

Seminole County Public Schools

Longwood 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	10
III. Planning for Improvement	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	20
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	20
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Longwood Elementary School

840 ORANGE AVE, Longwood, FL 32750

<http://www.scps.k12.fl.us/schools/schoolinfopage.cfm?schoolnumber=0091>

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Seminole County School Board on 10/24/2023.

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 Longwood Elementary School is to foster an inspirational learning environment that encourages perseverance while providing opportunities to create, collaborate, and communicate.

Provide the school's vision statement.

While Creating, Collaborating and Communicating, Longwood Elementary School will be a premier elementary school in the Lyman Cluster. Longwood will be recognized in the district and the state level for high standards, academic performance, and offering students future ready educational opportunities (Blended Learning, Reading Counts, and Cub Clubs focusing on STEAM activities). *Longwood will support the SCPS vision that every student will graduate from high school prepared for the future as a lifelong learner and a responsible citizen in a democratic society. *All students and will perform at the highest levels. *There will be equitable facilities and opportunities for all students. *The school's personnel will be highly qualified, diverse, innovative, enthusiastic, energetic, and dedicated to the mission.

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
Jones, Leigh	Principal	Oversee the daily activities and operations within Longwood ES, oversee instruction, school culture, and parent and family engagement supporting all stakeholders.
Sink, Amy	Assistant Principal	Supporting principal with all district and school initiatives including School Improvement Goals.
Sklar, Amy	School Counselor	The Guidance Counselor at Longwood Elementary School works with students, families, and staff to support overall well being. This includes supporting and aiding in the implementation of intervention, academic accommodations, and communicating to stakeholders academic or behavioral needs.
Hicks, Lindsay	Instructional Coach	The Instructional Coach supports all teachers and instructional paraprofessionals with understanding benchmarks, best practices, and data to drive successful instruction and student learning while focusing on SIP goals.
Martinez, Alicia	Behavior Specialist	Behavior Interventionist will support the Longwood community with the implementation of PBIS and behavior intervention, MTSS, and support of students within the academic environment.

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.

Longwood Elementary uses many strategies to include parents and the community in the development and review of School Improvement Plan (SIP). The School Advisory Council (SAC), which consists of staff, parents, and community members, is invited to attend the planning session and provide input and receive an explanation of the action plan and data. After the plan is developed, it is shared with members of the Parent Teacher Association (PTA) Board and the school staff. Data is shared with both groups of stakeholders throughout the year and parents are surveyed during school activities to get feedback on opportunities that are provided to them. Additionally, information about student achievement, school wide programs, and school priorities are communicated utilizing take home folders, newsletters, conferences, social media, and electronic communication.

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))

Every school meeting and/or team discussion that is held is aligned to the SIP. When agendas are developed, items are focused on school improvement and aligned to school improvement goals. Discussions held are based around school improvement and action items. This includes but is not limited to team leader meetings, PLC meetings with weekly data points, and curriculum project walkthroughs (monthly) and weekly data updates. When/if revision of the plan is necessary, admin team with schoolwide stakeholders will meet, discuss, and adjust as needed.

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	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	56%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	64%
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)* English Language Learners (ELL) 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: B 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: B
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	5	23	16	15	6	9	0	0	0	74	
One or more suspensions	1	4	2	2	3	2	0	0	0	14	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	9	6	4	6	0	0	0	0	25	
Course failure in Math	0	6	4	3	11	0	0	0	0	24	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	25	16	0	0	0	45	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	3	29	11	0	0	0	43	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	8	22	9	16	13	0	0	0	68	

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	9	8	5	24	16	0	0	0	63

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	3	8	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	16
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
One or more suspensions	3	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	
Course failure in ELA	0	6	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	12	
Course failure in Math	2	8	5	2	3	1	0	0	0	21	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	7	15	0	0	0	23	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	13	13	0	0	0	27	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	11	15	23	0	0	0	0	0	49	

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	0	6	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	10

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	3	13	6	3	5	6	0	0	0	36
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
One or more suspensions	3	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	
Course failure in ELA	0	6	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	12	
Course failure in Math	2	8	5	2	3	1	0	0	0	21	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	7	15	0	0	0	23	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	13	13	0	0	0	27	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	11	15	23	0	0	0	0	0	49	

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	0	6	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	10

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	3	13	6	3	5	6	0	0	0	36
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*	52	61	53	62	65	56	66		
ELA Learning Gains				58			49		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				39			11		
Math Achievement*	56	64	59	63	46	50	56		
Math Learning Gains				65			45		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				51			33		
Science Achievement*	70	65	54	54	65	59	60		
Social Studies Achievement*					62	64			
Middle School Acceleration					45	52			
Graduation Rate					62	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	91	77	59	88			90		

* 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	63
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	314
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	60

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	480
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
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	30	Yes	2	1
ELL	51			
AMI				
ASN	50			
BLK	29	Yes	1	1
HSP	55			
MUL	57			
PAC				
WHT	66			
FRL	53			

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	32	Yes	1	
ELL	67			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	53			
HSP	50			

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%
MUL	64			
PAC				
WHT	66			
FRL	53			

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	52			56			70					91
SWD	24			27			38				4	
ELL	27			31			54				4	91
AMI												
ASN	42			58							2	
BLK	37			21							2	
HSP	43			49			64				5	88
MUL	50			64							2	
PAC												
WHT	63			66			86				4	
FRL	40			46			56				5	90

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	62	58	39	63	65	51	54					88
SWD	23	41	39	35	46	33	6					
ELL	52	63		57	75							88
AMI												
ASN												

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
BLK	56			50								
HSP	53	49	28	54	54	37	41					86
MUL	55			73								
PAC												
WHT	70	63	46	73	71	73	65					
FRL	48	47	34	50	56	54	46					92

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	66	49	11	56	45	33	60					90
SWD	19	20	0	22	20		29					
ELL	50			31								90
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	56			38								
HSP	60	55		54	45		62					89
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	72	42		61	52		68					
FRL	62	50	13	48	43	31	56					87

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	60%	61%	-1%	54%	6%
04	2023 - Spring	58%	66%	-8%	58%	0%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	43%	60%	-17%	50%	-7%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	100%	66%	34%	54%	46%
03	2023 - Spring	46%	66%	-20%	59%	-13%
04	2023 - Spring	73%	68%	5%	61%	12%
05	2023 - Spring	31%	44%	-13%	55%	-24%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	68%	64%	4%	51%	17%

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 greatest need components for improvement are 3rd Grade ELA and math and 5th Grade math (non-RAMP).

Our secondary need for improvement includes 4th Grade ELA.

The highest contributing factor for this need for improvement specifically in 3rd grade is that approximately 24% of students in 3rd grade were identified as a student with a disability. A contributing factor in 5th grade math was that the teacher planned in isolation, meaning that the teacher was the only math teacher on the grade level. A contributing factor in 4th grade was that both ELA teachers were first year teachers.

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

ELA and math achievement across grades 3 – 5 demonstrated similar decline in overall achievement. In 3rd grade, students came into the 22-23 school year with large academic gaps and greatest SWD rate in the school. This attributed to lower overall 3rd grade scores impacting Longwood ES overall achievement in both ELA and Math. In 4th grade, ELA achievement was impacted by teachers new to the career field. In math specifically for 5th grade, RAMP students accounted for $\frac{1}{4}$ of the grade level and were at 100 percent proficiency. These students were high achieving; however, that left 3 classes of

students without high achieving peers in the classes; therefore, general education 5th grade math scores declined.

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.

3rd grade math had the greatest gap when compared to the state average. Contributing factors include the low performance of students with disabilities.

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

4th Grade math demonstrated the greatest growth from PM1 to PM3. The grade level went from 19 percent of student proficient to 73 percent of student proficient.

Another component that demonstrated great improvement was 3rd grade math. The grade level went from 9 percent proficient to 46 percent of students demonstrating proficiency.

One of the strongest contributing factors to student growth was strong grade level PLCs.

3rd and 4th Grade math teachers are seasoned math teachers that utilize small group instruction daily to address student learning needs.

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

Student attendance and on-grade level performance in ELA and Math

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

1. ELA PLC focus on instructional strategies and activities aligned to the standard.
2. Math PLC focus on instructional strategies and tasks aligned to the standard.
3. Curriculum Project and focus on SWD and academic achievement through partnership with SCPS ESSS and NIFDI.
4. Teacher coaching. Utilizing UF Lasinger trained instructional coaches across the school to work with colleagues using coaching cycles throughout the school year.
5. School-wide targeted and specific intervention to improve trust, collective responsibility, and overall academic achievement of all students.

Area of Focus

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

#1. 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.

Increasing academic achievement of students with disabilities. ESSA Federal Percent of Points Index indicates this is a high priority need and focusing on the success of these students will reduce achievement gaps and prepare these students for future academic success.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Increase achievement and learning gains for students with disabilities.

Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored through classroom walk throughs, review of progress monitoring data and through data chats with professional learning communities.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Leigh Jones (leigh_jones@scps.k12.fl.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.)

The following evidence-based interventions are available to support students based upon the area of need of the individual student: Leveled Literacy Intervention (LLI), Systematic Instruction in Phonological Awareness, Phonics and Sight Words (SIPPS), Wonders Tier 2 and Tier 3 Intervention, iReady or iStation, Success for All – FastTrack Phonics (at Title 1 schools), Reading Mastery, FastForward, Corrective Reading, Quick Reads and Elements of Reading.

The following evidence-based interventions are available to support students based upon the area of need of the individual student: iReady, DreamBox, SAVVAS enVision Math Diagnostic and Intervention System, Seminole Numeracy Project.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

A variety of interventions are available to the schools to allow them to meet the needs of individual students. This allows all the areas of reading to be addressed from foundations to comprehension across the K-12 continuum.

All of the listed interventions have been approved by Just Read, Florida through the vetting process for the K-12 Comprehensive Evidence- Based Reading Plan.

Math- All the listed interventions have research-based evidence for efficacy.

Standards based lessons differentiated to meet the needs of these specific student groups and data driven deliberate action planning will improve achievement and learning gains for our students. This strategy is aligned to having high expectations for all learners and teachers.

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.

What do we want all students to do?

Longwood Elementary School expects all students to master the ELA, Math, Science, and Social Studies standards in their grade level. Our expectation for students who may not have not mastered grade level standards to make a minimum of one year's growth in one year's time.

How will we know if they learn it?

Teachers work in PLCs weekly to determine student progress by utilizing formative assessments to drive discussion and instructional strategy review. Other data used throughout the school year will also be used which includes, but is not limited to progress monitoring using FAST and iReady data, weekly data chats with not only formative data, but also summative unit exams (when available). Data will be aligned to standards in ELA, math, science, and social studies. Each week teachers will review data, for not only all students in the grade level, but also subgroups including SWD, ELL, SRD, and tiered students.

How will we respond when some students do not learn?

During PLC, grade level teachers will review lessons taught and strategies that are being utilized in relation to the standard that some students did not master. During monthly coaching meetings with the Curriculum Project instructional coach, teachers and stakeholders, strategies and lessons will be reviewed. During these meetings, teachers will discuss whether students struggled to master the standard because of a presentation break down during the core or because the student needs targeted intervention, or whether the student needs differentiated instruction during small group and will plan for immediate adjustments or interventions. If it is identified that a teacher needs support with instructional strategies, the Lion Excellence team (a team made up of school-wide instructional coaches) will provide coaching support. Some actions teachers will take during small group differentiated instruction will be to provide small group instruction to review/focus on standards that were previously not mastered. This will be aligned with state standards but will specifically target gap achievement for students who lack mastery. Longwood ES will also provide additional tutoring to students who lack mastery for students with a disability and for students that demonstrate a high level 2 or low level 3 on FAST PMs throughout the year. Tutoring will address benchmarks specifically for each student as identified through data collected including but not limited to, FAST, iReady, classroom formative/summative assessments, and teacher observation

What evidence/data will there be to reflect monitoring for this strategy/action?

Progress monitoring results, iReady results, PLC data and reflection forms will all be used to monitor this action plan. In addition, the weekly data monitoring sheet for Curriculum Project will be used to monitor the effect of this action.

Person Responsible: Leigh Jones (leigh_jones@scps.k12.fl.us)

By When: Ongoing throughout the school year

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to**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 succeed when conditions for learning are optimized. A focus on campus safety, development of a culture where student voice and belonging are valued and sharing collective responsibility for the success of all students in the school increase student achievement.

Measurable Outcome:

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

5 Essentials Survey indicators for trust, collective responsibility and academic personalism will increase to or remain Well Organized.

Monitoring:

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

Conditions for Learning monitoring will occur during classroom walk through, PLC meetings, attendance and discipline data reviews.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Leigh Jones (leigh_jones@scps.k12.fl.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.)

The Multi-Tiered Support System (MTSS) process is a team-based approach that relies on a strong collaboration between families and professionals from a variety of disciplines regardless of the level implemented. MTSS provides a positive and effective means to support student learning, attendance and behavior.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

MTSS methods are research-based and proven to positively impact school climate and increase academic performance.

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.

Student Safety Team, made up of 3rd - 5th grade students, will meet with Longwood SRO monthly to discuss safety concerns.

Concerns will be brought to the student members by their class peers with the intention to work to come up with solutions to safety concerns on campus either by training, discussing with SRO, or by meeting with the Principal to discuss possible solutions to safety concerns.

Longwood ES will focus on raising 5Essential performance from neutral (56) within the category of

building teacher Collective Responsibility to a minimum of 70 (strong).

School-wide PLC Planning, cross grade level PLCs, individual teacher check-ins by administration, and the creation of the Longwood Excellence Team made up certified instructional coaches to work with less experienced teachers to model strategies and share their investment in the success of all students and how increasing Collective Responsibility will improve overall student success.

Person Responsible: Leigh Jones (leigh_jones@scps.k12.fl.us)

By When: Ongoing throughout the school year

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)).

In collaboration with the Assistant Superintendent, school leaders identify and align resources to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Evaluation of student achievement data and related early warning factors such as attendance and discipline referrals are at the core of this work. Principals review data with the school leadership team, staff, and other relevant stakeholders, then develop or modify goals and strategies to align with the school needs presented. These goals and strategies are then operationalized through action items within the annual School Improvement Plan. These specific interventions or activities are noted within the SIP, and funding resources are assigned (i.e., Title I, Part A, UniSIG).

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

N/A

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

For grade 3, coaches at RAISE schools will receive extra support from the State Regional Literacy Director through Professional Development that Just Read, Florida! has developed. In turn, coaches will use this professional development to improve the support to teachers at their respective schools. This

should support more explicit, systematic, benchmark-aligned instruction in classrooms to lead to improvement in student outcomes on state assessments.

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

N/A

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

The number of students in grade 3 that score below a Level 3 on the end of the year statewide ELA assessment will decrease by 2 percent.

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.

This area of focus will be monitored through strategic, data aligned PLC planning and collaboration, common formative assessment data, DRA, FAST and district progress monitoring assessment outcomes.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Jones, Leigh, leigh_jones@scps.k12.fl.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?

Research reflects a 0.47 effect size for small group learning.

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?

By working with students in small groups, teachers can provide targeted lessons and feedback to quickly accelerate student learning through both differentiation in the core and intervention.

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
Developing highly collaborative PLCs strategically focused on the use of formative assessment data. Utilizing results of FAST PM1 and PM2, DRA and district progress monitoring to design reading acceleration support for students. Utilizing SCPS Early Warning/MTSS systems to support interventions. Reading walk-throughs focused on identifying standards-based and differentiated whole group instruction and small group instruction. Utilizing pacing calendars and research based instructional materials and practices in 90-minute block. Utilizing additional research-based intervention curriculum for tier 2 and 3 students.	Jones, Leigh, leigh_jones@scps.k12.fl.us