

Brevard Public Schools

Longleaf Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	9
III. Planning for Improvement	13
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	0
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Longleaf Elementary School

4290 N WICKHAM RD, Melbourne, FL 32935

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

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.

Serving every student with excellence and professionalism that fosters well-rounded and confident individuals by implementing our schoolwide PAWS expectations (Positive Attitude, Acting Responsibly and Respectfully, Wise Choices, Safety First).

Provide the school's vision statement.

Guiding students toward limitless possibilities.

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
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.
Kledzik, Eddy	Other	Media Center Specialist supports school wide literacy and overall school improvement.
Vannorsdall, Nicole	Other	Literacy / Instructional Coach supports student and staff learning through collaboration, professional development, and monitoring of school wide data for action.

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.

The School Leadership Team shared the 2023-24 FAST ELA and Math scores as well as FCAT Science scores with all stakeholders during the beginning of the year faculty & staff meeting, SAC meeting, and PTO meeting. Input from stakeholders was gathered and used in the School Improvement Plan. Input included to continue focusing on ELA and Math with more emphasis this year on Science due to scores dropping.

Input on updating our vision and mission statements were requested of our stakeholders. Faculty, staff, SAC, and PTO were all asked to provide suggestions to improve and update our vision and mission statement. From the input provided, SAC came up with our new vision and mission statements.

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))

SIP will be monitored for effective implementation with walk-throughs and a calendar of school-wide scheduled science lab visits. The impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for students with the greatest achievement gap is being monitored through CPT meetings and grade level data tracking sheets. Through weekly CPT meetings using data tracking sheets the plan will be revised as needed to ensure continued student growth and achievement. The School Leadership Team will meet monthly to monitor implementation and impact of the SIP and share out to all stakeholders through monthly faculty meetings, SAC meetings, and PTO meetings which include families, businesses, and other community members.

Demographic Data	
2023-24 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
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	27%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	25%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
2021-22 ESSA Identification	N/A
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	2021-22: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
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	2	9	6	12	4	7	5	0	0	45
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	3
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	7	9	21	0	0	37
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	8	25	0	0	36
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	2	3	4	7	9	2	10	0	0	37

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	0	1	0	0	1	2	4	0	0	8

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	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1

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	2	0	2	1	1	4	3	0	0	13
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	8	9	3	0	0	20
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	5	9	8	0	0	22
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	2	4	0	1	3	2	2	0	0	14

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	0	0	0	4	6	2	0	0	12

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	3	3	0	0	2	0	0	0	9
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				2	0	2	1	1	4	3	0	0	13
One or more suspensions				0	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA				0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math				0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment				0	0	0	0	8	9	3	0	0	20
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment				0	0	0	0	5	9	8	0	0	22
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.				2	4	0	1	3	2	2	0	0	14

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	0	0	0	4	6	2	0	0	12

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	3	3	0	0	2	0	0	0	9
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	2022			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	79	61	56	82	62	57
ELA Learning Gains	71	63	61	73	60	58
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	60	54	52	72	57	53
Math Achievement*	78	60	60	85	63	63
Math Learning Gains	70	64	64	81	65	62
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	61	55	55	67	53	51
Science Achievement*	63	56	51	70	57	53
Social Studies Achievement*		0	50		0	
Middle School Acceleration						
Graduation Rate						
College and Career Acceleration						
ELP Progress						

** 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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	69
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	482
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	98

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

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	45			
ELL	67			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	61			
HSP	78			
MUL	70			
PAC				
WHT	69			
FRL	64			

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)

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	79	71	60	78	70	61	63					
SWD	41	51	50	43	51	41	38					
ELL	50			83								
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	63	67		56	58							
HSP	86	74		83	70		79					
MUL	76	83		62	58							
PAC												

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
WHT	80	70	61	81	72	58	60					
FRL	72	66	53	62	70	60	67					

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	78	73	74	83	78	84	66					
SWD	47	50	60	51	58	67	27					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	82			76								
HSP	81	67		86	94		70					
MUL	71			79								
PAC												
WHT	77	73	71	82	73	88	67					
FRL	69	64	69	76	74	69	55					

2018-19 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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18	ELP Progress
All Students	82	73	72	85	81	67	70					
SWD	55	67	62	53	66	59	57					
ELL	73			91								
AMI												
ASN	67	70		100	90							
BLK	71	75		71	67							
HSP	74	70	64	76	70	54	67					
MUL	79	87		89	93							
PAC												
WHT	85	72	79	86	83	72	73					
FRL	76	80	76	73	79	52	60					

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	66%	59%	7%	54%	12%
04	2023 - Spring	81%	61%	20%	58%	23%
06	2023 - Spring	79%	61%	18%	47%	32%
03	2023 - Spring	72%	56%	16%	50%	22%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	95%	67%	28%	54%	41%
07	2023 - Spring	*	58%	*	48%	*
03	2023 - Spring	82%	60%	22%	59%	23%
04	2023 - Spring	80%	61%	19%	61%	19%
05	2023 - Spring	52%	55%	-3%	55%	-3%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	55%	57%	-2%	51%	4%

III. Planning for Improvement

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

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

The data component showing the lowest performance at Longleaf was Science. 5th grade Science scores showed the lowest performance with a proficiency rate of 55% which is a decrease from 64% in 2022 and 68% in 2021 which is a 13 point drop over the last two years. Longleaf is now performing below the district average of 57% proficiency.

Contributing factors for this decline include limited time in the daily schedule for hands-on science instruction provided to students by utilizing the science lab and teacher vacancy. The vacancy led to higher class sizes with limited opportunities for consistent instruction using the 5E Model.

Although Longleaf has focused on Science trends have shown a decrease in science scores for the past 6 years.

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

The data component with the greatest decline was 5th grade Math with 69% proficiency in 2022 to 52% proficiency in 2023. This is a 17% decline and now below the district average of 55%.

The contributing factor for this decline was teacher vacancy. The vacancy led to higher class size at the start of the year. Once a teacher was allocated, the new teacher resigned in December which led to more changes and searching for a new teacher to fill a vacancy once again. These changes yielded inconsistent instruction in math.

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.

In all areas, Longleaf is above the state average. Science proficiency is our lowest performing area compared to the state. Longleaf had 55% proficiency in 2023 compared to the state average of 51%.

Contributing factors for this decline include limited time in the daily schedule for hands-on science instruction provided to students by utilizing the science lab and teacher vacancy. The vacancy led to higher class sizes with limited opportunities for consistent instruction using the 5E Model.

Longleaf science scores have been declining for a six year period

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

6th Grade Math scores was the data component with the most improvement. In 2022, 6th grade had 86% proficiency and increased to 95% proficiency compared to 67% being the district average while the state average was 47%.

Last year, departmentizing with two teachers was implemented with each teacher focusing on specific subjects. One teacher taught math and science while the other teacher taught ELA and social studies. This enabled teachers to focus on standards aligned instruction for the subjects they taught. In addition, the new curriculum was implemented with fidelity, and the math block increased from 60 to 90 minutes.

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

One potential area of concern based on EWS data is student attendance rate. Longleaf increased its number of students absent 10% or more days from 13 students in 2022 to 45 students in 2023.

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

1. Science proficiency in grade 5.
2. Reading proficiency in all grade levels.
3. Math proficiency in grade 5.

Area of Focus

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

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**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.

FAST state assessment data indicates the need for improvement in the area of 5th grade math. 5th grade math proficiency decreased from 69% in 2022 to 52% in 2023.

Measurable Outcome:

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

During the 2023-2024 school year, Longleaf's overall Math proficiency achievement on the 5th grade FAST state assessment will increase from 52% to 70%.

Monitoring:

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

5th grade teachers will work with the district math coach to collaboratively plan math instruction. Teachers will provide scaffolded supports and use standards aligned materials to provide quality math instruction as well as math intervention four days a week. The use of i-ready prerequisite reports will be used to track and monitor data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Rick Dillon (dillon.rick@brevardschools.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

Collaborative Planning Teams, Data chats, Job Embedded Coaching, MTSS, High Yield Instructional Strategies, Progress Monitoring, Data Analysis, Specific Instructional Feedback

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

We will focus on analyzing data and progress monitoring to ensure Math instruction is scaffolded for student's readiness. Teachers will focus on providing high yield instructional strategies during both small and whole group instruction when planning for Math. Continued focus on the quality and appropriateness of interventions, collaborative planning practice for Tier 1 instruction will allow us to accelerate learning through rigorous instruction and grade level learning opportunities while also addressing gaps in student performance through intervention and focused scaffolding techniques.

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.

Collaborate with our district math coach to plan and implement math standards based curriculum with fidelity.

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

By When: Ongoing throughout the school year.

Using data during CPT/Data meetings to identify and monitor students who are working below proficiency in order to provide targeted intervention to close achievement gaps.

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

By When: Ongoing throughout the school year.

Math Academic Support Program will be offered for grades 3-6. Students who are in the lowest 25% in mathematics will be invited to participate. Teachers will assign i Ready math lessons to guide instruction and address the standards.

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

By When: November 2023 - April 2024

Leadership team will conduct routine classroom observations to observe and monitor that instructional agreements are being implemented and offer feedback.

Person Responsible: Nicole Vannorsdall (vannorsdall.nicole@brevardschools.org)

By When: Ongoing throughout the school year.

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

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.

Science proficiency levels have consistently decreased over the past 6 years. In 2023, we decreased another 9% and are now at 55% of students scoring a level 3 and above. While Longleaf is still above the state average of 51%, we are below the district average of 57%. Science is an area which needs focus and improvement.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Grade 5 Science proficiency will increase from 55% to 70%. Teachers in K-6 will administer the District Science Summative Assessments and utilize the data to drive their instruction.

Monitoring:

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

During CPT meetings, grade level teams will analyze science assessment data from Performance Matters and isolated reports from PENDA to drive instruction. Teachers will monitor student usage, growth, mastery, and pass rate on PENDA Science to provide individualized lessons to target specific standards. Grade level challenges and incentives are for mastery.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Rick Dillon (dillon.rick@brevardschools.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

5E Instructional Model for Science, Data-driven decision making, Progress Monitoring Job Embedded Coaching, Writing in the content areas, PENDA Science, and are being implemented with fidelity.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Decrease in science proficiency is due to scheduling restraints impacting the ability to use the science lab which included hands-on experiences and cooperative interactions. The 2022-23 teacher vacancy led to higher class sizes with limited opportunities for consistent instruction using the 5E Model.

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.

Teachers will use PENDA weekly with fidelity.

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

By When: Weekly, ongoing throughout the year.

Teachers will use the district's science curriculum guides and the 5E instructional model to plan science instruction. As a grade level, teachers will follow the district science pacing and sequencing guide in order to fully address all benchmarks for their grade level.

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

By When: Planning will be ongoing throughout the year.

Additional time allocated to science blocks across all grade levels.

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

By When: Ongoing throughout the year

Host a family science night to include activities and experiments that align with grade level benchmarks to engage and connect with families.

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

By When: February 2024

Departmentalized instruction in fifth grade. Teams of teachers focusing on specific subjects.

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

By When: Ongoing throughout the school year.

Science Academic Support Program will be offered for grade 5. All 5th grade students will be invited to participate. Teachers will assign PENDA lessons to guide instruction and address the standards.

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

By When: November 2023 - April 2024

Leadership team will conduct routine classroom observations to observe and monitor that instructional agreements are being implemented and offer feedback.

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

By When: Ongoing throughout the school year.

Provide Professional Development facilitated by the district science resource teacher. With focus on implementation of the 5E instructional model.

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

By When: December 15th, 2023

Leadership team will conduct classroom walkthroughs of like schools to observe instructional best practices.

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

By When: October 25th, 2023

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

FAST state assessment data indicates the need for improvement in the area of ELA. 3rd grade ELA proficiency decreased from 80% in 2022 to 72% in 2023. 4th grade ELA proficiency decreased from 85% in 2022 to 81% in 2023. 5th grade ELA proficiency decreased from 78% in 2022 to 66% in 2023. 6th grade ELA proficiency decreased from 80% in 2022 to 79% in 2023.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Longleaf's overall ELA proficiency achievement on state assessments will increase from 75% to 80%.

Monitoring:

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

As a school, we will be monitoring the iReady and statewide progress monitoring/F.A.S.T. ELA assessments 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:

Nicole Vannorsdall (vannorsdall.nicole@brevardschools.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

Collaborative Planning Team Meetings, Data chats, Job Embedded Coaching, MTSS, High Yield Instructional Strategies, Progress Monitoring, Data Analysis, Specific Instructional Feedback

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific 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. Continued focus on the quality and appropriateness of interventions, collaborative planning practice for Tier 1 instruction, and implementation

of a quality, standards-aligned ELA curriculum will allow us to accelerate learning through rigorous instruction and grade level learning opportunities while also addressing gaps in student performance through intervention and focused scaffolding techniques.

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.

Weekly grade level CPT meetings will focus on curriculum, planning and data analysis. The literacy coach will support teachers with analyzing student data and using that data to plan and drive instruction, as well as work with teachers to ensure the lowest 25% of students are receiving data driven intervention.

Person Responsible: Nicole Vannorsdall (vannorsdall.nicole@brevardschools.org)

By When: Weekly, ongoing throughout the school year.

ELA Academic Support Program will be offered for grades 3-6. Students who are in the lowest 25% in ELA will be invited to participate. Teachers will assign i Ready ELA lessons to guide instruction and address the standards.

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

By When: November 2023 - April 2024

Leadership team will conduct routine classroom observations to observe and monitor that instructional agreements are being implemented and offer feedback.

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

By When: Weekly, ongoing throughout the school year.