

Collier County Public Schools

Laurel Oak Elementary School



2021-22 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	19
Positive Culture & Environment	25
Budget to Support Goals	26

Laurel Oak Elementary School

7800 IMMOKALEE RD, Naples, FL 34119

<https://www.collierschools.com/loe>

Demographics

Principal: Brian Castellani

Start Date for this Principal: 8/7/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	37%
2020-21 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 (73%) 2017-18: A (66%) 2016-17: A (68%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	

* 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 Collier 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	19
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	26

Laurel Oak Elementary School

7800 IMMOKALEE RD, Naples, FL 34119

<https://www.collierschools.com/loe>

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	No	25%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	34%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		A	A	A

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Collier 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 Oak Elementary is to engage all students in exemplary teaching and digital learning experiences that are rigorous, differentiated, meaningful and memorable.

Provide the school's vision statement.

In partnership with our families and community, we are creating a culture where everyone is a digital learner, a teacher, and a leader.

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Castellani, Brian	Principal	The roles and responsibilities of our school Principal are that of instructional leader first. At LOE there is a support system where our administrative team (Principal/Assistant Principals) oversee and facilitate the systems and monitor their effectiveness. The principal ensures the faculty is committed to providing a quality learning environment focused on academics, relationships, and the development of the whole child.
Johnessee, Sara	Assistant Principal	As one of our Assistant Principals, discipline and instructional planning and support is a strong focus, as well as the general safe operation of the school.
Scrant, Jennifer	Assistant Principal	As one of our Assistant Principals, discipline and instructional planning and support is a strong focus, as well as the general safe operation of the school.
Davison, Tom	Instructional Coach	Our Instructional Coach researches best practices, intervention models, provides on-going professional development both individual and group, and assists in the development and delivery of targeted intervention for reading, writing, and language arts.
Gaillard, Amy	School Counselor	Our School Guidance Counselor provides education, support, and social emotional guidance lessons that impact academic success. Additionally, she assists with targeted behavioral interventions focusing on social emotional concerns.
Venegas, Toni	Other	Our ESE Program Specialist ensures compliance with all IEP's and 504 plan and assists with the planning and direct instructional support of our ESE resource staff.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 8/7/2020, Brian Castellani

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.*

5

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.*

10

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

74

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,127

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

2

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

1

Demographic Data**Early Warning Systems****2021-22****The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	174	179	179	181	203	207	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1123
Attendance below 90 percent	5	6	4	12	6	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	2	9	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Course failure in Math	0	3	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	13	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	3	11	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	1	1	2	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9

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	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 9/13/2021

2020-21 - As Reported**The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	157	166	148	192	192	213	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1068
Attendance below 90 percent	1	0	3	3	6	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
One or more suspensions	0	2	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in Math	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	1	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

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

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

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	7	1	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

2020-21 - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	157	166	148	192	192	213	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1068
Attendance below 90 percent	1	0	3	3	6	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
One or more suspensions	0	2	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in Math	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	1	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

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

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

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	7	1	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis**School Data Review**

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

School Grade Component	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				82%	60%	57%	82%	61%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				71%	59%	58%	69%	62%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				57%	51%	53%	58%	54%	48%
Math Achievement				88%	68%	63%	83%	69%	62%
Math Learning Gains				73%	64%	62%	60%	65%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				75%	55%	51%	38%	55%	47%
Science Achievement				68%	59%	53%	71%	60%	55%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	80%	61%	19%	58%	22%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	85%	58%	27%	58%	27%
Cohort Comparison		-80%				
05	2021					
	2019	78%	60%	18%	56%	22%
Cohort Comparison		-85%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	87%	68%	19%	62%	25%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	89%	65%	24%	64%	25%
Cohort Comparison		-87%				
05	2021					
	2019	82%	67%	15%	60%	22%
Cohort Comparison		-89%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	66%	56%	10%	53%	13%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

Kinder-2nd Grade used iReady

3rd-5th Grade used Quarterly Benchmark Assessments

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	(68/163)42%	(96/153)63%	(138/169)82%
	Economically Disadvantaged	(14/39) 36%	(18/36) 50%	(1/3) 33%
	Students With Disabilities	(0/8) 0%	(3/7) 43%	(8/9) 89%
	English Language Learners	(3/11) 27%	(4/11) 36%	(6/13) 46%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	0	0	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	(72/151) 48%	(116/158) 73%	(134/160) 84%
	Economically Disadvantaged	(14/38) 37%	(26/39) 67%	(6/6) 100%
	Students With Disabilities	(2/7) 29%	(5/10) 50%	(8/12) 67%
	English Language Learners	(2/6) 33%	(4/8) 50%	(4/7) 57%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	0	0	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	(143/186) 77%	(147/187) 79%	(137/196) 70%
	Economically Disadvantaged	(26/45) 58%	(26/45) 58%	(26/50) 52%
	Students With Disabilities	(16/20) 80%	(17/24) 71%	(14/27) 52%
	English Language Learners	(4/12) 33%	(3/11) 27%	(3/13) 23%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	(154/186) 83%	(158/187) 84%	(130/199) 65%
	Economically Disadvantaged	(34/46) 74%	(31/45) 69%	(18/50) 36%
	Students With Disabilities	(14/20) 70%	(15/24) 63%	(14/27) 52%
	English Language Learners	(9/12) 75%	(9/12) 75%	(4/14) 29%

Grade 4				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	(137/194) 71%	(147/200) 74%	(146/199) 73%
	Economically Disadvantaged	(31/54) 57%	(35/56) 63%	(32/54) 59%
	Students With Disabilities	(11/30) 37%	(11/27) 41%	(7/26) 27%
	English Language Learners	(2/10) 20%	(3/10) 30%	(2/10) 20%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	(153/196) 78%	(169/201) 84%	(129/199) 65%
	Economically Disadvantaged	(34/54) 63%	(40/56) 71%	(28/53) 53%
	Students With Disabilities	(18/31) 58%	(15/27) 56%	(6/27) 22%
	English Language Learners	(6/10) 60%	(5/10) 50%	(2/10) 20%

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	(137/209) 66%	(155/213) 73%	(154/221) 70%
	Economically Disadvantaged	(32/65) 49%	(41/66) 62%	(35/67) 52%
	Students With Disabilities	(5/29) 17%	(8/29) 28%	(5/31) 16%
	English Language Learners	(2/12) 17%	(5/14) 36%	(4/15) 27%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	(159/209) 76%	(158/216) 73%	(116/221) 52%
	Economically Disadvantaged	(40/65) 62%	(36/66) 55%	(23/67) 34%
	Students With Disabilities	(9/29) 31%	(11/30) 37%	(4/31) 13%
	English Language Learners	(8/12) 67%	(9/14) 64%	(7/16) 44%
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	(122/210) 58%	(135/207) 65%	(138/215) 64%
	Economically Disadvantaged	(27/65) 42%	(31/65) 48%	(32/63) 51%
	Students With Disabilities	(4/29) 14%	(5/29) 17%	(32/63) 51% Students With Disabilities (4/29) 14% (5/29) 17% (4/30) 13%
	English Language Learners	(3/13) 23%	(4/14) 29%	(4/16) 25%

Subgroup Data Review

2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	43	42	45	49	35	24	32				
ELL	43	67		68	67		47				
ASN	78			97							
BLK	72			47							
HSP	73	60	53	78	53	33	63				
MUL	50			67							
WHT	82	69	52	85	63	56	75				
FRL	64	58	52	63	42	33	55				

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	53	51	48	66	62	56	44				
ELL	58	58	43	77	75	73	33				
ASN	89	64		96	87		90				
BLK	70										
HSP	73	65	54	81	71	73	50				
MUL	63	73		56	82						
WHT	86	76	63	91	73	82	74				
FRL	67	59	45	77	68	67	44				
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	43	53	54	49	53	41	23				
ELL	48	68	62	57	41	13					
ASN	97	80		97	81						
BLK	67			50							
HSP	74	70	57	76	53	26	52				
MUL	87	50		73	50						
WHT	83	69	58	85	62	44	78				
FRL	66	59	56	66	43	28	48				

ESSA Data Review

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

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	67
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	79
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	536
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	39
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	62
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	88
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	60
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	61
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	59
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
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%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	55
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis

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

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

Grade 5 science has shown a trend of increasing the scale score since 2017 and an increase in percent proficient across the same years on the state science assessment. Math scores show a trend of improving when significant support and focus is applied and therefore will be an area of focus for 2021-2022. In ELA, Kindergarten increased overall, every quarter last year, on the iReady Diagnostics. First grade increased by approximately 20% every quarter, leading up to EOY. The average in 2nd grade increased from the Quarter 1 to the EOY. ELA proficiency on the FSA was trending up until FY 21.

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

Grade 5 Math scale score decreased from 336 to 334 and the percent of students scoring 3 and higher decreased from 82% to 77%.
Math Gains for all and gains for the lowest 25% on the FSA show the greatest need for improvement. Additionally, ELA Achievement for all students will be a focus as the percent of proficiency on the FSA dropped when compared to pre-pandemic level.

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

Contributing factors would be the challenges faced by students and teachers during the 2020-2021 school year. Students were shifting in their instructional model (virtual and on campus) throughout the year. New actions will include a renewed focus on collaborative planning for math instruction, increased focus on student performance at the individual student level, and data analysis for instructional shifts and planning.

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

Grade 5 Science scale score increased from 207 to 211 and the percent of students scoring 3 and higher from increased from 66% to 72%. Grade 4 maintained percent proficient in ELA and increased math proficiency compared to FY 21 percentages on FSA.

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

Teachers utilized benchmark data to plan rigorous, engaging, review lessons based on student needs. Fluid grouping facilitated meeting more student needs.

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

Successful strategies and best practices, such as utilizing benchmark and state assessment data to plan rigorous, engaging, review lessons based on student needs, and facilitating fluid grouping will be continued. Students' individual needs will be addressed through differentiated instruction that occurs during designated blocks of time each week.

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

Individual data dialogues with teachers will occur each quarter, after benchmark assessments, to plan for needed supports of both students and teachers. Academic coach will provide professional development to all staff throughout the year to support the implementation of the BEST standards and new curricular materials.

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

Collaborative planning and curriculum committees will continue to meet monthly to monitor student progress, make adjustments to systems within the school, and facilitate work by all stakeholders towards meeting School Improvement Plan goals, as well as individual staff deliberate practice goals.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: ELA Achievement either declined by 3% or remained the same in 3rd through 5th grade when compared to proficiency percentages in 2019. Prior to 2020, Laurel Oak ELA Achievement was showing a trend toward increasing each year. This area of focus will improve student learning and success as reading proficiency impacts all content areas.

Measurable Outcome: Laurel Oak will increase ELA Achievement for 3rd through 5th grade from 78% to 83% on the 2022 FSA, in order to exceed 2019 percent proficiency.

Monitoring: Quarterly, school administrators will analyze data of students in the lowest 25%, on district quarterly benchmark assessments (grades 3-5), iReady diagnostics (grades K-5), and through teacher data dialogues. Teachers will complete our school-specific "Data Dig" data-tracking sheets, followed by individual meetings with administration each quarter.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Brian Castellani (castelbr@collierschools.com)

Evidence-based Strategy: Laurel Oak teachers will use the following evidence-based strategies to support the area of focus:

1. Blending and Segmenting Strategies
2. Organizing students to interact with content
3. Close Reading Strategies

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Blending and segmenting strategies improve decoding abilities for our primary students. Students will benefit from engaging with their peers, using varied strategies, that support their processing of content. Close reading will provide the opportunity for students to dive deeper into a text and therefore increase their comprehension and build knowledge.

Action Steps to Implement

Administration and academic coach will conduct formal and informal observations during ELA instruction to provide specific, focused feedback on standards-aligned instruction and use results to plan for targeted and differentiated professional development opportunities for instructional staff.

Person Responsible: Brian Castellani (castelbr@collierschools.com)

MTSS used to implement tiered interventions and monitor progress. Student Success Plans kept current in Focus, including entering data points. Change interventions as needed, based on results of intervention as evidenced by data collection specific to goal of intervention.

Person Responsible: Tom Davison (davisoth@collierschools.com)

Administrators and teachers will collaborate during weekly grade-level planning meetings and during individual FTEM conferences to deliberately plan for and monitor for the successful use of the identified evidence-based strategies.

Person Responsible: Brian Castellani (castelbr@collierschools.com)

Professional development provided by academic coach to support teachers' needs with the implementation of the BEST standards and new curriculum materials. Professional development will be provided to whole staff, grade-level teams, and small-group or individual sessions as need is determined by observation from administration and teacher request.

Person Responsible Jennifer Scrant (scranj@collierschools.com)

Quarterly data dialogue meetings with administrators and individual teachers to review progress monitoring data from common district assessments and collaboratively plan for any instructional adjustments. Specific focus on individual students' areas of success and areas needing continued support.

Person Responsible Brian Castellani (castelbr@collierschools.com)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Math Gains for the lowest 25% is identified as an area for improvement based on 2021 FSA results. There was a decrease of 30% compared to 2019. Prior to 2020, Laurel Oak Math Gains showed a significant increase and was a focus of the school improvement plan that school year which is evidence of the results that can be achieved when significant emphasis is given to math instructional practice and support.

Measurable Outcome: Laurel Oak will increase the percent of students making gains in the lowest 25%, in 3rd through 5th grade, from 45% to 65%, as evidenced by results on the 2022 Math FSA.

Monitoring: Quarterly, school administrators analyze data of students in the lowest 25%, on district quarterly benchmark assessments (grades 3-5), progress monitoring through the ALEKS program, HMH Growth Measure (grades K-3), and through teacher data dialogues. Teachers will complete our school-specific "Data Dig" data-tracking sheets, followed by individual meetings with administration each quarter.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Sara Johnessee (johnessa@collierschools.com)

Evidence-based Strategy: Laurel Oak teachers will use the following evidence-based strategies to support the area of focus:

1. Use and connect mathematical representations
2. 3 Reads Strategy
3. Organizing students to interact with content

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Students scoring in the lowest 25% will benefit from engaging with their peers to solve mathematical tasks using varied strategies, connecting mathematical concepts to representations, and hearing the reasoning of others. The 3 Reads Strategy will support students with analyzing tasks and increasing comprehension of the mathematics. All students will benefit from teachers deliberately planning to organize students to interact with content.

Action Steps to Implement

Monthly PLC/Data Chats with each grade-level team and instructional support staff to monitor lowest 25% student progress resulting from implementing evidence-based strategies. Tiered intervention data, benchmark assessment results, module assessment results, and ALEKS progress on critical standards will be reviewed.

Person Responsible Brian Castellani (castelbr@collierschools.com)

MTSS used to implement tiered interventions and monitor progress. Student Success Plans kept current in Focus, including entering data points. Change interventions as needed, based on results of intervention as evidenced by data collection.

Person Responsible Jennifer Scrant (scranj@collierschools.com)

Professional development to be planned and implemented, with the support of district math department and Laurel Oak instructional support staff (ESE/ELL), based on progress monitoring and result of informal and formal administrative observations of the use of identified evidence-based strategies.

Person Responsible Sara Johnessee (johnessa@collierschools.com)

Administrators and teachers will collaborate during weekly grade-level planning meetings and during individual FTEM conferences to deliberately plan for and monitor for the successful use of evidence-based strategies.

Person Responsible Brian Castellani (castelbr@collierschools.com)

Monthly vertical curriculum committees will meet to collaborate and share best practices related to the evidence-based strategies. Committees will also review school improvement plan goals and progress towards those goals at each meeting.

Person Responsible Jennifer Scrant (scranj@collierschools.com)

Quarterly data dialogue meetings with administrators and individual teachers to review progress monitoring data from common district assessments and collaboratively plan for any instructional adjustments. Specific focus on individual students' areas of success and areas needing continued support.

Person Responsible Brian Castellani (castelbr@collierschools.com)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Math Gains for all students is identified as an area for improvement based on 2021 FSA results. There was a decrease of 13% compared to 2019. Prior to 2020, Laurel Oak Math Gains showed a significant increase and was a focus of the school improvement plan that school year which is evidence of the results that can be achieved when significant emphasis is given to math instructional practice and support.

Measurable Outcome: Laurel Oak will increase the percent of 3rd through 5th grade students making gains in math by at least 10%, from 60% to 70%, as evidenced by results on the 2022 Math FSA.

Monitoring: Quarterly, school administrators will analyze data for all students through district quarterly benchmark assessments (grades 3-5), progress monitoring through the ALEKS program, HMH Growth Measure (grades K-3), and teacher data dialogues. Teachers will complete our school-specific "Data Dig" data-tracking sheets, followed by individual meetings with administration each quarter.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Sara Johnnessee (johnnessa@collierschools.com)

Evidence-based Strategy: Laurel Oak teachers will use the following evidence-based strategies to support the area of focus:

1. Elicit and use evidence of student thinking
2. Implement tasks that promote reasoning and problem solving
3. Organizing students to interact with content

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Teachers will use evidence of students' mathematical thinking to make instructional shifts for extension and acceleration on the spot and during collaborative planning. Students will also engage in solving tasks with varied strategies and examining the mathematical reasoning of their peers and their own. All students will benefit from teachers deliberately planning to organize students to interact with content. Strategies and resources from Marzano/LSI will be used.

Action Steps to Implement

Monthly vertical curriculum committees will meet to collaborate and share best practices related to the evidence-based strategies. Committees will also review school improvement plan goals and progress towards those goals at each meeting.

Person Responsible: Jennifer Scrant (scranj@collierschools.com)

Professional development to be planned and implemented, with the support of the district math department as needed, based on progress monitoring and result of informal and formal administrative observations of the use of identified evidence-based strategies.

Person Responsible: Brian Castellani (castelbr@collierschools.com)

Administrators and teachers will collaborate during weekly grade-level planning meetings and during individual FTEM conferences to deliberately plan for the use of evidence-based strategies. Monitoring for successful implementation will occur during formal and informal observations by administrators.

Person Responsible: Sara Johnnessee (johnnessa@collierschools.com)

Monthly PLC/Data Chats with each grade-level team and instructional support staff to monitor all students' progress resulting from implementing evidence-based strategies. Tiered intervention data, benchmark

assessment results, module assessment results, and ALEKS progress on critical standards will be reviewed.

Person Responsible Brian Castellani (castelbr@collierschools.com)

Instructional resource staff member will run a morning math lab that will be offered to students from kindergarten through 5th grade. Students will utilize district-supported resources (Waggle, ALEKS). Student progress on programs will be monitored for evidence of success, as well as student performance on module and benchmark assessments.

Person Responsible Sara Johnnessee (johnnessa@collierschools.com)

Quarterly data dialogue meetings with administrators and individual teachers to review progress monitoring data from common district assessments and collaboratively plan for any instructional adjustments. Specific focus on individual students' areas of success and areas needing continued support.

Person Responsible Brian Castellani (castelbr@collierschools.com)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Laurel Oak Elementary reported 0.0 incidents per 100 students. This rate is less than the statewide elementary school rate of 1.0 incidents per 100 students. Laurel Oak will continue to use the Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) to monitor the effectiveness of tiered behavior interventions each quarter. School culture and environment will be monitored through the use of our Positive Behavior Intervention and Support (PBIS) annual Action Plan, as well as through quarterly monitoring of discipline referrals and positive referrals.

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.

Our school community is committed to providing a quality learning environment focused on building a positive culture, academic success, relationships, and the development of the whole child. This year we will be implementing Connect for Success, twice a week. This initiative will provide every student an opportunity to develop meaningful relationships with their school staff and peers, with the goal of increasing their sense of belonging and connectedness. In partnership with our families and community, we create a culture where everyone is a digital learner, a teacher, and a leader. Laurel Oak offers incentive programs through PBIS recognition and rewards, as well as programs such as Reading Counts, Florida Reading Association Books (Grades K-2), and the annual Sunshine State Young Reader's Award Program (Grades 3-5) complete with ice cream parties. The huge inventory of over 20,000 books in areas such as: biography, non-fiction, audio books, fiction, early readers, picture books, reference materials, reading partner materials, and a nice assortment of books written in Spanish, as well as, bilingual materials written in Spanish and English contribute to offering a more inclusive environment for stakeholders.

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

At Laurel Oak Elementary, it is important for families and the school to work together and share responsibility for student success. We very much value family members' expertise about their children. Laurel Oak has a very engaged and dedicated PTO and School Advisory Council with representatives from all stakeholder groups. Through parent involvement events, school committees, and a daily focus on student success as a priority, Laurel Oak has a positive school culture and environment.

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: Differentiation	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00