Longleaf Elementary School

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Longleaf Elementary School

2600 LONGLEAF DR, Pensacola, FL 32526

www.escambiaschools.org

Demographics

Principal: Troy Brown

Start Date for this Principal: 7/11/2019

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
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* 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%) 2014-15: C (48%)
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

Longleaf Elementary School

2600 LONGLEAF DR, Pensacola, FL 32526

www.escambiaschools.org

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 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	66%

School Grades History

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

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 and position title 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.
Kellenberger, Sheila	Teacher, K-12	2nd grade teacher. Serves as grade level chair. Sits on leadership team to help make best decisions for the school.
Croker, Rena	Teacher, K-12	5th grade teacher. Serves as grade level chair. Sits on leadership team to help make best decisions for the school.
Everette, Nicole	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.
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.

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
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

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)
49

Date this data was collected or last updated
Friday 8/16/2019

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	8	12	7	14	12	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	61
One or more suspensions	0	3	2	4	8	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	6	2	14	8	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	14	33	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	74

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	1	13	14	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37

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	8	12	7	14	12	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	61
One or more suspensions	0	3	2	4	8	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	6	2	14	8	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	14	33	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	74

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	1	13	14	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37

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	
Number of students enrolled	86 (0)	80 (0)	86 (0)	94 (0)	87 (0)	108 (0)	541 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	10 (8)	17 (12)	20 (7)	27 (14)	16 (12)	19 (8)	109 (61)
One or more suspensions	0 (0)	5 (3)	1 (2)	6 (4)	5 (8)	12 (7)	29 (24)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	5 (6)	8 (2)	13 (14)	9 (8)	9 (4)	44 (34)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	11 (14)	20 (33)	32 (27)	63 (74)

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	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%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
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%
	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%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A

English Language Learners	
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	42
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
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%	
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	59
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	47
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.

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 ESE instructional schedule. Although required minutes were met, transitions interfered with maximum instructional time. Grade level content was not always utilized.

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 were implemented to increase teacher content knowledge and Tier 1/2 instruction. Solution Tree (Juli Dixon) provided 3 days of intensive math PD for all teachers in K-5th grade. Standards-based math manipulatives were purchased for each teacher. PD on instructional use of the manipulatives was provided and modeled. Admin conducted 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? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

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. Parent Involvement

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Lower Quartile gains in the lower quartile & for all students in 3rd-5th
Rationale	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.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	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	Nicole Everette (neverette@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. Provide feedback to teachers regarding their progress in making the ELA instructional shifts necessary for college and career readiness.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	7 teachers at Longleaf are currently pursuing their reading endorsement. This training will help them collect and use data for the purpose of planning for and delivering instruction leading to higher student achievement. Data collection is being conducted by admin team and disemenated 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 Step	
Description	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 & Math. 5. Monitor materials being used for Tier I and small group instruction for ELA & Math.
Person Responsible	Marnie Lowery (mlowery1@escambia.k12.fl.us)

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 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, Â§ 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.

Longleaf will host 2 family nights this year. An ELA night in the Fall and a STEM/Math night in the Spring. 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.

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.

Guidance counselor, and behavior coaches work with students to provide any services to meet the social-emotional needs of all students. They will provide counseling and or refer for overlay counselor and outside sources when needed. Guidance counselor is the mentor coordinator and specific mentors are placed with students in need. Pine Forest High School, Future Teacher Academy works with selected students as peer mentors. They read with and talk with students once a week. Suite 360 is utilize as needed for specific students needs.

At the beginning of the school year, August 2019, kindergarten teachers assessed each of their students to determine where to begin instruction. The results of these assessments along with expectations for each nine week grading period will be shared with parents during a parent/teacher conference in September, 2019.

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

The School Leadership Team meets regularly to review current data, including student achievement, STAR 360, iReady, Schoolnet, attendance, and discipline data. The team uses the results of this data analysis to determine the effectiveness of programs and resources being used in the classroom. PLCs are held to support teachers and instruction. A problem solving process is used to identify what additional professional development, personnel, or resources may be needed to meet the needs of the students.

Title I, Part A
Longleaf receives support through federal, state, and local programs. Title I funds of $383,.576.71 Funds

are being used to purchase a Curriculum Coordinator. Funds are being used to purchase resources and materials that supplement classroom instruction, increase parent involvement, and provide staff development for teachers.

In 2018-19 LL received $300,081.25 in UniSig funds. Funds were spent on student & teacher resources, teacher PD, and substitutes for PD. Therefore, in 2019-2020, our teachers are able to again apply all the PD & resources received the previous year. Admin will continue to build capacity within our teachers.

Title II
Professional learning opportunities are offered both at the school level and district level. See each individual goal area for specific professional learning opportunities (in-service education).

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)
Longleaf Elementary received approximately $19,659 in funding for SAI. The funding will be used to purchase instructional supplies and other resources to support the implementation of Florida Standards in classrooms.

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.

This is not applicable

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

Longleaf joins with Pine Summit Baptist Church which provide food bags to our most needy students each Friday. The school counselor determines through multiple channels which students receive these services.
Fishbein Orthodontics is a new business partner for the 2019-20 school year. They have and will provide food and snacks to our teachers for preplanning, teacher plan days, and teacher appreciation week.
Fishbein is also providing bags to each student of the month with a gift card and other resources inside. The partner is providing unrestricted contributions in order for admin to provide snacks to students during FSA testing days.
Coastal Roofing of Florida made a donation in order to support student incentives and treats for FSA testing days. Texas Roadhouse offers spirit nights for Longleaf families and in return gives back a % of the costs to our school.
Pine Forest High School Teacher Leader Academy and Chick Fil A leader Academy join with Longleaf students at least once a week to mentor chosen students in citizenship and academic needs.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Lower Quartile gains in the lower quartile & for all students in 3rd-5th	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00