Long Branch Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Long Branch Elementary School

3723 FRANKLIN ST, Jacksonville, FL 32206

http://www.duvalschools.org/longbranch

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)
A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)
A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)
A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways: 1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%; 2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%; 3. Have a school grade of D or F; or 4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), https://www.floridacims.org, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Long Branch Elementary will prepare students for the future through learning experiences that provide the opportunities to acquire knowledge and skills to support academic achievement, personal growth and success in a positive and diverse environment every day. We are developing Productive, Open-Minded, Well-Behaved, Engaged and Responsible (P.O.W.E.R.) students.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our goal is to work in partnership with our parents and community to create a safe environment where all students are respected and motivated as learners who are empowered to engage in preparing for a promising future filled with potential as Independent thinkers, independent learners and independent earners.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team
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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Graham, Wayman	Principal	Instructional Management 1. Monitor instructional and managerial processes to ensure that program activities are related to program outcomes and use findings to take corrective actions. 2. Regularly consult the campus-level committee about planning, operation, supervision, and evaluation of campus education program. Include students and community representatives when appropriate.

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development
Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

Our goal is to work in partnership with our parents and community to create a safe environment where all students are respected and motivated as learners who are empowered to engage in preparing for a promising future filled with potential as Independent thinkers, independent learners and independent earners.

SIP Monitoring
Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The SIP is monitored b-weekly by the Leadership Team to discuss quantitative and qualitative data Additionally, the SIP is monitored through our monthly SAC meetings and all stakeholders are involved.

Demographic Data
Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	93%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* Black/African American Students (BLK) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: D
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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	
Absent 10% or more days	23	44	24	29	20	10	0	0	0	150
One or more suspensions	4	5	2	7	2	4	0	0	0	24
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	2	4	2	2	1	2	0	0	0	13
Course failure in Math	2	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	34	26	14	0	0	0	74
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	17	19	6	0	0	0	42
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	2	44	41	36	27	11	0	0	0	161
	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 that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	5	58	44	47	27	11	0	0	0	192

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	51	37	38	34	22	23	0	0	0	205
One or more suspensions	9	6	8	4	4	7	0	0	0	38
Course failure in ELA	24	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	28
Course failure in Math	6	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	32	16	23	0	0	0	71
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	27	12	14	0	0	0	53
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	24	37	40	31	17	24	0	0	0	173

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	
Students with two or more indicators	2	3	4	9	20	27	0	0	0	65

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	
Retained Students: Current Year	3	0	0	3	0	1	0	0	0	7
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)
Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	
Absent 10% or more days	51	37	38	34	22	23	0	0	0	205
One or more suspensions	9	6	8	4	4	7	0	0	0	38
Course failure in ELA	24	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	28
Course failure in Math	6	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	32	16	23	0	0	0	71
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	27	12	14	0	0	0	53
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	24	37	40	31	17	24	0	0	0	173

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	
Students with two or more indicators	2	3	4	9	20	27	0	0	0	65

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	
Retained Students: Current Year	3	0	0	3	0	1	0	0	0	7
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	22	48	53	27	50	56	21		
ELA Learning Gains				48			33		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				50					
Math Achievement*	50	58	59	51	48	50	36		
Math Learning Gains				63			30		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				80					
Science Achievement*	48	52	54	40	59	59	32		
Social Studies Achievement*					63	64			
Middle School Acceleration					53	52			
Graduation Rate					46	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress		54	59						

In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	34
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	135
Total Components for the Federal Index	4

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	51
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	359
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	25	Yes	2	1
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	32	Yes	1	
HSP				
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				
FRL	30	Yes	1	1

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	37	Yes	1	
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	51			
HSP				
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				
FRL	50			

Accountability Components by Subgroup
Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	22			50			48					
SWD	21			29							2	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	19			50			45				4	
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	18			48			39				4	

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	27	48	50	51	63	80	40					
SWD	21	38		34	67		27					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	26	46	40	51	61	92	38					
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	24	44	55	49	61	79	39					

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	21	33		36	30		32					
SWD	31			41								
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	18	33		35	33		26					
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	20	37		34	26		33					

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)
The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	33%	47%	-14%	54%	-21%
04	2023 - Spring	21%	50%	-29%	58%	-37%
03	2023 - Spring	9%	46%	-37%	50%	-41%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	49%	59%	-10%	59%	-10%
04	2023 - Spring	33%	58%	-25%	61%	-28%
05	2023 - Spring	71%	52%	19%	55%	16%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	42%	48%	-6%	51%	-9%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection
Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

Reading was component that showed the lowest performance. The contributor factors that lead to the low reading performance is directly correlated to the early warning indicators and Covid-19. Many of our students are significantly below reading level and have extensive absences. In 3rd grade, we had a new teacher that struggled with content as well.

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

Reading showed the greatest decline. The contributing factors that lead to the lower/decline in reading performance is directly correlated to the early warning indicators and Covid-19. Many of our students are significantly below reading level and have extensive absences. In 3rd grade, we had a new teacher that struggled with content as well.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

The greatest gap as compared to the state data was in Reading. The contributor factors that lead to the low reading performance and large gap in state and school data is directly correlated to the early

warning indicators and Covid-19. Many of our students are significantly below reading level and have extensive absences. In 3rd grade, we had a new teacher that struggled with content as well.

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

Science showed the greatest improvement. This is attributed to academically strong teachers, data chats with parents and students, small group instruction and data monitoring though district assessments along with academic scrimmages.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

Attendance is one of our greatest concerns and teacher support. We had over 50% of our population miss 18 or more days. This increases educational gaps. Students reading below grade level is also another great concern.

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

Improve Attendance
Show increase in Reading Proficiency K-5
Increase Parental Involvement

Area of Focus
(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

One component of positive culture and the Early Warning Systems involves attendance. We have a culture of parents not overly concerned with student absences. This has to change.

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

The specific measurable outcome is increased the Average Daily Attendance or ADA from 82% to 92%. The goal is to provide incentives for students and parents to bring their children to school on time.

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

This will be monitored daily in Focus.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Wayman Graham (grahamw@duvalschools.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

The evidence-based intervention for this area involves the My Village Project that has a proven track record of increasing attendance through community and family engagement.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The rationale is based on the data derived from My Village Project.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Increasing ELA/Reading Proficiency is a major focus in K-5th grade with an intensive Focus on 3rd grade ELA.

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

The school plans increase ELA proficiency in 3rd ELA by 15% and increase schoolwide proficiency by 10%.

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

We will monitor using assessment data from Freckle, benchmark assessments, PMAs and DMAs, and Benchmark Walkthroughs.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Wayman Graham (grahamw@duvalschools.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

The evidence-based intervention will be P.D., PLCs for the teachers and progress monitoring for students. We will also utilize the Benchmark Walkthrough Tool to check instructional delivery, assessment alignment, student engagement, etc.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The rationale is based on research based best practices.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review
Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

All data components are reviewed and funds are allocated based on school needs.

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

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

Teachers will use W.I.N. interventions that include UFLI and tutoring from READ USA. Tutoring will be during school and after school as well. Teachers will also use interventions from Benchmark Advance.

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

Teachers will use W.I.N. interventions that include UFLI and tutoring from READ USA. Teachers will also use interventions from Benchmark Advance and Freckle. Tutoring and additional foundational support will happen during small group in class with support from various staff.

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 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 Measurable Outcomes

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

Monitoring

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 impact student achievement outcomes.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:
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. §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?

Rationale:
Explain the rationale for selecting 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 evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

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

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements
This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))
List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

A developmental plan and data analysis meeting is held with stakeholders and a plan is derived from this meeting based on goals. Title I funding is disseminated based on the goals.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.
List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

Parent and Family Engagement Plans are implemented annually with specific intentionality on engaging parents. We implement various events from Literacy and Math Night to other initiatives that are related to increasing capacity in parents.

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii)

The school plans to strengthen the academic program by utilizing professional development and PLCs to increase capacity in faculty and staff, thus increasing the potential for greater student outcomes.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

This plan is developed through various stakeholder feedback sessions and data analysis discussions and meetings.

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan
Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

Long Branch Elementary has full-service programs that include therapy, counseling, and social services. Additionally, we have mentoring programs through the Boys and Girls Club as well.

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

N/A

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

We have a multi tiered support system (MTSS) that addresses and looks to prevent problem behavior.

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

Professional learning opportunities are taken advantage of monthly during Early Release Day and bi-weekly during PLCs.

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

Long Branch Elementary works in hand with John Love Pre-K Learning Center to give guidance to parents during this transitional time.

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

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

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System	$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

No