James A. Long Elementary School

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

James A. Long Elementary School

1400 OLD JACKSONVILLE RD, Palatka, FL 32177

www.putnamschools.org/o/jal

Demographics

Principal: Beth Nelson

Start Date for this Principal: 6/1/2017

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	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (51%) 2017-18: C (48%) 2016-17: C (53%) 2015-16: C (52%) 2014-15: C (49%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Putnam County School Board on 11/5/2019.

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

James A. Long Elementary School

1400 OLD JACKSONVILLE RD, Palatka, FL 32177

www.putnamschools.org/o/jal

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2018-19 Title I School**	**2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School KG-6	Yes	100%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	34%

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	C	C	C	C

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Putnam County School Board on 11/5/2019.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at https://www.floridaCIMS.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

At James A. Long Elementary School, students will be inspired to think, to learn, to care and to become successful, responsible citizens.

Provide the school's vision statement.

I am somebody. I was somebody when I got here. I'll be a better somebody when I leave. I am powerful and I am strong. I deserve the education I can get here. I have important things to do, people to impress, and places to go! I will make it a great day . . . or not, the choice is mine.

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
Hedstrom, Mary Beth	Principal	The principal is the primary leader on campus who's responsible for implementation of policies and procedures, establishing school culture/climate, setting high expectations, hire and evaluate staff, administer the budget, ensure implementation of effective instructional instructional practices, monitor student achievement, and encourage parent involvement in a safe and nurturing environment.
Gilyard, Joanne	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal's job responsibilities is to assist the primary leader, the principal, in implementation of policies and procedures, establishing school culture/climate, setting high expectations, hire and evaluate staff, administer the budget, ensure implementation of effective instructional instructional practices, monitor student achievement, and encourage parent involvement in a safe and nurturing environment. The duties include Safety & Security, Instructional observations, and other duties as assigned.
Wright-Purifoy, Jennifer	School Counselor	Our counselor's responsibilities include: provide for small group, individual, and crisis counseling and inform partners (teachers, parents, community agencies) of the referral system; Identify and support students in need of assistance concerning grades, attendance, and personal issues, partnering with parents in planning for their students' needs; interpret data such as standardized tests and special interest tests,etc.; provide screenings for students being considered for special programs; serve as liaison/consultant to partners providing resources as needed; peer mediation/conflict resolution. Job duties include: assist with establishing PTO, Mentoring program, and Club Roar (behavior, attendance, and academics focus group).
Clifton, Sarajo	Instructional Coach	The Instructional Coach's duties and responsibilities include overseeing the LLI intervention program on campus. this entails ensuring the tutors are properly trained in how to execute the LLI process, materials are available, schedules are conducive, data is entered, etc. She also oversee the administration of the kindergarten FLKRS test, and assist with administering first grade CogAT screener. In addition to that, she also ensures students are identified and grouped for reading intervention, using iReady data, state standardized assessment results, and teacher observations/recommendations.

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	96	83	82	64	89	97	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	511
Attendance below 90 percent	17	30	17	9	23	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	122
One or more suspensions	1	3	4	4	10	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	3	30	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	62
	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	2	0	1	18	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30

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	14	8	7	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)
31

Date this data was collected or last updated
Tuesday 9/17/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	23	25	29	18	17	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	133
One or more suspensions	0	2	6	4	3	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	7	23	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	68
	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	2	5	5	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26

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	23	25	29	18	17	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	133
One or more suspensions	0	2	6	4	3	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	7	23	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	68
	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	2	5	5	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26

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	56%	46%	57%	54%	43%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	54%	55%	58%	54%	50%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	41%	54%	53%	41%	50%	52%
Math Achievement	55%	51%	63%	59%	52%	61%
Math Learning Gains	60%	56%	62%	73%	56%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	40%	43%	51%	37%	42%	51%
Science Achievement	51%	41%	53%	55%	37%	51%

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	96 (0)	83 (0)	82 (0)	64 (0)	89 (0)	97 (0)	0 (0)	511 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	17 (23)	30 (25)	17 (29)	9 (18)	23 (17)	26 (21)	0 (0)	122 (133)
One or more suspensions	1 (0)	3 (2)	4 (6)	4 (4)	10 (3)	6 (6)	0 (0)	28 (21)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	2 (2)	0 (0)	3 (2)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	3 (7)	30 (23)	29 (38)	0 (0)	62 (68)
	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (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	56%	41%	15%	58%	-2%
	2018	52%	40%	12%	57%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	50%	43%	7%	58%	-8%
	2018	50%	38%	12%	56%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				
05	2019	52%	42%	10%	56%	-4%
	2018	61%	39%	22%	55%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				
06	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		-61%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2019	53%	46%	7%	62%	-9%
	2018	62%	48%	14%	62%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	62%	53%	9%	64%	-2%
	2018	55%	50%	5%	62%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019	44%	44%	0%	60%	-16%
	2018	63%	48%	15%	61%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		-19%				
Cohort Comparison		-11%				
06	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		-63%				

SCIENCE							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison	
05	2019	49%	38%	11%	53%	-4%	
	2018	64%	42%	22%	55%	9%	
Same Grade Comparison		-15%					
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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	24	33	31	21	48	41	8				
BLK	31	41	33	35	49	38	18				
WHT	63	57	41	63	64	42	64				
FRL	46	46	39	45	55	39	47				
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	31	26	10	34	39	15	47				
BLK	30	45	28	34	35	16	45				
HSP	62	58		69	75						
WHT	65	50	14	71	62	29	72				
FRL	47	43	18	52	48	17	63				
2017 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
SWD	28	24		39	38						
BLK	23	40	32	38	61	33	19				
HSP	54			62							
WHT	68	61	52	69	80	43	78				
FRL	45	49	36	48	63	36	40				

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)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	51
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	357
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	29
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	35
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	

Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	56
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	45
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

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.

Science was the data component that showed the lowest performance. Contributing factors include personnel issues - teacher left in September, teacher left in October and a teacher on maternity leave for the first semester.

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

Science achievement showed the greatest decline from the prior year. Contributing factors include personnel issues - teacher left in September, teacher left in October and a teacher on maternity leave for the first semester.

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 data components that have the greatest gap when compared to the state are ELA learning gains of the bottom quartile(-12) and Math learning gains of the bottom quartile (-11). Contributing to this gap is inadequate foundational skills being provided in early grades. The gap diminished from 2018 to 2019, going up 19 points in ELA and 17 points in Math.

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

ELA Learning Gains of the Bottom Quartile and Math Learning Gains of the Bottom Quartile showed the most improvement. Early identification of these students, along with as assigned mentor for each, contributed to the improvement.

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

A potential area of concern as a result of reflection on the EWS data: 27 students are identified as havihng two or more early warning indicators.

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

1. Providing quality core instruction in all areas.
2. Identifying students who need remediation and providing differentiated instruction to ensure learning gains.
3. Identifying students who need acceleration and providing differentiated instruction to ensure learning gains.
4. Identifying and monitoring students in the lowest performing quartile to ensure learning gains.
5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Quality Core Instruction
Rationale	If there is ongoing focus, understanding and implementation of quality instruction that supports individual student needs, then there will be an increase in student achievement. School Grade points increased from 333/C in 2018 to 357/C in 2019.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Earn at least 378 points for a school grade of B.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Mary Beth Hedstrom (mhedstrom@my.putnamschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Continue to implement the Marzano Focused Teacher Evaluation Model with fidelity to provide the needed feedback and coaching to increase the quality of instruction; including an emphasis on Conditions for Learning that are embedded in the model.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	There is a direct correlation between the quality of instruction and student achievement. iObservation monitoring tool is used to determine teaching efficacy.
Action Step	
Description	1. Continued ongoing professional development on Marzano Focused Teacher Evaluation system, 2. with emphasis on Conditions for Learning, utilizing the LSI trend tracker, 3. and ongoing feedback and coaching as indicated by the data generated.
Person Responsible	Mary Beth Hedstrom (mhedstrom@my.putnamschools.org)

#2	
Title	African-American subgroup
Rationale	Historical school grade data trends reveal African-American subgroup fell below the 41% Federal Index threshold. This subgroup also experienced some of the lowest performance and greatest declines.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	The measurable outcome the school plans to achieve would be for the students to become proficient/on grade level on iReady and FSA assessments, as well as the school earn at least 378 points for a school grade of B.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Mary Beth Hedstrom (mhedstrom@my.putnamschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	The vast majority of our African-American students, 1st-5th grades receives additional tier II and/or tier III intervention up to 5 days/week through the evidence-based Leveled Literacy Intervention (LLI) program purchased by the school, as well as other interventions.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	The evidence-based LLI program states that "a child who even 2 years below grade level and reach grade level in 18 weeks when the program is implemented to fidelity. Historical data from use of the program suggests the highly effectiveness of the program.

Action Step	
Description	1. Continue the LLI pull-out in some classrooms 2. Continue the LLI push-in to other classrooms 3. Continue monitoring student progress so as to move students out as they reach achievement and others in who demonstrate the need. 4. Continue the additional interventions through other interventions in place (such as iReady, Mindplay, Smarty Ants, A-Z Learning, Reflex Math, Accelerated Reader programs) 5. Continue strengthening core instruction and use of high yield strategies such as high expectations, rigorous instruction, aligned resources, high and authentic student engagement, and consistent opportunities for practice on the skills
Person Responsible	Sarajo Clifton (sclifton@my.putnamschools.org)

#3	
Title	Students With Disabilities
Rationale	Historical school grade data trends reveal Students With Disabilities fell below the 41% Federal Index threshold and falling below 32% for 2 years consecutive years. This subgroup also experienced some of the lowest performance and greatest declines.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	The measurable outcome the school plans to achieve would be for the students to become proficient/on grade level on iReady and FSA assessments, as well as the school earn at least 378 points for a school grade of B.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Mary Beth Hedstrom (mhedstrom@my.putnamschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	The our SWD students, 1st-5th grades receives additional tier II and/or tier III intervention up to 5 days/week through the evidence-based Leveled Literacy Intervention (LLI) program purchased by the school, as well as iReady and Mindplay programs adopted by our district.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	The strategies used are evidence-based and historical student/evidence suggests the success of the programs.

Action Step	
Description	1. Continue the small group tier II and tier III LLI interventions 2. Continue the additional interventions through iReady 3. Continue the additional interventions through Mindplay 4. Continue the additional interventions through other interventions in place (such as Smarty Ants, A-Z Learning, Reflex Math, Accelerated Reader programs) 5. Continue strengthening core instruction and use of high yield strategies such as high expectations, rigorous instruction, aligned resources, high and authentic student engagement, and consistent opportunities for practice on the skills
Person Responsible	Joanne Gilyard (jgilyard@my.putnamschools.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).

Safety:We will decrease the number of incidents by putting more safety systems and structures in place to ensure a safe campus.
Engagement: Attendance of faculty & staff, and of students is being monitored and incentives are put in place to encourage greater attendance.
Performance: As a result of our implementation of strategies to strengthen student learning, teaching practices, and leadership practices, we expect to experience a increase in our school grade.

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 Schoolwide Improvement Plan 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.

James A. Long plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other stakeholders through various ongoing activities of our PTO; Open House/Meet The Teacher; Quarterly Data Nights- where students present their academic data, that represents their progress, to their parents; Various PBIS initiatives; Dads Take Your Child To School Day; Career & College Readiness activities- a week long of activities consisting of each student dressing for success, researching careers and creating career boards to make presentation of them on Data Night to parents, and receiving motivating information on graduating high school and entering secondary school. James A. Long also establishes partnerships with local organizations such as Kiwanis Club-Terrific Kid program, Communities in School-Mentoring partnership that coincides with our school's Club Roar group which focuses on positive behavior, good attendance, and improved academics.

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.

The Keys to Kindergarten Success Workshop is provided each year for pre-kindergarten parents. The school sends home the kindergarten first nine week expectations at this time, with all parents, so that they may start instruction at home over the summer. This helps parents understand the intensity of the kindergarten curriculum. We use the end of the year VPK assessment to create balanced classrooms in kindergarten.
We hold open enrollment for kindergarten throughout the summer. We collaborate with the 6th Grade Center to facilitate the transition students from 5th grade to 6th grade. 5th grade students visit the 6th Grade Center at the end of the year to learn expectations and to become familiar with the school. This helps to decrease the anxiety of the transition from elementary school.

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

The James A. Long SBLT consists of the Guidance Counselor, CRT, Principal or AP. All teachers have been trained in the MTSS and the processes are reviewed periodically. Appropriate forms and data are collected at the classroom level and brought to the attention of the MTSS team when support is needed.

In accordance with ESSA Section 118 (b} (2}, the methodology used to allocate State and local funds to each school receiving assistance under this part (Title I, Part A) ensures that the school receives all the State and local funds it would otherwise receive if it were not receiving Federal funds. The District has a methodology for support not supplant when allocating State and local funds to each school.

The District's Chief Financial Officer assures comparability across all schools for the allocation of instructional staff. Staff allocations are based on a formula applied consistently so that all schools that are comparable receive allocations in a comparable manner.

The funding formula is based on Florida Public Schools Full-time Equivalent (FTE) data. For the past

several years, grades Kindergarten, first, second, and third grades have been allocated 1 teacher per 17 students. Grades four and five are allocated 1 teacher per 21 students.

Expenditures of titled funds at the school level are monitored to ensure expenditures supplement the general curriculu. All expenditures are reviewed by the Federal Programs Office to ensure compliance with applicable Federal and State guidelines.

School leadership teams conduct a district unified Comprehensive Needs Assessment (CNA) at the end of each school year. The CNA reports on how resources including personnel, instruction, and curriculum are aligned to identified needs. Student programming outcomes are monitored both in the CNA and district school data report-outs conducted quarterly.

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.

In accordance with ESSA Section 118 (b} (2}, the methodology used to allocate State and local funds to each school receiving assistance under this part (Title I, Part A) ensures that the school receives all the State and local funds it would otherwise receive if it were not receiving Federal funds. The District has a methodology for supporting not supplanting when allocating State and local funds to each school.

Each school year, the District's Chief Financial Officer assures comparability across all schools for the allocation of instructional staff. Staff allocations are based on a formula applied consistently so that all schools that are comparable receive allocations in a comparable manner. The report is audited by the State yearly to assure the District meets this mandate.

The funding formula is based on Florida Public Schools Full-time Equivalent (FTE) data. For the past several years, grades Kindergarten, first, second, and third grades have been allocated 1 teacher per 17 students. Grades four, five, six, seven, and eight are allocated 1 teacher per 21 students.

Expenditures of titled funds at the school level are then monitored to ensure expenditures supplement the general curriculum and fulfill the intent of grant funding. All expenditures are reviewed by the Federal Programs Office to ensure compliance with applicable Federal and State guidelines.

Federal funding projects are monitored for auditing purposes by the Office of Federal Programs. Audit boxes for each program are maintained and aligned to pertinent work papers and Federal and State guidance

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

James A. Long Elementary School has cultivated a partnership with Beck Automotive Group to advance college and career awareness. We also work closely with the District Graduation Coaches to ensure our students are on track for graduation.