achievement was 20% in 2018, but decreased to 11% in 2019. Science Achievement for African American students was only 9% in 2019. The achievement gaps in ELA Achievement is 18 percentage points; in ELA Learning Gains it is 12 points; in math achievement its 23 points; and is 11 points in science achievement.</p>
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	<p>ELA Learning Gains for African American students will increase from 24% to 40%.</p> <p>ELA achievement for African American students will increase from 31% to 45%.</p> <p>Math Achievement for African American students will increase from 11% to 30%.</p> <p>Math Learning Gains for African American students will increase from 40% to 50%.</p> <p>Science Achievement for African American students will increase from 9% to 25%.</p>
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Charlene Montford (cmontford@legacyac.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Conduct grade level team meetings and provide minutes from the PLC's - Grade level teams will monitor the success of the interventions and support - Principal and grade level teams will monitor students' progress, i.e, class assessments, report cards, the presence or absence of EWS indicators - Notes and minutes from quarterly parent-student conferences for targeted students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	To keep the data in front of the students at all times.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provide Training for teachers in cultural responsive teaching. Emphasize its importance as part of teachers' lesson planning. 2. Emphasize the importance of lesson planning, with renewed focus on developing instructional routines, assessing students' learning and understanding, unpacking and teaching the state's standards, and creating and using assessments that reflect the standards.

3. Develop small group instruction for identified students during daily intervention and enrichment periods.

**Person
Responsible**

Charlene Montford (cmontford@legacyac.org)

#3	
Title	Providing Support and Reducing the Number of Students with EWS Indicators
Rationale	Two sets of EWS data that are troubling are those in attendance and the number of students whose 2019 FSA performances were at Level I. Fourteen percent (36 students) had attendance below 90%. Additionally, 79 students had FSA performances at Level I, of those 35 were in ELA and 44 were in mathematics.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	We will reduce the number of students in each data set by 50%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Charlene Montford (cmontford@legacyac.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Walk throughs by Principal. Minutes from PLC's and grade level team meetings Grade level teams monitoring the success of the intervention and support Principal and grade level team monitoring students' progress, i.e., class assessments, report cards, the presence or absence of EWS indicators Principal attending PLC's and grade level meetings specifically to monitor progress of students
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	To keep the data in front of the students at all times
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Contact the parents of every student who has at least two EWS indicators. (Throughout the school year) 2. Be proactive in having our teacher teams, counselor, and social worker contact and meet with parents and students when they suspect that a student is struggling in academics and/or behavior. (Throughout the school year) 3. Require that PLC's and teacher teams discuss and review the instructional and achievement data and the indicators on a regular basis, particularly during scheduled data analysis meetings. (Throughout the school year) 4. Hold conferences with both parents and students in order to discern and try to resolve the underlying reasons for the truant behavior. (Throughout the school year) 5. Implement MTSS plan that will address both learning and behavioral challenges that the student displays. (Throughout the school year)
Person Responsible	Charlene Montford (cmontford@legacyac.org)

#4	
Title	Improving Instruction and Achievement for the L25% in ELA and Mathematics
Rationale	The scores for students in the lowest 25% were at 33% in ELA in 2019, a 24 percentage point less than the district scores and 20 percentage points less than the state scores. In Math the scores were at 50%, 3 percentage points less than the district scores and only 1% point less than the state scores. We are prioritizing this areas so that we more than meet all of the needs of our students.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	ELA Learning Gains for the lowest 25% will increase from 33% to 50%. Math Learning Gains for the lowest 25% will increase from 50% to 65%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Charlene Montford (cmontford@legacyac.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Walk throughs by Principal Minutes from PLC's and grade level team meetings Grade level teams monitoring the success of the intervention and support Principal and grade level teams monitoring students' progress, i.e., formative assessments, report cards, engagement in classes, the presence or absence of EWS indicators. Principal attending PLC's and grade level meetings specifically to monitor progress of students
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	To collect and keep the data for students
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Teachers, grade level teams, and/or PLC's will implement MTSS plan that will address both learning and behavioral challenges that the student displays. (Throughout the school year) 2. Teachers will include targeted students in appropriate Tier II or Tier III instruction during classroom instruction and/or during the intervention period. (Throughout the school year) 3. Teacher teams, counselor, and social worker will be proactive in contacting and meeting with parents and students when they suspect that a student is struggling in academics and/or in behavior. Use report cards, discipline concerns, teachers' concerns, or classroom assessment as a tool to identify struggling students. (Throughout the school year) 4. Require that PLC's and teacher teams discuss and review the instructional and achievement data and the EWS indicators on a regular basis. Make sure that teams then adjust their instruction and needed support for students. (Throughout the school year) 5. Grade level teams and/or PLC's will hold conferences with both parents and students in order to discern and try to resolve the underlying reasons for the truant behavior. (Throughout the school year)

Person Responsible Charlene Montford (cmontford@legacyac.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information)

Part IV: Title I Requirements

Additional Title I Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Pilot SIP to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students

NA

PFEP Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services

NA

Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another

NA

Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact

NA

Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations

NA

Part V: Budget

1	III.A	Areas of Focus: Standards Aligned Instruction in ELA, Math and Science.	\$0.00
2	III.A	Areas of Focus: Improving Performances and Achievement of African American Students	\$0.00
3	III.A	Areas of Focus: Providing Support and Reducing the Number of Students with EWS Indicators	\$0.00
4	III.A	Areas of Focus: Improving Instruction and Achievement for the L25% in ELA and Mathematics	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00