

Sarasota County Schools

Laurel Nokomis School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	18
Positive Culture & Environment	33
Budget to Support Goals	33

Laurel Nokomis School

1900 LAUREL RD E, Nokomis, FL 34275

www.sarasotacountyschools.net/laurelnokomis

Demographics

Principal: Raymond Wilson

Start Date for this Principal: 5/1/2016

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	38%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (70%) 2017-18: A (75%) 2016-17: A (69%) 2015-16: A (69%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	18
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	33

Laurel Nokomis School

1900 LAUREL RD E, Nokomis, FL 34275

www.sarasotacountyschools.net/laurelnokomis

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Combination School PK-8	No	35%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	24%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	A	A	A	A

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at

<https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The mission of Laurel Nokomis School is, "Can do, work hard, get smart."

We Believe:

Students have the right to learn, and teachers have the right to teach. Students learn best and teachers instruct best in an environment free of disruption.

Administrators, educators, and staff members have a responsibility to work cooperatively, support one another, display mutual respect, and provide a positive educational environment that meets the physical, academic, and social-emotional needs of all students.

Students have a responsibility to work cooperatively with one another and to demonstrate respect for adults and peers in the learning community. Students should be held accountable for their own behavior.

Every child can learn successfully when strategies that best meet his/her needs are identified and utilized.

In addition to traditional subject areas, a comprehensive curriculum should include art, music, physical education, science, technology and languages.

We adhere to and support the rigorous Florida Standards and NGSSS. Continuous academic improvement, with excellence as a goal, is promoted and celebrated.

We encourage active, supportive participation of parents and the community as it is essential for the success of our students and our school.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Laurel Nokomis School is to prepare our students to be college and career ready, life-long learners and independent, responsible citizens.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Wilson, Raymond	Principal	
Cutrona, Sheryl	Instructional Coach	
Parrish, Sue	Administrative Support	
Oliver, Christine	Assistant Principal	
Wasserman, Heather	Assistant Principal	
Sirocchi, Eliana	Administrative Support	
Rasbury, Shannon	Teacher, K-12	
Schramm, Dave	Teacher, K-12	
Darby, Sean	Teacher, K-12	
Glass, Ashley	Teacher, K-12	
Porvaznik, Susan	Teacher, K-12	
Fortune, Julie	Teacher, K-12	
Delaney, Matt	Teacher, K-12	
Costigan, Kate	Administrative Support	
O'Berry, Gabrielle	School Counselor	
Reichman, Michael	School Counselor	
Miller, Susan	Teacher, K-12	Team Leader, Grade 5
Ipe, Robin	Teacher, K-12	Team Leader, Grade 6
McGinnity, Sue	Teacher, ESE	Behavior Specialist, ASD
Petz, Heather	Teacher, K-12	
Chamberlain, Melanie	Teacher, ESE	
Nguyen, Nicole	Teacher, K-12	
Wardlaw, Laura	Administrative Support	
Schumacher-Martin, Joey	Administrative Support	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Sunday 5/1/2016, Raymond Wilson

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

10

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

15

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

92

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	38%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (70%) 2017-18: A (75%) 2016-17: A (69%) 2015-16: A (69%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

Early Warning Systems**Current Year**

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	45	116	108	101	132	127	139	147	140	0	0	0	0	1055
Attendance below 90 percent	0	11	6	7	6	6	4	6	9	0	0	0	0	55
One or more suspensions	0	8	5	1	6	10	10	21	15	0	0	0	0	76
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	4	2	20	13	13	0	0	0	0	52
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	9	20	24	10	0	0	0	0	65

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Students with two or more indicators		0	3	2	0	6	7	21	20	14	0	0	0	0	73

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 8/13/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	99	108	108	130	125	135	144	144	176	0	0	0	0	1169
Attendance below 90 percent	3	15	8	12	7	14	10	11	19	0	0	0	0	99
One or more suspensions	0	1	3	6	12	4	13	14	17	0	0	0	0	70
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	1	0	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	4	14	33	27	16	17	0	0	0	0	111

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators		0	1	2	2	4	12	6	6	12	0	0	0	45

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	99	108	108	130	125	135	144	144	176	0	0	0	0	1169
Attendance below 90 percent	3	15	8	12	7	14	10	11	19	0	0	0	0	99
One or more suspensions	0	1	3	6	12	4	13	14	17	0	0	0	0	70
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	1	0	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	4	14	33	27	16	17	0	0	0	0	111

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	1	2	2	4	12	6	6	12	0	0	0	0	45

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

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

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	71%	67%	61%	78%	69%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	59%	60%	59%	71%	62%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	45%	52%	54%	65%	58%	51%
Math Achievement	80%	70%	62%	80%	68%	58%
Math Learning Gains	71%	65%	59%	72%	64%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	59%	55%	52%	63%	57%	50%
Science Achievement	69%	63%	56%	69%	58%	53%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Social Studies Achievement	97%	88%	78%	0%	85%	75%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey										
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	78%	70%	8%	58%	20%
	2018	71%	68%	3%	57%	14%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	58%	67%	-9%	58%	0%
	2018	68%	67%	1%	56%	12%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison		-13%				
05	2019	71%	68%	3%	56%	15%
	2018	74%	66%	8%	55%	19%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				
06	2019	69%	63%	6%	54%	15%
	2018	84%	63%	21%	52%	32%
Same Grade Comparison		-15%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				
07	2019	73%	64%	9%	52%	21%
	2018	77%	62%	15%	51%	26%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		-11%				
08	2019	70%	66%	4%	56%	14%
	2018	77%	70%	7%	58%	19%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison		-7%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	76%	73%	3%	62%	14%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	68%	72%	-4%	62%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	61%	72%	-11%	64%	-3%
	2018	73%	71%	2%	62%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		-12%				
Cohort Comparison		-7%				
05	2019	69%	70%	-1%	60%	9%
	2018	80%	72%	8%	61%	19%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				
06	2019	82%	67%	15%	55%	27%
	2018	89%	66%	23%	52%	37%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				
07	2019	89%	73%	16%	54%	35%
	2018	86%	73%	13%	54%	32%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019	80%	65%	15%	46%	34%
	2018	64%	63%	1%	45%	19%
Same Grade Comparison		16%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	61%	65%	-4%	53%	8%
	2018	74%	67%	7%	55%	19%
Same Grade Comparison		-13%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	74%	62%	12%	48%	26%
	2018	69%	62%	7%	50%	19%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	95%	85%	10%	71%	24%
2018	93%	80%	13%	71%	22%
Compare		2%			
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	98%	73%	25%	61%	37%
2018	100%	77%	23%	62%	38%
Compare		-2%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	100%	69%	31%	57%	43%
2018	0%	71%	-71%	56%	-56%
Compare		100%			

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	34	46	43	54	57	48	44	95	20		
ELL	47	56	56	67	76	67	36				
ASN	76	56		88	78						
BLK	67	54		67	62						
HSP	66	59	54	77	73	50	69	87	85		
MUL	72	65	50	83	85	80	76		90		
WHT	71	59	41	80	70	57	69	98	79		
FRL	61	54	48	69	70	60	46	95	61		
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	46	62	60	52	63	55	52	62			
ELL	35	71	77	53	94	100					
ASN	86	60		86	93						
BLK	53			67							
HSP	70	60	40	80	72	61	64	92			

2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
MUL	79	61		82	64		83				
WHT	79	66	60	83	75	67	73	93	77		
FRL	68	61	58	72	68	56	62	87	72		
2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	27	55	54	40	56	56	19				
ELL	56	67		50	60						
ASN	90	59		85	80						
BLK	75	50		67	50						
HSP	71	75	69	70	67	63	57				
MUL	85	75		87	89		80				
WHT	78	71	64	81	72	62	69		53		
FRL	67	67	61	69	64	60	55		32		

ESSA Data

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

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	67
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	38
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	670
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	49
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	55
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

English Language Learners	
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	75
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	63
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	66
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	75
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	69
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	61
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection

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

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

2019 FSA Data revealed 4th Grade ELA (58% proficient) - A closer look at the data suggest that teachers had a heavier focus on DOK 1 type activities. Reading instruction was restructured to encourage a greater focus on standards mastery and less reliance on supplementary reading programs. In addition, departmentalization occurred for the first time with 4th grade that year.

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

2019 FSA data revealed 6th Grade ELA proficiency declined from 84% to 69% - Teachers in 6th grade experienced a dynamic in which students with severe needs and support were integrated into mainstream classrooms. There were many issues related to social-emotional needs of students.

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.

2019 FSA data revealed 4th Grade Math (State Average 64%, LNS 61%) - A closer look at the data suggest that teachers had a heavier focus on DOK 1 type activities. Math instruction was restructured to encourage a greater focus on standards mastery and use of Math Mentality. In addition, departmentalization was developed for the first time with 4th grade.

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

In 2019 FSA data revealed 3rd Grade ELA (71% to 78% proficient) - We implemented individualized reading support such as Orton-Gillingham, ESE resource teacher supported small group instruction, utilized inclusion model, and increased strategies to enhance writing, and ongoing progress monitoring and feedback.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

In 2019 FSA data, there were 33 students in grade 5 that scored a level 1 on the state assessment for math, approximately 50 students scored a level 1 or level 2 on FSA ELA.

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

Since Data is from 2018-2019 FSA:

1. 5th Grade ELA

2. 6th Grade ELA
3. 7th Grade ELA
4. Improve remote learner attendance
5. Decrease discipline referrals

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: 2019 FSA data revealed a proficiency level of 58% for 4th grade ELA. This indicated that 42% of 4th grade students were reading/writing below grade level. Reading and writing are highly correlated to literacy development and academic success. Rationale includes the need to increase reading level proficiency to meet expected outcomes.

Measurable Outcome: By the year 2021, there will be at least a 4% increase from 58% to 62% overall proficiency for 4th grade FSA ELA.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Matt Delaney (matt.delaney@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

- ~Year 2- Implementation school wide writing committee and use of TOP Score writing program (step by step lessons to help students learn proper format; graphic organizer use; informative, opinion, narrative teaching)
- ~Departmentalization of ELA and Math, in addition resource teacher assigned to provide ESE support based on content area specialty
- ~Use of strategic inclusion/co-teaching models to support lowest quartile
- ~Use of LAFS, iReady and Standards Mastery for standards based instruction
- ~Use of Reading Wonders Curriculum
- ~Use of Instructional Focus Guide to align, pace instruction and develop quality lesson plans
- ~Use of Accelerated Reader with quarterly goals and incentives to encourage love of reading
- ~Use of Orton-Gillingham for remediation and intervention
- ~Collaborative Planning Times with teachers to review data and design lessons
- ~Professional Development focusing on comprehension, writing and increasing DOK
- ~Data chats with administration monthly
- ~Reading intervention teacher supporting 8 at risk students

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

- ~Departmentalization allows for collaboration to develop lesson plans, utilize resources, and create small group targeted instruction/interventions; Reduced number of subjects to plan for aiding with concurrent learning. ESE Resource teacher's planning time aligns with subject area and CPT time.
- ~The Inclusion Model allows for continuity of maximizing instructional support by the ESE Resource teacher through specially designed instruction with the general education teacher.
- ~ Research shows Visible Learning and High Expectations Teaching (Learning Intention, Success Criteria and Teacher Clarity) positively impact student performance
- ~Continue to implement a Growth Mindset Strategy: (i.e., "This is hard work and we will NOT give up on any student")
- ~Research has shown that accessing iReady at least 45 min/week improves mastering grade level standards; Monitoring and use of iReady data supports student learning; Administration will support with data chats.
- ~School wide writing program (Top Score) K-8 alignment

Action Steps to Implement

1. Professional development scheduled and offered
2. iReady LAFS provided to all teachers and students for ILA
3. Level 1 & Level 2's ILA

4. PLC Waiver for monthly data chats
5. CPT's (discussion of student data, and departmentalization planning and design)
6. Informal observation & walk-throughs
7. iReady Standards Mastery
8. Admin Virtual sit-ins (Remote Learners)
9. Admin Motivational Virtual Pep Talks (Remote Learners)

Person Responsible Matt Delaney (matt.delaney@sarasotacountyschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	2019 FSA data revealed a proficiency level of 69% for 5th grade ELA. This indicated that 31% of 5th grade students were reading/writing below grade level. Reading and writing are highly correlated to literacy development and academic success. Rationale includes the need to increase reading level proficiency to meet expected outcomes.
Measurable Outcome:	By the year 2021, there will be at least 4% increase from 69% to 73% overall proficiency for 5th grade FSA ELA;
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Susan Miller (susan.miller@sarasotacountyschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	<p>~Year 2- Implementation school wide writing committee and use of TOP Score writing program (step by step lessons to help students learn proper format; graphic organizer use; informative, opinion, narrative teaching)</p> <p>~Departmentalization of ELA and Math, in addition resource teacher assigned to provide ESE support based on content area specialty</p> <p>~Use of strategic inclusion/co-teaching models to support lowest quartile</p> <p>~Use of LAFS, iReady and Standards Mastery for standards based instruction</p> <p>~Use of Reading Wonders Curriculum</p> <p>~Use of Instructional Focus Guide to align, pace instruction and develop quality lesson plans</p> <p>~Use of Accelerated Reader with quarterly goals and incentives to encourage love of reading</p> <p>~Use of Orton-Gillingham for remediation and intervention</p> <p>~Collaborative Planning Times with teachers to review data and design lessons</p> <p>~Professional Development focusing on comprehension, writing and increasing DOK</p> <p>~Data chats with administration monthly</p> <p>~Departmentalization allows for collaboration to develop lesson plans, utilize resources, and create small group targeted instruction/interventions; Reduced number of subjects to plan for aiding with concurrent learning. ESE Resource teacher's planning time aligns with subject area and CPT time.</p> <p>~The Inclusion Model allows for continuity of maximizing instructional support by the ESE Resource teacher through specially designed instruction with the general education teacher.</p> <p>~ Research shows Visible Learning and High Expectations Teaching (Learning Intention, Success Criteria and Teacher Clarity) positively impact student performance</p> <p>~Continue to implement a Growth Mindset Strategy: (i.e., "This is hard work and we will NOT give up on any student")</p> <p>~Research has shown that accessing iReady at least 45 min/week improves mastering grade level standards; Monitoring and use of iReady data supports student learning; Administration will support with data chats.</p> <p>~School wide writing program (Top Score) K-8 alignment</p>
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	

Action Steps to Implement

1. Professional development scheduled and offered
2. iReady LAFS provided to all teachers and students for ILA
3. Level 1 & Level 2's ILA
4. PLC Waiver for monthly data chats
5. CPT's (discussion of student data, and departmentalization planning and design)

6. Informal observation & walk-throughs
7. Admin Virtual sit-ins (Remote Learners)
8. Admin Motivational Virtual Pep Talks (Remote Learners)

Person Responsible Susan Miller (susan.miller@sarasotacountyschools.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: 2019 FSA data revealed a proficiency level of 69% for 6th grade ELA. This indicated that 31% of 6th grade students were reading/writing below grade level. Reading and writing are highly correlated to literacy development and academic success. Rationale includes the need to increase reading level proficiency to meet expected outcomes.

Measurable Outcome: By the year 2021, there will be at least 4% increase from 69% to 73% overall proficiency for FSA ELA;

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Julie Fortune (julie.fortune@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

- ~Master schedule to departmentalize ELA and ILA teachers, including ESE ELA content area teachers; Collaborative Planning Times with teachers to review data and design lessons
- ~Use of strategic inclusion/co-teaching models to support lowest quartile in all content areas
- ~Use of double FUSION block for ELA/ILA scheduling for Level 1 and 2 students which allows for 110 minutes of reading instruction
- ~Use of ILA for all Level 1 and 2 students
- ~Use of Rewards and Rewards Plus programs for striving readers; Monitor Reading Fluency
- ~Use of LAFS, iReady and Standards Mastery for standards based instruction
- ~Use of Instructional Focus Guide to align, pace instruction and develop quality lesson plans
- ~Use of Accelerated Reader with quarterly goals and incentives to encourage love of reading
- ~Professional Development focusing on comprehension, writing and increasing DOK
- ~Data chats with administration monthly
- ~Utilize supplementary Vocabulary Workshop curriculum materials, robust pre-reading strategies/activities

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

- ~The Inclusion Model allows for continuity of maximizing instructional support by the ESE Resource teacher through specially designed instruction with the general education teacher.
- ~Continue to implement a Growth Mindset Strategy: (i.e., "This is hard work and we will NOT give up on any student")
- ~Data analysis and use of Rewards/Rewards Plus program (multi-modality reading program)
- ~Research has shown that accessing iReady at least 45 min/week improves mastering grade level standards; Monitoring and use of iReady data supports student learning; Administration will support with data chats.
- ~ Research shows Visible Learning and High Expectations Teaching (Learning Intention, Success Criteria and Teacher Clarity) positively impact student performance
- ~Departmentalization allows for collaboration to develop lesson plans, utilize resources, and create small group targeted instruction/interventions; Reduced number of subjects to plan for aiding with concurrent learning. ESE Resource teacher's planning time aligns with subject area and CPT time.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Professional development scheduled and offered
2. iReady LAFS provided to all teachers and students for ILA
3. Level 1 & Level 2's ILA
4. PLC Waiver for monthly data chats
5. CPT's (discussion of student data, and departmentalization planning and design)
6. Informal observation & walk-throughs
7. DAR testing for students scoring at K-3 range on iReady
8. Regrouping based on Diagnostic/Formative Assessment Data
9. Admin Virtual sit-ins (Remote Learners)
10. Admin Motivational Virtual Pep Talks (Remote Learners)

Person Responsible Julie Fortune (julie.fortune@sarasotacountyschools.net)

#4. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: There is a rise in students experiences regarding mental health concerns and crisis. This interferes with their ability to adequately participate in the educational environment due to lack of attendance and/or discipline referrals.

Measurable Outcome: ~Students who exhibit mental health concerns will be provided with resources and supports to increase their ability to effectively apply the knowledge, attitudes, and skills necessary to understand and manage emotions; set and achieve positive goals; feel and show empathy for others; establish and maintain positive relationships; and make responsible decisions. Therefore, we will monitor the number of service referrals and their impact on student emotional/academic progress.

~Reduce absenteeism by 25% for those students identified as having less than 90% attendance.

~By the year 2021 there will be a reduction of suspensions from the previous year. LNS will reduce the percentage of suspensions to less than 10%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Michael Reichman (michael.reichman@sarasotacountschools.net)

- ~Relationship Building/Mentoring/Check-in; Check-out
- ~Suite 360 Mental Health Modules
- ~Restorative Strategies
- ~CHAMPS/PBIS rewards and incentives/Lightning Pride/Positive Behavior Referrals
- ~Monthly Civility Squad
- ~Weekly Support Team Meeting
- ~Basic Needs (Backpack Program, Clothes Closet, Snack Shack, etc.)
- ~Outside Referral Agencies (JFCS, Centerstone, Coastal Behavioral, YAR, Teen Court)
- ~Teacher/Parent Conferences/Partnerships
- ~Safety Plans/Re-Entry Plans/FBA/BIP
- ~CPI
- ~CAARS (Counseling As A Related Service)
- ~Lightning Pride Reward (No grade below a "C", No discipline referrals, No more than 2 unexcused absences, must meet AR goal)
- ~Truancy/Social worker home visits for address verification and after multiple absences
- Automated district calls
- ~MTSS
- ~Parent notifications letters
- ~Outside agency support
- ~Attendance contracts
- ~Student Recognition
- ~Guidance Talks/Restorative Circles

Evidence-based Strategy:

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: ~Relationship Building/Mentoring/Check-in; Check-out -.52 effect size
 ~Suite 360 Mental Health Modules- State-mandated
 ~Restorative Strategies-Restorative Strategies focus on repairing harm to relationships instead of assigning blame and dispensing punishment. These strategies are a framework for building community and for responding to challenging behavior through authentic dialogue, coming to understanding,

and making things right. Restorative Practices provide accountability and promote empathy
 ~CHAMPS/PBIS -.72 effect size: a positive classroom climate fosters mutual respect and safety, ultimately support student learning;
 ~Weekly Support Team Meeting-Collective Efficacy 1.57 effect size
 ~Basic Needs (Backpack Program, Clothes Closet, Snack Shack, etc.)- Maslow Research
 ~Outside Referral Agencies (JFCS, Centerstone, Coastal Behavioral)-
 ~Parent Conferences-work as partners in educating and supporting students
 ~Safety Plans/Re-Entry Plans/FBA/BIP-specific plans put in place based on student need
 ~CPI-Crisis prevention responding to students
 ~CAARS- Counseling w/guidance/social worker/psychologist

Action Steps to Implement

1. Professional Development for staff and students (Kognito, Youth Mental Health First Aid)
2. School-wide CHAMPS overview and implementation
3. Guidance support (professional development, referral process, student support, etc.)
4. Weekly support team meeting discussions
5. School-Wide Support Team referrals
6. First-Step Referrals Grades 6-8;JFCS Referrals Grades K-5 (Youth At-Risk referrals when needed)
7. On-going parent contact, conferences, communication
8. School-Climate ("3 for 3" annual survey)
9. Monthly team leader meetings and discussion to review behavior trends, responses and interventions.
10. Utilize District Dashboard data/SIS data (Attendance, Discipline-Suspension)
11. TPS Data
12. Provide mentoring services
13. Conduct guidance talk/restorative circles.
14. Lightning Pride Reward (No grade below a "C", No discipline referrals, No more than 2 unexcused absences, must meet AR goal)
15. Truancy/Social worker home involvement/visit
16. Monthly attendance meetings
17. 3/5/9 letter notifications
18. Wellness checks
19. Address verification
20. Admin Virtual sit-ins (Remote Learners)
21. Admin Motivational Virtual Pep Talks (Remote Learners)

Person Responsible Raymond Wilson (raymond.wilson@sarasotacountyschools.net)

#5. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: To increase math level proficiency to meet expected outcomes, in addition to, grant opportunities for students to access advanced and high school math credit courses. This is a continued area of focus to support acceleration.

Measurable Outcome: By the year 2021, there will be at least 82% proficiency on FSA Math; By the end of the 2021 school year, student enrollment will maintain or increase by 2% in Algebra 1.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Dave Schramm (david.schramm@sarasotacountyschools.net)

- Evidence-based Strategy:**
- ~Utilize additional resources such as iReady Math Toolbox, Algebra Nation, Khan Academy, USA Test Prep, IXL
 - ~Collaborate with colleagues to develop lesson plans, utilize resources and develop targeted interventions
 - ~Implement Visible Learning/High Expectations Teaching Strategies Create Critical Thinking/Int. Math Course Option (math fusion blocks)
 - ~Maintain iReady "Strive for 45"
 - ~iReady Standard Mastery
 - ~Assign/Monitor iReady Lessons (Learning Progressions/Standards Mastery/Flexible Grouping)
 - ~Provide Direct Instruction (Lowest Quartile) for targeted small group instruction
 - ~Provide Ongoing Before and After School Tutoring (Select voluntary teachers)
 - ~Employ Inclusion/Co-Teaching Model
 - ~Monitor and Sustain Math Acceleration percentages and success Integrate Go Math/ Math Mentality Training
 - ~Utilize Blackboard Learn Resources (Maximizing Math Mentality IFGs)
 - ~Develop placement rubrics and analysis of student data (math enrichment opportunities)
 - ~Closely analyze numerator/denominator in regards to students not enrolled
 - ~Double blocks for advanced math students needing extra support
 - ~Family Involvement
 - ~Progress Monitoring
 - ~Grade Level Vertical Alignment- Departmentalization by content

- Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**
- ~Utilize additional resources to remediate, supplement, differentiate instruction and progress monitor.
 - ~Collaboration to develop lesson plans, utilize resources and develop targeted interventions: Collective Efficacy Effective Size: 1.57
 - ~Continue Visible Learning/High Expectations Teaching Strategies
 - ~Enrollment of Level 3 Math students in a Double Block(Accelerated Math)/Int. Math Courses
 - ~Maintain iReady "Strive for 45": Curriculum Associates research based
 - ~iReady Standard Mastery: lessons and IFG
 - ~USA Test Prep for 6th, 7th, 8th grades, Algebra and Geometry to identify, remediate and progress monitor skills related to standards
 - ~ Inclusion (Content area ESE Resource teacher support with common planning times)
 - ~Before/After School Tutoring to support students
 - ~Analyze numerator/denominator in regards to students not enrolled: determine/ monitor percentage of students placed in advanced math (consider level 3's, 4's & 5's)
 - ~Integrate core curriculum Training: IFG's
 - ~Blackboard Learn Resources (Maximizing Math Mentality IFGs)

- ~Family Involvement-communication with expectations and course requirements
- ~Vertical Alignment- accelerate students in intermediate grades

Action Steps to Implement

1. Professional development scheduled and offered
2. CPT's (discussion of student data, and departmentalization planning and design)
3. Informal observation & walk-throughs
4. Master Scheduling
5. Math Fusion Blocks
6. Before/Afterschool Tutoring (Voluntary)
8. Progress Monitoring
9. Teacher Professional Development
10. Supplemental Resources (USA Test Prep, IXL, Algebra Nation)

Person Responsible Dave Schramm (david.schramm@sarasotacountyschools.net)

1. Professional development scheduled and offered
2. CPT's (discussion of student data, and departmentalization planning and design)
3. Informal observation & walk-throughs
4. Master Scheduling
5. Math Fusion Blocks
6. Before/Afterschool Tutoring (Voluntary)
7. Progress Monitoring
8. Teacher Professional Development
9. Supplemental Resources (USA Test Prep, Algebra Nation)
10. Admin Virtual sit-ins (Remote Learners)
11. Admin Motivational Virtual Pep Talks (Remote Learners)

Person Responsible Dave Schramm (david.schramm@sarasotacountyschools.net)

#6. Other specifically relating to Lowest Quartile Subgroups**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Data indicates that students in the lowest quartile are performing below proficiency. We need to increase efforts and employ strategies to close the achievement gap. Therefore, we will closely progress monitor student data in this subgroup to increase lowest quartile level of proficiency and learning gains in ELA and Math to meet expected outcomes.

Measurable Outcome:

By the year 2021, learning gains will be at least 49% for lowest quartile students for FSA ELA; learning gains will be at least 52% for lowest quartile students for FSA Math. To close the achievement gap for Students With Disabilities (SWD) by increasing the proficiency on ELA from 34% to 38%; ELA learning gains from 46% to 50%; Math learning gains 57% to 61%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Christine Oliver (christine.oliver@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

- ~ Grades 6-8 FUSION Double Block (ELA/ILA at the beginning of the day/Level 1 and 2)
- ~Assign Differentiated ILA programs (REWARDS, REWARDS PLUS, LAFS)
- ~ Provide Inclusion Support through Master Scheduling
- ~ Utilize Learning Ally
- ~Create Center-based instruction
- ~Provide Mentoring & ongoing motivation strategies
- ~Partner with the Laurel Civic Association for Enrichment support
- ~Maintain "iReady Strive for 45"
- ~Conduct ongoing data chats to support small group targeted instruction.
- ~Employ Visible Learning (LISC), Growth Mindset and High Expertise Teaching Strategies (i.e.,sticking with the student)
- ~Utilize IXL (Fluency building)
- ~Schedule Critical Thinking class to provide Tier 2/3 extra support Grades 6-8
- ~Provide Voluntary Before/After school tutoring
- ~Integrate Accountable Talk to increase visible learning and meta-cognitive skills
- ~Provide feedback through the use of rubrics, check lists, etc.
- ~Provide Real-world activities/Field trips
- ~Educate students/parents and assist with Grade Portal Access
- ~Conduct Grade Conferencing/Monitoring student grades
- ~Assign and schedule APEX (as needed for grades 6-8)
- ~FUSION Double Block (ELA/ILA at the beginning of the day/Level 1 and 2) with inclusive ESE resource support to maximize instructional strategies
- ~Provide Inclusion Support through Master Scheduling with content area assigned ESE resource teachers and common planning times to collaborate and develop rigorous lesson plans
- ~Utilize Learning Ally to support access to grade level resources and exposure to grade level vocabulary (supports fluency)
- ~Create Center-based instruction
- ~Utilization of iReady programming for data monitoring, Strive for 45 minutes/content area, data chats and creation of center-based small group targeted instruction.
- ~Employ Visible Learning (LISC), Growth Mindset and High Expertise Teaching Strategies; Accountable Talk to increase visible learning and meta-cognitive skills
- ~Utilize IXL (Fluency building)
- ~Critical Thinking class to provide Tier 2/3 extra support; Apex as needed
- ~Provide Real-world activities/Field trips

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

- ~Educate students/parents and assist with Grade Portal Access
- ~Conduct Grade Conferencing/Monitoring student grades
- ~Assign and schedule APEX (as needed)

Action Steps to Implement

1. Create master schedule to include Critical Thinking options to provide Tier 2/3 intervention support
2. Integrate Accountable Talk to increase visible learning and meta-cognitive skills
3. Schedule FUSION Double Block (ELA/ILA at the beginning of the day/Level 1 and 2)
4. Provide feedback through the use of rubrics, check lists, etc.
5. Master schedule for inclusive content based ESE Support
6. Content and Grade Level professional development scheduled and offered
7. CPT (discussion of student data and departmentalization planning and design)
8. Informal observations and walkthroughs

Person Responsible [no one identified]

#7. Other specifically relating to FSAA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Students accessing Florida Standards Access Points are held to the same high expectations for academic progress as students accessing Florida Standards curriculum. The goal is to increase student academic performance on Access Points in ELA, MATH, SCI, & SS.

Measurable Outcome: FSAA Levels 1-2-3-4: By the year 2021, there will be a minimum of two percentage points increase in student learning gains when less than 70% are demonstrating proficiency; one percentage point when more than 70% are demonstrating proficiency in Reading and Math.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Joey Schumacher-Martin (joan.schumacher-martin@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

- ~Implement Teach Town Encore (Elementary) and Attainment Company Curriculum (Middle School)
- ~Incorporate Speech Language Therapy services via Inclusion Model
- ~Incorporate Visual Supports
- ~Utilize CPALMS
- ~Utilize Access Weebly (<https://acesstofls.weebly.com/>)
- ~Incorporate Life Skills Real World Experiences (Field Trips, SMART Cafe)
- ~Utilize iReady (Reading/Math)
- ~Provide Mainstreaming opportunities

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

- ~Implement Teach Town and Attainment Company Curriculum:
- ~Classroom data such as teacher generated test/quiz
- ~Incorporate Speech Language Therapy services via Inclusion Model: intervention
- ~Incorporate Visual Supports: intervention
- ~Utilize CPALMS: provides standard-based instruction
- ~Utilize Access Weebly (<https://acesstofls.weebly.com/>):
- ~Supplementary practice to increase understanding
- ~Incorporate Life Skills Real World Experiences (Field Trips, SMART Cafe): social adaptation
- ~Utilize iReady (Reading/Math): on-going progress monitoring
- ~Provide Mainstreaming opportunities: least restrictive environment

Action Steps to Implement

1. IEP goals/objectives
2. FSAA scores
3. iReady
4. Administrative walk-throughs and observations
5. Ongoing feedback
6. Data Analysis (Data chats)
7. Admin Virtual sit-ins (Remote Learners)
8. Admin Motivational Virtual Pep Talks (Remote Learners)

Person Responsible: Heather Wasserman (heather.wasserman@sarasotacountyschools.net)

#8. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science**Area of Focus
Description and
Rationale:**

Prior data has indicated continued need to focus on improving science scores. The goal is to increase science level proficiency to meet expected outcomes.

**Measurable
Outcome:**

By the year 2021, there will be a minimum of 73% proficiency on State Science Assessment (SSA).

**Person
responsible for
monitoring
outcome:**

Shannon Rasbury (shannon.rasbury@sarasotacountyschools.net)

**Evidence-based
Strategy:**

~Use of Discovery Education Science Techbook
 ~Implement and Monitor Common Assessments
 ~Conduct an item analysis of common assessment data to formulate small group instruction
 ~Collaborate with colleagues to develop lesson plans, utilize resource
 ~Provide Real-World experiences
 ~Incorporate Gizmos and Virtual Labs
 ~Inquiry Based Instruction
 ~Utilize Virtual Reality Sets for instructional support
 ~Utilize Tech Active Classrooms and resources
 ~Incorporate IXL lessons (8th Grade- Fluency Building)
 ~Departmentalization (3rd, 4th, and 5th Grade) and Middle School
 ~Tutoring provided during lunches, before and after school (additional support)
 ~Science Fair Participation
 ~Implement and Monitor Common Assessments/Conduct an item analysis of common assessment data to formulate small group instruction and identify areas of need for reteaching for science standards
 ~Collaborate with colleagues to develop lesson plans, utilize resources through common planning times
 ~Provide Real-World experiences- Field trips related to Science Standards- Lab experiments for hands on
 Incorporate Gizmos and Virtual Labs - continued practice
 ~Utilize Virtual Reality Sets for instructional support- multi-modality
 ~Utilize Tech Active Classrooms and resources- Increase collaboration and research using technology resources
 ~Incorporate IXL lessons (Fluency Building)- Increase practice based on standards
 ~Departmentalization (3rd, 4th, and 5th Grade; Middle School) - focus on content area
 ~Voluntary tutoring provided during lunches, before and after school (additional support)-
 ~Voluntary participation in Stem Fair - Creative

**Rationale for
Evidence-based
Strategy:****Action Steps to Implement**

1. Common/Unit Assessments
2. Participation in Science Fair (Voluntary)
3. Master Scheduling (Departmentalization)
4. Data Chats
5. Admin Virtual sit-ins (Remote Learners)
6. Admin Motivational Virtual Pep Talks (Remote Learners)

**Person
Responsible**

Shannon Rasbury (shannon.rasbury@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

All priorities are being addressed.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

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

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

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

Laurel Nokomis School provides Parent and Family Engagement materials and trainings designed to provide assistance to parents and families in understanding challenging State academic standards, State and local academic assessments, how to monitor a child's progress, and how to work with educators to improve the achievement of their children at convenient, flexible times such as mornings and evenings as well as at-home/attendance zone visits to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students. Additionally, technology including social media and virtual meeting programs (Zoom, Teams, etc.) promote participation and awareness through live and recorded sessions to accommodate varying schedules. In addition, the district and school website contain links, resources, and materials, such as parent guides, study guides, practice assessments, student performance materials, and training to help parents and families work with their children to improve achievement.

The full text and summary of this Schoolwide Improvement Plan may be found online or as a hard copy by request.

Parent and families are regularly invited to attend PTO Meetings and School Advisory Meetings to formulate suggestions and to participate, as appropriate, in decisions relating to the education of their children. Laurel Nokomis School responds to any such suggestions as soon as practicably possible as evidenced by meeting minutes and notes. If this schoolwide improvement plan is not satisfactory to parents, parents/families are encouraged to submit such comments in writing so that the school can document and submit any parents' comments.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				\$8,439.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
			1211 - Laurel Nokomis School	Other		\$8,439.00
<i>Notes: Top Score (2nd-5th Grade)</i>						
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				\$10,047.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
			1211 - Laurel Nokomis School	General Fund		\$5,639.00
<i>Notes: Vocabulary Workshop (6th, 7th, 8th grades)</i>						
			1211 - Laurel Nokomis School	Other		\$902.00
<i>Notes: Rewards/Rewards Plus</i>						
			1211 - Laurel Nokomis School	Other		\$1,458.00
<i>Notes: Ready LAFS</i>						
			1211 - Laurel Nokomis School	Other		\$548.00
<i>Notes: Academic Therapy Publication (Phonic Book Series)</i>						
			1211 - Laurel Nokomis School	Other		\$1,500.00
<i>Notes: Accelerated Reader Incentives</i>						
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning				\$1,800.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
			1211 - Laurel Nokomis School	Other		\$1,800.00
<i>Notes: PBIS Incentive Funding</i>						
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math				\$13,920.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
			1211 - Laurel Nokomis School	Other		\$9,350.00
<i>Notes: IXL- grades 4-8</i>						
			1211 - Laurel Nokomis School	General Fund		\$1,275.00
<i>Notes: USA Test Prep (6th, 7th, 8th grade) supplemental</i>						
			1211 - Laurel Nokomis School	Other		\$3,295.00

						<i>Notes: Reflex Math - school license</i>
6	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: Lowest Quartile Subgroups				\$0.00
7	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: FSAA				\$0.00
8	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science				\$1,965.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
			1211 - Laurel Nokomis School	Other		\$1,965.00
						<i>Notes: Gizmos</i>
					Total:	\$36,171.00