Brevard Public Schools

# 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** 10

**Planning for Improvement** 16

**Positive Culture & Environment** 22

**Budget to Support Goals** 23

# Longleaf Elementary School

4290 N WICKHAM RD, Melbourne, FL 32935

http://www.longleaf.brevard.k12.fl.us

**Demographics**

## Principal: Jason Sherburne L

Start Date for this Principal: 9/11/2019

| | |
|---|---|
| **2019-20 Status**<br>(per MSID File) | Active |
| **School Type and Grades Served**<br>(per MSID File) | Elementary School<br>PK-6 |
| **Primary Service Type**<br>(per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| **2019-20 Title I School** | No |
| **2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate**<br>(as reported on Survey 3) | 25% |
| **2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented**<br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities<br>Black/African American Students<br>Hispanic Students<br>Multiracial Students<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| **School Grades History** | 2018-19: A (76%)<br>2017-18: A (68%)<br>2016-17: A (70%)<br>2015-16: A (73%) |
| **2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*** | |
| **SI Region** | Southeast |
| **Regional Executive Director** | LaShawn Russ-Porterfield |
| **Turnaround Option/Cycle** | N/A |
| **Year** | |
| **Support Tier** | |
| **ESSA Status** | N/A |

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

## School Board Approval

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

## SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

## Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

# Table of Contents

**Purpose and Outline of the SIP** 4

**School Information** 7

**Needs Assessment** 10

**Planning for Improvement** 16

**Title I Requirements** 0

**Budget to Support Goals** 23

# Longleaf Elementary School

4290 N WICKHAM RD, Melbourne, FL 32935

http://www.longleaf.brevard.k12.fl.us

## 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-6 | No | 29% |

| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | Charter School | 2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
|---|---|---|
| K-12 General Education | No | 25% |

## School Grades History

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

## School Board Approval

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

## SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a 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.**

Serving every student with excellence in an environment that values effort, achievement, growth, and social emotional development with school wide expectations of PAWS (Positive Attitude, Acting Responsibly & Respectfully, Wise Choices, Safety First).

**Provide the school's vision statement.**

Guiding today's students to be tomorrow's leaders.

## 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 |
|---|---|---|
| Sherburne, Jason | Principal | Oversees all aspects of the school focused on achievement, safety, and development in collaboration with all stakeholders. |
| Dillon, Rick | Assistant Principal | Supports school and district initiatives for school improvement and student achievement. |
| Whalen, Kaylee | Instructional Coach | Literacy Coach supports student and staff learning through collaboration, professional development, and monitoring of school wide data for action. |
| Kledzik, Eddy | Instructional Media | Media Center Specialist supports school wide literacy and overall school improvement. |
| Gabreski, Taylor | School Counselor | Guidance counselor supports students' social emotional learning and academic needs. |

## Demographic Information

**Principal start date**
Wednesday 9/11/2019, Jason Sherburne L

**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.*
7

**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.*

5

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

44

**Demographic Data**

| | |
|---|---|
| **2020-21 Status**<br>(per MSID File) | Active |
| **School Type and Grades Served**<br>(per MSID File) | Elementary School<br>PK-6 |
| **Primary Service Type**<br>(per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| **2019-20 Title I School** | No |
| **2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate**<br>(as reported on Survey 3) | 25% |
| **2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented**<br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities<br>Black/African American Students<br>Hispanic Students<br>Multiracial Students<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| **School Grades History** | 2018-19: A (76%)<br>2017-18: A (68%)<br>2016-17: A (70%)<br>2015-16: A (73%) |
| **2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*** | |
| **SI Region** | Southeast |
| **Regional Executive Director** | LaShawn Russ-Porterfield |
| **Turnaround Option/Cycle** | N/A |
| **Year** | |
| **Support Tier** | |
| **ESSA Status** | N/A |
| * 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 | 74 | 71 | 86 | 69 | 81 | 89 | 75 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 545 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 1 | 2 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 |

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

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

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Thursday 9/10/2020

### 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 | 76 | 90 | 77 | 87 | 94 | 91 | 106 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 621 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 3 | 16 | 14 | 14 | 11 | 15 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 91 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 |

**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 | 14 | 14 | 10 | 18 | 13 | 18 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 103 |

**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 | 1 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

**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 | 76 | 90 | 77 | 87 | 94 | 91 | 106 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 621 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 3 | 16 | 14 | 14 | 11 | 15 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 91 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 |

**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 | 14 | 14 | 10 | 18 | 13 | 18 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 103 |

**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 | 1 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

## Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

**School Data**
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

| School Grade Component | 2019 | | | 2018 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement | 82% | 62% | 57% | 81% | 63% | 55% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 73% | 60% | 58% | 67% | 60% | 57% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 72% | 57% | 53% | 66% | 52% | 52% |

| School Grade Component | 2019 | | | 2018 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| Math Achievement | 85% | 63% | 63% | 84% | 64% | 61% |
| Math Learning Gains | 81% | 65% | 62% | 70% | 62% | 61% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 67% | 53% | 51% | 56% | 52% | 51% |
| Science Achievement | 70% | 57% | 53% | 68% | 56% | 51% |

## EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

| Indicator | Grade Level (prior year reported) | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | |
| | (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.**

| ELA | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2019 | 84% | 64% | 20% | 58% | 26% |
| | 2018 | 83% | 63% | 20% | 57% | 26% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 1% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 85% | 61% | 24% | 58% | 27% |
| | 2018 | 76% | 57% | 19% | 56% | 20% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 9% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 2% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 77% | 60% | 17% | 56% | 21% |
| | 2018 | 70% | 54% | 16% | 55% | 15% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 7% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 1% | | | | |
| 06 | 2019 | 82% | 60% | 22% | 54% | 28% |
| | 2018 | 77% | 63% | 14% | 52% | 25% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 5% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 12% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2019 | 83% | 61% | 22% | 62% | 21% |
| | 2018 | 84% | 62% | 22% | 62% | 22% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -1% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 86% | 64% | 22% | 64% | 22% |
| | 2018 | 89% | 59% | 30% | 62% | 27% |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -3% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 2% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 81% | 60% | 21% | 60% | 21% |
| | 2018 | 70% | 58% | 12% | 61% | 9% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 11% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -8% | | | | |
| 06 | 2019 | 88% | 67% | 21% | 55% | 33% |
| | 2018 | 85% | 68% | 17% | 52% | 33% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 3% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 18% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2019 | 70% | 56% | 14% | 53% | 17% |
| | 2018 | 76% | 57% | 19% | 55% | 21% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -6% | | | | |
| 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 | 55 | 67 | 62 | 53 | 66 | 59 | 57 | | | | |
| ELL | 73 | | | 91 | | | | | | | |
| ASN | 67 | 70 | | 100 | 90 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 71 | 75 | | 71 | 67 | | | | | | |
| HSP | 74 | 70 | 64 | 76 | 70 | 54 | 67 | | | | |
| MUL | 79 | 87 | | 89 | 93 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 85 | 72 | 79 | 86 | 83 | 72 | 73 | | | | |
| FRL | 76 | 80 | 76 | 73 | 79 | 52 | 60 | | | | |

| 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 | 46 | 33 | 22 | 55 | 64 | 60 | | | | | |
| ASN | 100 | | | 100 | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 69 | 73 | | 71 | 58 | | | | | | |
| HSP | 55 | 38 | 27 | 71 | 62 | 50 | 58 | | | | |
| MUL | 74 | 42 | | 78 | 75 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 82 | 58 | 42 | 86 | 74 | 70 | 81 | | | | |
| FRL | 64 | 49 | 35 | 73 | 62 | 70 | 68 | | | | |

| 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 | 55 | 53 | 55 | 53 | 47 | 41 | 40 | | | | |
| ASN | 91 | | | 100 | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 63 | 77 | | 63 | 62 | | | | | | |
| HSP | 75 | 65 | | 78 | 70 | | | | | | |
| MUL | 82 | 67 | | 73 | 67 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 82 | 67 | 63 | 87 | 70 | 58 | 70 | | | | |
| FRL | 64 | 53 | 57 | 68 | 59 | 55 | 62 | | | | |

## 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) | N/A |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 76 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 0 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 530 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 7 |
| Percent Tested | 99% |

| Subgroup Data | |
|---|---|
| **Students With Disabilities** | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 60 |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| **English Language Learners** | |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | 82 |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| 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 | 82 |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |

| Black/African American Students | |
|---|---|
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students | 71 |
| 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 | 68 |
| 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 | 87 |
| 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 | 79 |
| 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 | 71 |
| 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.**

On the 2019 FSA, science proficiency was lower than all other data components with 70% of students at Level
3 and above. The trends indicated a fluctuation of scores from year to year. In 2018, 78% of students were proficient, and in 2017, 68% of students were proficient. Scores were above the district and the state but required a specific focus for continuous improvement. During the 2019-2020 school year, Longleaf implemented focus calendars that integrated science standards into the ELA block. Teachers utilized the 5E model when planning lessons. Longleaf also set up a Science Lab for teachers to conduct science explorations. Due to COVID-19 and distance learning, students were unable to participate in hands-on science activities and received online based science instruction during the last nine weeks of school. At the beginning of the 2020 school year, fifth grade students took the Science Summative Assessment. The average score on the assessment was a 56%. The change in instruction during distance learning could be a contributing factor for student achievement during the 2020-2021 school year and Longleaf will continue working on this.

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

The greatest decline in data components from 2019 was in science with a decrease of 8%. This may be contributed to limited times designated for hands-on science activities and access to the Science Lab. While there was integration of science content in the ELA block, it may be not have been enough time spent on informational text. During the fall semester of the 2019-2020 school year, students were able to participate in hands-on science activities through our Science Lab. Teachers also completed focus calendars that integrated science standards through informational text and components of the 5E Model into their ELA block. Due to COVID-19 these plans and hands-on activities were impacted which could lead to a decline in the 2020-2021 school year. Looking at our iReady Math Diagnostic data from Fall 2019 to Winter 2019, students placing in Tier 1 increased from 40% to 61%. Our 2020 Fall data shows that 30% of our students are in Tier 1 which is a decrease since our Winter 2019 diagnostic. On the iReady ELA 2019 Diagnostic 2, Longleaf had 74% of students in Tier 1, this decreased on iReady ELA Diagnostic 1 2020 with 57% of students in Tier 1.

**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.**

We had no data components with a gap below the state in based on the 2018-2019 scores. In comparison to the state, the area we needed the most growth in was science. Longleaf scored at 70% which is 17% above
the state. This data matches the trend at Longleaf that science proficiency is lower than all other data. The factors that may contribute to this trend are limited instructional time for hands-on science experiences and limited exposure to science based informational text. The trend may also be caused by the lack of time designated for teaching 3rd and 4th grade science standards thus creating gaps in proficiency with standards not
addressed in 5th grade. During the 2019-2020 school year, the leadership team addressed the issue of time by providing more time in the science block which allowed for more instructional time that focused on science. Integrating science into the ELA block also allowed teachers more of an opportunity to address the science standards.

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

2019 FSA ELA data showed the most improvement in both same grade level comparison and cohort comparison with all grade levels 3-6 scoring above the state and district. Actions which provided improvement in this area includes daily MTSS, implemented Kagan structures into the ELA block to provide student engagement among peers and the curriculum. iReady diagnostic for ELA data was used to drive instruction, plan, and form small groups. Standards focus documents were used in grade level planning and teachers completed focus calendars every nine weeks. Teachers used QLA's to analyze data and drive instruction, teachers used ATU's and DBQ's to provide standards based instruction. The focus of work continued in the 2019-2020 school year. On the iReady Reading Diagnostic in the fall, 54% of students placed in Tier 1 that increased to 74% of students placing in Tier 1 on the winter reading diagnostic. Although impacted by COVID, students were still provided standards aligned instruction throughout distance learning.

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

In 2018, EWS data showed that attendance was an area of concern with 91 students having an attendance rate below 90%. In 2019-2020 we saw an improvement in attendance with 18 students having an attendance rate below 90%. Looking at attendance data, distance learning did not seem to be a substantial factor for attendance for all of our students. Absences were equally distributed among the first and second semester. Looking at the EWS data for 2020-2021 one area of concern continues to be the amount of students who scored a level one on FSA Math in 2018-2019. During the 2019-2020 school year, grade level teams implemented a one day a week math intervention block, used Ready Florida MAFS in grades 3-5 for small group instruction, and used Ready Florida MAFS in grades 1 and 2 for math curriculum. Longleaf will continue to work on this data during the 2020-2021 school year.

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

1. Increase science proficiency levels.
2. Increase math proficiency levels.
3. Continue to improve ELA proficiency levels for all students.
4.
5.

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

**Areas of Focus:**

| #1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math | |
|---|---|
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** | On the 2019 FSA, Longleaf's math learning gains for the lowest 25% decreased by 1%. In 2018, 68% of the lowest 25% made a learning gain in math. In 2019, 67% of the lowest 25% made a learning gain in math. 2020 Fall iReady Math Diagnostic Data shows 30% of our students in Tier 1, which is a decrease from 2019 Winter iReady Math Diagnostic when 61% of students placed in Tier 1. |
| **Measurable Outcome:** | During the 2020-2021 school year, the math learning gains for the lowest 25% will increase to 70%. Longleaf's lowest 25% in math will make learning gains due to teachers providing math intervention four days a week, teachers intentionally planning math instruction and providing scaffolded supports, and teachers using standards aligned materials to provide quality math instruction. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Jason Sherburne (sherburne.jason@brevardschools.org) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** | RTI and Math Instruction<br>High Yield Instructional Strategies |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** | The problem is likely occurring because of the lack of fidelity for our school wide intervention in math. In 2019-2020 a once a week math intervention was implemented. Based on last year's one day a week intervention and due to COVID, Longleaf is implementing math intervention four days a week. This math intervention will also focus on meeting the needs of students in our ESSA subgroups. |

**Action Steps to Implement**

Identify and monitor students who fall in an ESSA subgroup in order to provide targeted intervention to close achievement gaps.

**Person Responsible** Kaylee Whalen (whalen.kaylee@brevardschools.org)

Implement a school wide math intervention schedule four days a week. During this time, teachers will provide math intervention to students using the iReady Toolbox materials.

**Person Responsible** Rick Dillon (dillon.rick@brevardschools.org)

Teachers will use data from district assessments, CPALMS formative assessments, and iReady data to drive instruction.

**Person Responsible** Kaylee Whalen (whalen.kaylee@brevardschools.org)

First and Second grade teachers will use Ready Florida MAFS curriculum in order for primary grades to provide mathematical instruction that aligns to grade level standards and develop a strong foundation to help close the achievement gap as soon as possible.

**Person Responsible** Rick Dillon (dillon.rick@brevardschools.org)

Teachers will use the Enhanced Standards Document for Mathematics when planning in order to address any potential gaps that may have occurred during the 2019-2020 school year.

**Person Responsible** Jason Sherburne (sherburne.jason@brevardschools.org)

Academic support will be offered after school for grades 3-6. Each grade level will participate in ASP one day a week with a focus on mathematics. Students who are substantially deficient in mathematics, based on the iReady diagnostic, were invited to participate. ASP teachers will provide small group instruction focusing on the grade level standards.

**Person Responsible** Rick Dillon (dillon.rick@brevardschools.org)

| #2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science | |
|---|---|
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** | Science proficiency levels have fluctuated the past 3 years. In 2019, 70% of students scored level 3 and above. In 2018, 78% of students were proficient. In 2017, 68% of students were proficient. On the 2020 Fall Science Summative Assessment, 20.6% of students were proficient; therefore, the plan is to continue our work and focus on improving science proficiency. |
| **Measurable Outcome:** | Grade 5 Science proficiency will increase from 70% to 75%. Teachers in K-6 will administer the District Science Summative Assessments and utilize the data to drive their instruction. Teachers in grades K-6 will plan their science instruction using the 5E Instructional Model. Teachers in grades 3-4 will focus on providing targeted instruction of priority science standards by using the district provided Priority Units. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Rick Dillon (dillon.rick@brevardschools.org) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** | 5E Instructional Model for Science<br>Job Embedded Coaching<br>Writing in the content areas |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** | The decrease in scores for science are due to limited time that is designated for hands-on experiences and more support needed for integrating science into the ELA block. If teachers are intentionally planning using the 5E instructional model to integrate science into the reading block and provide students with hands-on science activities then scores will increase. |

**Action Steps to Implement**

Literacy Coach will provide support to teachers with integration of science content into the ELA block to include comprehension of science text and response to text through writing during the explanation and elaboration stage of the 5E Instructional Model.

**Person Responsible** Kaylee Whalen (whalen.kaylee@brevardschools.org)

Teachers will use the science lab to provide engagement and exploration opportunities to students as appropriate with COVID procedures.

**Person Responsible** Rick Dillon (dillon.rick@brevardschools.org)

When planning reading instruction, teachers will integrate science content into their ELA block through informational text.

**Person Responsible** Kaylee Whalen (whalen.kaylee@brevardschools.org)

Teachers will use the 5E Instructional Model to plan science instruction. Teachers will develop grade level focus calendars and add science to these calendars using the Science Curriculum Guides in order to fully address the benchmarks.

**Person Responsible** Rick Dillon (dillon.rick@brevardschools.org)

Teachers in grades 3-4 will teach each Priority Unit from the district to ensure that all priority standards will be taught before those students reach grade 5.

**Person Responsible** Jason Sherburne (sherburne.jason@brevardschools.org)

Host a virtual science night to involve and connect parents and families. The virtual night would include activities and experiments that align with grade level science standards.

**Person Responsible** Jason Sherburne (sherburne.jason@brevardschools.org)

Teachers will administer the district created Science summative assessments after each unit to progress monitor. Teachers will use the data from the summative assessments to reteach and plan instruction.

**Person Responsible** Rick Dillon (dillon.rick@brevardschools.org)

| #3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA | |
|---|---|
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** | ELA levels on the iReady diagnostic decreased from Diagnostic 2 in 2019 to Diagnostic 1 in 2020. On the 2019 Diagnostic 2, 74% of students placed in Tier 1, 22% in Tier 2 and 4% in Tier 3. Our 2020 Diagnostic 1 scores show a decrease in placement with 57% of our students placing in Tier 1, 36% placing in Tier 2, and 7% placing in Tier 3. Due to the instructional impact that COVID 19 has placed on our students and to help recover any learning loss, Longleaf is focused on intentionally planning high quality, standards aligned instruction. |
| **Measurable Outcome:** | ELA achievement for grades 3-6 will increase to 86% on the 2021 FSA. The goal is there will be no learning loss in ELA. On the iReady ELA Diagnostic, 76% of our students will be placed in Tier 1. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Kaylee Whalen (whalen.kaylee@brevardschools.org) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** | PLCs<br>Job Embedded Coaching<br>RTI<br>High Yield Instructional Strategies |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** | Longleaf decrease in scores for ELA are due to loss of instruction from COVID 19. If teachers intentionally plan ELA instruction and focus on strategies that accelerate student learning then scores will increase. |

**Action Steps to Implement**

Grade level CPT meetings will be held twice a month with one meeting focusing on data and one on curriculum and instruction. The literacy coach will support teachers with analyzing student data and using that data to plan instruction.

**Person Responsible** Kaylee Whalen (whalen.kaylee@brevardschools.org)

Teachers will use learning cycles to support their lesson planning and instruction. Learning cycles will be developed to include priority standards, complex text, scaffolding strategies, and assessments.

**Person Responsible** Kaylee Whalen (whalen.kaylee@brevardschools.org)

Job embedded professional development and coaching will be provided on scaffolding and how to accelerate student learning to close any academic gaps due to loss of learning.

**Person Responsible** Kaylee Whalen (whalen.kaylee@brevardschools.org)

Academic and technical support will be offered after school to brick and mortar students and eLearners in order to provide targeted support for students. This support program is being provided through the CARES Act. One teacher for primary and one teacher for intermediate grades will provide academic and technical support in the evenings. This will be based on student needs and will occur twice a week.

**Person Responsible** Rick Dillon (dillon.rick@brevardschools.org)

Literacy coach will facilitate common planning with teams and focus on prioritizing standards and addressing gaps in instruction.

**Person Responsible** Kaylee Whalen (whalen.kaylee@brevardschools.org)

Leadership team will develop a PLC agenda and expectations to maintain consistency and focus on goals.

**Person Responsible** Jason Sherburne (sherburne.jason@brevardschools.org)

Host a virtual literacy night to involve and connect parents and families.

**Person Responsible** Eddy Kledzik (kledzik.eddy@brevardschools.org)

Academic support will be offered after school for grades 3-6. Each grade level will participate in ASP one day a week with a focus on ELA. Students who are substantially deficient in ELA, based on the iReady diagnostic, were invited to participate. Teachers will use the iReady Tools for Scaffolding Comprehension to provide scaffolded instruction on the grade level standards.

**Person Responsible** Rick Dillon (dillon.rick@brevardschools.org)

### Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

.

## 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 creates a welcoming environment that ensures all of our stakeholders are involved. Our focus is on creating a positive school culture. We have implemented PBIS to create a positive environment. Our students also participate in weekly Sanford Harmony lessons that focuses on social emotional learning. Due to COVID-19 procedures, it is important for Longleaf to continue to communicate with families and ensure they feel involved and connected to our school. Administration, teachers, and staff communicate with parents on a consistent basis to keep them involved with our school and their child's academics. Longleaf families participate in virtual academic conferences, virtual open house, and virtual SAC meetings. According to our 2019-2020 parent survey, it showed that 94% of our families feel welcomed at our school and 59% of our parents felt they were able to contribute to decision making at our school. According to the Youth Truth Survey, 92% of students felt their teacher treated them with respect and 89% of students felt

teachers cared about them. Based on 2019 Insight Survey data, 95% of teachers feel that Longleaf promotes a safe and productive learning environment.One of our opportunities this school year is to focus on providing parents with information on how to support their learners at home. In our 2019-2020 parent survey, only 42% of our parents felt that teachers provided information about ways to help their child academically. 72% of parents felt it would be helpful to receive academic materials at home for supporting their child. Another opportunity this year is to support teachers by providing them with leadership opportunities. On our Insight Survey data, only 7% of teachers felt they were given opportunities to pursue teacher leadership roles.

**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: Math** | **$0.00** |
| **2** | **III.A.** | **Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science** | **$0.00** |
| **3** | **III.A.** | **Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA** | **$0.00** |
| | | **Total:** | **$0.00** |