Brevard Public Schools

Longleaf Elementary School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

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: 9/11/2019

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)	*[Data Not Available]*
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 Grades History	2018-19: A (76%) 2017-18: A (68%) 2016-17: A (70%) 2015-16: A (73%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Dustin Sims
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	[not available]

* 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, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Whalen, Kaylee	Reading Coach	Literacy Coach supports student and staff learning through collaboration, professional development, and monitoring of school wide data for action.
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.
Gabreski, Taylor	Guidance Counselor	Guidance counselor supports students' social emotional learning and academic needs.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Wednesday 9/11/2019, Jason Sherburne L

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
7

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
5

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
44

Total number of students enrolled at the school
599

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.
4

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.
3

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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	79	89	80	90	71	81	88	0	0	0	0	0	0	578
Attendance below 90 percent	2	1	0	2	1	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
One or more suspensions	0	2	2	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	2	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on 2021 FSA ELA	0	0	0	0	3	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Level 1 on 2021 FSA Math	0	0	0	0	4	4	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

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	2	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

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	4	1	2	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 8/25/2021

2020-21 - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	74	71	86	69	81	89	75	0	0	0	0	0	0	545
Attendance below 90 percent	1	2	5	3	1	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	9	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	15

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	1	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

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	4	1	4	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

2020-21 - 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	
Number of students enrolled	74	71	86	69	81	89	75	0	0	0	0	0	0	545
Attendance below 90 percent	1	2	5	3	1	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	9	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	15

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	1	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

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	4	1	4	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

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

School Grade Component	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	78%			82%	62%	57%	78%	60%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	73%			73%	60%	58%	57%	54%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	74%			72%	57%	53%	38%	46%	48%
Math Achievement	83%			85%	63%	63%	84%	62%	62%
Math Learning Gains	78%			81%	65%	62%	73%	59%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	84%			67%	53%	51%	68%	49%	47%
Science Achievement	66%			70%	57%	53%	78%	57%	55%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments
NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	84%	64%	20%	58%	26%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	85%	61%	24%	58%	27%
Cohort Comparison		-84%				
05	2021					
	2019	77%	60%	17%	56%	21%
Cohort Comparison		-85%				
06	2021					
	2019	82%	60%	22%	54%	28%
Cohort Comparison		-77%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2021					
	2019	83%	61%	22%	62%	21%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	86%	64%	22%	64%	22%
Cohort Comparison		-83%				
05	2021					
	2019	81%	60%	21%	60%	21%
Cohort Comparison		-86%				
06	2021					
	2019	88%	67%	21%	55%	33%
Cohort Comparison		-81%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2021					
	2019	70%	56%	14%	53%	17%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

ELA iReady, Math iReady

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	50/56%	64/72%	77/87%
	Economically Disadvantaged	10/42%	17/71%	20/83%
	Students With Disabilities	6/33%	10/56%	72%
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	39/44%	57/64%	73/82%
	Economically Disadvantaged	10/42%	14/58%	19/79%
	Students With Disabilities	6/33%	8/44%	12/67%
	English Language Learners	0	0	0

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	19/24%	36/45%	58/73%
	Economically Disadvantaged	4/16%	7/28%	19/76%
	Students With Disabilities	3/23%	4/31%	9/69%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	11/14%	28/35%	52/65%
	Economically Disadvantaged	5/20%	7/28%	16/64%
	Students With Disabilities	2/15%	6/46%	8/62%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	44/49%	63/70%	74/82%
	Economically Disadvantaged	9/45%	12/60%	18/90%
	Students With Disabilities	3/33%	4/44%	5/56%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	15/17%	46/51%	61/68%
	Economically Disadvantaged	3/15%	7/35%	13/65%
	Students With Disabilities	0/0%	2/22%	3/33%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	44/62%	55/77%	61/86%
	Economically Disadvantaged	11/58%	12/63%	16/84%
	Students With Disabilities	3/27%	6/55%	7/64%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	0/0%	1/33%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	8/11%	29/41%	53/75%
	Economically Disadvantaged	0/0%	4/21%	13/68%
	Students With Disabilities	0/0%	1/1%	6/55%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	0/0%	3/100%

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	38/47%	52/64%	61/75%
	Economically Disadvantaged	8/42%	13/68%	14/74%
	Students With Disabilities	6/29%	9/43%	13/62%
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	22/27%	42/52%	61/75%
	Economically Disadvantaged	3/16%	8/42%	15/79%
	Students With Disabilities	2/1%	8/38%	12/57%
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	0	0	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0

Grade 6				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	46/52%	57/64%	63/72%
	Economically Disadvantaged	15/52%	18/62%	20/69%
	Students With Disabilities	3/21%	6/43%	4/29%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	0/0%	1/100%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	25/28%	41/47%	62/70%
	Economically Disadvantaged	10/34%	12/41%	19/66%
	Students With Disabilities	0/0%	2/14%	7/50%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%

Subgroup Data Review

2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	47	50	60	51	58	67	27				
BLK	82			76							
HSP	81	67		86	94		70				
MUL	71			79							
WHT	77	73	71	82	73	88	67				
FRL	69	64	69	76	74	69	55				

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
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 Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	[not available]
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	77
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	536

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	93%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	51
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	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	79
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	80
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	75
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	76
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	68
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Analysis
Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

Longleaf increased learning gains for our students in the lowest 25% in ELA and Math. In 2019, Longleaf's learning gains of the lowest 25% in ELA was 72% this increased to 74% in 2021. In Math, Longleaf's learning gains of the lowest 25% in 2019 was 67% which increased to 84% in 2021. On the 2021 FSA, science proficiency was lower than all other data components with 68% of students at Level 3 and above. In 2019, 70% of students were proficient, and in 2018, 78% of students were proficient. Although the scores were above the district and the state, the trend we are seeing is a continuous decline in the area of science. Therefore, we must remain focused on science instruction to increase student achievement. At the beginning of the 2021 school year, fifth grade students took the Science Summative Assessment. The average score on the assessment was a 60%. The final trend we have noticed is Longleaf's English Language Learners and Students with Disabilities have the lowest proficiency percentage in ELA based on our progress monitoring data. Longleaf also did not increase overall learning gains from 2019 to 2021 in ELA.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Longleaf's need for improvement continues to be in the areas of ELA and science. 5th grade Science achievement levels decreased from 70% in 2019 to 66% in 2021. Longleaf's overall ELA achievement levels decreased from 82% in 2019 to 78% in 2021. In looking at Longleaf's subgroup data, our English Language Learners are not proficient on state assessments and district progress monitoring assessments.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

The decrease in Science proficiency may be contributed to limited times designated for hands-on science activities and access to the Science Lab. During the fall semester of the 2019-2020 school year, students were able to participate in hands-on science activities through our Science Lab. Teachers also completed focus calendars that integrated science standards through informational text and components of the 5E Model
into their ELA block. Due to COVID-19 these plans and hands-on activities were impacted which may have lead to a decline in the 2020-2021 school year. Longleaf also saw a decrease in ELA Achievement on the FSA. This decrease could be a result of eLearning impacting education as well as a need for unified implementation of ELA standards aligned instruction. Moving forward in the 2021-2022 school year Longleaf will continue to focus on increasing the amount of hands on science instruction provided to students by utilizing the science lab. Longleaf is also focused on providing standards aligned instruction and tasks by using our new adopted ELA curriculum with fidelity.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Longleaf's proficiency in ELA and Math on the FSA for students in the lowest 25% has continued to increase over the last three years. In 2018, 38% of students in the lowest 25% were proficient on the ELA FSA. In 2019, 72% of students in the lowest 25% were proficient on the ELA FSA. In 2020, 74% of students in the lowest 25% were proficient on the ELA FSA. Students in the lowest 25% have also increased proficiency in Math 2018- 68%, 2019-67% and 2021-84%.

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

Over the last three years, Longleaf has restructured our schoolwide intervention time and placed a strong focus on using data to provide strong research-based intervention instruction with fidelity. By increasing our grade level data meetings, this allowed teachers to triangulate data and consistently monitor students in order to select an evidence based program to provide intervention. Teachers used the district Identification and Intervention Decision Trees with fidelity to guide this process. Longleaf also implemented math intervention four days a week. This focus supported our students who fell within the lowest 25%. Students in the lowest 25% showed a significant increase in proficiency on the FSA ELA and Math assessment.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

During the 2021-2022 school year, teachers will be focused on providing scaffolds to help all students access grade-level content. Longleaf will use ongoing progress monitoring data and diagnostic data to determine missed learning. Teachers will utilize the district Benchmark Overview documents to support planning in order to intentionally scaffold instruction. For science, teachers will follow the 5E model in order to build knowledge and vocabulary. Students will have opportunities to work in collaborative groups focusing on academic content while fostering social emotional skills.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

We are going to continue to provide professional development opportunities regarding best practices in ELA and Science instruction to increase student achievement. Job-embedded professional development will be provided on the new B.E.S.T. standards, ELA curriculum, and scaffolding instruction.

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

To ensure sustainability Longleaf will continue to analyze and monitor data to ensure that the strategies implemented maintain or increase our identified areas of improvement. Professional development and planning will be adjusted based on current needs.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Science proficiency levels have decreased the past 3 years. In 2021, 68% of students scored level 3 and above. In 2019, 70% of students were proficient. In 2018, 78% of students were proficient. On the 2021 Fall Science Summative Assessment, 60% of students were proficient; therefore, the plan is to continue our work and focus on improving science proficiency.
Measureable Outcome:	Grade 5 Science proficiency will increase from 68% to 70%.
Monitoring:	District assessments will be inputted into Performance Matters. During CPT meetings, grade level teams will analyze assessment data. Teachers will monitor student usage and pass rate on PENDA Science.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Rick Dillon (dillon.rick@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	5E Instructional Model for Science Data-driven decision making Progress Monitoring Job Embedded Coaching Writing in the content areas PENDA Science
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The decrease in scores for science are due to COVID protocols impacting the ability to utilize the Science Lab which included hands-on experiences and cooperative interactions. If teachers are analyzing progress monitoring data and intentionally planning purposeful standards aligned tasks while using the 5E instructional model then scores will increase.

Action Steps to Implement

Teachers will use the science lab to provide engagement and exploration opportunities to students as appropriate with COVID procedures.

Person Responsible Jason Sherburne (sherburne.jason@brevardschools.org)

Teachers will use the district Science Curriculum Guides and the 5E Instructional Model to plan science instruction. As a grade level, teachers will follow the district science pacing and sequence guide in order to fully address all benchmarks for their grade level.

Person Responsible Kaylee Whalen (whalen.kaylee@brevardschools.org)

Teachers in grades 3-5 will use the FLDOE Lessons Learned from the SSA in order to identify and prioritize grade level benchmarks to ensure that students are mastering those benchmarks through the 5E instructional model.

Person Responsible Rick Dillon (dillon.rick@brevardschools.org)

Pending COVID protocols, host a science night to engage and connect parents and families. The science night would include activities and experiments that align with grade level science benchmarks.

Person Responsible Jason Sherburne (sherburne.jason@brevardschools.org)

Teachers will utilize district created formative assessments to progress monitor and administer the district created Science summative assessments. Assessments will be inputted into Performance Matters in order to monitor student achievement as a school.

Person Responsible Kaylee Whalen (whalen.kaylee@brevardschools.org)

Teachers in grades 3-6 will implement PENDA Science into their science instruction to reinforce grade level content. Teachers will monitor student progress and pass rate.

Person Responsible Rick Dillon (dillon.rick@brevardschools.org)

Academic support will be offered after school for grade 5 students in Science. Teachers will use CPALMS, the district science pacing and hands on experiences to provide instruction on the science benchmarks.

Person Responsible Rick Dillon (dillon.rick@brevardschools.org)

Leadership team will facilitate vertical planning to focus on prioritizing science standards.

Person Responsible Kaylee Whalen (whalen.kaylee@brevardschools.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Longleaf's overall ELA achievement levels decreased from 82% in 2019 to 78% in 2021. Due to the instructional impact that COVID 19 has placed on our students along with the adoption of new standards, Longleaf will continue to focus on intentionally planning high-quality instruction and tasks utilizing the Benchmark Advance curriculum. Upon further review of the data, it is evident that our ELL subgroup is not meeting proficiency on state and district assessments.
Measureable Outcome:	Longleaf's overall ELA achievement on the FSA will increase from 78% to 80%. In addition, 33% of our ELL subgroup will become proficient on the district progress monitoring assessments.
Monitoring:	As a school, we will be monitoring the iReady ELA Diagnostics to identify student proficiency levels and to guide the direction of intervention. Teachers will use formative assessments and checks to determine small group instruction during the core ELA block. ELA instruction will be monitored through classroom observations, grade level planning, and analyzing all data points.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jason Sherburne (sherburne.jason@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Job Embedded Coaching MTSS/RTI High Yield Instructional Strategies Progress Monitoring Data Analysis Specific Instructional Feedback
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	When planning ELA instruction, teachers will focus on providing high yield instructional strategies during both small and whole group instruction. Schoolwide, we will focus on analyzing data and progress monitoring to ensure ELA instruction is scaffolded for student's readiness.

Action Steps to Implement

For the 2021-2022 school year, grade level planning times have been revamped to include six meetings: three in the area of curriculum and planning and three in the area of data analysis. The literacy coach will support teachers with analyzing student data and using that data to plan instruction/tasks.

Person Responsible	Kaylee Whalen (whalen.kaylee@brevardschools.org)

Job embedded professional development and coaching will be provided on scaffolding instruction and independent student tasks.

Person Responsible	Kaylee Whalen (whalen.kaylee@brevardschools.org)

Teachers will implement the new Benchmark Advance/SAVVAS curriculum with fidelity and utilize the district overview documents for pacing.

Person Responsible	Jason Sherburne (sherburne.jason@brevardschools.org)

Leadership team will conduct 5x5 classroom walk-throughs to observe and offer feedback.

Person Responsible	Rick Dillon (dillon.rick@brevardschools.org)

Professional development will be provided to teachers on how to interpret WIDA scores and use the Can Do Descriptors to help scaffold instruction for ELL's.

Person Responsible	Taylor Gabreski (gabreski.taylorleigh@brevardschools.org)

Teachers of ELL's will use the Integrated ELD section of the Benchmark Curriculum to scaffold instruction. 6th grade teachers will use the SAVVAS English Learner Support resources.

Person Responsible	Kaylee Whalen (whalen.kaylee@brevardschools.org)

Academic support will be offered after school for grades 3,4, and 6. The focus of ASP will be on ELA targeting comprehension. Students who are substantially deficient in ELA, based on the iReady diagnostic and FSA, will be invited to participate.

Person Responsible	Kaylee Whalen (whalen.kaylee@brevardschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the SafeSchoolsforAlex.org, compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

According to the Safe Schools for Alex data during the 2019-2020 school year, Longleaf had 0.6 incidents per 100 students which compared to all elementary schools in the state falls into the moderate category. Our highest area, with 4 incidents, was harassment. Based on school data during the 2020-2021 school year, our highest area was physical aggression one sided. Therefore, we will be focusing on building self-regulation strategies through our PBIS program and our schoolwide SEL program, Sanford Harmony.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

According to our 2020-2021 parent survey, it showed that 83% of our families feel welcomed at our school and 60% of our parents felt they were able to contribute to decision making at our school, however 53% of parents would like more information about school issues to be addressed. In our 2020-2021 parent survey, only 45% of our parents felt that teachers provided information about ways to help their child academically. 73% of parents felt it would be helpful to receive academic materials at home for supporting their child. After reflecting on the Insight Survey, in order to make families feel more involved we are increasing the number of ways we communicate. Frequent Blackboard messages are sent through email to all stakeholders as well as posting on our Facebook page. Longleaf families participate in virtual or in person academic conferences, virtual open house, and virtual and in person SAC meetings. We frequently update our marquee to provide current information and event dates.
According to the 2021 Youth Truth Survey, 87% of students felt their teacher treated them with respect and 86% of students felt teachers cared about them. 29% of our students felt that their peers behaved well during class. In order to address this, Longleaf will continue to focus on our positive school culture and environment through PBIS and our SEL program Sanford Harmony. Teachers received professional development from Sanford Harmony to support their implementation. Based on 2020-2021 Insight Survey data, peer culture (7.7) and the learning environment (7.5) were our highest scoring domains. Our areas to improve on are observation and feedback (5.9) and instructional planning and student growth (5.9). To address these areas we have increased our collaborative planning meetings to three times a month to support teachers with instructional planning. Administration will also be increasing classroom observations and providing teachers feedback from those walk-throughs.

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

Longleaf creates a welcoming environment that ensures all stakeholders are involved. This year our Longleaf community assisted in creating Buddy's Place for students to shop with their Buddy Bucks earned for displaying PAWS expectations. The Longleaf community donated items, money, talent, and time to get the store up and running. Our students also participate in weekly Sanford Harmony lessons that focus on social emotional learning. Volunteers are able to select tasks and events through a sign-up genius to support our school. Melbourne Police Department supports us with our monthly safety drills and provides us feedback. We monthly SAC meetings where parents and community members provide input on our school improvement plan and budget. Our Non-Instructional Staff supports classrooms by encouraging students to follow the PAWS expectations. Community members and business partners provide our school with donations. As a whole, Longleaf works collaboratively with families to foster a home to school connection through open communication.

Part V: Budget

1	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science**	**$0.00**
2	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA**	**$0.00**
		Total:	**$0.00**