

Brevard Public Schools

Longleaf Elementary School



2019-20 School Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	7
Planning for Improvement	12
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Longleaf Elementary School

4290 N WICKHAM RD, Melbourne, FL 32935

<http://www.longleaf.brevard.k12.fl.us>

Demographics

Principal: Jason Sherburne L

Start Date for this Principal: 7/25/2016

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-6
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	24%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Asian Students Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grade	2018-19: A
School Grades History	2017-18: A 2016-17: A 2015-16: A 2014-15: A 2013-14: A
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Dustin Sims
Turnaround Option/Cycle	
Year	

Support Tier	NOT IN DA
ESSA Status	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement

Serving every student with excellence in an environment that values effort, achievement, growth, and social emotional development with school wide expectations of PAWS (Positive Attitude, Acting Responsibly & Respectfully, Wise Choices, Safety First).

Provide the school's vision statement

Guiding today's students to be tomorrow's leaders.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Sherburne, Jason	Principal	Oversees all aspects of the school focused on achievement, safety, and development in collaboration with all stakeholders.
Dillon, Rick	Assistant Principal	Supports school and district initiatives for school improvement and student achievement.
Whalen, Kaylee	Instructional Coach	Literacy Coach supports student and staff learning through collaboration, professional development, and monitoring of school wide data for action.
Kledzik, Eddy	Instructional Media	Media Center Specialist supports school wide literacy and overall school improvement.
Gabreski, Taylor	Guidance Counselor	Guidance counselor supports students' social emotional learning and academic needs.

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Number of students enrolled	76	90	77	87	94	91	106	0	0	0	0	0	0	621
Attendance below 90 percent	3	16	14	14	11	15	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	91
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	4	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on Math FSA (above is ELA)	0	0	0	0	9	6	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	24

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Students with two or more indicators	14	14	10	18	13	18	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	103

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Retained Students: Current Year		1	5	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Students retained two or more times		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)

47

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 9/13/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Attendance below 90 percent		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in ELA or Math		
Level 1 on statewide assessment		

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	82%	62%	57%	78%	60%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	73%	60%	58%	57%	54%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	72%	57%	53%	38%	46%	48%
Math Achievement	85%	63%	63%	84%	62%	62%
Math Learning Gains	81%	65%	62%	73%	59%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	67%	53%	51%	68%	49%	47%
Science Achievement	70%	57%	53%	78%	57%	55%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey								
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)							Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	
Number of students enrolled	76 (0)	90 (0)	77 (0)	87 (0)	94 (0)	91 (0)	106 (0)	621 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	3 ()	16 ()	14 ()	14 ()	11 ()	15 ()	18 ()	91 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 ()	0 (0)	1 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	2 (0)	0 (0)	3 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	4 (0)	2 (0)	6 (0)	12 (0)
Level 1 on Math FSA (above is ELA)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	9 (0)	6 (0)	9 (0)	24 (0)

Grade Level Data

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

NOTE: 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
03	2019	84%	64%	20%	58%	26%
	2018	83%	63%	20%	57%	26%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	85%	61%	24%	58%	27%
	2018	76%	57%	19%	56%	20%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				
05	2019	77%	60%	17%	56%	21%
	2018	70%	54%	16%	55%	15%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				
06	2019	82%	60%	22%	54%	28%
	2018	77%	63%	14%	52%	25%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		12%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	83%	61%	22%	62%	21%
	2018	84%	62%	22%	62%	22%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	86%	64%	22%	64%	22%
	2018	89%	59%	30%	62%	27%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				
05	2019	81%	60%	21%	60%	21%
	2018	70%	58%	12%	61%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison		-8%				
06	2019	88%	67%	21%	55%	33%
	2018	85%	68%	17%	52%	33%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		18%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	70%	56%	14%	53%	17%
	2018	76%	57%	19%	55%	21%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	55	67	62	53	66	59	57				
ELL	73			91							
ASN	67	70		100	90						
BLK	71	75		71	67						
HSP	74	70	64	76	70	54	67				
MUL	79	87		89	93						
WHT	85	72	79	86	83	72	73				
FRL	76	80	76	73	79	52	60				

2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	46	33	22	55	64	60					
ASN	100			100							
BLK	69	73		71	58						
HSP	55	38	27	71	62	50	58				
MUL	74	42		78	75						
WHT	82	58	42	86	74	70	81				
FRL	64	49	35	73	62	70	68				

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index - All Students	76
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	530

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	60
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	82
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	82
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	71
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	68
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	87
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A

Native American Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	79
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	71
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

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

Science proficiency is lower than all other data components at 70% of students at Level 3 and above. The trends indicate a fluctuation of scores from year to year. In 2018, 78% of students were proficient and 68% in 2017. Scores are above the district and the state but require a specific focus for continuous improvement.

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

The greatest decline in data components from the prior year are in science with a decrease of 8%. This may be contributed to limited times designated for hand-on science experiences and access to the Science Lab. While there was integration of science content in the ELA block, it may be not enough time spent on informational text.

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

We have no data components with a gap below the state. In comparison to the state, the area we need the most growth in is science. Longleaf scored at 70% which is 17% above the state. This data matches the trend at Longleaf that science proficiency is lower than

all other data. The factors that may contribute to this trend are limited instructional time for hands-on science experiences and limited exposure to science based informational text. The trend may also be caused by the lack of time designated for teaching 3rd and 4th grade science standards thus creating gaps in proficiency with standards not addressed in 5th grade.

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

2019 FSA ELA data showed the most improvement in both same grade level comparison and cohort comparison with all grade levels 3-6 scoring above the state and district. Actions which provided improvement in this area includes daily MTSS, implemented Kagan structures into the ELA block to provide student engagement among peers and the curriculum. iReady diagnostic for ELA data was used to drive instruction, plan, and form small groups. Standards focus documents were used in grade level planning and teachers completed focus calendars for every nine weeks. Teachers used QLA's to analyze data and drive instruction, teachers used ATU's and DBQ's to provide standards based instruction.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

EWS data shows that attendance is an area of concern. There were 91 students with an attendance rate below 90%. An additional area of concern based on the EWS data is that Longleaf had 24 students score a Level 1 on FSA Math.

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

1. Increase science proficiency levels.
2. Increase math learning gains for lowest 25%.
3. Continue to improve ELA proficiency levels for all students.
4. Increase student attendance rate.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Science Proficiency
Rationale	Science proficiency levels have fluctuated the past 3 years. In 2019, 70% of students scored level 3 and above. In 2018, 78% of students were proficient. In 2017, 68% of students were proficient. While this is above the state and district, it is one of our lowest proficient levels.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Grade 5 Science proficiency will increase from 70% to 75%. Teachers in K-6 will administer the District Science Formative and Summative Assessments and utilize the data to drive their instruction. Teachers in grades K-6 will plan their science instruction using the 5E Instructional Model. Teachers in grades 3-4 will focus on providing targeted instruction of priority science standards by using the district provided Priority Units.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Jason Sherburne (sherburne.jason@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	5E Instructional Model for Science Job Embedded Coaching Writing in the content areas
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	The decrease in scores for science are due to limited time that is designated for hands-on experiences and more support needed for integrating science into the ELA block. If teachers are intentionally planning using the 5E instructional model to integrate science into the reading block and provide students with hands-on science learning experiences then scores will increase.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Longleaf will adjust the master calendar to provide increased time for science instruction. 2. Literacy Coach will provide support to teachers with integration of science content into the ELA block to include comprehension of science text and response to text through writing during the explanation and elaboration stage of the 5E Instructional Model. 3. Science Lab moved to the main building and organized to allow easy access to for all grade levels. 4. School wide inventory of science materials was organized, cataloged and stored in the science lab to allow teachers to provide hands-on experiences that correlate with the grade level science standards. 5. Teachers will use the science lab to provide engagement and exploration opportunities to students. 6. Focus calendars will be developed to include 2-3 hands-on experiences per semester that align with science standards being taught in the classroom. 7. Professional Development on data analysis of science assessments for aligned standards based instruction, utilization of resources and maximizing hands-on learning opportunities in the science lab provided by Michelle Ferro, BPS Science Content Specialist. 8. Parent volunteers scheduled to support the science lab by organizing and prepping materials for hands-on science experiences. Parent volunteers will also support teachers during the hands-on experiences. 9. Media specialist will facilitate science based STEM activities during media

class focusing on science based literature, research, testing, data collection, and data analysis.

10. Teachers will use the 5E Instructional Model to plan science instruction. Grade level focus calendars will show where teachers are at in the 5E model for each standard. The focus calendars will show an integration of science content in the ELA block.

11. Teachers in grades 3-4 will teach each Priority Unit from the district to ensure that all priority standards will be taught before those students reach grade 5.

**Person
Responsible**

Jason Sherburne (sherburne.jason@brevardschools.org)

#2	
Title	Math Learning Gains Lowest 25%
Rationale	Longleaf's math learning gains for the lowest 25% decreased by 1% last year. In 2018, 68% of the lowest 25% made a learning gain in math. In 2019, 67% of the lowest 25% made a learning gain in math.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	During the 19-20 school year, the math learning gains for our lowest 25% will increase from 67% to 70%. Longleaf's lowest 25% in math will make learning gains due to teachers providing math intervention one day a week. Teachers will also be using standards-aligned curriculum materials to provide quality math instruction.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Jason Sherburne (sherburne.jason@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	RTI and Math Instruction High Yield Instructional Strategies Professional Development
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	We believe the problem is occurring because of an absence of a school wide math intervention. Professional development in high yield instructional strategies for mathematical practice and designating math intervention one day a week will benefit all math students including students in the lowest 25%.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provide professional development to teachers on high yield instructional strategies for mathematical practice. 2. Identify lowest 25% students in math to better plan instruction and activities that support their academic needs. 3. Implement a school wide math intervention schedule one day a week. During this time, teachers will provide math intervention to students using district math assessments and the iReady math diagnostic to determine instructional needs. 4. Teachers will use Ready MAFS resources and Achieve the Core as tools for instruction. 5. Teachers will utilize Ready Florida MAFS books in grades 3, 4 and 5 for targeted small group instruction that aligns to the state standards. 6. Kindergarten teachers implemented Eureka Math, while first and second grade teachers implemented Ready Florida MAFS curriculum in order for primary grades to provide mathematical instruction that aligns to grade level standards and develop a strong foundation to help close the achievement gap as soon as possible. 7. Professional development was provided on Kagan Day 2 structures to support student engagement among peers and the curriculum. 8. Students who fall within the lowest 25% for math will be monitored using the iReady Growth Monitoring assessment. Teachers will use this data to help support students through targeted intervention and instruction.
Person Responsible	Jason Sherburne (sherburne.jason@brevardschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information)