

Escambia County School District

Longleaf Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	9
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	19
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	19
VI. Title I Requirements	23
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	25

Longleaf Elementary School

2600 LONGLEAF DR, Pensacola, FL 32526

www.escambiaschools.org

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.

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, 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
Gordon, Wesley	Curriculum Coordinator	Data monitoring, classroom walk throughs, Professional development and instructional coaching.

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.

School Advisory Council input is used in conjunction with our school leadership team to help make decisions for the school through out the year. The school leadership team regularly uses input from all steak holders in deciding what professional development is needed to improve academic performance of underperforming subgroups, and how to work with teachers to incorporate the observed need for professional development.

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))

In order to meet the needs of our greatest achievement gaps, we will schedule regular data meetings with teachers; the administration will meet weekly with grade levels to help guide planning sessions; weekly classroom walk troughs will be conducted in order to assure rigorous instruction is being implemented; and regular feedback will be provided to teachers to help them maintain effective pacing of instruction and to include students in frequent data conferences to develop goals for improvement.

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 PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	69%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	TSI
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) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) 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	19	35	15	30	20	23	0	0	0	142
One or more suspensions	1	4	3	7	3	4	0	0	0	22
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	6	13	26	8	1	0	0	0	54
Course failure in Math	0	3	8	14	6	7	0	0	0	38
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	4	10	19	19	2	6	0	0	0	60
	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	1	6	2	16	7	8	0	0	0	40

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	5	6	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	18
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	3	3	0	0	0	7

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	19	24	44	22	24	22	0	0	0	155
One or more suspensions	1	8	1	2	6	10	0	0	0	28
Course failure in ELA	0	10	8	6	5	3	0	0	0	32
Course failure in Math	0	7	7	8	8	5	0	0	0	35
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	19	22	0	0	0	45
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	4	21	31	0	0	0	56
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	1	8	7	10	19	17	0	0	0	62

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	7	10	6	5	3	0	0	0	0	31
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	2	2	1	0	0	0	5

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	19	24	44	22	24	22	0	0	0	155
One or more suspensions	1	8	1	2	6	10	0	0	0	28
Course failure in ELA	0	10	8	6	5	3	0	0	0	32
Course failure in Math	0	7	7	8	8	5	0	0	0	35
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	19	22	0	0	0	45
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	4	21	31	0	0	0	56
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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	1	8	7	10	19	17	0	0	0	62

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	7	10	6	5	3	0	0	0	0	31
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	2	2	1	0	0	0	5

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*	43	48	53	47	51	56	43		
ELA Learning Gains				53			41		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				49			57		
Math Achievement*	40	50	59	44	46	50	38		
Math Learning Gains				53			32		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				52			33		
Science Achievement*	49	52	54	41	52	59	40		
Social Studies Achievement*					55	64			
Middle School Acceleration					45	52			
Graduation Rate					50	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress		62	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)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	46
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	185
Total Components for the Federal Index	4

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	48
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	339
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99
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	18	Yes	4	4
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	39	Yes	1	
HSP	25	Yes	1	1
MUL	43			
PAC				
WHT	61			
FRL	43			

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	25	Yes	3	3
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	42			
HSP	57			
MUL	65			
PAC				
WHT	52			
FRL	45			

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	43			40			49					
SWD	19			20			9				4	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	36			29			44				4	
HSP	25			25							2	
MUL	36			50							2	
PAC												
WHT	60			60			60				4	
FRL	41			38			44				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	47	53	49	44	53	52	41					
SWD	21	36	26	19	35	25	13					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	40	55	50	28	46	50	24					
HSP	47	75		47	58							
MUL	56	57		68	63		80					
PAC												
WHT	54	43		59	60	50	45					
FRL	44	54	45	41	49	47	33					

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	43	41	57	38	32	33	40					
SWD	11	22	27	16	22	10	13					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	34	31	55	30	22	33	21					
HSP	32			37								
MUL	57			38								
PAC												
WHT	54	52		48	40		74					
FRL	38	38	50	34	32	40	32					

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	38%	49%	-11%	54%	-16%
04	2023 - Spring	54%	57%	-3%	58%	-4%
03	2023 - Spring	48%	44%	4%	50%	-2%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	45%	51%	-6%	59%	-14%
04	2023 - Spring	45%	58%	-13%	61%	-16%
05	2023 - Spring	35%	47%	-12%	55%	-20%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	46%	51%	-5%	51%	-5%

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.

The data component that shows the lowest performance is SWD. For the past three years, we have been trending below 41%. The contributing factors are pacing of content, unfocused small group instruction, and lack of training of tiered interventions.

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

The greatest declines would be in math, the multiracial subgroup showing a decline of 18.4%, and in ELA, the Hispanic subgroup showed a drop of 15.8%. Factors leading to these declines may be explained by our teachers being challenged with the new standards. More specifically, in math, having supplemental materials and resources that were BEST aligned to adequately support student needs.

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 data component that shows the greatest gap is in Math. In Math, the gap difference was -16% when compared to the state. Some factors that contributed to this decline includes new standards and lack of supplemental resources and materials.

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

The component that showed the most improvement is Hispanics in Science. The Hispanic subgroup increased from 0% to 33.3%. Our school participated in STARBASE this year. The teachers also participated in grade level planning. During planning, teachers analyzed data and collaborated on effective strategies to improve science scores.

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

The major area of concern are absences.

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

Our highest priority of focus is going to have to be our SWD subgroup as they have performed below 32% for more than three years. Additionally, we will have to prioritize attendance and tardies. We also need to focus on professional development and data tracking to address our staffing needs.

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.

Reducing the percentage of students with 5 or more absences will decrease from a high of 45.78% as reported on 22-23 PDMR Data report, with a goal of a 50% reduction.

Measurable Outcome:

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

From a high of 45.78% of students with five or more absences, the number of students, with five or more absences, will be reduced to 23% by the end of the academic school year.

Monitoring:

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

To monitor the desired outcomes, our guidance counselor will monitor absences and tardiness of students through FOCUS. The guidance counselor will monitor attendance daily. This will be ongoing throughout the school year by the guidance counselor and leadership team.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Christopher Gayo (cgayo@ecsdfl.us)

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.)

Monitor the progress of all students, and proactively intervene when students show early signs of attendance problems. We will also provide intensive, individualized support to students and their families who have attendance issues that are interfering with academic success.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

In analyzing the attendance data of 2022-2023, issues with attendance have been steadily increasing as the school year progressed. According to the National Center for Education Statistics, attendance is related to student achievement. Students who attend school regularly have been shown to achieve at higher levels than students who do not have regular attendance.

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.

Guidance counselor will meet the leadership team quarterly to discuss attendance data in Focus. We have meetings with parents to explain the importance of attendance. We will implement rewards to recognize students with good and improved attendance. Meet with parents of students with chronic absenteeism and offer resources to improve attendance.

Person Responsible: Christopher Gayo (cgayo@ecsdfl.us)

By When: In collaboration with the leadership team, will be checked monthly.

#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 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.

Students with disabilities are the only subgroup that doesn't fit the criteria of 32% based on the 21-22 ESSA data. According to 2021-2022 data, 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 7 percentage points going from a federal index of 25% for 2022 to 32% 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' data. This includes STAR, unit and PM assessments. The leadership team will meet monthly to monitor students progress. We will identify students in need of intervention and provide small group instruction to increase achievement. We will continuously track iReady data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Terri Herrington (therrington@ecsdf.us)

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.)

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 Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific 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.

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.

The lead ESE teacher and the leadership team will meet with the ESE teachers and teacher assistants monthly. At the meeting, data will be reviewed and a plan will be implemented to improve students' academic performance. Professional development will be offered to teachers and teacher assistants. This professional development will include training teacher assistants on the terminology of IEP accommodations and how to provide accommodations to their students. We will also monitor the progress quarterly to ensure goals are being met.

Person Responsible: Terri Herrington (therrington@ecsdfi.us)

By When: Monthly data meetings and quarterly progress monitoring.

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).

Funding allocations for Title I funds are based on survey 3 poverty data. Schools receive these allocations in the spring and work with Title I and the level directors to determine how those funds are utilized. Title I schools also receive additional funding for low income students to support parent involvement. UniSIG allocations are based on school grade and overall Federal Index rates and are received in late summer. The schools work with the School Transformation Office (STO) and level directors to determine the usage of these funds to maximize impact on student achievement. Both Title I and UniSIG are aligned so there are no resource duplications between these two main school improvement funding sources. The Human Resource Department works with Budgeting, Finance, Title I, STO, and Executive staff to review staffing to ensure schools in need have staffing that reflects the need of the school. Title I, UniSIG, Reading Allocation, ESSER, and SAI funding sources are utilized to add supplemental positions to meet the needs of schools and align to state and district goals. School Improvement funding allocations are also utilized to pay staff to attend planning sessions and professional development sessions with the Professional Development Department and STO based on input from BSI and the district. The district identifies resources for coaching and planning support through the level directors, School Transformation Office, Title I, and Professional Development Department. Schools are tiered based on need including school grade, overall federal index, graduation rates, and ESSA subgroup data. Supplemental resources in addition to the district purchased core resources are reviewed based on the school need and approved for purchase utilizing school improvement funding and SAI funding. The district has also begun to utilize Canvas as the LMS to help support resource allocation to include benchmark aligned lessons, professional development, and content training for schools. Additional support that is identified by quarterly meetings with schools and monthly meetings with the BSI team will be supported through the LMS to ensure school needs and district resources are being appropriately allocated for the 2023-2024 school year.

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

The following data was used to determine the critical need:

34% of Kindergarten ELA students scoring below the 40th percentile on the Spring 2023 STAR Early Literacy Assessment.

56% of First grade ELA students scoring below the 40th percentile on the Spring 2023 STAR Early Literacy Assessment.

53% of Second grade ELA students scoring below the 40th percentile on the Spring 2023 STAR Early Literacy Assessment.

Students who score below the 40th percentile on STAR Early Literacy or STAR Reading are not considered proficient. The number of students who were not considered proficient at the end of 2022-2023 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 related to Reading/ELA

The following data was used to determine the critical need:

Third grade ELA students scoring below proficiency rate was 49% on the 2023 FAST.

Fourth grade ELA students scoring below proficiency rate was 47% on the 2023 FAST.

Fifth grade ELA students scoring below proficiency rate was 61% on the 2023 FAST.

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

ELA proficiency as determined by those scoring at or above the 40th percentile on STAR Early Literacy or STAR Reading 2023 will increase for grades kindergarten through 2nd grade to 50% or higher on FAST-STAR PM3.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

The ELA proficiency rate will increase for grades third through fifth to 50% or higher in each grade on the 2024 FAST PM3.

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.

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 the percent of students meeting benchmark on the first grade quarterly decoding probe per classroom. (See FOCUS report)
 - c. Second grade: STAR Reading results and the percent of students whose fluency rate is average per the time of year on the Hasbrouck and Tindal fluency norms chart. (See Amira)
 - d. Grades 3-5: analyze results by classroom of district module assessments.
2. 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 Florida Literacy Practice Profiles.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Brown, Troy, tbrown2@ecsdfi.us

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?

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 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 RtI teams monitor the effectiveness of interventions with individual students by collecting data and tracking student progress.

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?

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
-------------	-----------------------------------

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, including writing.
 Review grade-level data from core curriculum assessments and overall classroom walkthrough trends to problem solve.

Action Step 2: Literacy Coaching-
 District coaches and/or school mentor teachers will facilitate use of the literacy practice profiles in the delivery of instruction with B.E.S.T. ELA Standards, including writing.
 Administration seeks coaching support from district coaches and the State Regional Literacy Director for walkthroughs and intervention support.

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.

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.

Brown, Troy,
 tbrown2@ecsdfi.us

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.

The Title I Annual Meeting is held during the first quarter of the school year. All stakeholders (families, teachers, staff, and community members) are invited to attend. During this meeting the following information is shared: School Improvement Plan, Parent & Family Engagement Plan, Title I Budget, Parents’ Right to Know (defined by Title I law), and the School-Family Compact.

Throughout the school year, SIP progress is regularly shared and discussed through the School Advisory Council. Regardless of membership status, all stakeholders are invited to attend School Advisory Council meetings.

Links to the school's SIP are posted on the school's homepage as well as the schools Our Title I Family page.

School webpage: <https://www.escambiaschools.org/Page/39>

Our Title I link: <https://www.escambiaschools.org/domain/787>

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))

During the 23-24 school year, parent conferences will be held by all teachers to share the progress of each student. FAST data will be reviewed with families. Two academic Family Nights are scheduled to build the capacity of families in Language Arts and Math. Teachers will share strategies which can be used at home. Teachers send daily and/or weekly information home to parents regarding their child's academic and social progress.

The Parent & Family Engagement Plan is shared with families during the Title I Annual Meeting, posted on our website, and messaged to families through the student information system FOCUS.

The Parent & Family Engagement Plan is accessible from our school's website

<https://www.escambiaschools.org/Page/39>

<https://www.escambiaschools.org/domain/787>

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)

Our teachers will participate in a multitude of professional development and collaborative planning throughout the school year. This will include opportunities for book studies to include "Teach Like a Champion", "Kids These Days", and "Visual Learning:Feedback". Additionally, we will have monthly data meetings to review student progress as well as weekly collaborative planning time for each grade level. We will also provide professional development in iReady and STAR programs so that our teachers can make the most effective use of these programs for instruction.

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))

Voluntary Pre-Kindergarten: Title I Part A co-funds VPK services, by extending full day services in schools with our highest poverty. Family events provide guidance and modeling of emergent literacy development activities. IDEA: Provides students with disabilities a Free Appropriate Public Education (FAPE) that is tailored to their individual needs including an Individualized Education Plan (IEP), placement in the Least Restrictive Environment (LRE), appropriate evaluation, parent and teacher participation, and procedural safeguards.

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))

Our guidance counselor provides frequent check-ins with students to ensure that they are on track with their school work and behavior. Additionally, we make use of a Lakeview counselor that collaborates with students and families to ensure all needs are met and provided for. We employ a behavior coach who adds needed support to help guide students in the development of skills needed for behavior choices and how to make best decisions when frustration occurs within the classroom and school. This helps the students to grow in their life long skills that are needed outside of their academics.

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))

Not applicable.

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 employ a behavior coach who adds needed support to help guide students in the development of skills needed for behavior choices and how to make best decisions when frustration occurs within the classroom and school. This helps the students to grow in their life long skills that are needed outside of their academics.

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))

Our teachers will participate in a multitude of professional development and collaborative planning throughout the school year. This will include opportunities for book studies to include "Teach Like a Champion", ""Kids These Days", and "Visual Learning:Feedback". Additionally, we will have monthly data meetings to review student progress as well as weekly collaborative planning time for each grade level. We will also provide professional development in iReady and STAR programs so that our teachers can make the most effective use of these programs for instruction.

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))

Parents are given information including strategies to make transitions smoother and help them work with their children at parent/teacher conferences, in newsletters, and at school events. Teachers also share VPK assessment results with parents after each administration so that parents know their students' progress and where they fall in the expectation of being Kindergarten Ready. Staff are provided with training opportunities online, at the individual schools, and at the district level. Training topics include procedural information, required parent involvement elements, curriculum & instruction, standards, safety, best practices, using assessments, and behavior.

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: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$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