Longleaf Elementary School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

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 (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-6
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2021-22 Title I School	No
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	25%
2021-22 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	2021-22: A (69%) 2018-19: A (76%) 2017-18: A (68%)
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

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)	**2021-22 Title I School**	**2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-6	No	25%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	27%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	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
For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.**:**

Name	Position 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.
Kledzik, Eddy	Instructional Media	Media Center Specialist supports school wide literacy and overall school improvement.
Vannorsdall, Nicole	Instructional Coach	Literacy Coach supports student and staff learning through collaboration, professional development, and monitoring of school wide data for action.

Demographic Information

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

Number of teachers with a 2022 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 2022 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.*
6

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

45

Total number of students enrolled at the school

628

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

8

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

6

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current 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	77	82	101	86	89	89	82	0	0	0	0	0	0	606
Attendance below 90 percent	2	0	2	1	1	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
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 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	8	9	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	5	9	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	2	4	0	1	3	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	14

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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	4	6	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	12

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	**9**	**10**	**11**	**12**	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	3	3	0	0	2	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	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 8/19/2022

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	79	89	80	90	71	81	88	0	0	0	0	0	0	578
Attendance below 90 percent	2	1	0	2	1	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
One or more suspensions	0	2	2	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	2	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on 2021 FSA ELA	0	0	0	0	3	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Level 1 on 2021 FSA Math	0	0	0	0	4	4	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

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	2	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

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	2	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	79	89	80	90	71	81	88	0	0	0	0	0	0	578
Attendance below 90 percent	2	1	0	2	1	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
One or more suspensions	0	2	2	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	2	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on 2021 FSA ELA	0	0	0	0	3	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Level 1 on 2021 FSA Math	0	0	0	0	4	4	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

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	2	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

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	2	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
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 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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	79%	61%	56%				82%	62%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	71%						73%	60%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	60%						72%	57%	53%
Math Achievement	78%	49%	50%				85%	63%	63%
Math Learning Gains	70%						81%	65%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	61%						67%	53%	51%
Science Achievement	63%	60%	59%				70%	57%	53%

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
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	84%	64%	20%	58%	26%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	85%	61%	24%	58%	27%
Cohort Comparison		-84%				
05	2022					
	2019	77%	60%	17%	56%	21%
Cohort Comparison		-85%				
06	2022					
	2019	82%	60%	22%	54%	28%
Cohort Comparison		-77%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	83%	61%	22%	62%	21%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	86%	64%	22%	64%	22%
Cohort Comparison		-83%				
05	2022					
	2019	81%	60%	21%	60%	21%
Cohort Comparison		-86%				
06	2022					
	2019	88%	67%	21%	55%	33%
Cohort Comparison		-81%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	70%	56%	14%	53%	17%
Cohort Comparison						
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-70%				

Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	41	51	50	43	51	41	38				
ELL	50			83							
BLK	63	67		56	58						
HSP	86	74		83	70		79				
MUL	76	83		62	58						
WHT	80	70	61	81	72	58	60				
FRL	72	66	53	62	70	60	67				
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	47	50	60	51	58	67	27				
BLK	82			76							
HSP	81	67		86	94		70				
MUL	71			79							
WHT	77	73	71	82	73	88	67				
FRL	69	64	69	76	74	69	55				
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				

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	69
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	482
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	45
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	67
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	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	61
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	78

Hispanic Students	
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	70
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	69
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	64
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

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?

Longleaf decreased in learning gains for our students in the lowest 25% in ELA and Math. In 2019, Longleaf's learning gains of the lowest 25% in ELA was 72% which increased to 74% in 2021 but dropped again to 60% in 2022. In Math, Longleaf's learning gains of the lowest 25% in 2019 was 67% which increased to 84% in 2021 but dropped again to 61% in 2022. On the 2022 FSA, science proficiency was one of the lower data components with 63% of students at Level 3 and above. In 2021 FSA, science proficiency was at 66% of students at Level 3 and above. In 2019, 70% of students were proficient, and in 2018, 78% of students were proficient. Although the scores were above the district and the state, the trend we are seeing is a continuous decline in the area of science. Therefore, we must remain focused on science instruction and continuing our intervention cycles for both ELA and Math to increase student achievement.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

The greatest need for improvement is proficiency in 5th grade science as it has declined from 78% in 2018 to 63% in 2022. In addition, State assessment data also indicates the need for improvement in the areas of ELA and Math for our lowest 25% making learning gains.

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

There are multiple contributing factors to this need for improvement. The greatest from this past school year was the continuation of the impact from Covid-19. Mandatory student quarantines were a large barrier to students receiving quality instruction. The decrease in Science proficiency may also be contributed to limited times designated for hands-on science activities and access to the Science Lab. Moving forward in the 2022-2023 school year Longleaf will continue to focus on increasing the amount of hands on science instruction provided to students by utilizing the science lab. Teachers will also complete focus calendars that integrate science standards through informational text and components of the 5E Model. Longleaf is also focused on providing standards aligned instruction and tasks by using our newly adopted ELA and Math curriculum with fidelity.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

When comparing Longleaf's FSA scores to both district and state averages, Longleaf scores higher in all subjects in all grade levels. Longleaf's 2021 FSA data compared to the 2022 data, showed an increase of ELA schoolwide proficiency from 78% to 79%.
Longleaf's mean scale score for FSA ELA Grade 3, was 310, compared to 299 at the state, and 80% of students were proficient, where the state, was at 53%.
Longleaf's mean scale score for FSA ELA Grade 4, was 327, compared to 312 at the state, and 85% of students were proficient, where the state, was at 57%.
Longleaf's mean scale score for FSA ELA Grade 5, was 331, compared to 321 at the state, and 78% of students were proficient, where the state, was at 55%.
Longleaf's mean scale score for FSA ELA Grade 6, was 340, compared to 324 at the state, and 80% of students were proficient, where the state, was at 52%.

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

Implementation of the district adopted Benchmark and Savvas curriculums showed a positive impact on student achievement. Consistent planning with the Literacy coach amongst grade levels was also a contributing factor to this achievement. Longleaf has continued our schoolwide intervention time and placed a strong focus on using data to provide strong research-based intervention instruction with fidelity. By increasing our grade level data meetings, this allowed teachers to triangulate data and consistently monitor students in order to select an evidence based program to provide intervention. Teachers used the district Identification and Intervention Decision Trees with fidelity to guide this process.

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

During the 2022-2023 school year, teachers will be focused on providing scaffolds to help all students access grade-level content. Longleaf will use ongoing progress monitoring data and diagnostic data to determine gaps in learning. Teachers will utilize the district Benchmark Overview documents to support planning in order to intentionally scaffold instruction. For science, teachers will follow the 5E model in order to build knowledge and vocabulary. Classes will also routinely visit the science lab for

hands on, real world experiments. Students will also have opportunities to work in collaborative groups focusing on academic content while fostering life skills. Working with our district math coach, all grade levels will collaboratively plan and implement the Reveal and EdGems curriculums, providing interventions as necessary. Students falling in the lowest 25% will receive daily intervention during our schoolwide walk to intervention time in both ELA and Math.

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.

Longleaf will continue to provide professional development opportunities regarding best practices in ELA and Science instruction to increase student achievement. Job-embedded professional development will be provided by our district math coach on the B.E.S.T. standards, new math curriculum, and scaffolding
instruction. The district MTSS facilitator will present to our grade level teams during CPT meetings. The district math coach will present math resources strategies for math intervention time.

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

CPT meetings were restructured to analyze and monitor data weekly. Data will be recorded digitally this year to ensure sustainability. Longleaf will continue to analyze and monitor data to ensure that the strategies implemented maintain or increase our identified areas of improvement. Professional development and planning will be adjusted based on current needs.

Areas of Focus
Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	FSA state assessment data indicates the need for improvement in the area of ELA for our lowest 25% making learning gains, 74% in 2021 to 60% in 2022. Learning gains overall have decreased from, 73% to 71%. Longleaf's overall ELA achievement levels also had a minimal increase from 78% in 2021 to 79% in 2022.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	Longleaf's overall ELA proficiency achievement on state assessments will increase from 79% to 82%. According to district assessments, 65% of our lowest 25% subgroup will show growth from PM1 to PM3.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	As a school, we will be monitoring the iReady and statewide progress monitoring/ F.A.S.T. ELA assessments to identify student proficiency levels and to guide the direction of intervention. Teachers will use formative assessments and checks to determine small group instruction during the core ELA block. ELA instruction will be monitored through classroom observations, grade level planning, and analyzing all data points.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Nicole Vannorsdall (vannorsdall.nicole@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	Collaborative Planning Teams, Data chats, Job Embedded Coaching, MTSS, High Yield Instructional Strategies, Progress Monitoring, Data Analysis, Specific Instructional Feedback
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the**	When planning ELA instruction, teachers will focus on providing high yield instructional strategies during both small and whole group instruction. Schoolwide, we will focus on analyzing data and progress monitoring to ensure ELA instruction is scaffolded for student's readiness. Continued focus on the quality and appropriateness of interventions, collaborative planning practice for Tier 1 instruction, and implementation of a quality, standards-aligned ELA curriculum will allow us to accelerate learning through rigorous instruction and grade level learning opportunities while also addressing gaps in student performance through intervention and focused scaffolding techniques.

**resources/
criteria used for
selecting this
strategy.**

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

For the 2022-2023 school year, grade level planning times have been revamped to include weekly meetings
which will focus on curriculum, planning and data analysis. The literacy coach will support teachers with analyzing student data and using that data to plan and drive instruction, as well as work with teachers to ensure the lowest 25% of students are receiving data driven intervention.

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

Leadership team will conduct routine classroom observations to observe and monitor that instructional agreements are being implemented and offer feedback.

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

Academic Support Programs will target students in the lowest 25% based on their academic needs using CPALMS and FCRR.

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

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	Science proficiency levels have consistently decreased over the past 4 years. In 2022, we decreased another 3% and are now at 63% of students scoring a level 3 and above. While Longleaf is still above the state average of 48%, this is an area which needs improvement. On the 2022 Fall Science Summative Assessment, 57% of students showed proficiency; therefore, the plan is to continue our work and focus on improving science proficiency.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	Grade 5 Science proficiency will increase from 63% to 70%.Teachers in K-6 will administer the District Science Summative Assessments and utilize the data to drive their instruction.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	During CPT meetings, grade level teams will analyze science assessment data from Performance Matters to drive instruction. Teachers will monitor student usage and pass rate on PENDA Science. Mrs. Beck will complete a schoolwide competition/contest to increase usage.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jason Sherburne (sherburne.jason@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	5E Instructional Model for Science, Data-driven decision making, Progress Monitoring Job Embedded Coaching, Writing in the content areas, PENDA Science
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	The decrease in scores for science are due to COVID protocols impacting the ability to utilize the Science Lab which included hands-on experiences and cooperative interactions. During the 2021-2022 school year, a 5th grade teacher took a leave of absence and the class was disbursed to the remaining 5th grade teachers which impacted instruction. Teachers will analyze progress monitoring data and intentionally plan purposeful standards aligned tasks while using the 5E instructional model to increase scores.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Teachers will plan lessons using the 5E model and will use the science lab on a routine basis to provide standards-based science engagement and exploration opportunities to students.

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

Teachers will use the district Science Curriculum Guides and the 5E Instructional Model to plan science instruction. As a grade level, teachers will follow the district science pacing and sequence guide in order to fully address all benchmarks for their grade level. Teachers will use PENDA weekly with fidelity during their science block.

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

Teachers in grades 3-5 will use the FLDOE Lessons Learned from the SSA in order to identify and prioritize grade level benchmarks to ensure that students are mastering those benchmarks through the 5E instructional model.

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

Host a family science night to include activities and experiments that align with grade level science benchmarks to engage and connect with parents and families.

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

Teachers will utilize formative and summative assessments to progress monitor, drive instruction, and administer the district created Science assessments.

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

A science Academic Support Program will be implemented and provided to students scoring below the 70% proficiency rate on district created science assessments.

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

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	FSA state assessment data indicates the need for improvement in the area of Math. Learning gains overall have decreased from, 78% to 70%. Longleaf's overall Math proficiency achievement levels also decreased from 83% in 2021 to 78% in 2022. Our lowest 25% making learning gains went from 84% in 2021 to 61% in 2022.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	During the 2022-2023 school year, Longleaf's overall Math proficiency achievement on state assessments will increase from 78% to 83%. According to district assessments, 70% of our lowest 25% subgroup will show growth from PM1 to PM3.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	Teachers will work with the district math coach to collaboratively plan math instruction. Teachers will provide scaffolded supports and use standards aligned materials to provide quality math instruction as well as math intervention four days a week. The use of i-ready prerequisite reports will be used to track and monitor data.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Rick Dillon (dillon.rick@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Collaborative Planning Teams, Data chats, Job Embedded Coaching, MTSS, High Yield Instructional Strategies, Progress Monitoring, Data Analysis, Specific Instructional Feedback
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.	Schoolwide, we will focus on analyzing data and progress monitoring to ensure Math instruction is scaffolded for student's readiness. Teachers will focus on providing high yield instructional strategies during both small and whole group instruction when planning for Math. Continued focus on the quality and appropriateness of interventions, collaborative planning practice for Tier 1 instruction will allow us to accelerate learning through rigorous instruction and grade level learning opportunities while also addressing gaps in student performance through intervention and focused scaffolding techniques.

Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Using data during CPT meetings, identify and monitor students who are working below proficiency in order to provide targeted intervention to close achievement gaps.

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

Collaborate with our district math coach to plan and implement math standards based curriculum with fidelity.

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

Math Academic Support Program will be offered for grades 3-6. Students who are in the lowest 25% in mathematics will be invited to participate. Teachers will utilize CPALMS and Measuring Up to guide instruction and address the standards.

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

RAISE
The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale
Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

N/A

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

N/A

Measurable Outcomes:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.

- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and

- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)

N/A

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

N/A

Monitoring:
Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

N/A

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Evidence-based Practices/Programs:
Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. Â§7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

N/A

Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:
Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?

- Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

N/A

Action Steps to Implement:
List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership

- Literacy Coaching

- Assessment

- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring

N/A

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

Utilizing multiple surveys including Youth Truth Survey, Teacher Insight Survey, and the Parent Survey, Longleaf Elementary School takes that data and uses it to drive discussions with the staff, students, parents, and stakeholders of Longleaf Elementary. Longleaf Elementary is a very happening place and always buzzing with excitement. A monthly PAW Print is sent out with current school news and upcoming events. The Paw Print also contains a special "Principal Message" in each edition. This has led to 92% of the families indicating they had a special connection and felt welcomed by the principal. 94% of our families also indicated that they feel welcomed at our school in general which is a significant increase from 83% the prior year. 65% of our parents felt they were able to contribute to decision making at our school which was an increase from 60% the prior year. Youth Truth data suggested that Relationships and Engagement were our two top themes in comparison to other like schools. Our teacher insight survey suggested Peer Culture,

Learning Environment and School Operations were all above the benchmark in comparison with other BPS schools.

In our 2021-2022 parent survey, only 53% of our parents felt that teachers provided information about ways to help their child academically. 73% of parents felt it would be helpful to receive more academic support materials at home for supporting their child. Many comments in the parent survey also indicated that communication needed to be streamlined to a few different platforms instead of every teacher doing something different. Youth Truth data suggested that Culture and Belonging were lower rated themes. Teacher Insight Survey data suggested that Academic Expectations and Observation/Feedback were our lowest benchmarks.

After reflecting on the Parent Survey, in order to make families feel more involved we are streamlining the number of ways we communicate. We will utilize FOCUS, Blackboard, Longleaf School Website and Facebook as our means of communication this year. We will also cross post information to all of these platforms so every parent is receiving communication. Utilizing ESSER funds and additional school funds, we will host ASP (Academic Support Program) sessions as well as send home helpful resources that parents can utilize with their students. We will also host family nights centered around academic support. Longleaf will continue to focus on our positive school culture and environment through PBIS and our SEL Life Skills program Sanford Harmony. Teachers received professional development from Sanford Harmony to support their implementation. To address the low areas in the Insight Survey, we will hold weekly collaborative planning meetings to support teachers with instructional planning. The Leadership Team will also increase classroom observations and provide teachers with feedback from those walk-throughs.

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

Longleaf creates a welcoming environment that ensures all stakeholders are involved. We will continue promoting our PBIS program which creates positive opportunities for students. We are implementing Bobcat Bash where students get to spend their hard-earned Buddy Bucks for different activities, they would like to attend such as, kickball games, computer lab time, maker space and many other fun and engaging activities. We will also continue Buddy's Place for students to shop with their Buddy Bucks earned for displaying PAWS expectations. The Longleaf community donated items, money, talent, and time to get the store up and running last year and have committed themselves again this year to keep it up and running. Our students also participate in weekly Sanford Harmony lessons that focus on life skills. The Melbourne Police Department supports us with our monthly safety drills and provides us feedback. We hold monthly SAC meetings where parents and community members provide input on our school improvement plan and budget.
Our Non-Instructional Staff supports classrooms by encouraging students to follow the PAWS expectations and models positive school wide behavior. Community members and business partners provide our school with donations. Volunteers can select tasks and events through a sign-up genius to support our school.
New this year, we have created a wonderful PTO filled with amazing people who truly care about promoting a positive school culture. They have been very busy welcoming new families and planning fun family events. As a whole, Longleaf works collaboratively with families to foster a home to school connection through open communication.