Brevard County Public Schools
School Improvement Plan
2012-2013

Name of School:

Central Area

Longleaf Elementary

Area:

Central

Principal:

Sandra Demmon

Area Superintendent:

Marilyn Sylvester

SAC Chairperson:

Tiffiny Fleeger & Deborah Carlson

Superintendent: Dr. Brian Binggeli

Mission Statement:

Unity in opening minds and touching hearts. Developing knowledge and skills of life, For life, for a better tomorrow.

Vision Statement:

Longleaf is a community of learners committed to providing an academically rich, safe, and creative environment. Empowering members to attain their personal best while demonstrating

Lifeskills. Longleaf is guiding today's students to become tomorrow's leaders.

Brevard County Public Schools
School Improvement Plan
2012-2013

RATIONAL – Continuous Improvement Cycle Process

Data Analysis from multiple data sources: *(Needs assessment that supports the need for improvement)*

One place to start – three year trend history (optional):

Longleaf Elementary School received an "A" for the 2011-2012 school year.

2012 BPS Student Survey

- 34% of students responded that they felt challenged to do their best by working with others to solve problems.
- 43% felt challenged when participating in the teaching and learning process.
- For the statement that reads: "I believe my school work will help me later in life" 47% strongly agreed.

Students strongly agreed they were learning 21st Century skills by:

- teamwork (41%)
- effective communication (37%)
- meaningful projects (38%)
- practical use of technology (31%)
- real-world issues (29%)
- how to research (38%)
- organizational skills (28%)
- personal character (38%)

2013 Longleaf Student Survey of grades 4-6

- 64% of students agree that their teacher asks them to explain their answers.
- 19% said that they strongly agree.
- The student survey question: "My instruction keeps me interested." fell in the 40% range as agree for each subject.
- The students that disagreed with the above statement fell in the 20% range.

2012 FCAT 2.0

Longleaf scored as follows on the FCAT 2.0:

- 84% of students met high standards in reading by scoring at level 3 or above. This is a 1% increase from 2011.
- 83% of students met high standards in math by scoring at level 3 or above. This is a 1% increase from 2011.
- 94% of students scored a 3.0 or higher on writing. This is a 5% decrease for us this year but aligns with our previous writing trends.
- 79% of students met high standards in science by scoring at level 3 or above. Longleaf stayed the same in this area with a 79% in 2011.
- 74% of Longleaf's students made learning gains in reading. We had no change in the percent of students making learning gains from 2011.
- 76% of Longleaf's students made learning gains in mathematics. We had no change in the percent of students making learning gains from 2011.
- 74% of Longleaf's lowest 25% made learning gains in reading. This is a decrease of 6% from 2011.
- 62% of Longleaf's lowest 25% made learning gains in mathematics. This is a decrease of 17% from 2011.

Demographic Data

47% of students with disabilities scored at or above level 3 in reading.
53% of students with disabilities scored at or above level 3 in mathematics.
67% of ELL students scored at or above level 3 in reading.
67% of ELL students scored at or above level 3 in mathematics.
76% of free and reduced lunch students scored at or above level 3 in reading.
69% of free and reduced lunch students scored at or above level 3 in mathematics.
75% of Asian students scored at or above level 3 in reading.
90% of Asian students scored at or above level 3 in mathematics.
69% of black students scored at or above level 3 in reading.
75% of black students scored at or above level 3 in mathematics.
79% of Hispanic students scored at or above level 3 in reading.
74% of Hispanic students scored at or above level 3 in mathematics.
68% of multi-racial students scored at or above level 3 in reading.
81% of multi-racial students scored at or above level 3 in mathematics.
87% of white students scored at or above level 3 in reading.
85% of white students scored at or above level 3 in mathematics.

Analysis of Current Practice: *(How do we currently conduct business?)*

1. For the past two years Longleaf's school improvement plan has focused on Response to Intervention and providing all students with the intervention strategies they need to be successful. In addition the plan focused on increased parent knowledge of the school improvement process. RtI or MTSS has now become how we do business at Longleaf Elementary. Parent awareness of our school improvement process increased and we have now adopted the strategies implemented last year into our annual procedures.

2. Critical thinking skills were addressed as Goal 3 in our plan last year. Brevard's Effective Strategies For Teaching brought a new attention to the importance of instruction in critical thinking skills. Critical thinking skills are now being embedded in all aspects of our teacher's classroom instruction, and we will continue to train, model and monitor the use of Best Practices related to critical thinking in all of our instruction.

3. Longleaf has been an established Professional Learning Community for the past six years. Teachers work in their collaborative teams on a weekly basis to do the work of improving instruction for all students. There is a pervasive feeling throughout the school and grade level teams that students belong to everyone and we will all work together to help them all succeed.

4. Each grade level meets monthly with the members of our Individual Problem Solving Team as a Data Team to review and discuss student progress, RtI, and other necessary areas to support student progress.

5. All teachers serve on Leadership Teams that are chaired by teacher leaders with strengths in the particular area of the team, the 21st Century Skills, Leadership Team is one example of the types of teams that have been created to support instruction and student achievement. Each of the teams work collaboratively to expand their focus area throughout the school community.

6. Peer observation began in earnest last year with the introduction of the IPPAS evaluation process. Most teachers embraced the idea of having peers observe them in their classrooms and vice versa. Feedback forms are completed and shared between teachers. The majority of our teachers have had no less than three teachers observe their rooms, and have visited three on their own. This year the teachers have already started peer observations without any prompting from administration.

7. Relying on currently adopted core curriculum materials, teachers currently spend a majority of instructional time using fictional text. Formative and summative assessments for reading are mostly made up of tests from "Treasures" reading series, which is comprised of 60% fiction and 40% non-fiction text. Integration of reading instruction within the content areas is not occurring as a daily practice across all grade levels.

Best Practice: *(What does research tell us we should be doing as it relates to data analysis above?)*

Research by John Hattie and Vivian Robinson shows that the greatest impact on student learning is the involvement of the student in their learning process. With the state adoption of the Common Core Standards, this research is being supported. By the time students complete the core, students must be able to read and comprehend independently and proficiently the kinds of complex texts commonly found in college and careers. With Common Core, students are required to dive deeper into the content. They are being asked to analyze, synthesize, and apply their knowledge. The students are being required to actively participate in their own learning instead of just receiving information from the teacher. Dr. Max Thompson says that schools need to teach students reading stamina, through the use of extended reading passages and by moving more expository texts into all grade levels. Students today are asked to read very little expository text – as little as 7 and 15 percent of elementary and middle school instructional reading is expository (Yopp & Yopp, 2006). There is evidence that current standards, curriculum, and instructional practice have not done enough to foster the independent reading of complex texts so crucial for college and career readiness, particularly in the case of informational texts.

The Common Core State Standards establish a "staircase" of increasing text complexity in what students must be able to read so that all students are ready for the demands of college and career level reading no later than the end of high school. The standards also require the progressive development of reading comprehension so that students advancing through the grades are able to gain more from whatever they read.

Vocabulary has been empirically connected to reading comprehension since at least 1925 (Whipple, 1925) and had its importance to comprehension confirmed in recent year (National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, 2000). It is widely accepted among researchers that the difference in students' vocabulary levels is a key factor in disparities in academic achievement (Baumann & Kameenui, 1991, Stanovich, 1986) but that vocabulary instruction has been neither frequent nor systematic in most schools. Research suggests that if students are going to grasp and retain words and comprehend text, they need incremental, repeated exposure in a variety of contexts to the words they are trying to learn. When students make multiple connections between a new word and their own experiences, they develop a flexible understanding of the word they are learning. Therefore not only learning what the

word means but how to use the word in a variety of contexts (Landauer, McNamara, Dennis, & Kintsch, 2007). Research conducted by Dr. Robert Marzano has shown that teaching vocabulary in context has an effect size of .85, with a 33 percentile gain.

CONTENT AREA:

Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Parental Involvement	Drop-out Programs
Language Arts	Social Studies	Arts/PE	Other:		

School Based Objective: *(Action statement: What will we do to improve programmatic and/or instructional effectiveness?)*

Students will be expected to build knowledge, gain insights, explore possibilities, and broaden their perspectives through reading a diverse array of classic and contemporary literature with a focus on integrating challenging informational texts across content areas. All Longleaf teachers will utilize research-based strategies to instruct their students to read and comprehend complex literary and informational texts independently and proficiently.

Strategies: *(Small number of action oriented staff performance objectives)*

Barrier	*Action Steps*	*Person Responsible*	*Timetable*	*Budget*	*In-Process Measure*
1. Teacher Training	1. Provide training on Overall Common Core	Principal	August 2012		Agenda Notes

2. Materials / Resources Teacher understand-ing of the Demands of Text Complexity	2. Ordered Make it Real Strategies for Success with Informational Texts By: Linda Hoyt for all classroom teachers	Principal	October 2012	$1200.00	Purchase Order Book Study materials
3. Materials / Resources	3. Order Common Core Support Materials from Curriculum Associates (1 set per grade level)	Assistant Principal	October 2012	$2373.00	Purchase Order Assessment Data from the books
4. Teacher Training	4.Provide model lesson on Close Reading	Assistant Principal District Resource Teacher	November 6, 2012		Agenda PDD Records Classroom Observations Peer Observations
5.Teacher Training	5.Schedule training with district resource teacher on Informational Text	Principal	October 3, 2012		Agenda Training follow-up Documents Classroom Observations
6. Materials / Resources	6. BPS Quality Questioning Handbooks	Principal	October 2012		Purchase Order Classroom Walk-Through Data
7. Teacher Training	7. Quality Questioning & Text Complexity	Assistant Principal Reading Coach	November 2012		Agenda PDD Records Classroom Walk-Through, Peer Observations
8. Student Interest	8. Conduct a Student Pre and Post Survey on literary and informational text	Principal Classroom Teachers	October 2012 May 2012		Survey Results

EVALUATION – Outcome Measures and Reflection

Qualitative and Quantitative Professional Practice Outcomes: *(Measures the level of implementation of the professional practices throughout the school)*

- Increased use of informational text across content areas and documented through the use of classroom walkthroughs and lesson plans.
- Increase percentage of teachers scoring at the distinguished level on the Brevard Instructional Personnel Performance Appraisal System; Dimension 3- delivers engaging, challenging and relevant lessons.
- Teacher lesson plans will document daily inclusion of informational text across content areas.
- Pre/post student survey will show an increase in the amount of informational text they are reading in school.

Qualitative and Quantitative Student Achievement Expectations: *(Measures of student achievement)*

- On the 2012 FCAT Strand of Informational Text: 4th- 6.5/8 points, 5th -6.6/8 points, 6th- 10.5/14 points
- FAIR 2012 Assessment Period 1- K-27% moderate risk, 1st- 28% moderate risk, 2nd- 59% moderate to high risk, 3rd- 54% moderate to high risk, 4th- 40% moderate to high risk, 5th – 38% moderate to high, and 6th-38% moderate to high risk
- 2012 FCAT Science (informational text) 79% scored at 3 and above
- Social Studies Assessments (EOY 2012 to EOY 2013) - 3rd- 87% grade level average – 90%

  4th- 87% grade level average – 90%

  5th- 89% grade level average – 92%

  6th- 82% grade level average – 85%

APPENDIX A

(ALL SCHOOLS)

Reading Goal	**2012 Current Level of Performance** (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects ie. 28%=129 students)	**2013 Expected Level of Performance** (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects ie. 31%=1134 students)
In 2012 84% of students in grades 3-6 scored at level 3 or above on the FCAT 2.0. Examining the shifts in ELA and Content Area Literacy within the CCSS, 50% of what students read throughout the school day should be informational text, increasing to 70% for sixth grade. Addressing this shift, staff development will target strengthening the quality of integrating reading instruction within all content areas, and increasing the percentage of informational text student's access within the classroom. Site based teacher planning will include developing lessons with informational text requiring high levels of text complexity,		

higher level reasoning and thinking questions, and summarization through oral and written responses. This planned and purposeful instruction will increase the number of students scoring on or above grade level. By May 2013 85% of students in grades 3-6 will score at level 3 or above on the FCAT 2.0.		
Anticipated Barrier(s): **1.**		
Strategy(s): **1.**		
FCAT 2.0 Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 **Barrier(s):** **Strategy(s):** **1.**	84% = 357 students	88%
Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at levels 4, 5, and 6 in Reading **Barrier(s):** **Strategy(s):** **1.**	N/A	N/A
FCAT 2.0 Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Reading **Barrier(s):** Curriculum and time set aside to offer enrichment lessons to high achieving students. **Strategy(s):** 1. Create MTSS groups that provide enrichment and strategies to high performing students through the use of non-fiction articles, books, and digital resources. 2. Provide afterschool activities that provide enrichment to high-performing students.	57% = 243 students	58%
Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in Reading **Barrier(s):** **Strategy(s):** **1.**	N/A	N/A

Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning Gains in Reading **Barrier(s):** **Strategy(s):** **1.**	N/A	N/A
FCAT 2.0 Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in Reading **Barrier(s):** **Strategy(s):** **1.** **Florida Alternate Assessment:** Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in Reading **Barrier(s):** **Strategy(s):** **1.**	74% = 54 students	76%
Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six years school will reduce their Achievement Gap by 50%: **Baseline data 2010-11:**		
Student subgroups by ethnicity NOT making satisfactory progress in reading : White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian: Multi-Racial: **2010 – 2012** **White:** **14% - 34 students** **Black:** **50% - 6 students** **Hispanic:** **8% - 1 student** **Asian:** **8% - 1 student** **American Indian:** **0%** **Multi-Racial:** **29% - students**	Enter numerical data for current level of performance 13% - 40 students 31% - 5 students 21% - 11 students 25% - 5 students 0% 30% - 8 students	Enter numerical data for expected level of performance 11% 20% 18% 20% 28%
English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Reading **Barrier(s):** **Strategy(s):** **1.**	0% All ELL students made growth in 2012 as measured by CELLA	0%

Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Reading **Barrier(s):** **Strategy(s):** **1.**	53% - 26 students	50%
Economically Disadvantaged Students not making satisfactory progress in Reading **Barrier(s):** **Strategy(s):** **1.**	24% - 14 students	22%

Reading Professional Development

PD Content/Topic/Focus	Target Dates/ Schedule	Strategy(s) for follow-up/monitoring
Common Core training focusing on Close Reading	Oct/Nov	Lesson Plans, Classroom Walk-Through Data, Peer Observations
Common Core and Informational Text and Quality Questioning	Oct/Nov	Lesson Plans, Classroom Walk-Through Data, Observations
Make It Real- Strategies for Success with Informational Text - book study	On-going 2012-13	Lesson Plans, Classroom Walk-Through Data, Observations, Agendas

CELLA GOAL	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person/Process/ Monitoring
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in **Listening/ Speaking:** 56%	Teachers with ESOL endorsement	All teachers assigned with ELL students will take one class until endorsed or coverage	Assistant Principal Classroom Teachers
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in **Reading:** 33%	Teachers with ESOL endorsement	All teachers assigned with ELL students will take one class until endorsed or coverage	Assistant Principal Classroom Teachers

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in **Writing**: 50%	Teachers with ESOL endorsement	All teachers assigned with ELL students will take one class until endorsed or coverage	Assistant Principal Classroom Teachers

Mathematics Goal(s): **1.**	**2012 Current Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)**	**2013 Expected Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)**
Anticipated Barrier(s): **1.**		
Strategy(s): **1.**		
FCAT 2.0 Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 **Barrier(s):** **Strategy(s):** **1.**	83% = 355 students	90%
Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at levels 4, 5, and 6 in Mathematics **Barrier(s):** **Strategy(s):** **1.**	N/A	
FCAT 2.0 Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Mathematics **Barrier(s):** **Strategy(s):** **1.**	54% = 229 students	58%
Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in Mathematics **Barrier(s):** **Strategy(s):** **1.**	N/A	
Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning Gains in Mathematics **Barrier(s):** **Strategy(s):** **1.**	N/A	
FCAT 2.0 Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in Mathematics **Barrier(s):** **Strategy(s):** **1.**	62% = 54 students	64%

Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in Mathematics **Barrier(s):** **Strategy(s):** **1.**	N/A	
Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six years school will reduce their Achievement Gap by 50%: **Baseline Data 2010-11:**		
Student subgroups by ethnicity : White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian: Multi-Racial: **2010 – 2012** **White: 14% - 33 students** **Black: 58% - 7 students** **Hispanic: 24% - 9 students** **Asian: 9% - 1 student** **American Indian: 0%** **Multi-Racial: 35% - 6 students**	15% - 46 students 25% - 4 students 26% - 14 students 10% - 1 students 0 30% - 8 students	12% 12% 22% 0 0 25%
English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Mathematics	33% - 4 students	
Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Mathematics	47% - 16 students	
Economically Disadvantaged Students not making satisfactory progress in Mathematics	31% – 18 students	

Mathematics Professional Development

PD Content/Topic/Focus	Target Dates/ Schedule	Strategy(s) for follow-up/monitoring

Common Core Math Strategies training by K-2 Math Launch Team and Math Contact	October 2012	Agendas PDD records Classroom Walk-Through Data Peer Observations / Feedback Training follow-up and reflection

Writing	2012 Current Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)	2013 Expected Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)
Barrier(s): **Strategy(s):** **1.**		
FCAT: Students scoring at Achievement level 3.0 and higher in writing	94% = 114 students	96
Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing	N/A	

Science Goal(s) (Elementary and Middle) **1.**	2012 Current Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)	2013 Expected Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)

Barrier(s): **Strategy(s):** **1.**		
Students scoring at Achievement level 3 in Science**:**	77%	81%
Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at levels 4, 5, and 6 in Science	N/A	
Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Science:	18% = 2 students	20%
Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in Reading	N/A	

Science Goal(s) (High School) **1.**	**2012 Current Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)**	**2013 Expected Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)**
Barrier(s): **Strategy(s):** **1.**		
Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at levels 4, 5, and 6 in Science		
Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in Science		
Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. **White:** **Black:** **Hispanic:** **Asian:** **American Indian**:		
English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra		

Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra		
Economically Disadvantaged Students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra		

APPENDIX B

(SECONDARY SCHOOLS **ONLY**)

Algebra 1 EOC Goal	2012 Current Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)	2013 Expected Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)
Barrier(s): **Strategy(s):** **1.**		
Students scoring at Achievement level 3 in Algebra**:**		
Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra:		
Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six years school will reduce their Achievement Gap by 50%: Baseline Data 2010-11		
Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. **White:** **Black:** **Hispanic:**		
English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra		
Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra		

Economically Disadvantaged Students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra		

Geometry EOC Goal	2012 Current Level of Performance(Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)	2013 Expected Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)
Barrier(s): **Strategy(s):** **1.**		
Students scoring at Achievement level 3 in Geometry**:**		
Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Geometry:		
Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six years school will reduce their Achievement Gap by 50%: Baseline Data 2010-11		
Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. **White:** **Black:** **Hispanic:**		
English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry		
Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry		
Economically Disadvantaged Students not making satisfactory progress in Geometry		

Biology EOC	2012 Current	2013

Goal	Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)	Expected Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)
Students scoring at Achievement level 3 in Biology**:**		
Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Biology:		

Civics EOC	2012 Current Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)	2013 Expected Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)
Students scoring at Achievement level 3 in Civics**:**		
Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Civics:		

U.S. History EOC	2012 Current Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)	2013 Expected Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)
Students scoring at Achievement level 3 in U. S. History**:**		
Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in U. S. History:		

Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) Goal(s)	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person/Process/ Monitoring
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement: **Goal 1:** **Goal 2:**			

Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person/Process/Monitoring
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement: **Goal 1:** **Goal 2:**			

Additional Goal(s)	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person/Process/Monitoring
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement: **Goal 1:** **Goal 2**:			

APPENDIX C

(TITLE 1 SCHOOLS ONLY)

Highly Effective Teachers

Describe the school based strategies that will be used to recruit and retain high quality, highly effective teachers to the school.

Descriptions of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date
1.		
2.		
3.		

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

Provide the number of instructional staff and paraprofessionals that are teaching out-of-field and/or who are not highly effective. *When using percentages, include the number of teachers the percentage represents (e.g., 70% [35]).

Number of staff and paraprofessionals that are teaching out-of-field/and who are not highly effective	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective
N/A	

For the following areas, please write a brief narrative that includes the data for the year 2011-12 and a description of changes you intend to incorporate to improve the data for the year 2012-13.

MULTI-TIERED SYSTEM OF SUPPORTS (MTSS)/RtI (Identify the MTSS leadership team and it role in development and implementation of the SIP along with data sources, data management and how staff is trained in MTSS)

Marilyn Sylvester, Principal
Kathryn Lott, Assistant Principal
Donna Ballard, Guidance Counselor
Tracy Pogue, Speech and Language Pathologist
Amy Carrubba, Staffing Specialist
Joan Adamson, School Psychologist
Debra Willman, Reading Coach
Classroom Teachers

PARENT INVOLVEMENT:

2011-2012

- **32% Parents participated in the Brevard School Survey**
- **Reading/Language Arts Instruction**
  45% Excellent
  42% Good
  8% Fair
  5% Poor

To improve data 2012-13:

- **Promote survey via marquee, newsletter, website, Edline, SynerVoice, SAC, Booster meetings, signs in car loop, student planners, at parent nights, etc.**
- **Host curriculum nights to inform parents of the reading instruction, common core alignment and our School Improvement focus on Informational text to heighten learner knowledge of content.**

Writing Night/Science Fair Night- October 9
Math Night (to include reflection/writing)- November 8
Reading/Lang Arts Night- January 17

ATTENDANCE: (Include current and expected attendance rates, excessive absences and tardiness)

- CURRENT- 96.8% (1.3% higher than District average)- for days 1-20 of 2012-2013 which is slightly lower than last year at this time.
- 96%- Average for 2011-12 Expected average EOY 1012-13- 96%
- Tardies- 8% 2011-12

Longleaf continues to do well with low absenteeism and tardiness. We will continue awareness on the importance of a prompt arrival each morning and daily attendance.

SUSPENSION:

Longleaf had 74 referrals in 2011-2012 in which 15 resulted in suspensions. Guidance class is taught on the activity wheel to all 5th and 6th grade classes. Class discussions focus on peer pressure, friendship, citizenship, bullying and other topics faced by those students. However, based on the 2011-2012 discipline data, referrals and suspensions are not an issue at Longleaf.

DROP-OUT (High Schools only):

POSTSECONDARY READINESS: (How does the school incorporate students' academic and career planning, as well as promote student course selections, so that students' course of study is personally meaningful? Describe strategies for improving student readiness for the public postsecondary level based on annual analysis of the High School Feedback Report.)