

Escambia County School District

Longleaf Elementary School



2022-23 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 | 14 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 0 |

Longleaf Elementary School

2600 LONGLEAF DR, Pensacola, FL 32526

www.escambiaschools.org

Demographics

Principal: Troy Brown

Start Date for this Principal: 8/1/2017

| | |
|--|--|
| 2019-20 Status (per MSID File) | Active |
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | Elementary School PK-5 |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| 2021-22 Title I School | Yes |
| 2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 100% |
| 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: C (48%) 2018-19: C (48%) 2017-18: D (39%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| SI Region | Northwest |
| Regional Executive Director | Rachel Heide |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle | N/A |
| Year | |
| Support Tier | |
| ESSA Status | TSI |
| * 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 | 10 |
| Planning for Improvement | 14 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 0 |

Longleaf Elementary School

2600 LONGLEAF DR, Pensacola, FL 32526

www.escambiaschools.org

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-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 | 69% |

School Grades History

| Year | 2021-22 | 2020-21 | 2019-20 | 2018-19 |
|-------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Grade | C | | C | C |

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

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

Provide the school's vision statement.

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

School Leadership Team

Membership

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 |
|----------------------|-----------------------------|--|
| Brown, Troy | Principal | Principal |
| Hoskins, Chentell | Assistant Principal | Assistant Principal |
| Gordon, Wesley | Curriculum Resource Teacher | Curriculum Coordinator |
| Gayo, Christopher | School Counselor | Guidance Counselor |
| Hendricks, Quaytisha | Teacher, K-12 | |
| Herrington, Terri | Teacher, K-12 | ESE lead teacher for Longleaf's ESE units. She participates with the leadership team to make sure that academic needs are being met in the school. |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 8/1/2017, Troy Brown

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.*

0

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.*

10

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

43

Total number of students enrolled at the school

551

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

3

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 | 91 | 78 | 107 | 64 | 79 | 83 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 502 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 19 | 24 | 44 | 22 | 24 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 155 |
| One or more suspensions | 1 | 8 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 10 | 8 | 6 | 5 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 32 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 7 | 7 | 8 | 8 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 35 |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 19 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 45 |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 21 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 56 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

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 | 1 | 8 | 7 | 10 | 19 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 62 |

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 | 7 | 10 | 6 | 5 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 31 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 9/19/2022

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 | 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 | 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 |

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 | 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 | 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 |

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 | 47% | 51% | 56% | | | | 48% | 53% | 57% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 53% | | | | | | 44% | 55% | 58% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 49% | | | | | | 39% | 52% | 53% |
| Math Achievement | 44% | 46% | 50% | | | | 53% | 57% | 63% |
| Math Learning Gains | 53% | | | | | | 55% | 60% | 62% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 52% | | | | | | 46% | 52% | 51% |
| Science Achievement | 41% | 52% | 59% | | | | 48% | 54% | 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 | 54% | 56% | -2% | 58% | -4% |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 04 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 45% | 52% | -7% | 58% | -13% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -54% | | | | |
| 05 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 45% | 51% | -6% | 56% | -11% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -45% | | | | |

| 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 | 66% | 55% | 11% | 62% | 4% |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 04 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 51% | 58% | -7% | 64% | -13% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -66% | | | | |
| 05 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 44% | 55% | -11% | 60% | -16% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -51% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 48% | 55% | -7% | 53% | -5% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |

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 | 21 | 36 | 26 | 19 | 35 | 25 | 13 | | | | |
| BLK | 40 | 55 | 50 | 28 | 46 | 50 | 24 | | | | |
| HSP | 47 | 75 | | 47 | 58 | | | | | | |
| MUL | 56 | 57 | | 68 | 63 | | 80 | | | | |
| WHT | 54 | 43 | | 59 | 60 | 50 | 45 | | | | |
| FRL | 44 | 54 | 45 | 41 | 49 | 47 | 33 | | | | |
| 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 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 59 | 42 | 47 | 56 | 61 | 70 | 76 | | | | |
| FRL | 49 | 43 | 39 | 54 | 53 | 45 | 44 | | | | |

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) | TSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 48 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 1 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 339 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 7 |
| Percent Tested | 99% |

Subgroup Data

| Students With Disabilities | |
|--|-----|
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 25 |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | 3 |
| English Language Learners | |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Native American Students | |
| Federal Index - Native American Students | |
| Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Asian Students | |
| Federal Index - Asian Students | |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Black/African American Students | |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students | 42 |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Hispanic Students | |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | 57 |
| 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 | 65 |
| 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 | 52 |
| 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 | 45 |
| 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?

Our Reading and Math proficiencies have increased from the previous school year. 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 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

The greatest need for improvement is found in the learning gains of the ELA lowest quartile students and SWD Subgroup.

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 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

The most improved areas were learning gains in ELA and Math.

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

Ensuring teachers have the time and resources to implement interventions for all students in Tier II and Tier III. We also utilized researched based supplemental materials.

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 4 and 5; PD opportunities; and implementation of small group instruction in

all grade levels based on F.A.S.T data, module/unit assessments, and Star 360 data. This data will 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 will be provided at all levels of Layer and Tier support. This includes PD on data analysis and implementing small group instruction based on data.

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

We will increase classroom walkthroughs and frequently monitor data to ensure teachers are implementing best practices in the classroom.

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 Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Longleaf's Math proficiency for the 2021-2022 school year was 44%. We have not met the district and state average in proficiency.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Math proficiency will increase from 44% to 48% overall.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

The Math will be monitored throughout the year using F.A.S.T. data, iReady scores, and District Math assessments. F.A.S.T. will be monitored after every session. iReady will be monitored after every diagnostics test. Math-topic tests will be monitored every two weeks. 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.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Chentell Hoskins (choskins@ecsdfi.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

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. Utilize K-12 Everglades resources for intervention and reteaching during small group instruction when needed.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

iReady specific paths have been 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

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 district assessment and F.A.S.T. data to 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@ecsdfi.us)

Implement benchmark-based daily focus questions. This is a review of grade-level standards and uses data from the focus lessons to guide instruction.

Person Responsible

Chentell Hoskins (choskins@ecsdfi.us)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

**Area of Focus
Description and
Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Students with disabilities are the only subgroup that doesn't fit the criteria of 41%. Students with disabilities are currently at the federal index of 25%.

**Measurable Outcome:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**

Students with disabilities will increase their federal index by 15 percentage points going from a federal index of 25% for 2022 to 41% federal index on the 2023 state assessment.

**Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**

To monitor for desired outcomes, we will collect data, analyze, and track the percentage of students scoring satisfactorily each quarter on STAR and PM assessments. We will identify students in need of intervention and provide small group instruction to increase achievement. We will continuously track iReady data and classroom assessments.

The administration team will conduct classroom walkthroughs to observe how Pre-K to Grade 5 curriculum is being delivered and make suggestions for improvement.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Terri Herrington (therrington@ecsdf.us)

**Evidence-based Strategy:
Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**

Teachers will use the core curriculum with scaffold/gradual release strategies for reading complex text. Researched-based strategies such as before, during, and after reading strategies for reading comprehension. Implementing the use of a multi-sensory approach to engage all students academically. Implementing UDL for all learners but specifically ensuring these strategies are being provided for our SWD. Ensuring that all of our teachers, including our general education teachers, are prepared with accommodations for a variety of learners to increase the likelihood of success for all learners.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**

Support and gradual release in the reading of complex text have been proven to increase students' reading ability/achievement level. Limited vocabulary impedes students understanding of the text. "UDL is based upon the most widely replicated finding in educational research: learners are highly variable in their response to instruction. In virtually every report of research on

instruction or intervention, individual differences are not only evident in the results; they are prominent." Multi-sensory instruction helps students make connections and form memories. Multi-sensory teaching takes into account that different kids learn in different ways.

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.

Train teachers and their teacher assistants on the terminology of IEP accommodations and how to provide accommodations to their students.

Person Responsible Terri Herrington (therrington@ecsdf.us)

Provide teachers with an accommodations cheat sheet.

Person Responsible Terri Herrington (therrington@ecsdf.us)

Provide professional development and model to teachers as needed on differentiation strategies. (Sunday System & Ortin Gillingham)

Person Responsible Terri Herrington (therrington@ecsdf.us)

Collaborate with administrative with progress monitoring students with disabilities.

Person Responsible Terri Herrington (therrington@ecsdf.us)

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

The following data was used to determine the critical need:

Kindergarten ELA proficiency rate was 49% on the Spring 2022 STAR Early Literacy Assessment.

First grade ELA proficiency rate was 38% on the Spring 2022 STAR Early Literacy Assessment. Second grade ELA proficiency rate was 32% on the Spring 2022 STAR Reading Assessment.

Students who score at the 53rd percentile on STAR Early Literacy or STAR Reading are considered proficient. The number of students who were not considered proficient at the end of 2021-2022 indicates a need to 1) improve core instruction and 2) identify student deficiencies and provide interventions immediately in order to close achievement gaps.

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

The following data was used to determine the critical need:

Third grade ELA proficiency rate was 49% on the 2022 FSA.

Fourth grade ELA proficiency rate was 48% on the 2022 FSA.

Fifth grade ELA proficiency rate was 43% on the 2022 FSA.

Achievement in ELA for grades 3rd - 5th has (not) reached 41% proficiency in all subgroups:

Students with Disabilities (21%)

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)

ELA proficiency as determined by those scoring at or above the 53rd percentile on STAR Early Literacy or STAR Reading 2022 will increase from 49% in K, 38% in 1st grade, and 32% in 2nd grade on STAR AP4 to 50% on FAST-STAR PM3.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

ELA proficiency will increase from 49% in 3rd grade, 48% in 4th grade, and 43 % in 5th grade on the 2022 FSA to 50% or higher in each grade on the 2023 FAST.

The ELA Proficiency for all identified ESSA subgroups will increase to 50% or higher on new 2023 FAST Progress Monitoring assessments by 23-24.

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.

To monitor for desired outcomes, we will collect data, analyze, and track the percent of students scoring satisfactorily each quarter. We will identify students in need of intervention according to the intervention decision tree.

- a. Kindergarten: STAR Early Literacy results and percent of students earning satisfactory performance on the standards-based grading rubric.
- b. First grade: STAR Early Literacy/Reading results and track the percent of students meeting benchmark

on the first grade quarterly decoding probe per classroom.

c. Second grade: STAR Reading results and track the percent of students whose fluency rate is average per the time of year on the Hasbrouck and Tindal fluency norms chart.

d. Grades 3-5: analyze results by classroom of district module assessments.

Administration will conduct weekly classroom walkthroughs to observe delivery of Pre-K to Grade 5 literacy instruction and suggest improvements through the use of the Literacy Practice Profile tool.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Brown, Troy, tbrown2@ecsdfl.us

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?

Longleaf Elementary uses HMH Into Reading 2022 for its Comprehensive Core Reading/Language Arts Program (CCRP)

The district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan outlines in detail how the various components Into Reading meets Florida's definition of evidence-based. The district ELA Department mapped B.E.S.T. and created curriculum frameworks to ensure that Tier I instruction is standards-aligned. In order to ensure the measurable outcomes are reached in K-5, our school will 1) focus on five key literacy instructional practices (explicit, systematic, scaffolded, differentiated instruction with corrective feedback) required by Rule 6A-6.053, F.A.C., K-12 CERP and 2) provide intensive, systematic instruction on foundational reading skills according to the K-12 CERP Intervention Decision Trees.

Tier 1 instruction is monitored by the school's administration team through weekly classroom walkthroughs and by being present during collaborative lesson planning. Teachers and Rtl teams monitor the effectiveness of interventions with individual students by collecting data and tracking student progress.

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?

The use of Houghton Mifflin Into Reading 2022 as a Comprehensive Core Language Arts/Reading Program is supported by recommended practices in the The Institute of Education Sciences Practice Guides as described in the K-12 CERP. The core curriculum includes accommodations for students with a disability, and students who are English language learners; provides print-rich explicit and systematic, scaffolded, and

differentiated instruction; builds background and content knowledge; incorporates writing in response to reading; and incorporates the principles of Universal Design for Learning.

A focus on five key literacy instructional practices (explicit, systematic, scaffolded, differentiated instruction with corrective feedback) with this comprehensive curriculum will increase the proficiency of our students in K-5.

Furthermore, following the Institute of Education Sciences recommendations (strong evidence) for interventions, teachers follow the K-12 CERP Intervention Decision Trees to provide interventions in decoding and building fluency, matched to student need during a dedicated intervention period daily.

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 |
|-------------|-----------------------------------|
|-------------|-----------------------------------|

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>Action Step 1: Literacy Leadership- Develop a schoolwide reading plan to increase student academic achievement and monitor student reading growth. Provide professional development regarding the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards. Review grade-level data from core curriculum assessments and overall classroom walkthrough trends to problem solve.</p> | <p>Brown, Troy, tbrown2@ecsdfl.us</p> |
|---|--|

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>Action Step 3: Assessment Our school utilizes the MTSS 4-step problem solving process to analyze data and determine need for differentiated instruction/ intervention. Grade level teams will meet to discuss the use of formative assessment to guide differentiation in the classroom; analyze core reading material assessment results, and use STAR for screening, diagnostics, and progress monitoring.</p> | <p>Hoskins, Chentell, choskins@ecsdfl.us</p> |
|---|---|

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>Action Step 4: Professional Learning - We will provide training to teachers at our school on the following: Use of STAR360 reports, core reading program data, and the intervention decision trees Differentiation during the 90 minute block, and use of Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions during the language arts intervention period. Five key literacy instructional practices (explicit, systematic, scaffolded, differentiated instruction with corrective feedback) required by Rule 6A-6.053, F.A.C., K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-Based Reading Plan The B.E.S.T. ELA standards and the science of reading</p> | <p>Hoskins, Chentell, choskins@ecsdfl.us</p> |
|---|---|

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>Action Step 2: Literacy Coaching- District coaches and/or school mentor teachers will facilitate common lesson planning using the district adopted curriculum and pacing guides, including how to effectively deliver instruction of B.E.S.T. ELA Standards, engagement strategies, etc.). Administration seeks coaching support from district coaches and the State Regional Literacy Director for walkthroughs and intervention support.</p> | <p>Gordon, Wesley, wgordon1@ecsdfl.us</p> |
|---|--|

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.

The school addresses building a positive school culture and environment by setting high expectations for both students, staff, and the community. We keep the staff updated on current state requirements, district

requirements, and any changes that would affect the school and students. The students are our top priority, in both 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, happy, and engaging learning environment.

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

Stakeholders and their roles in promoting a positive culture and environment at our 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 all stakeholders are focused on our students and are doing what is best for their learning growth and personal development.

The staff - in ensuring that they are positive with their students and the work that they do to challenge the students in putting forth their best effort for their learning and development.