

Sarasota County Schools

Laurel Nokomis School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	23
Positive Culture & Environment	29
Budget to Support Goals	30

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
2020-21 Title I School	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	38%
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 (70%) 2017-18: A (75%) 2016-17: 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	

* 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	12
Planning for Improvement	23
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	30

Laurel Nokomis School

1900 LAUREL RD E, Nokomis, FL 34275

www.sarasotacountyschools.net/laurelnokomis

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)
Combination School PK-8	No	31%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	27%

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 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	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Wilson, Raymond	Principal	Develops, leads, evaluates, and facilitates data-based decision-making, ensures that the MTSS Team implements, documents, and communicates with staff and parents regarding school-based plans and activities. Develops master schedule and interventions within the schedule.
Cimillo, Paula	Assistant Principal	Responsible for progress monitoring through data collection, data analysis, professional development and intervention approaches. Helps to develop master schedule and interventions within the schedule. Provides information about core content, identifies and analyzes key student data points to assist with Tier 1 and Tier 2 interventions within the classroom.
Saddler, Jeanine	Assistant Principal	Leads PBIS initiatives and monitors behavioral data of student discipline and attendance. Provides information about core content, identifies and analyzes key student data points to assist with Tier 1 and Tier 2 interventions within the classroom. Leads and monitors school health and safety policies and procedures.
Reichman, Michael	School Counselor	Supports interventions for students through MTSS process. Works with the School Social Worker and other school support personnel to link children and families to community resources/outside agencies. Supports school and family communication.
O'Berry, Gabrielle	School Counselor	Supports interventions for students through MTSS process. Works with the School Social Worker and other school support personnel to link children and families to community resources/outside agencies. Supports school and family communication.
Wardlaw, Laura	ELL Compliance Specialist	Participates in data collection, assists and collaborates with teachers for the needs of ELL students.
Nguyen, Nicole	Reading Coach	Assists with the screening and early intervention programs for at-risk students in reading; responsible for progress monitoring through data collection, data analysis, professional development and intervention approaches.
Fortune, Julie	Teacher, K-12	ELA Department Chair and Content Leader
Schramm, Dave	Teacher, K-12	Math Department Chair and Content Leader
Darby, Sean	Teacher, K-12	Social Studies Department Chair and Content Leader
Rasbury, Shannon	Teacher, K-12	Science Department Chair and Content Leader

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Glass, Ashley	Teacher, K-12	Second Grade Team Leader
Blaszczyk, Dawn	Teacher, K-12	4th Grade Team Leader
McGinnity, Sue	Behavior Specialist	Supports students and staff to provide services and expertise on issues ranging from intervention with groups of students to individual students with academic and behavioral needs.
Carter, Amanda	Teacher, K-12	Kindergarten Team Leader
Fourman, Nikki	Teacher, K-12	First Grade Team Leader
Stritz, Katie	Teacher, K-12	3rd Grade Team Leader
Pettibone, Andrea	Teacher, K-12	5th Grade Team Leader

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.*

16

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

103

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,314

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

11

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

10

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	103	101	120	146	139	169	170	188	178	0	0	0	0	1314
Attendance below 90 percent	1	9	7	6	5	6	3	5	6	0	0	0	0	48
One or more suspensions	0	3	3	1	5	8	8	8	3	0	0	0	0	39
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 FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	4	3	21	12	10	0	0	0	0	50
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	8	19	21	7	0	0	0	0	57
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	4	6	10	12	14	32	29	18	0	0	0	0	125

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	5	6	2	16	1	0	0	0	35

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	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
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

Friday 8/20/2021

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	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	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	3
Students retained two or more times			0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1

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	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	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	0	3
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1

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				71%	67%	61%	78%	68%	60%
ELA Learning Gains				59%	60%	59%	65%	60%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				45%	52%	54%	58%	55%	52%
Math Achievement				80%	70%	62%	83%	70%	61%
Math Learning Gains				71%	65%	59%	75%	64%	58%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				59%	55%	52%	66%	59%	52%
Science Achievement				69%	63%	56%	73%	66%	57%
Social Studies Achievement				97%	88%	78%	94%	84%	77%

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	78%	70%	8%	58%	20%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	58%	67%	-9%	58%	0%
Cohort Comparison		-78%				
05	2021					
	2019	71%	68%	3%	56%	15%
Cohort Comparison		-58%				
06	2021					
	2019	69%	63%	6%	54%	15%
Cohort Comparison		-71%				
07	2021					
	2019	73%	64%	9%	52%	21%
Cohort Comparison		-69%				
08	2021					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	70%	66%	4%	56%	14%
Cohort Comparison		-73%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	76%	73%	3%	62%	14%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	61%	72%	-11%	64%	-3%
Cohort Comparison		-76%				
05	2021					
	2019	69%	70%	-1%	60%	9%
Cohort Comparison		-61%				
06	2021					
	2019	82%	67%	15%	55%	27%
Cohort Comparison		-69%				
07	2021					
	2019	89%	73%	16%	54%	35%
Cohort Comparison		-82%				
08	2021					
	2019	80%	65%	15%	46%	34%
Cohort Comparison		-89%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	61%	65%	-4%	53%	8%
Cohort Comparison						
08	2021					
	2019	74%	62%	12%	48%	26%
Cohort Comparison		-61%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	95%	85%	10%	71%	24%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	98%	73%	25%	61%	37%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	100%	69%	31%	57%	43%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

iReady: K-8

Science/SS Benchmark Assessments: 3-8

FSA scores: 3-8

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	24%	44%	71%
	Economically Disadvantaged	21%	63%	100%
	Students With Disabilities	6%	20%	50%
	English Language Learners	50%	57%	78%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	14%	58%	77%
	Economically Disadvantaged	24%	45%	85%
	Students With Disabilities	0	37%	61%
	English Language Learners	0	57%	78%
Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	46%	65%	79%
	Economically Disadvantaged	16%	41%	71%
	Students With Disabilities	8%	13%	35%
	English Language Learners	17%	67%	71%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	32%	28%	77%
	Economically Disadvantaged	7%	50%	70%
	Students With Disabilities	0	7%	41%
	English Language Learners	0	67%	71%

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	67%	79%	85%
	Economically Disadvantaged	22%	37%	60%
	Students With Disabilities	25%	29%	48%
	English Language Learners	0	67%	100%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	25%	21%	73%
	Economically Disadvantaged	3%	53%	60%
	Students With Disabilities	11%	14%	47%
	English Language Learners	0	0	67%
Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	50%	63%	72%
	Economically Disadvantaged	55%	68%	79%
	Students With Disabilities	7%	14%	32%
	English Language Learners	0	33%	100%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	26%	38%	71%
	Economically Disadvantaged	13%	56%	64%
	Students With Disabilities	1%	17%	31%
	English Language Learners	0	0	0

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	54%	55%	70%
	Economically Disadvantaged	27%	43%	50%
	Students With Disabilities	11%	8%	36%
	English Language Learners	0	0	50%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	49%	38%	77%
	Economically Disadvantaged	14%	58%	51%
	Students With Disabilities	0	8%	30%
	English Language Learners	0	0	50%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	59	68	67%
	Economically Disadvantaged			54.3%
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	100%
	English Language Learners			25%
Grade 6				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	56%	58%	62%
	Economically Disadvantaged	44%	44%	58%
	Students With Disabilities	6%	9%	12%
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	51%	44%	68%
	Economically Disadvantaged	30%	63%	68%
	Students With Disabilities	13%	12%	16%
	English Language Learners	0	0	33%

Grade 7				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	57%	64%	70%
	Economically Disadvantaged	46%	50%	65%
	Students With Disabilities	13%	17%	12%
	English Language Learners	0	0	25%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	48%	57%	65%
	Economically Disadvantaged	42%	58%	55%
	Students With Disabilities	5%	13%	9%
	English Language Learners	25%	50%	25%
Civics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			92% (Gr 8)
	Economically Disadvantaged			100% (Gr 8)
	Students With Disabilities			83% (Gr 8)
	English Language Learners			0 (Gr 8)

Grade 8				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	65%	68%	73%
	Economically Disadvantaged	37%	44%	50%
	Students With Disabilities	26%	29%	42%
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	57%	11%	66%
	Economically Disadvantaged	31%	44%	40%
	Students With Disabilities	18%	11%	32%
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			71.8%
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	54.5%
	English Language Learners	0	0	100%

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	29	47	46	41	56	51	45	83	45		
ELL	54	73	57	64	70	65	70				
ASN	75	82		79	65						
BLK	56	31		50	54						
HSP	69	70	63	72	65	41	65	91	100		
MUL	70	76		72	56		72				
WHT	75	68	45	80	74	71	75	93	90		
FRL	61	61	51	63	62	55	63	88	88		
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				

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
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			
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		

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	70
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	44
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	702
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	98%
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%	

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	75
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	48
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	71
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	69
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	75
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	66
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?

In ELA from 2019-2021-- increased percent proficient in grades 4, 5, 6, & 8, with grades 4, 6, 8 increasing by more than 5 points. Grades 3 & 7 showed a decrease in percent proficient, with grade 3, showing a 5 point decrease. Met target goal of 63% for ELA learning gains by earning 68%. Missed ELA target goal of 49% learning gains for the lowest 25% with 48%.

In Math from 2019-2021--increased percent proficient in grades 4 & 5 by 9 and 11 points. Kept same percentage for grade 3 (76%). In grades 6, 7, 8 showed a decrease in percent proficient by more than 5 points. In Math achievement, despite missing overall target goal of 82% proficiency by 4 points and overall learning gains by 2 points, we showed a slight increase in learning gains for the lowest 25% by 1 point.

In Science from 2019-2021, we met our overall proficiency goal of 73%. The trend data shows consistency in the low 70s. In 2021, 5th grade increased from 61% to 67% proficiency and 8th grade increased 69% to 73%.

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

- 1) Math in grades 6, 7, 8 showed the largest decrease in percent proficient.
- 2) ELA in grades 3, 7 showed the largest decrease in percent proficient.
- 3) Lowest 25% learning gains in ELA went from 45% in 2019, to 48% in 2021. The goal is to continue increasing percentage of lowest 25% students making learning gains.

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

As it relates to decrease Math, a greater emphasis was placed on ELA performance the previous year. Due to COVID concerns, during the 2020-21 school year instruction was delivered both online and face-to-face. This type of delivery was very challenging.

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

ELA-grades 4, 5, 6, 8
Math- grades 4, 5

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

In ELA, there was a greater emphasis on core instruction.

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

(ELA)

- Standards-based instruction (quality lesson plans)
- Opportunities for students to use higher level thinking and problem solving skills
- MTSS (progress monitor interventions regularly)
- Small group instruction
- Schoolwide focus to build writing skills
- Benchmark Intervention Kits (StartUp, BuildUp, SpiralUp, Grades 3-5 Accessing Complex Texts Comprehension)
- Orton Gillingham

(MATH)

- Before/After school tutoring
- Fluency practice (IXL)
- Standards-based instruction (quality lesson plans)
- MTSS (progress monitor interventions regularly)
- Small group instruction

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.

WIDA / ESOL PD:

- Scaffolding Learning through Language
- Considerations when Educating Bilingual Learners with Identified Learning Disabilities
- ESOL Methods of Teaching English
- ESOL Testing & Evaluation
- ESOL Applied Linguistics
- ESOL Curriculum & Materials

SWD PD:

- Introduction to Differentiating Instruction: Responding to All Learners
- Technology to Support Reading Comprehension
- Reading, Writing, and ASD
- Autism Spectrum Disorder Endorsement Program (Cohort 2021-2022)

Math PD:

- Monthly Math Club for K-8 Teachers

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

After School Academic Program (ASAP)

Differentiated Instruction

Work with district curriculum specialists for specific FSA strands and transition to B.E.S.T. standards

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	From 2019 & 2021, Math in grades 6, 7, 8 showed a decrease in percent proficient and showed minimal growth for overall learning gains with the lowest 25% population. Grade 6 (82% to 64%); Grade 7 (89% to 83%, -6); Grade 8 (80% to 61%, -19). As for learning gains, the Lowest 25% (Target goal of 63% to 64%, +1)
---	--

PRIMARY GOALS

By the year 2022, there will be an increase of a 4 percentage point from 64% to 68% for grade 6, increase of a 4 percentage point from 83% to 87% for grade 7, increase of a 4 percentage point from 61% to 65% for grade 8.

Measurable Outcome:	By the year 2022, there will be an overall increase of a 4 percentage point from 64% to 68% for the Lowest 25% making learning gains.
----------------------------	---

OTHER GOALS

- Grade 3, at least a 4% increase from 76% to 80% overall proficiency.
- Grade 4, 2022, at least a 4% increase from 70% to 74% overall proficiency
- Grade 5, at least a 4% increase from 80% to 84% overall proficiency
- Monitor iReady assessments as well as weekly lessons pass rates for iReady.
- Review classroom performance data for areas in need of growth.
- Standards Mastery
- Monthly Data Chats w/Teachers

Monitoring:**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Paula Cimillo (paula.cimillo@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

- Grade Conferencing w/students
- Goal setting w/students
- ESE Resource Teacher support/small group instruction
- Math Enrichment (double-block courses)
- After School Academic Program (Teacher recommendation)
- Standards-based instruction
- Targeted instruction for FSA strands in need of improvement

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

A significant number of students in the Lowest 25% are SWD and did not meet proficiency benchmarks for FSA. We used the results from FSA and other diagnostic measures to determine these strategies.

Action Steps to Implement

- 1) Use of iReady data to identify students that are not proficient
- 2) Use of IXL for fluency building across grade levels
- 3) Allocate staffing to support the After School Academic Program (Tutoring)
- 4) Teachers continue weekly PLC and monthly data chats to monitor student progress.
- 5) MTSS Cycle (Intervention discussions for students of concern)

Person Responsible Paula Cimillo (paula.cimillo@sarasotacountyschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	From 2019 & 2021 ELA in grades 3 and 7 showed a decrease in percent proficient. Grade 3 (78% to 73%, -5), Grade 7 (73% to 72%, -1). As for learning gains for the Lowest 25% (Target goal of 49% to 48%, -1)
Measurable Outcome:	<p>PRIMARY GOALS</p> <p>By the year 2022, there will be an increase of at least 4 percentage points from 73% to 77% for Grade 3, and increase of at least 4 percentage points from 72% to 76% for Grade 7.</p> <p>By the year 2022, there will be an overall increase of at least 4 percentage points from 48% to 52% for the Lowest 25% population making learning gains.</p>
Monitoring:	<p>OTHER GOALS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Grade 4, at least 4% increase from 69% to 73% overall proficiency - Grade 5, at least 4% increase from 74% to 78% overall proficiency - Grade 6, at least 4% increase from 74% to 78% overall proficiency - Grade 8, at least 4% increase from 78% to 82% overall proficiency <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Monitor iReady assessments as well as weekly lessons pass rates for iReady (District form provided). - Review classroom performance data for areas in need of growth. - Standards Mastery - Monthly Data Chats w/Teachers
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Raymond Wilson (raymond.wilson@sarasotacountyschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Grade Conferencing w/students - Goal setting w/students - ESE Resource Teacher support/small group instruction - Math Enrichment (double-block courses) - After School Academic Program (Teacher recommendation) - Standards-based instruction - Targeted instruction for FSA strands in need of improvement
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	A significant number of students in the Lowest 25% are SWD and did not meet proficiency benchmarks for FSA. We used the results from FSA and other diagnostic measures to determine these strategies.

Action Steps to Implement

- 1) Use of iReady data to identify students that are not proficient
- 2) Use of IXL for fluency building across grade levels
- 3) Allocate staffing to support the After School Academic Program (Tutoring)
- 4) Teachers continue weekly PLC and monthly data chats to monitor student progress.
- 5) MTSS Cycle (Intervention discussions for students of concern)

Person Responsible [no one identified]

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Overall, Lowest 25% learning gains in MATH went from 63% target goal in 2019, to 64% in 2021. Overall, Lowest 25% learning gains in ELA went from 45% target goal in 2019, to 48% in 2021. The goal is to continue increasing by at least 4 percentage points of Lowest 25% students making learning gains.
Measurable Outcome:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Classroom walkthroughs - MTSS Intervention tracking - iReady Lesson pathways performance results
Monitoring:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Monitor iReady assessments as well as weekly lessons pass rates for iReady (District form provided). - Review classroom performance data for areas in need of growth. - Standards Mastery - Monthly Data Chats w/Teachers
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jeanine Saddler (jeanine.saddler@sarasotacountyschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Grade Conferencing w/students - Goal setting w/students - ESE Resource Teacher support/small group instruction - Math Enrichment (double-block courses) - After School Academic Program (Teacher recommendation) - Standards-based instruction - Targeted instruction for FSA strands in need of improvement - REWARDS and REWARDS Plus instruction (Middle School) - Benchmark (Elementary)
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	A significant number of students in the Lowest 25% are SWD and did not meet proficiency benchmarks for FSA. We used the results from FSA and other diagnostic measures to determine these strategies.

Action Steps to Implement

- 1) Use of iReady data to identify students that are not proficient
- 2) Use of IXL for fluency building across grade levels
- 3) Allocate staffing to support the After School Academic Program (Tutoring)
- 4) Teachers continue weekly PLC and monthly data chats to monitor student progress.

Person Responsible Jeanine Saddler (jeanine.saddler@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safeschoolsforalex.org), 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.

According to the SafeSchoolsforAlex.org, LNS reported .05 incidents per 100 students which places the school in LOW concern ranking. However, by the year 2022, there will be a reduction of suspensions to less than 10%.

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.

At LNS students and staff display the Lightning Way by demonstrating civility throughout the campus. The School also incorporates the use of the CHAMPS system of behavioral expectations along with our District's Civility Squad Character Traits as part of the Positive Behavior Support Plan that assists to increase in academic performance while clearly communicating behavioral expectations and establishing a positive school culture. The PBIS plan also includes supports that addresses individual student needs using the Multi-Tiered System of Supports and RTI process which develops targeted intervention that best support student needs both academically and/or behaviorally. Both the CHAMPS and the MTSS-RTI programs are researched and evidence-based strategies.

The school's PBIS program is centered around displaying and demonstrating the Lightning Way which encourages students to be DEDICATED, PREPARED, APPROPRIATE, RESPECTFUL, and PROMPT to earn and give respect. These Lightning Way expectations are also tied to tickets in which students can earn to redeem at the school's Lightning Boutique. CHAMPS provide an additional layer of specific behavioral expectations tied to an activity and/or area of the school such as the classroom, hallways, cafeteria, etc. Teachers and staff practice and teach these expectations and the school promotes and posts messaging that is consistent throughout the campus so students can quickly reference appropriate behavior expectations anytime during the school day and in all areas. This communicates to our students how they should properly conduct themselves.

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

Principal, Assistant Principals- model expectations, provide ongoing support for teachers in the areas of instruction and student discipline, staff recognition, shared decision making.

Behavioral Specialists- Facilitates PBIS initiatives and develop behavior management plans.

School Counselors- provide ongoing support for teachers through securing and managing services for students

Team Leaders- serve as liaison to share concerns and brainstorm possible solutions.

PTO- Organizes schoolwide events to build a greater sense of community and family.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math				\$12,936.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
			1211 - Laurel Nokomis School	Other		\$9,641.00
			<i>Notes: IXL Fluency Practice (Gr 3-8)- PTO/SAC</i>			
			1211 - Laurel Nokomis School	Other		\$3,295.00
			<i>Notes: Reflex Math- PTO</i>			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				\$10,808.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	3373	120-Classroom Teachers	1211 - Laurel Nokomis School	General Fund		\$1,728.00
			<i>Notes: Reading A-Z</i>			
	3373	120-Classroom Teachers	1211 - Laurel Nokomis School	General Fund		\$7,500.00
			<i>Notes: Scholastic Magazines</i>			
	3373	120-Classroom Teachers	1211 - Laurel Nokomis School	General Fund		\$1,580.00
			<i>Notes: LAFS Books</i>			
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Small Group Instruction				\$45,935.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	3373	120-Classroom Teachers	1211 - Laurel Nokomis School	General Fund		\$785.00
			<i>Notes: REWARDS & REWARDS PLUS</i>			
	3373	120-Classroom Teachers	1211 - Laurel Nokomis School	General Fund		\$150.00
			<i>Notes: Heggarty</i>			
	5900		1211 - Laurel Nokomis School	Other		\$3,000.00
			<i>Notes: TOP Score- Writing Practice (PTO)</i>			
	3290	120-Classroom Teachers	1211 - Laurel Nokomis School	Other Federal		\$42,000.00
			<i>Notes: Jump Start funds for (After School Academic Support)</i>			
Total:						\$69,679.00