

Escambia County School District

Longleaf Elementary School



2021-22 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	19
Positive Culture & Environment	21
Budget to Support Goals	22

Longleaf Elementary School

2600 LONGLEAF DR, Pensacola, FL 32526

www.escambiaschools.org

Demographics

Principal: Troy Brown

Start Date for this Principal: 7/26/2021

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
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2020-21 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%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	
* 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	19
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	22

Longleaf Elementary School

2600 LONGLEAF DR, Pensacola, FL 32526

www.escambiaschools.org

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 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	63%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		C	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 Lingleaf 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 Lingleaf 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	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Brown, Troy	Principal	Principal oversees curriculum and safety of the school. Conducts classroom walk-throughs, data analysis, and oversees the implementation of needed professional development as indicated by the school data. The principal communicates with the leadership team and readjusts focus throughout the year as needed.
Evans, Quinn	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal supports the Principal. Assistant Principal oversees curriculum and safety of the school. Conducts classroom walk-throughs, data analysis, and oversees the implementation of needed professional development as indicated by the school data. The Assistant Principal communicates with the leadership team and readjusts focus throughout the year as needed.
Robinson, Laura	Curriculum Resource Teacher	The Curriculum Coordinator insures the implementation of standards-based curriculum across content that meets the current standards expectations for each grade level. CC supports individual teachers based on data assessments, classroom walk-throughs, teacher needs, and other needs as assigned.
Gayo, Christopher	School Counselor	Provides support for school leadership team utilizing the early warning systems. Assists with RTI/MTSS process and provides counseling to students and families.
Hernandez, Joshua	Other	RTI/MTSS Coordinator provides oversight of the implementation of the RTI/MTSS process. Provides training and assistance to teachers with their RTI/MTSS students, as well as monitors the fidelity of RTI/MTSS process. Assists with teacher selection of interventions of students that appropriately meets the needs of students in deficit.
Hendricks, Quaytisha	Teacher, K-12	1st Grade Teacher who is Reading Endorsed. She participates with the leadership team to make sure that academic needs are being met in the school.
Pitman, Tammy	Teacher, K-12	5th Grade Teacher participates with the leadership team to make sure that academic needs are being met in the school. She is also the ELA Representative for Longleaf Elementary.
Hauck, Kim	Instructional Media	Is the primary contact for AR implementation throughout the school. She monitors usage and sets goals for the students.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 7/26/2021, 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

44

Total number of students enrolled at the school

586

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

5

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.

4

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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	82	112	71	84	93	85	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	527
Attendance below 90 percent	17	46	28	25	32	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	169
One or more suspensions	3	6	2	3	4	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Course failure in ELA	0	11	12	15	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48
Course failure in Math	0	5	8	12	9	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	5	24	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	4	39	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	74
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	6	7	11	13	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42

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	14	5	5	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 7/26/2021

2020-21 - 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	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

2020-21 - 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	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

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				48%	53%	57%	41%	49%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				44%	55%	58%	40%	46%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				39%	52%	53%	44%	40%	48%
Math Achievement				53%	57%	63%	37%	55%	62%
Math Learning Gains				55%	60%	62%	30%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				46%	52%	51%	36%	48%	47%
Science Achievement				48%	54%	53%	46%	55%	55%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

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	2021					
	2019	54%	56%	-2%	58%	-4%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	45%	52%	-7%	58%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		-54%				
05	2021					
	2019	45%	51%	-6%	56%	-11%
Cohort Comparison		-45%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	66%	55%	11%	62%	4%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	51%	58%	-7%	64%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		-66%				
05	2021					
	2019	44%	55%	-11%	60%	-16%
Cohort Comparison		-51%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	48%	55%	-7%	53%	-5%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

STAR was utilized for Fall, Winter, and Spring ELA and Math progress monitoring. The science district quarterly assessment was used for science progress monitoring. The numbers reflect the membership, students tied to the school during both survey 2 and 3.

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	71/28	80/48	82/38
	Economically Disadvantaged	56/21	64/45	65/29
	Students With Disabilities	13/31	14/43	13/31
	English Language Learners	N/a	n/a	n/a
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	72/39	80/34	76/46
	Economically Disadvantaged	57/33	64/28	61/41
	Students With Disabilities	12/42	13/31	10/30
	English Language Learners	n/a	n/a	n/a
Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	76/34	79/44	82/43
	Economically Disadvantaged	61/28	62/42	65/40
	Students With Disabilities	15/27	17/18	17/12
	English Language Learners	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	77/31	80/33	77/29
	Economically Disadvantaged	62/26	63/30	61/25
	Students With Disabilities	15/40	17/29	16/25
	English Language Learners	n/a	n/a	n/a

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	79/20	83/33	75/40
	Economically Disadvantaged	56/16	56/30	49/41
	Students With Disabilities	18/6	21/19	15/7
	English Language Learners	2/0	2/0	2/0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	76/26	82/33	78/37
	Economically Disadvantaged	53/23	55/31	53/30
	Students With Disabilities	17/18	21/14	18/17
	English Language Learners	2/0	2/50	2/50
Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	85/26	92/39	89/36
	Economically Disadvantaged	59/20	65/31	61/26
	Students With Disabilities	20/10	17/18	16/13
	English Language Learners	1/0	1/0	1/0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	84/38	90/33	86/45
	Economically Disadvantaged	60/37	65/32	58/41
	Students With Disabilities	21/19	16/6	16/19
	English Language Learners	1/0	1/0	1/0

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	83/21	93/28	88/33
	Economically Disadvantaged	51/22	59/25	56/30
	Students With Disabilities	13/0	18/6	15/7
	English Language Learners	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	83/22	94/27	84/37
	Economically Disadvantaged	51/22	60/25	55/27
	Students With Disabilities	13/0	18/11	15/13
	English Language Learners	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	71/23	82/40	75/40
	Economically Disadvantaged	49/22	56/32	47/32
	Students With Disabilities	16/6	15/7	12/8
	English Language Learners	n/a	n/a	n/a

Subgroup Data Review

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	11	22	27	16	22	10	13				
BLK	34	31	55	30	22	33	21				
HSP	32			37							
MUL	57			38							
WHT	54	52		48	40		74				
FRL	38	38	50	34	32	40	32				
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						

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
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				

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	41
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	284
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	17
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	

Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	32
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	35
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	48
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	54
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	38
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

Our Reading and Math proficiencies, especially in 3rd Grade, showed a need for improvement. We will continue to focus on Reading instruction across grade levels, paying particular attention to our SWD and lower quartile students.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Due to the lack of current data, a definitive area of improvement can not be reached at this time. However, our efforts with small-group differentiated instruction based on current data will continue until additional data is available.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

The contributing factors were attendance, Tier 1 instruction, and helping the students reach proficiency or above. We are going to focus on differentiated small-group instruction based on the state standards. We will adjust as data changes throughout the year.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Due to the lack of current data, a definitive area of most improvement can not be reached at this time. However, our efforts with small-group differentiated instruction based on current data will continue until additional data is available.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

The biggest contributing factor to the increase in achievement, in addition to core curriculum, were the research based supplemental materials purchased through Title 1 funds.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

Smaller classes by hiring an extra teacher in fifth grade through the use of Title I funds; continuing with departmentalizing in grades 3, 4, and 5; use of small group instruction in all grade levels, use of iReady and Star 360 data to drive curriculum and planning

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Professional development opportunities for small group instruction, data analysis that drives the small group instruction and how to best accelerate the filling of gaps for all students.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

Classroom walkthrough communication enhancements with the new program, KickUp; continuing PD with iReady and curriculum associates

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on the Math proficiency on the 2021 FSA data, we will increase our proficiency from 40% to 45% proficient. This is well below both the District and State average.
Measurable Outcome:	Math proficiency will increase from 40% to 45% overall. Our Math LG for SWD will increase from 22% to 40% overall.
Monitoring:	The Math will be monitored throughout the year using STAR360 scores, iReady scores, and District Math assessments. School administration, curriculum coordinator, MTSS coordinator, and teachers will meet for data meetings after each assessment to discuss the plan for continued instruction based on the past and current data. Target students will be identified and all students will be taught in small groups based on their needs according to the data.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Troy Brown (tbrown2@ecsdfl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Provide direct and explicit strategies during whole group instruction. Use small group iReady instruction to instruct in areas of weakness and create a path for students to follow in iReady lessons.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	iReady specific paths have shown to improve student scores on standardized assessments. iReady small group instruction aids with student understanding of the standard expectation and prior skills needed to be mastered to be proficient at their current grade level expectations.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Using district assessment develop small groups for Math instruction and, based on the standards that students are not proficient, using both iReady online tool and iReady workbooks, teach small groups the lessons needed.

Person Responsible Troy Brown (tbrown2@ecsdfl.us)

2. Put items from needed standards in google classroom for students to work on during Math rotation in class and check when students come to small group with the teacher.

Person Responsible Laura Robinson (lrobinson3@ecsdfl.us)

3. Meet with students to monitor growth throughout the process.

Person Responsible Troy Brown (tbrown2@ecsdfl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus	ELA proficiency is 36%. This is below the District and State average. The ELA LG of 29% is also below the District and State averages.
Description and Rationale:	Grades K-2 ELA proficiency rate was 40% on the spring AP3 STAR 360 assessment.
Measurable Outcome:	ELA proficiency for grades 3-5 will increase from 36% to 45% overall. ELA LG will increase from 29% to 40% overall. K-2 students will reach 50% ELA proficiency or higher on the spring 2022 STAR360 assessment.
Monitoring:	The ELA will be monitored throughout the year using STAR360 scores, iReady scores, unit assessments and District ELA assessments. School administration, curriculum coordinator, MTSS coordinator, and teachers will meet for data meetings after each assessment to discuss the plan for continued instruction based on the past and current data. Target students will be identified and all students will be taught in small groups based on their needs according to the data.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Laura Robinson (lrobinson3@ecsdfi.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Strategies being used are small groups based on data, iReady leveled lessons, multi-syllabic word strategies/sorts, and thinking maps. The new adopted Reading series also has supports that teachers are learning to use to support student progression.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Using district approved materials and student data, the strategies listed above are used to increase student knowledge in areas of weakness.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Use current data to determine the areas of weakness for each student. Then, make up small groups to address the varying areas of weaknesses for students.

Person Responsible Troy Brown (tbrown2@ecsdfi.us)

2. Show students how to use the strategies they need.

Person Responsible Quinn Evans (qevans@ecsdfi.us)

3. Make sure that the intervention is at the appropriate level for each student.

Person Responsible Laura Robinson (lrobinson3@ecsdfi.us)

4. Using direct and explicit instruction, teach the strategies to students and provide guided practice until the students feel that they can do it on their own.

Person Responsible Laura Robinson (lrobinson3@ecsdfi.us)

5. Monitor the student progress in all weak areas and adjust as needed. Weekly, monthly, etc.

Person Responsible Troy Brown (tbrown2@ecsdfi.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safeschoolsforalex.org), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

Out of School suspensions were high and we will look to reduce the number for the 2021-2022 school year. Continued use of the Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports will be an expectation and the use of the Miss Kendra Program, the Suite360 Program, and programs through the guidance office such as Anti Bullying and Violence Prevention, Red Ribbon Week, etc

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.

The school addresses building a positive school culture and environment by setting high expectations for both students and staff. We keep the staff updated on current state requirements, district requirements, and any changes that affect the school and students. The students are our top priority, both with their safety and their learning; making a year's growth in a year's time. We value all students and do our best to ensure a safe and happy environment.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

Stakeholders and their roles in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school are as follows:

The principal and assistant principal - in setting the culture and environment for all students, staff, and community. They ensure that we are focused on our students and doing what is best for them.

The staff - in ensuring that they are positive with their students and the work that they do for each and every student.

The students - in ensuring that they come to school and work their hardest to learn each and every day.

The community - that we get the support from our community to support our students in any and all ways that they possibly can to support the students of their community.

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: ELA	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00