

Table of Contents

- SIP Authority 1
- I. School Information 2
 - A. School Mission and Vision 2
 - B. School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring 2
 - C. Demographic Data..... 6
 - D. Early Warning Systems 7
- II. Needs Assessment/Data Review 10
 - A. ESSA School, District, State Comparison 11
 - B. ESSA School-Level Data Review 12
 - C. ESSA Subgroup Data Review 13
 - D. Accountability Components by Subgroup..... 14
 - E. Grade Level Data Review 17
- III. Planning for Improvement..... 18
- IV. Positive Learning Environment 35
- V. Title I Requirements (optional)..... 38
- VI. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review 44
- VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus 45

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Seminole County School Board on Board Approved 10/07/2025.

SIP Authority

Section (s.) 1001.42(18)(a), 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, F.S., by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S. Code (U.S.C.) § 6311(c)(2); 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, F.S., and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), F.S., 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, F.S.; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate.

SIP Template in Florida Continuous Improvement Management System Version 2 (CIMS2)

The Department's SIP template meets:

1. All state and rule requirements for public district and charter schools.
2. ESEA components for targeted or comprehensive support and improvement plans required for public district and charter schools identified as Additional Targeted Support and Improvement (ATSI), Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI), and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI).
3. Application requirements for eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

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.

I. School Information

A. School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement

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

Provide the school's vision statement

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

B. School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

1. School Leadership Membership

School Leadership Team

For each member of the school leadership team, enter the employee name, and identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities as they relate to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.

Leadership Team Member #1

Employee's Name

Leigh Jones

leigh_jones@scps.k12.fl.us

Position Title

Principal

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Oversee the daily activities and operations within Longwood ES, oversee instruction, school culture, and parent and family engagement supporting all stakeholders.

Leadership Team Member #2

Employee's Name

Teodora Adames

teddy_adames@scps.k12.fl.us

Position Title

Assistant Principal

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Supporting principal with all district and school initiatives including School Improvement Goals.

Leadership Team Member #3

Employee's Name

Alicia Martinez

alicia_martinez@scps.k12.fl.us

Position Title

School Administration Manager

Job Duties and Responsibilities

The School Administration Manager oversees all aspects of school operations, including scheduling, event coordination, maintenance projects, and safety plans. I also manage facility rentals, inventory procedures, student attendance, and serve as an emergency response contact.

Leadership Team Member #4

Employee's Name

Lindsay Hicks

lindsay_hicks@scps.k12.fl.us

Position Title

Instructional Coach

Job Duties and Responsibilities

The Instructional Coach supports all teachers and instructional paraprofessionals with understanding benchmarks, best practices, and data to drive successful instruction and student learning while focusing on SIP goals.

Leadership Team Member #5

Employee's Name

Angela Giddens

angela_giddens@scps.k12.fl.us

Position Title

Instructional Coach

Job Duties and Responsibilities

The Instructional Coach supports all teachers and instructional paraprofessionals with understanding benchmarks, best practices, and data to drive successful instruction and student learning while focusing on SIP goals.

Leadership Team Member #6

Employee's Name

Kelly Stivers

stiverkm@scps.k12.fl.us

Position Title

Guidance Counselor

Job Duties and Responsibilities

The Guidance Counselor at Longwood Elementary School works with students, families, and staff to support overall well being. This includes supporting and aiding in the implementation of intervention, academic accommodations, and communicating to stakeholders academic or behavioral needs.

2. Stakeholder Involvement

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 (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(2), ESEA Section 1114(b)(2)).

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

To ensure a comprehensive and inclusive School Improvement Plan (SIP), we will implement a robust process to involve a diverse group of stakeholders, including the school leadership team, teachers and staff, parents, students, and community leaders (as applicable). The process will begin by establishing a School Advisory Council (SAC) and conducting Professional Learning Communities

(PLCs) sessions where data is meticulously reviewed and analyzed. During PLCs, teachers and staff will examine student performance data, identify areas needing improvement, and propose actionable strategies. SAC meetings, which will include parents and community leaders (as applicable), will provide a platform to discuss this data, gather feedback, and consider additional perspectives. Input from these discussions will be carefully documented and integrated into the SIP. Parents and students will be able to contribute insights on school climate and support services, while community leaders will be able to offer resources and partnership opportunities. This iterative process ensures that the SIP is data-driven and reflective of the entire school community's needs and aspirations, fostering a sense of collective ownership and commitment to school improvement.

3. 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 academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan with stakeholder feedback, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(3), ESEA Section 1114(b)(3)).

To ensure the effective implementation and impact of the School Improvement Plan (SIP) on increasing student achievement, particularly for those with the greatest achievement gaps, we have established a rigorous monitoring and evaluation process. The school leadership team, along with designated members of the School Advisory Council (SAC), will conduct regular reviews of the SIP progress through monthly meetings and quarterly performance assessments. Key performance indicators (KPIs) aligned with the State's academic standards will be tracked using data from standardized tests, formative assessments, and classroom observations. For students with significant achievement gaps, targeted interventions will be monitored closely, with progress reports generated. Additionally, feedback from teachers, parents, and students will be gathered periodically to assess the effectiveness of implemented strategies.

C. Demographic Data

2025-26 STATUS (PER MSID FILE)	ACTIVE
SCHOOL TYPE AND GRADES SERVED (PER MSID FILE)	ELEMENTARY PK-5
PRIMARY SERVICE TYPE (PER MSID FILE)	K-12 GENERAL EDUCATION
2024-25 TITLE I SCHOOL STATUS	YES
2024-25 ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED (FRL) RATE	66.7%
CHARTER SCHOOL	NO
RAISE SCHOOL	YES
2024-25 ESSA IDENTIFICATION *UPDATED AS OF 1	ATSI
ELIGIBLE FOR UNIFIED SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANT (UNISIG)	
2024-25 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 <i>*2022-23 SCHOOL GRADES WILL SERVE AS AN INFORMATIONAL BASELINE.</i>	2024-25: B 2023-24: A 2022-23: B 2021-22: B 2020-21:

D. Early Warning Systems

1. Grades K-8

Current Year 2025-26

Using 2024-25 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
School Enrollment	79	87	79	77	114	94				530
Absent 10% or more school days	7	13	14	7	20	11				72
One or more suspensions	1	6	3	0	2	3				15
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	4	19	15	6	6	3				53
Course failure in Math	4	16	8	7	16	9				60
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	7	19	19	11	17				73
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	7	6	20	14	16				63
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.053, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-3)	2	8	6	12	24	0				52
Number of students with a substantial mathematics defined by Rule 6A-6.0533, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-4)	1	10	5	5	0	10				31

Current Year 2025-26

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	4	20	20	20	21	17				102

Current Year 2025-26

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students retained:

INDICATOR	GRADE LEVEL								TOTAL	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		8
Retained students: current year	5	8	0	1	2	0				16
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0				0

Prior Year (2024-25) As Last 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 school days	6	18	11	22	20	13				90
One or more suspensions	6	7	2	5	3	2				25
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)		3	5	1	2					11
Course failure in Math		5	1	2	9	3				20
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment				14	21	13				48
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment				22	18	14				54
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.053, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-3)	20	2	28	28						78
Number of students with a substantial mathematics defined by Rule 6A-6.0533, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-4)	12	2	4	14	10					42

Prior Year (2024-25) As Last Reported (pre-populated)

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		6	5	2	3	1				17

Prior Year (2024-25) As Last Reported (pre-populated)

The number of students retained:

INDICATOR	GRADE LEVEL									TOTAL
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained students: current year		1		5						6
Students retained two or more times										0

2. Grades 9-12 (optional)

This section intentionally left blank because it addresses grades not taught at this school or the school opted not to include data for these grades.

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review (ESEA Section 1114(b)(6))

A. ESSA School, District, State Comparison

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.

Data for 2024-25 had not been fully loaded to CIMIS at time of printing.

ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENT	2025			2024			2023**		
	SCHOOL	DISTRICT†	STATE†	SCHOOL	DISTRICT†	STATE†	SCHOOL	DISTRICT†	STATE†
ELA Achievement*	63	68	59	63	66	57	52	61	53
Grade 3 ELA Achievement	68	71	59	66	69	58	45	62	53
ELA Learning Gains	52	63	60	68	62	60			
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	44	56	56	67	55	57			
Math Achievement*	63	69	64	61	67	62	56	64	59
Math Learning Gains	70	65	63	71	64	62			
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	46	47	51	44	43	52			
Science Achievement	63	68	58	78	68	57	70	65	54
Social Studies Achievement*			92						
Graduation Rate									
Middle School Acceleration									
College and Career Acceleration									
Progress of ELLs in Achieving English Language Proficiency (ELP)	66	73	63	65	75	61	51	77	59

*In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPi) than in school grades calculation.

**Grade 3 ELA Achievement was added beginning with the 2023 calculation.

† District and State data presented here are for schools of the same type: elementary, middle, high school, or combination.

B. ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2024-25 ESSA FPPI	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL FPPI – All Students	59%
OVERALL FPPI Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the FPPI	535
Total Components for the FPPI	9
Percent Tested	100%
Graduation Rate	

ESSA OVERALL FPPI HISTORY						
2024-25	2023-24	2022-23	2021-22	2020-21**	2019-20*	2018-19
59%	65%	63%	60%	51%		65%

* Any school that was identified for Comprehensive or Targeted Support and Improvement in the previous school year maintained that identification status and continued to receive support and interventions in the 2020-21 school year. In April 2020, the U.S. Department of Education provided all states a waiver to keep the same school identifications for 2019-20 as determined in 2018-19 due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

** Data provided for informational purposes only. Any school that was identified for Comprehensive or Targeted Support and Improvement in the 2019-20 school year maintained that identification status and continued to receive support and interventions in the 2021-22 school year. In April 2021, the U.S. Department of Education approved Florida's amended waiver request to keep the same school identifications for 2020-21 as determined in 2018-19 due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

C. ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2024-25 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%
Students With Disabilities	38%	Yes	1	
English Language Learners	36%	Yes	1	
Black/African American Students	46%	No		
Hispanic Students	54%	No		
Multiracial Students	75%	No		
White Students	65%	No		
Economically Disadvantaged Students	56%	No		

D. 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.

2024-25 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS													
	ELA ACH.	GRADE 3 ELA ACH.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	MATH ACH.	MATH LG	MATH LG L25%	SCI ACH.	SS ACH.	MS ACCEL.	GRAD RATE 2023-24	C&C ACCEL 2023-24	ELP PROGRESS
All Students	63%	68%	52%	44%	63%	70%	46%	63%					66%
Students With Disabilities	35%	31%	40%	25%	39%	55%	35%	42%					
English Language Learners	27%		50%	42%	14%	31%	20%						66%
Black/African American Students	36%	50%	30%		42%	70%							
Hispanic Students	57%	67%	53%	38%	53%	64%	40%	50%					65%
Multiracial Students	71%				79%								
White Students	74%	72%	55%	46%	75%	73%	50%	77%					
Economically Disadvantaged Students	57%	66%	54%	46%	54%	66%	48%	53%					63%

2023-24 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

	ELA ACH.	GRADE 3 ELA ACH.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	MATH ACH.	MATH LG	MATH LG L25%	SCI ACH.	SS ACH.	MS ACCEL.	GRAD RATE 2022-23	C&C ACCEL 2022-23	ELP PROGRESS
All Students	63%	66%	68%	67%	61%	71%	44%	78%					65%
Students With Disabilities	28%	30%	53%	63%	31%	53%	41%						
English Language Learners	22%		40%	30%	39%	67%							65%
Asian Students	70%				80%								
Black/African American Students	45%	55%	58%		41%	50%							
Hispanic Students	55%	58%	64%	64%	53%	69%	48%	76%					65%
Multiracial Students	64%		58%		64%	67%							
White Students	74%	78%	74%	85%	70%	75%	40%	92%					
Economically Disadvantaged Students	56%	60%	64%	63%	52%	69%	48%	73%					62%

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

	ELA ACH.	GRADE 3 ELA ACH.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	MATH ACH.	MATH LG	MATH LG L25%	SCI ACH.	SS ACH.	MS ACCEL.	GRAD RATE 2021-22	C&C ACCEL 2021-22	ELP PROGRESS
All Students	52%	45%			56%			70%					51%
Students With Disabilities	24%	29%			27%			38%					
English Language Learners	27%				31%			54%					91%
Asian Students	42%				58%								
Black/African American Students	37%				21%								
Hispanic Students	43%	33%			49%			64%					88%
Multiracial Students	50%				64%								
White Students	63%	48%			66%			86%					
Economically Disadvantaged Students	40%	34%			46%			56%					90%

E. 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.

SUBJECT	GRADE	2024-25 SPRING				
		SCHOOL	DISTRICT	SCHOOL - DISTRICT	STATE	SCHOOL - STATE
ELA	3	66%	69%	-3%	57%	9%
ELA	4	60%	67%	-7%	56%	4%
ELA	5	58%	64%	-6%	56%	2%
Math	3	58%	70%	-12%	63%	-5%
Math	4	61%	69%	-8%	62%	-1%
Math	5	37%	46%	-9%	57%	-20%
Math	6	100%	71%	29%	60%	40%
Science	5	61%	66%	-5%	55%	6%

III. Planning for Improvement

A. Data Analysis/Reflection (ESEA Section 1114(b)(6))

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

Most Improvement

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

Our data shows that math was the area of greatest improvement in the 2024–25 school year. We saw gains in Math Achievement, as well as in the Learning Gains of our Lowest 25% of students. This growth can be directly attributed to the intentional support provided in the classroom. Our math coach and interventionist pushed into classrooms regularly to lead small group instruction alongside teachers. This side-by-side model allowed for targeted, real-time support that met students at their level while reinforcing instructional strategies for teachers. The consistent presence of both support staff and classroom teachers working together made a significant impact on student learning and progress in math.

Lowest Performance

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

The data component that showed the lowest performance in the 2024–25 school year was ELA Learning Gains for the Lowest 25% of students, with a score of 44%. This indicates that less than half of our most struggling readers demonstrated sufficient growth over the year. Several factors contributed to this decline. One major factor was the lack of targeted, consistent interventions in ELA, especially compared to the structured support we had in place for math. While our math coach and interventionist regularly pushed into classrooms to provide small group instruction, similar embedded support was not in place for ELA. Looking at the trend, the ELA Learning Gains for the Lowest 25% dropped significantly, from 67% in 2023–24 to 44% in 2024–25, a 23-point decrease. This trend is a clear signal that we need to restructure our support system for struggling readers, ensuring that our interventions are as robust and strategically aligned as those in math. Prioritizing early literacy, investing in reading intervention programs, and incorporating a co-teaching or push-in model for ELA could help reverse this trend and better support our most at-risk students moving forward.

Greatest Decline

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

ELA Learning Gains showed the greatest decline, dropping 16 points from 68% in 2023–24 to 52% in 2024–25, indicating fewer students made measurable progress in reading. This decline was largely due to the lack of consistent, embedded reading support in classrooms. Unlike math, which benefited from dedicated interventionists and coaches working alongside teachers. Additionally, a strong instructional focus on math may have unintentionally reduced emphasis on ELA progress monitoring and intervention. Moving forward, rebalancing instructional priorities by embedding reading support, expanding push-in interventions, offering professional development and maintaining consistent progress monitoring will be essential to improving ELA outcomes.

Greatest Gap

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.

Science Achievement showed the greatest gap compared to the state average, dropping to 63% in 2024–25—9 points below the state’s 72%—after scoring 78% the previous year. Limited intervention and enrichment resources meant fewer opportunities for struggling students to receive targeted support. To close this gap, we must rebuild a strong science culture by ensuring consistent instruction, providing professional development on standards, and increasing hands-on, inquiry-based learning opportunities.

EWS Areas of Concern

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

Chronic Absenteeism: A total of 83 students across grades K–5 missed 10% or more of school days. This level of absenteeism can significantly impact students’ academic progress, social-emotional development, and engagement. Early intervention to address attendance barriers will be critical to improving outcomes for these students.

Highest Priorities

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

1. Strengthen ELA Support for Lowest 25%, ELLs and SWD’s-With ELA Learning Gains for the Lowest 25% dropping to 44%, this is the most urgent area for improvement. Implementing push-in reading intervention, targeted small group instruction, and progress monitoring will be essential to accelerate growth for our most struggling readers.

ELLs- The data for English Language Learners (ELLs) reveals a significant area of concern. ELA Achievement for ELLs dropped from 27% in 2023–24 to 22% in 2024–25, indicating that fewer than one in four ELL students are currently performing at grade level in reading. This decline moves us further from our goal of raising ELA Achievement for ELLs to at least 62% or higher, which would reflect both equity and alignment with broader school performance targets.

SWDs- The current ELA proficiency level for Students with Disabilities (SWDs) stands at 33%, which underscores a critical achievement gap when compared to the schoolwide goal of 62% or higher proficiency. This means that less than one-third of our SWD population is meeting grade-level expectations in reading, highlighting the urgent need for more effective and targeted support.

2. Rebuild Science Instructional Rigor-Science Achievement declined significantly and now shows the largest gap compared to the state average. We must re-prioritize science instruction, ensure consistent pacing across grades, and incorporate hands-on, inquiry-based learning to rebuild student performance and interest in science.

3. Maintain and Expand Effective Math Interventions-Math showed the greatest gains due to strategic in-class support. Continuing this momentum is vital. We should sustain the push-in model with the math coach and interventionist, while expanding data-driven small groups and enrichment opportunities for all levels of learners.

4. Strengthen Professional Development in small group instruction- Currently, there are noticeable variations in how small group instruction is delivered—from grouping strategies and instructional materials to the level of engagement and targeted skill development. To ensure all students, particularly those in the lowest 25%, ELLs, and students with disabilities, receive the personalized support they need, we must invest in high-quality, ongoing professional development that builds teacher confidence and competence in this area.

B. Area(s) of Focus (Instructional Practices)

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

Area of Focus #1

Address the school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a description of your Area of Focus for each relevant grade level, how it affects student learning and a rationale explaining how it was identified as a crucial need from the prior year data reviewed.

At Longwood Elementary, English Language Arts (ELA) has been identified as the primary area of focus for the 2025–26 school year. This determination is based on a close review of our prior year's data, which revealed concerning trends. While overall ELA achievement remained stagnant at 63%, there was a significant drop in student growth indicators: ELA Learning Gains fell from 68% to 52%, and Learning Gains among the Lowest 25% of students declined sharply from 67% to 44%—a 23-point decrease.

This decline in growth directly impacts student learning by signaling that fewer students are making the expected year-to-year progress in reading comprehension, vocabulary development, and critical thinking. For our most vulnerable readers—those in the lowest quartile—this lack of progress means existing gaps are widening, making it increasingly difficult for them to access grade-level content and succeed across all subject areas.

Measurable Outcome

Measurable Outcome: Include prior year data and state the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each relevant grade level. This should be a data-based, objective outcome.

For the 2025–26 school year, Longwood Elementary School identified a critical need to strengthen student achievement in English Language Arts (ELA), as overall ELA Achievement remained at 63%, while ELA Learning Gains declined from 68% to 52%, and Learning Gains for the Lowest 25% dropped from 67% to 44%. In response, the school is implementing a comprehensive, multi-tiered system of support that includes counseling, school-based mental health services, mentoring, and specialized interventions to address students' well being and behavioral needs. These supports are designed to enhance student engagement, emotional regulation, and resilience—key factors that influence academic success. Through strategies such as Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports (PBIS), targeted mentoring, and increased access to mental health resources, Longwood aims to increase overall ELA Achievement from 63% to 68% or higher, raise ELA Learning Gains from 52% to 62% or higher, and improve Learning Gains for the Lowest 25% from 44% to 65% or

higher by the end of the 2025–26 school year.

Monitoring

Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for implementation and impact to reach the desired outcome.

The Leadership Team will monitor this area through monthly PLCs, MTSS, and data chats. Additionally, the Leadership Team will utilize the SCPS Instructional Priorities Walkthrough Tool to monitor benchmark aligned instruction, monitor for learning, student engagement, and conditions for learning.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Leigh Jones-Principal , Teddy Adames- Assistant Principal , Lindsay Hicks-Literacy Coach

Evidence-based Intervention:

Evidence-based intervention: (May choose more than one evidence-based intervention.) Describe the evidence-based intervention (practices/programs) being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each relevant grade level and describe how the identified interventions will be monitored for this Area of Focus (20 U.S.C. § 7801(21)(A)(i) and (B), ESEA Section 8101(21)(A) and (B)).

Description of Intervention #1:

The following evidence-based interventions are available to support students based upon the area of need of the individual student: Magnetic Reading (promising evidence), Systematic Instruction in Phonological Awareness, Phonics and Sight Words (SIPPS) (moderate evidence), Wonders Tier 2 and Tier 3 Intervention (state approved adopted materials), iReady (moderate evidence) FastForward (promising evidence), and Quick Reads (strong evidence). For students with disabilities who are served in separate classroom environments for the majority of the instructional day, additional curriculum has been included to address reading deficits as needed: Reading Mastery (promising evidence) and Corrective Reading (strong evidence). English Language Learners may also utilize Imagine Learning Language and Literacy (promising evidence) and Imagine Learning Espanol (promising evidence).

Rationale:

A variety of interventions are available to the schools to allow them to meet the needs of individual students. This allows all the areas of reading to be addressed from foundations to comprehension across the K-12 continuum. All of the listed interventions have been included in the K-12 Comprehensive Evidence- Based Reading Plan.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement:

Action step(s) needed to address this Area of Focus or implement this intervention. Identify 2 to 3 action steps and the person responsible for each step.

Action Step #1

Establish Small Group Instruction Routines

Person Monitoring:

Leigh Jones- Principal, Teddy Adames- Assistant
Principal Lindsay Hicks- Instructional Coach,
Angela Giddens – Instructional Coach

By When/Frequency:

By september/ Ongoing

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

Group students based on formative assessment data (e.g., i-Ready diagnostics, FAST PM 1, and UFLI data). Develop structured lesson plans incorporating phonics, vocabulary, and comprehension strategies. Schedule consistent small group time in daily literacy blocks. Use visual schedules and clear routines to support SWDs and ELLs. Ensure all student work is benchmark aligned.

Action Step #2

Push-in Support from Literacy/Instructional Coach

Person Monitoring:

Leigh Jones- Principal, Teddy Adames- Assistant
Principal, Lindsay Hicks- Instructional Coach,
Angela Giddens – Instructional Coach

By When/Frequency:

Ongoing

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

Create a coaching schedule for classroom visits. Literacy coach models lessons and co-teaches small groups. Teachers reflect and debrief with coach after sessions. Focus on strategies that support language development and differentiation.

Action Step #3

Implement Instructional Coaching with Dr. Taylor Wenzel

Person Monitoring:

Leigh Jones- Principal, Teddy Adames- Assistant
Principal, Lindsay Hicks- Instructional Coach,
Angela Giddens – Instructional Coach

By When/Frequency:

Ongoing

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

Schedule coaching sessions aligned with school calendar. Teachers set goals and receive feedback on small group instruction. Use video reflections or peer observations to refine practices. Emphasize structured literacy and inclusive strategies for ELLs and SWDs.

Action Step #4

Monitor and Evaluate Effectiveness

Person Monitoring:

Leigh Jones- Principal, Teddy Adames- Assistant
Principal, Lindsay Hicks- Instructional Coach,
Angela Giddens – Instructional Coach

By When/Frequency:

Ongoing

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

Review student progress data (i-Ready, FAST, classroom assessments). Adjust groups and instructional focus based on data trends. Conduct walkthroughs and fidelity checks. Ensure all student work is benchmark aligned. Share successes and challenges during PLCs.

Area of Focus #2

Address the school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a description of your Area of Focus for each relevant grade level, how it affects student learning and a rationale explaining how it was identified as a crucial need from the prior year data reviewed.

Math showed the greatest gains due to strategic in-class support. Continuing this momentum is vital. Recent school-wide data indicates that while there have been slight improvements in math achievement and gains among our lowest-performing students, significant gaps remain—particularly for our ELLs and SWDs.

Measurable Outcome

Measurable Outcome: Include prior year data and state the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each relevant grade level. This should be a data-based, objective outcome.

Based on the prior year's math performance data, the school has established clear, measurable outcomes to drive improvement, particularly for English Language Learners (ELLs) and Students with Disabilities (SWDs). Schoolwide math achievement increased slightly from 61% to 63%, while learning gains decreased marginally from 71% to 70%. The lowest 25% of students showed a small gain from 44% to 46%. However, subgroup data reveals significant gaps: ELLs achieved only 14% proficiency in math, and SWDs reached 39%, both far below the school's goal of 62%.

To address these disparities, the school aims to increase math proficiency in 3rd grade from 58% to 62% or higher, in 4th grade from 60% to 62% or higher, and in 5th grade from 63% to 65% or higher. For ELLs, the target is to raise achievement from 14% to 62% or higher, and for SWDs, from 39% to 62% or higher. The goal for the lowest 25% of students is to improve learning gains from 46% to 62% or higher. These outcomes will be measured using state assessments, i-Ready diagnostics, and progress monitoring tools to ensure data-driven instruction and accountability.

Monitoring

Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for implementation and impact to reach the desired outcome.

The Leadership Team will monitor this area through monthly PLCs, MTSS, and data chats. Additionally, the Leadership Team will utilize the SCPS Instructional Priorities Walkthrough Tool to monitor benchmark aligned instruction, monitor for learning, student engagement, and conditions for learning.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Leigh Jones- Principal, Teddy Adames- Assistant Principal, Lindsay Hicks- Instructional Coach, Angela Giddens – Instructional Coach

Evidence-based Intervention:

Evidence-based intervention: (May choose more than one evidence-based intervention.) Describe the evidence-based intervention (practices/programs) being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each relevant grade level and describe how the identified interventions will be monitored for this Area of Focus (20 U.S.C. § 7801(21)(A)(i) and (B), ESEA Section 8101(21)(A) and (B)).

Description of Intervention #1:

The following evidence-based interventions are available to support students based upon the area of need of the individual student, i-Ready, SAVVAS enVision Math Diagnostic and Intervention System.

Rationale:

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

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement:

Action step(s) needed to address this Area of Focus or implement this intervention. Identify 2 to 3 action steps and the person responsible for each step.

Action Step #1

Implement and Monitor Computer-Assisted Instruction

Person Monitoring:

Leigh Jones- Principal, Teddy Adames- Assistant Principal, Lindsay Hicks- Instructional Coach, Angela Giddens – Instructional Coach

By When/Frequency:

Ongoing

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

Teachers will ensure students engage in regular use of i-Ready Math or additional Math instructional materials for individualized practice. Usage and progress will be monitored weekly through platform reports and reviewed during PLCs.

Action Step #2

Daily Number Talks and Math Discourse

Person Monitoring:

Leigh Jones- Principal, Teddy Adames- Assistant Principal, Lindsay Hicks- Instructional Coach, Angela Giddens – Instructional Coach

By When/Frequency:

Ongoing

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

Teachers will incorporate short, structured math discussions into daily lessons to build number sense and mathematical language, especially for ELLs. Fidelity will be monitored through classroom walkthroughs.

Action Step #3

Provide Coaching on Explicit and Systematic Instruction

Person Monitoring:

Leigh Jones- Principal, Teddy Adames- Assistant Principal, and Angela Giddens – Instructional Coach

By When/Frequency:

Ongoing

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

Instructional coaches will support teachers in planning and delivering direct math instruction using structured modeling and guided practice. Coaching cycles will include modeling, co-teaching, and feedback sessions. We will sustain the push-in model with the math coach and interventionist, while expanding data-driven small groups and enrichment opportunities for all levels of learners.

Area of Focus #3

Address the school’s highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a description of your Area of Focus for each relevant grade level, how it affects student learning and a rationale explaining how it was identified as a crucial need from the prior year data reviewed.

This year, science achievement declined significantly and now shows the largest gap compared to the state average. Our science scores dropped from 78% to 63% We must re-prioritize science instruction, ensure consistent pacing across grades, and incorporate hands-on, inquiry-based learning to rebuild student performance and interest in science.

Measurable Outcome

Measurable Outcome: Include prior year data and state the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each relevant grade level. This should be a data-based, objective outcome.

Our science proficiency will increase from 63% to 75% or higher.

Monitoring

Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for implementation and impact to reach the desired outcome.

The Leadership Team will monitor this area through monthly PLCs, data chats, and classroom

walkthroughs. Additionally, the Leadership Team will utilize the SCPS Instructional Priorities Walkthrough Tool to monitor benchmark aligned instruction, monitor for learning, student engagement, and conditions for learning.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Leigh Jones- Principal, Teddy Adames- Assistant Principal, Lindsay Hicks- Instructional Coach, Angela Giddens – Instructional Coach

Evidence-based Intervention:

Evidence-based intervention: (May choose more than one evidence-based intervention.) Describe the evidence-based intervention (practices/programs) being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each relevant grade level and describe how the identified interventions will be monitored for this Area of Focus (20 U.S.C. § 7801(21)(A)(i) and (B), ESEA Section 8101(21)(A) and (B)).

Description of Intervention #1:

To improve science achievement and close the gap, the school will implement inquiry-based instruction, hands-on learning, and explicit teaching strategies. Students will engage in investigations that promote questioning, evidence-based reasoning, and conceptual understanding, while hands-on activities such as labs and experiments will boost engagement and retention. Teachers will also use explicit instruction to introduce complex content with clear modeling and guided practice, supporting ELLs and SWDs.

Rationale:

Implementing targeted science interventions is based on a significant decline in student achievement—from 78% to 63%—which now represents the largest gap compared to the state average. This drop indicates a need to adopt strategies that actively engage students and deepen their understanding of scientific concepts. Inquiry-based instruction allows students to explore, question, and investigate, fostering critical thinking and problem-solving skills essential for science literacy. Hands-on learning through experiments and interactive activities increases engagement and retention, making science more accessible and meaningful. Additionally, explicit instruction ensures that complex content is delivered clearly and systematically, supporting all learners, especially English Language Learners and Students with Disabilities. These evidence-based practices are essential to rebuilding student performance and interest in science, and will be monitored through regular walkthroughs, lesson plan reviews, and data analysis to ensure consistent implementation and impact.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement:

Action step(s) needed to address this Area of Focus or implement this intervention. Identify 2 to 3 action steps and the person responsible for each step.

Action Step #1

Integrate Inquiry-Based and Hands-On Science Instruction Across Grade Levels

Person Monitoring:

Leigh Jones- Principal, Teddy Adames- Assistant

By When/Frequency:

Ongoing

Principal, Lindsay Hicks- Instructional Coach,
Angela Giddens – Instructional Coach

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

Teachers will implement hands-on, inquiry-based science lessons aligned with the state standards and pacing guide. These lessons will include experiments, investigations, and opportunities for students to ask questions, collect data, and draw conclusions. Instructional coaches will support teachers in planning and modeling these lessons to ensure consistency and rigor.

Action Step #2

Monitor Implementation and Student Progress Through Walkthroughs and Data Reviews

Person Monitoring:

Leigh Jones- Principal, Teddy Adames- Assistant
Principal, Lindsay Hicks- Instructional Coach,
Angela Giddens – Instructional Coach

By When/Frequency:

Ongoing

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

School leaders will conduct instructional walkthroughs to observe science instruction, focusing on the use of inquiry-based strategies and student engagement in hands-on learning. In addition, grade-level PLCs will review formative assessment data, student work samples, and adjust instruction based on student needs.

Action Step #3

Push-In Support

Person Monitoring:

Leigh Jones-Principal, Teddy Adames- Assistant
Principal, Tammy Uliano-Interventionist

By When/Frequency:

Ongoing

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

Our Interventionist will push into 5th grade classrooms to co-teach science lessons that are aligned with grade-level standards. This collaborative approach allows for targeted support during core instruction, reinforcing key concepts and providing differentiated strategies to meet the needs of all learners. By partnering with classroom teachers, the Interventionist will help ensure students build a strong foundation in science content while also integrating academic vocabulary and critical thinking skills.

Area of Focus #4

Address the school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA required by RAISE (specific questions)

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a description of your Area of Focus for each relevant grade level, how it affects student learning and a rationale explaining how it was identified as a crucial need from the prior year data reviewed.

Based on the 24-25 FAST data for grades K–2, there is a clear and concerning trend in early literacy proficiency, with the most significant need identified in Kindergarten. Of the 70 kindergarten students assessed, 39 (56%) scored below Level 3, exceeding the 50% threshold and highlighting an urgent need for targeted intervention. While the percentages in Grades 1 and 2 are below the critical threshold, they remain notable and warrant continued support. In Grade 1, 33 out of 78 students (42%) scored below Level 3, and in Grade 2, 30 out of 68 students (44%) fell below proficiency. These findings suggest that while early literacy skills may improve slightly as students progress through the grades, a large portion of students are still not meeting grade-level expectations and would benefit from sustained instructional support and evidence-based interventions.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

In grades K–2, our ELA instructional practices will prioritize the consistent use of small group routines to ensure effective, differentiated instruction. These small group structures are essential in fostering collaboration, personalized learning, and targeted support for our youngest learners. They allow teachers to meet individual student needs more effectively, promote active engagement, and build foundational communication and teamwork skills.

Small group instruction is particularly impactful at the early elementary level, where students are developing critical reading and literacy skills. This approach enables teachers to provide both remediation and enrichment in a focused, supportive environment, ensuring that all students—regardless of their starting point—are supported in their growth toward grade-level proficiency.

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

In grades 3–5, our instructional focus in ELA will center around implementing consistent and effective small group routines to support student learning. Small group instruction is a powerful tool for fostering collaboration, personalized learning, and targeted support. It enables teachers to differentiate instruction, address individual learning needs, and create a more engaging, student-centered classroom environment. By working in smaller, focused settings, students are given the opportunity to participate more actively, build confidence, and develop essential communication and teamwork skills.

This approach is especially critical for our English Language Learners (ELLs) and Students with Disabilities (SWDs)—two subgroups identified as needing increased support based on last year’s performance data. Small group instruction provides these students with scaffolded learning opportunities, repeated exposure to academic language, and individualized feedback, all of which are key to improving their literacy skills and overall academic achievement.

Grades K-2: Measurable Outcome(s)

By the end of the academic year, student proficiency in early literacy will increase significantly across primary grade levels through the implementation of targeted small group instruction and professional development support. Kindergarten proficiency will improve from 44% to 68% or higher, first grade from 58% to 68% or higher, and second grade from 56% to 68% or higher. These gains will be achieved through consistent use of differentiated strategies, structured literacy routines, and ongoing coaching aligned with best practices in language development.

Grades 3-5: Measurable Outcome(s)

For the 2025–26 school year, Longwood Elementary School identified a critical need to strengthen student achievement in English Language Arts (ELA), as overall ELA Achievement remained at 63%, while ELA Learning Gains declined from 68% to 52%, and Learning Gains for the Lowest 25% dropped from 67% to 44%. In response, the school is implementing a comprehensive, multi-tiered system of support that includes counseling, school-based mental health services, mentoring, and specialized interventions to address students' well being and behavioral needs. These supports are designed to enhance student engagement, emotional regulation, and resilience—key factors that influence academic success. Through strategies such as Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports (PBIS), targeted mentoring, and increased access to mental health resources, Longwood aims to increase overall ELA Achievement from 63% to 68% or higher, raise ELA Learning Gains from 52% to 62% or higher, and improve Learning Gains for the Lowest 25% from 44% to 65% or higher by the end of the 2025–26 school year.

Monitoring

Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for implementation and impact to reach the desired outcome.

The Leadership Team will monitor this area through monthly PLCs, MTSS, and data chats. Additionally, the Leadership Team will utilize the SCPS Instructional Priorities Walkthrough Tool to monitor benchmark aligned instruction, monitor for learning, student engagement, and conditions for learning.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Leigh Jones-Principal , Teddy Adames- Assistant Principal , Lindsay Hicks-Literacy Coach

Evidence-based Intervention:

Evidence-based intervention: (May choose more than one evidence-based intervention.) Describe the evidence-based intervention (practices/programs) being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each relevant grade level and describe how the identified interventions will be monitored for this Area of Focus (20 U.S.C. § 7801(21)(A)(i) and (B), ESEA Section 8101(21)(A) and (B)).

Description of Intervention #1:

The following evidence-based interventions are available to support students based upon the area of

need of the individual student: Magnetic Reading (promising evidence), Systematic Instruction in Phonological Awareness, Phonics and Sight Words (SIPPS) (moderate evidence), Wonders Tier 2 and Tier 3 Intervention (state approved adopted materials), iReady (moderate evidence) FastForward (promising evidence), and Quick Reads (strong evidence). For students with disabilities who are served in separate classroom environments for the majority of the instructional day, additional curriculum has been included to address reading deficits as needed: Reading Mastery (promising evidence) and Corrective Reading (strong evidence). English Language Learners may also utilize Imagine Learning Language and Literacy (promising evidence) and Imagine Learning Espanol (promising evidence).

Rationale:

A variety of interventions are available to the schools to allow them to meet the needs of individual students. This allows all the areas of reading to be addressed from foundations to comprehension across the K-12 continuum. All of the listed interventions have been included in the K-12 Comprehensive Evidence- Based Reading Plan.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement:

Action step(s) needed to address this Area of Focus or implement this intervention. Identify 2 to 3 action steps and the person responsible for each step.

Action Step #1

Establish Small Group Instruction Routines Group students based on formative assessment data (e.g., i-Ready diagnostics, FAST PM 1, and UFLI). Develop structured lesson plans incorporating phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension strategies. Schedule consistent small group time in daily literacy blocks. Use visual schedules and clear routines to support SWDs and ELLs. Ensure all student work is benchmark aligned.

Person Monitoring:

Leigh Jones-Principal , Teddy Adames- Assistant Principal , Lindsay Hicks-Literacy Coach

By When/Frequency:

Ongoing

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

To support effective classroom instruction, a structured coaching schedule will be implemented for literacy-focused classroom visits. During these visits, the literacy coach will model lessons and co-teach small group instruction, emphasizing strategies that promote language development and differentiation to meet diverse student needs. Following each session, teachers will engage in reflective conversations and debrief with the coach to discuss instructional practices, student engagement, and opportunities for growth. This collaborative approach ensures ongoing professional development and fosters a culture of continuous improvement in literacy instruction.

Action Step #2

Professional development funds will be allocated to contract Dr. Taylor Wenzel to provide targeted support for our K–2 teachers. Dr. Wentzel will work directly with educators to help them implement effective small group routines within their daily literacy block. This professional learning opportunity will focus on building consistent structures and strategies that enhance student engagement, promote differentiated instruction, and support literacy development across early grade levels. Through hands-on guidance and collaborative planning, teachers will gain the tools and confidence needed to

integrate small group instruction seamlessly into their daily practice.

Person Monitoring:

Leigh Jones-Principal , Teddy Adames- Assistant Principal , Lindsay Hicks-Literacy Coach

By When/Frequency:

Ongoing

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

The Leadership Team will monitor this area through monthly PLCs, MTSS, and data chats. Additionally, the Leadership Team will utilize the SCPS Instructional Priorities Walkthrough Tool to monitor benchmark aligned instruction, monitor for learning, student engagement, and conditions for learning.

Area of Focus #5

Address the school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

ESSA Subgroups specifically relating to Students With Disabilities (SWD), English Language Learners (ELL)

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a description of your Area of Focus for each relevant grade level, how it affects student learning and a rationale explaining how it was identified as a crucial need from the prior year data reviewed.

Based on student achievement data from the 2024–2025 school year, there is a clear need to intensify efforts to improve instruction in English Language Arts (ELA), Math, and Science, with particular attention to supporting English Language Learners (ELLs) and Students with Disabilities (SWDs). In ELA, 35% of SWDs achieved proficiency, with 40% making learning gains. Among ELLs, 27% reached proficiency, while 50% demonstrated learning gains. In Math, 39% of SWDs were proficient, and 55% showed learning gains. ELLs performed significantly lower in Math, with just 14% reaching proficiency and 31% making learning gains. In Science, 42% of SWDs achieved proficiency while 0% of ELLs demonstrated proficiency, indicating a need for targeted instructional support in this area as well. These data points highlight persistent achievement gaps and reinforce the urgency of implementing differentiated instruction, data-driven interventions, and collaborative teaching strategies to ensure equitable academic outcomes for all students.

Measurable Outcome

Measurable Outcome: Include prior year data and state the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each relevant grade level. This should be a data-based, objective outcome.

Increase ELA achievement for Students with Disabilities (SWDs) from 35% to 68% or higher, and increase their learning gains from 40% to 68% or higher. Increase ELA achievement for English Language Learners (ELLs) from 27% to 62% or higher, and increase their learning gains from 50% to 68% or higher. Increase Math achievement for SWDs from 39% to 68% or higher, and increase their learning gains from 55% to 62% or higher. Increase Math achievement for ELLs from 14% to 68% or

higher, and increase their learning gains from 31% to 62% or higher. Additionally, increase Science achievement for SWDs from 42% to 75% or higher and ELLs from 0% to 62% or higher.

Monitoring

Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for implementation and impact to reach the desired outcome.

The Leadership Team will monitor this area through monthly PLCs, MTSS, and data chats. Additionally, the Leadership Team will utilize the SCPS Instructional Priorities Walkthrough Tool to monitor benchmark aligned instruction, monitor for learning, student engagement, and conditions for learning.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Leigh Jones-Principal , Teddy Adames- Assistant Principal , Lindsay Hicks-Literacy Coach, Angela Giddens- Math Instructional Coach, Wendy Cronson- ESE Support Facilitator, and Katie Lind- ESE Support Facilitator

Evidence-based Intervention:

Evidence-based intervention: (May choose more than one evidence-based intervention.) Describe the evidence-based intervention (practices/programs) being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each relevant grade level and describe how the identified interventions will be monitored for this Area of Focus (20 U.S.C. § 7801(21)(A)(i) and (B), ESEA Section 8101(21)(A) and (B)).

Description of Intervention #1:

The following evidence-based interventions are available to support students based upon the area of need of the individual student: Magnetic Reading (promising evidence), Systematic Instruction in Phonological Awareness, Phonics and Sight Words (SIPPS) (moderate evidence), Wonders Tier 2 and Tier 3 Intervention (state approved adopted materials), iReady (moderate evidence) FastForward (promising evidence), and Quick Reads (strong evidence). For students with disabilities who are served in separate classroom environments for the majority of the instructional day, additional curriculum has been included to address reading deficits as needed: Reading Mastery (promising evidence) and Corrective Reading (strong evidence). English Language Learners may also utilize Imagine Learning Language and Literacy (promising evidence) and Imagine Learning Espanol (promising evidence).

Rationale:

A variety of interventions are available to the schools to allow them to meet the needs of individual students. This allows all the areas of reading to be addressed from foundations to comprehension across the K-12 continuum. All of the listed interventions have been included in the K-12 Comprehensive Evidence- Based Reading Plan.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement:

Action step(s) needed to address this Area of Focus or implement this intervention. Identify 2 to 3 action steps and the person responsible for each step.

Action Step #1

Establish Small Group Instruction Routines.

Person Monitoring:

Leigh Jones-Principal , Teddy Adames- Assistant Principal , Lindsay Hicks-Literacy Coach

By When/Frequency:

Ongoing

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

Group students based on formative assessment data (e.g., i-Ready diagnostics, FAST PM 1, UFLI). Develop structured lesson plans incorporating phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension strategies. Schedule consistent small group time in daily literacy blocks. Use visual schedules and clear routines to support SWDs and ELLs.

Action Step #2

Targeted Professional Development

Person Monitoring:

Leigh Jones-Principal , Teddy Adames- Assistant Principal , Lindsay Hicks-Literacy Coach

By When/Frequency:

Ongoing

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

Dr. Taylor Wenzel to train K–5 teachers on implementing daily small group routines during the literacy block, with an emphasis on differentiation and language development.

Action Step #3

Targeted Intervention

Person Monitoring:

Leigh Jones-Principal , Teddy Adames- Assistant Principal , Alex Bacon-ESOL Teacher, Wendy Cronson- ESE Support Facilitator, and Katie Lind-ESE Support Facilitator.

By When/Frequency:

Ongoing

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

To provide targeted intervention for English Language Learners (ELLs) and Students with Disabilities (SWDs), Longwood Elementary will implement a data-informed support system that identifies individual student needs and delivers focused instructional strategies. Teachers and support staff will regularly analyze assessment data, including progress monitoring results and formative assessments, to pinpoint specific skill gaps and adjust instruction accordingly. Based on this data, students will be grouped for small-group interventions that address both academic and language development needs. These sessions will be facilitated by trained personnel, including ESOL and ESE specialists, who will collaborate with classroom teachers to ensure instructional alignment and continuity.

Action Step #4

Push-In Support

Person Monitoring:

Leigh Jones-Principal , Teddy Adames- Assistant Principal , Alex Bacon-ESOL Teacher, Wendy Cronson- ESE Support Facilitator, Katie Lind- ESE Support Facilitator, Lindsay Hicks- Literacy Coach, Angela Giddens- Instructional Coach and Aimee Huber- Interventionist

By When/Frequency:

Ongoing

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

To strengthen instructional support for English Language Learners (ELLs) and Students with Disabilities (SWDs), Longwood Elementary will implement a co-teaching model in which ESE Support Facilitators, Interventionists, instructional coaches and the ESOL teacher will push into classrooms to work directly with small groups of students. These educators will collaborate with classroom teachers to deliver differentiated instruction that targets specific academic and language development needs. Using ongoing assessment data, student groups will be formed based on skill gaps and learning goals, allowing for focused, responsive instruction within the general education setting. This inclusive approach ensures that students receive consistent support without being pulled from core instruction, while also fostering collaboration among staff to promote equitable learning outcomes.

IV. Positive Learning Environment

Area of Focus #1

Student Attendance

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus for each relevant grade level, how it affects student learning and a rationale explaining how it was identified as a crucial need from the prior year data reviewed.

During the 2024–2025 school year, 23% of our students had 10 or more absences, reflecting a 2% decrease from the previous year. Additionally, the percentage of students with 15 or more absences declined slightly from 24% to 23.4%. Chronic absenteeism remains a concern, as students who miss school frequently lose access to consistent instruction that is essential for developing foundational skills. This is especially critical in the early grades, where missing instructional time can lead to gaps in basic reading skills, creating a snowball effect that negatively impacts future learning.

Measurable Outcome

Include prior year data and state the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each relevant grade level. This should be a data-based, objective outcome.

We will reduce the number of students with 10+ absences in grades from 23.4% to 15% or lower.

Monitoring

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

The Leadership Team and the social worker will monitor this area through bi-weekly meetings, MTSS, data chats, and parent contact.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Leigh Jones- Principal, Teddy Adames- Assistant Principal, Kaley Oliver- Social Worker, and Aimee Huber- Interventionist

Evidence-based Intervention:

Evidence-based intervention: (May choose more than one evidence-based intervention.) Describe the evidence-based intervention (practices/programs) being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each relevant grade level and describe how the identified interventions will be monitored for this Area of Focus (20 U.S.C. § 7801(21)(A)(i) and (B), ESEA Section 8101(21)(A) and (B)).

Description of Intervention #1:

State statute requires that school teams shall be diligent in facilitating intervention services and make all reasonable efforts to resolve nonattendance behavior. Using the MTSS problem-solving model, teams are responsible for providing and monitoring appropriate interventions for individual students. To ensure students are provided with the necessary resources and interventions, schools should form comprehensive teams with clear roles and responsibilities.

Rationale:

Through the use of evidence-based intervention supports, schools invest in fostering a culture that promotes engagement and attendance. However, some students struggle to attend school regularly. Unchecked absences can lead to lower achievement levels and gaps in knowledge that may prove challenging to overcome. It is critical for students and families to understand that absence due to arriving late, or missing full days, whether excused or unexcused can negatively affect learning. Efforts to curb tardiness, chronic absenteeism, and truancy can address the needs of students and families, mitigating student failure.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement:

Action step(s) needed to address this Area of Focus or implement this intervention. Identify 2 to 3 action steps and the person responsible for each step.

Action Step #1

PBIS

Person Monitoring:

Leigh Jones- Principal, Teddy Adames- Assistant Principal, and Aimee Huber- Interventionist

By When/Frequency:

Ongoing

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

The PBIS School-Wide Committee will develop a tiered reward system to recognize various levels of attendance improvement, using the PBIS framework. The committee, composed of teachers and

administrators, will establish clear criteria for earning rewards for perfect or most improved attendance and will identify and procure appropriate incentives. Administrators will lead attendance awareness campaigns through announcements, messages sent home, and reward celebrations. Teachers will provide immediate positive reinforcement for good attendance and support intervention plans for students with chronic absenteeism. The school social worker, interventionist and administrators will monitor attendance data on a weekly and monthly basis to identify trends and needs. The PBIS Committee will hold monthly meetings to review progress, evaluate the effectiveness of strategies, and make necessary adjustments.

V. Title I Requirements (optional)

A. Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP)

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b) (ESEA Section 1114(b)). This section of the SIP is not required for non-Title I schools.

Dissemination Methods

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership, and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(4), ESEA Section 1114(b)(4)).

List the school's webpage where the SIP is made publicly available.

A finalized copy of the SIP and SWP will be posted to Longwood Elementary's website (see link below) after the draft is shared with stakeholders such as PTA and SAC. Feedback from the stakeholders will be used for the final version of the SIP.

<https://www.lwes.scps.k12.fl.us/>

Positive Relationships With Parents, Families and other Community Stakeholders

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.

List the school's webpage where the school's Parental Family Engagement Plan (PFEP) is made publicly available (20 U.S.C. § 6318(b)-(g), ESEA Section 1116(b)-(g)).

Longwood Elementary School welcomes parents and families on campus for events such as Meet the Teacher and Curriculum Night to meet the teacher and learn about classroom updates. In addition, Longwood ES hosts Reading Nights, Mathematics/STEM Night, Art Night, and will have an inaugural Multi-Cultural Night for families to attend and learn curricular information and strategies to support their child from home. Longwood ES regularly hosts opportunities for families to spend time on campus during our bi-annual book fair, Dad's Day to Play, Makerspace with Mom, and Grandparents Day. Weekly updates are sent to families via phone and email. Skyward Family Access houses information for parents to find attendance, grade, and course information. Parents can access the Parental and Family Engagement Plan on Longwood's website

<https://www.lwes.scps.k12.fl.us/>

Plans to Strengthen the Academic Program

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part II of the SIP (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(7)(A)(ii), ESEA Section 1114(b)(7)(A)(ii)).

Longwood Elementary plans to strengthen the academic program by increasing learning time through targeted interventions and enrichment opportunities. Night events focused on improving math and ELA achievement will be held in collaboration with parents. These efforts align with our SIP Areas of Focus on increasing student proficiency in core subjects. Talent Development is offered to students in each grade level for enrichment as well.

How Plan is Developed

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other federal, state and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under this Act, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d) (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(5) and §6318(e)(4), ESEA Sections 1114(b)(5) and 1116(e)(4)).

Throughout the course of the school year, Federal Projects and Resource Development department leadership meet with leadership from the Department of Teaching and Learning (Title II, Part A), Families in Need (Title IX, Part A), Student Support Services (IDEA), Alternative Program (Title I, Part D), and Early Learning (Pre- K/VPK). At these cross-department collaborative meetings, status updates of the Title I, Part A funded activities and initiatives are discussed. Such topics could include discussions between Federal Projects and Resource Development staff and Department of Teaching and Learning (DTL) staff discussing the status of the proposed activities that fall under the direction of DTL. Such activities/programs include split-funded teacher- on-assignment Program Specialists, Reading Eggs at Title I elementary schools, an incoming third grade summer learning program, a summer literacy bus, and additional teacher induction mentors at Title I schools with high numbers of new educators. These decisions may impact the Title I, Part A plan for the following school year, which would then lead to further conversations with DTL leadership about adjusting needs and priorities for the other Title I, Part A funded activities.

Federal Projects and Resource Development department leadership also meet with leadership from the

Department of Teaching and Learning (Title II, Part A), Families in Need (Title IX, Part A), Student Support Services (IDEA), Alternative Program (Title I, Part D), and Early Learning (Pre-K/VPK) to develop the Title I, Part A plan. The various areas of focus which are supported with Title I, Part A

funds are discussed with the respective leadership from those departments/programs, to ensure that the activities being proposed have the highest likelihood of success.

During the planning phase of Title I school-wide plans, which spans early December to late March for the upcoming school year, leadership from the Federal Projects and Resource development department collaborate with Title I school principals, and district-level leadership who oversee TIPA areas of focus, on developing Title I schoolwide plans which will best contribute to closing academic achievement gaps. As TIPA SWPs are being developed, Title I school principals may indicate from which departments they want support in the development and implementation of their plans:

Alternative Programs, Career & Technical Education, ePathways, Early Learning/VPK, ESOL World Languages & Student Access, Families in Need, Federal Projects & Resource Development, Leadership Pathways, Student Assignment & Program Access, Student Support Services, Teaching and Learning. Such cross-departmental collaboration could include braiding Title I, Part A and IDEA funding to split-fund an ESE teacher, or Title I, Part A and Title III, Part A funds both supporting a supplemental English language acquisition program at a Title I school.

B. Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

Components of the Schoolwide Program Plan, as applicable

Include descriptions for any additional, applicable strategies that address the needs of all children in the school, but particularly the needs of those at risk of not meeting the challenging state academic standards which may include the following:

Improving Student's Skills Outside the Academic Subject Areas

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(7)(A)(iii)(I), ESEA Section 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(I)).

Longwood Elementary School supports the whole child by providing a comprehensive range of services that nurture students' mental health and behavioral development alongside their academic growth. The school offers counseling by a certified school counselor who delivers individual and group sessions, classroom guidance lessons, and crisis support. In collaboration with Seminole County Public Schools and local mental health agencies, Longwood also provides access to licensed mental health professionals and early intervention services. Specialized support is available through Exceptional Student Education (ESE), including speech, occupational, and physical therapies, as well as behavioral interventions. Mentoring programs—both peer-based and adult-led—foster positive relationships and personal growth. Additionally, strategies like Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports (PBIS) and family engagement initiatives help create a safe, inclusive, and supportive learning environment. These services collectively empower students with the skills they need to manage emotions, build healthy relationships, and make responsible decisions, laying a strong foundation for lifelong success.

Preparing for Postsecondary Opportunities and the Workforce

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(7)(A)(iii)(II), ESEA Section 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(II)).

Longwood Elementary uses a variety of strategies to promote college and career readiness among students. Our annual Teach-In event, held in November, invites community professionals to speak with students about their careers. Throughout the year, we also host family engagement events focused on supporting core subjects such as Reading, Math, and Science. Fifth grade students receive presentations on middle school transfer options and available programs of emphasis. All students at Longwood Elementary participate in computer science and coding activities during the school year, with 5th graders taking part in an Industry Certification program. These certifications cover essential digital tools, including word processing, spreadsheets, and multimedia presentations. We also integrate 21st-century skills across all content areas, emphasizing collaborative learning,

critical thinking, problem-solving, inquiry, project-based learning, and hands-on activities. Grade-level teams work together to incorporate social studies standards into the ELA block using informational texts outlined in district instructional plans.

Addressing Problem Behavior and Early Intervening Services

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior and early intervening services coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III), ESEA Section 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)).

Longwood ES utilizes a PBIS model with clear expectations of Longwood P.A.W.S. Longwood Lions bucks are a token system to reward positive behaviors. Each classroom has a hierarchy of consequences posted and taught so students are aware of the steps taken when classroom or school expectations are not followed. Longwood's Student Support team meets with students for behavior interventions, social skills development, and other situations as needed. Data is collected and monitored for behavior interventions. General Education and ESE Behavior Intervention Plans are created and followed as needed. Training is provided by the behavior interventionist and supported by the behavior coaching academy to staff for individualized behavior plans.

Professional Learning and Other Activities

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high-need subjects (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(7)(A)(iii)(IV), ESEA Section 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(IV)).

Professional Development: Longwood Elementary will plan targeted professional development activities aligned with our areas of focus to support student achievement. All teachers and instructional paraprofessionals will be invited to participate.

Teacher Retention: To support teacher retention, monthly NEST (New Educators Support Team) meetings will be held. Beginning teachers will be paired with a coach or peer mentor through our Lion Excellence program.

Teacher Recruitment: Longwood Elementary will encourage current teachers to pursue clinical education certification, helping to increase the number of interns placed on our campus and strengthen our future teacher pipeline.

Strategies to Assist Preschool Children

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(7)(A)(iii)(V), ESEA Section 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(V)).

Longwood Elementary uses several strategies to support preschool children in transitioning smoothly

to kindergarten. The school hosts a Kindergarten Signing Night and a Kindergarten Meet and Greet, where families can meet the teachers and participate in a guided tour of the campus led by our kindergarten team. Before the school year begins, we also offer a Meet the Teacher event, providing students and parents with an opportunity to become familiar with the classroom environment. Additionally, kindergarten teachers are available for individual conferences to discuss student needs and help families prepare for a successful start to school. These efforts ensure a welcoming and supportive transition from early childhood education to elementary school.

VI. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review

This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI or CSI (ESEA Sections 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (2)(C) and 1114(b)(6)).

Process to Review the Use of Resources

Describe the process you engage in with your district to review the use of resources to meet the identified needs of students.

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

Specifics to Address the Need

Identify the specific resource(s) and rationale (i.e., data) you have determined will be used this year to address the need(s) (i.e., timeline).

In the area of literacy, performance data from FAST and iReady in elementary schools or benchmark assessments in secondary schools are used to progress monitor whether core instruction is meeting the needs of students. A benchmark of 80% of students being at or above the 26th percentile is used to monitor whether further supports are needed. This data along with the data from district leadership walkthroughs in ELA classrooms are used by assistant superintendents to help school leaders problem solve after the administration of these assessments.

VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Check if this school is eligible for 2025-26 UniSIG funds but has chosen NOT to apply.

No

BUDGET	ACTIVITY	FUNCTION/ OBJECT	FUNDING SOURCE	FTE	AMOUNT
Plan Budget Total					0.00