

Escambia County School District

Longleaf Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| School Demographics | 3 |
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 11 |
| Planning for Improvement | 15 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 17 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 17 |

Longleaf Elementary School

2600 LONGLEAF DR, Pensacola, FL 32526

www.escambiaschools.org

Demographics

Principal: Troy Brown

Start Date for this Principal: 8/5/2017

| | |
|--|--|
| 2019-20 Status (per MSID File) | Active |
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | Elementary School PK-5 |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| 2019-20 Title I School | Yes |
| 2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 100% |
| 2019-20 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* Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: C (48%) 2017-18: D (39%) 2016-17: C (44%) 2015-16: D (38%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| SI Region | Northwest |
| Regional Executive Director | Rachel Heide |
| 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 is pending approval by the Escambia 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.

Table of Contents

| | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 11 |
| Planning for Improvement | 15 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 17 |

Longleaf Elementary School

2600 LONGLEAF DR, Pensacola, FL 32526

www.escambiaschools.org

School Demographics

| | | |
|---|-------------------------------|---|
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | 2019-20 Title I School | 2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) |
| Elementary School PK-5 | Yes | 100% |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | Charter School | 2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
| K-12 General Education | No | 64% |

School Grades History

| Year | 2019-20 | 2018-19 | 2017-18 | 2016-17 |
|-------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Grade | C | C | D | C |

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

<https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The mission of Longleaf Elementary School is to provide a safe learning environment where students are encouraged to develop into responsible citizens as they progress to their highest potential.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Longleaf Elementary is to develop a school with the highest student achievement and a culture where students and teachers develop the habits of life long learners.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

| Name | Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|--------------------|------------------------|---|
| Brown, Troy | Principal | |
| Heath, Laureen | Teacher, K-12 | 1st grade teacher. Serves as grade level chair. Sits on leadership team to help make best decisions for the school. |
| Lowery, Marnie | Assistant Principal | Assistant Principal, outside the AP duties and responsibilities, she manages, evaluates, and tracks math & Science instruction and data analysis. Provides daily feedback to teachers on Tier I instructional needs. Coordinates Math family and school events. Provides any PD needed in regards to Math, Science, & school needs. |
| Welch, Christina | Teacher, K-12 | Kindergarten teacher. Sits on IEP meetings and serves as a leader for her grade level. Participates on the leadership team to help ensure needs are being met in our school. |
| Sims, Megan | Teacher, ESE | 3rd & 4th grade ESE Inclusion teacher. Serves as a leader in our school on ESE and inclusion needs. Participates on leadership team to help make best decisions for the school. |
| Gilmore, Stephanie | Administrative Support | Curriculum Coordinator. Manages, evaluates, and track ELA instruction and data analysis. Works with Principal and Assistant Principal to provide the best support for our classrooms in regards to ELA instruction. Coordinates ELA family and school events. Provides any PD needed in regards to ELA. |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Saturday 8/5/2017, Troy Brown

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

0

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

7

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

33

Demographic Data

| | |
|--|--|
| 2020-21 Status (per MSID File) | Active |
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | Elementary School PK-5 |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| 2019-20 Title I School | Yes |
| 2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 100% |
| 2019-20 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* Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: C (48%) 2017-18: D (39%) 2016-17: C (44%) 2015-16: D (38%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| SI Region | Northwest |
| Regional Executive Director | Rachel Heide |
| 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 . | |

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 | 64 | 86 | 74 | 85 | 99 | 89 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 497 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 9 | 21 | 8 | 20 | 15 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 85 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 6 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 3 | 9 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 |

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 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 |

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 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 8/5/2020

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 | |
| Number of students enrolled | 86 | 80 | 86 | 94 | 87 | 108 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 541 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 10 | 17 | 20 | 27 | 16 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 109 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 5 | 1 | 6 | 5 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 5 | 8 | 13 | 9 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 44 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 20 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 63 |

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 | 5 | 12 | 12 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 47 |

The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|----|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 0 | 8 | 5 | 11 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 27 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 |

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 | |
| Number of students enrolled | 86 | 80 | 86 | 94 | 87 | 108 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 541 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 10 | 17 | 20 | 27 | 16 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 109 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 5 | 1 | 6 | 5 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 5 | 8 | 13 | 9 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 44 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 20 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 63 |

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 | 5 | 12 | 12 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 47 |

The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|----|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 0 | 8 | 5 | 11 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 27 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 |

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 | 48% | 53% | 57% | 48% | 50% | 55% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 44% | 55% | 58% | 47% | 51% | 57% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 39% | 52% | 53% | 33% | 43% | 52% |
| Math Achievement | 53% | 57% | 63% | 49% | 53% | 61% |
| Math Learning Gains | 55% | 60% | 62% | 48% | 53% | 61% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 46% | 52% | 51% | 48% | 45% | 51% |
| Science Achievement | 48% | 54% | 53% | 37% | 50% | 51% |

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

| Indicator | Grade Level (prior year reported) | | | | | | Total |
|-----------|-----------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | |
| | (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.

| ELA | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2019 | 54% | 56% | -2% | 58% | -4% |
| | 2018 | 45% | 52% | -7% | 57% | -12% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 9% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 45% | 52% | -7% | 58% | -13% |
| | 2018 | 46% | 51% | -5% | 56% | -10% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -1% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 45% | 51% | -6% | 56% | -11% |
| | 2018 | 32% | 44% | -12% | 55% | -23% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 13% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -1% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2019 | 66% | 55% | 11% | 62% | 4% |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| | 2018 | 36% | 54% | -18% | 62% | -26% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 30% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 51% | 58% | -7% | 64% | -13% |
| | 2018 | 50% | 58% | -8% | 62% | -12% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 1% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 15% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 44% | 55% | -11% | 60% | -16% |
| | 2018 | 28% | 52% | -24% | 61% | -33% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 16% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -6% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2019 | 48% | 55% | -7% | 53% | -5% |
| | 2018 | 44% | 55% | -11% | 55% | -11% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 4% | | | | |
| 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 | 16 | 26 | 19 | 24 | 50 | 43 | | | | | |
| BLK | 37 | 41 | 38 | 48 | 50 | 44 | 35 | | | | |
| HSP | 64 | | | 69 | | | | | | | |
| MUL | 71 | 53 | | 57 | 53 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 59 | 42 | 47 | 56 | 61 | 70 | 76 | | | | |
| FRL | 49 | 43 | 39 | 54 | 53 | 45 | 44 | | | | |

| 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 | 15 | 42 | 43 | 18 | 36 | 35 | 27 | | | | |
| BLK | 30 | 32 | 42 | 28 | 29 | 35 | 27 | | | | |
| HSP | 39 | 27 | | 30 | 18 | | | | | | |
| MUL | 72 | 71 | | 40 | 41 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 49 | 46 | 50 | 48 | 28 | 35 | 66 | | | | |
| FRL | 36 | 34 | 36 | 31 | 28 | 33 | 35 | | | | |

| 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 | 10 | 30 | 35 | 14 | 26 | 22 | 15 | | | | |
| BLK | 36 | 46 | 40 | 38 | 48 | 56 | 23 | | | | |
| HSP | 39 | 31 | | 59 | 46 | | | | | | |
| MUL | 57 | 61 | | 57 | 56 | | 58 | | | | |
| WHT | 57 | 44 | 21 | 56 | 45 | 40 | 44 | | | | |
| FRL | 45 | 45 | 29 | 44 | 45 | 46 | 30 | | | | |

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 | 48 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 1 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 333 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 7 |
| Percent Tested | 100% |
| Subgroup Data | |
| Students With Disabilities | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 25 |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | 2 |
| English Language Learners | |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Native American Students | |
| Federal Index - Native American Students | |
| Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |

| Asian Students | |
|--|-----|
| Federal Index - Asian Students | |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Black/African American Students | |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students | 42 |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Hispanic Students | |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | 67 |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Multiracial Students | |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students | 59 |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Pacific Islander Students | |
| Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students | |
| Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| White Students | |
| Federal Index - White Students | 59 |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students | |
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students | 47 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| 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.

Our students with disabilities subgroup was below 40. For 2 consecutive years, our SWD subgroup fell below 32%. We attribute last years percentage to the change of the instructional routines and content utilized during Tier I and Tier II instruction. The content provided through ESE instruction did not provide the rigor of instruction needed to assist our students with disabilities.

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

ELA lower quartile groups scored at 44% in 2018 and then 39% in 2019. 51% of SWD were also in our lower quartile for ELA. The factors that contributed to our low performance in the SWD subgroup are due to the factors above listed in section a.

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.

Our lowest 25% in ELA was our biggest gap compared to the state average. There was a 14% differential between the school's percentage & the state. Due to 51% of our SWD students being the in lowest 25% and the factors that contributed to that loss, this is the reason for the gap. See a. and b. above.

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

3rd Grade Math had a 30% increase in proficiency from 2018 to 2019. Math - 4th grade students increased in proficiency from 4th grade at 28% to 44% in 5th grade. Weekly PLCs will be continued to increase teacher content knowledge and Tier 1/2 instruction. Standards-based math manipulatives were purchased for each teacher will continue to be utilized. Reflex math will be utilized for fact fluency. Faculty will receive PD for best practices for Reflex math. Admin conducts daily walkthroughs to monitor Tier 1 instruction. Immediate feedback was provided to teachers. Bi-weekly data chats and analysis were conducted amongst grade levels and teachers to monitor data and differentiate instruction as needed. Lower quartile students were identified and targeted. Strategies to ensure learning gains were discussed and modeled in grades 3-5.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

Level 1 on statewide assessment for 4th & 5th graders and attendance below 90% are our areas of concern.

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

1. ELA Lower 25% learning gains
2. Math Lower 25% learning gains
3. Learning gains in ELA
4. Learning gains in Math
5. Attendance and Tardies

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Lower Quartile gains in the lower quartile & for all students in 3rd-5th. Learning gains in the lower quartile for the 2018-2019 school year declined from the previous year. 50% of our SWD population were in the LQ for ELA. A more streamlined schedule has been created to assist with the learning gains of our LQ, SWD students, and all students in 3rd-5th grade.

Measurable Outcome: At least 50% of our students in the lower quartile will make a learning gain in both ELA & Math. At least 55% of all other students in 3rd-5th will make a learning gain in ELA and Math.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Stephanie Gilmore (sgilmore1@ecsdfl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:

1. Encourage teachers to pursue Reading Endorsement courses to strengthen their knowledge of how to provide interventions to students with reading difficulties.
2. Review assessment data (i.e. STAR360, DAR2+, SRA in-program assessments, Wonders Unit Assessments, Third Grade Portfolio, iReady, etc.) every two weeks, hold data meetings to identify students in need of intervention, determine who will provide the intervention(s), with the use of the District K-5 Intervention Decision tree, determine appropriate intervention and duration.
3. Utilize a walkthrough tool such as the Instructional Practice Guide to monitor: 1) the use of grade level complex and meaningful text, 2) questioning that requires students to cite evidence, infer, analyze, and integrate knowledge between texts or parts of text, 3) evidence of extended writing in response to reading, 4) attention to academic vocabulary.
4. Multi-syllabic routine will be utilized with our lower 25% students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Reading endorsement courses provide knowledge pertaining to foundational reading skills. This will provide teachers with additional strategies to implement for Tier 1/2/3 instruction. Continual data review promotes data usage for the purpose of planning for and delivering instruction leading to higher student achievement. Data collection is being conducted by admin team and disseminated and discussed with teachers. Daily walkthroughs are being conducted by admin team. Feedback is given to teachers. Tier I instruction is being monitored for instructional needs.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Identify students in the lower quartile
2. Collect & Analyze data from STAR 360, iReady & classroom assessments.
3. Monitor whether students with SWD & students in the lower quartile are on track to make a learning gain from all STAR 360 assessments.
4. Monitor small group activities/lessons being used with all students in ELA.
5. Monitor materials being used for Tier I and small group instruction for ELA.

Person Responsible: Stephanie Gilmore (sgilmore1@ecsdfl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

1. ELA Lower 25% learning gains
2. Math Lower 25% learning gains
3. Learning gains in ELA
4. Learning gains in Math
5. Attendance and Tardies

Changes to the master schedule have been made to accommodate all lower quartile students in ELA & Math, along with needs for addressing learning gains in all areas. Weekly grade level, common planning will be supported by the CC and AP for ELA & Math. Data will be used to determine academic needs and edits to instructional sequences. Frequent school-wide callouts, letters, and teacher phone calls will be used to address tardies and encourage on time attendance.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

Longleaf will host a virtual open house. The virtual open house will allow parents to view the school and classrooms as well as receive additional information pertaining to classroom routines and expectations. Each family will receive a folder containing their child's data in addition to information on how parents can support their student at home. Longleaf will host two family nights this year. An ELA night and a STEM/Math night. Parents will be invited to have a meal with their child, then visit various stations to learn about activities families can do at home with their children. Activities and materials will be given out to families to take home. Longleaf will also have a SAC committee that consists on stakeholders within the school and beyond. This committee will work together to make decisions about Longleaf. Longleaf produces many "call outs" to families informing them of important events of news at the school. Teachers utilize monthly/weekly newsletters to communicate with the families of their students. Longleaf has a digital sign that houses various information regarding events and or needs of the school.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

| | | | |
|---------------|--------|---|---------------|
| 1 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA | \$0.00 |
| Total: | | | \$0.00 |