

Collier County Public Schools

# Laurel Oak Elementary School



## 2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| <b>School Demographics</b>                | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>     | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>                 | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>                   | <b>11</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>           | <b>15</b> |
| <b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b> | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>            | <b>0</b>  |

# 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

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>2019-20 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active   |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Elementary School<br>PK-5  |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education   |
| <b>2021-22 Title I School</b>  | No   |
| <b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 37%  |
| <b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities<br>English Language Learners<br>Asian Students<br>Black/African American Students<br>Hispanic Students<br>Multiracial Students<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2021-22: A (70%)<br>2018-19: A (73%)<br>2017-18: A (66%)   |
| <b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>  |  |
| <b>SI Region</b>   | Southwest  |
| <b>Regional Executive Director</b>   |  |
| <b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>   | N/A  |
| <b>Year</b>  |  |
| <b>Support Tier</b>  |  |
| <b>ESSA Status</b>   | N/A  |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</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 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](http://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

---

|                                       |           |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b> | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>             | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>               | <b>11</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>       | <b>15</b> |
| <b>Title I Requirements</b>           | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>        | <b>0</b>  |

# Laurel Oak Elementary School

7800 IMMOKALEE RD, Naples, FL 34119

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

## School Demographics

| School Type and Grades Served<br>(per MSID File) | 2021-22 Title I School | 2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate<br>(as reported on Survey 3) |
|--|------------------------|--|
| Elementary School<br>PK-5                        | No                     | 37%  |
| Primary Service Type<br>(per MSID File)          | Charter School         | 2018-19 Minority Rate<br>(Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)               |
| K-12 General Education                           | No                     | 34%  |

## School Grades History

| Year  | 2021-22 | 2020-21 | 2019-20 | 2018-19 |
|-------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| 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 while developing leadership skills.

**Provide the school's vision statement.**

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

### School Leadership Team

**Membership**

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.:

| 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 Laurel Oak Elementary, there is a support system where our administrative team 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, culture, climate and the development of the whole child. Our School Advisory Committee is also led by our school principal. |
| Antonetti, Dena   | 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. Additional responsibility includes school-based testing coordinator.   |
| 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      | Reading Coach       | Our Reading 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. Mrs. Hacker, is also a school guidance counselor at Laurel Oak. She also provides the same supports to our students and is also working with our PBIS program.  |
| Venegas, Toni     |                     | Our ESE Program Specialist ensures compliance with all IEP's and 504 plans and assists with the planning and direct instructional support of our ESE resource staff.   |
| Hacker, Briana    | 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. She also oversees the Positive Behavioral Interventions System (PBIS).  |

## Demographic Information

### Principal start date

Friday 8/7/2020, Brian Castellani



**Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

1

**Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

26

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

59

**Total number of students enrolled at the school**

1,203

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

6

**Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.**

6

### Demographic Data

### Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

| Indicator  | Grade Level |     |     |     |     |     |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|--|-------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|  | K           | 1   | 2   | 3   | 4   | 5   | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Number of students enrolled                              | 179         | 197 | 188 | 205 | 199 | 225 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 1193  |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 24          | 20  | 23  | 21  | 27  | 26  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 141   |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 0           | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| 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 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0           | 0   | 0   | 5   | 20  | 19  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 44    |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0   | 0   | 3   | 15  | 15  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 33    |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0           | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 11    |

**Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":**

| Indicator                           | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|                                     | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Retained Students: Current Year     | 3           | 1 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 10    |
| 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**

Friday 8/26/2022

**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                              | 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  |       |

**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                              | 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  |       |

## 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      | 2022   |          |       | 2021   |          |       | 2019   |          |       |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
|                             | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement             | 76%    | 64%      | 56%   |        |          |       | 82%    | 60%      | 57%   |
| ELA Learning Gains          | 70%    |          |       |        |          |       | 71%    | 59%      | 58%   |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  | 53%    |          |       |        |          |       | 57%    | 51%      | 53%   |
| Math Achievement            | 83%    | 56%      | 50%   |        |          |       | 88%    | 68%      | 63%   |
| Math Learning Gains         | 75%    |          |       |        |          |       | 73%    | 64%      | 62%   |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 59%    |          |       |        |          |       | 75%    | 55%      | 51%   |
| Science Achievement         | 75%    | 72%      | 59%   |        |          |       | 68%    | 59%      | 53%   |

### 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 |
| 01                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 02                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 03                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 80%    | 61%      | 19%                        | 58%   | 22%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 85%    | 58%      | 27%                        | 58%   | 27%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -80%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 78%    | 60%      | 18%                        | 56%   | 22%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -85%   |          |                            |       |                         |

| MATH              |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade             | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 01                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 02                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 03                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 87%    | 68%      | 19%                        | 62%   | 25%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 89%    | 65%      | 24%                        | 64%   | 25%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -87%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 82%    | 67%      | 15%                        | 60%   | 22%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -89%   |          |                            |       |                         |

| SCIENCE           |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade             | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 66%    | 56%      | 10%                        | 53%   | 13%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |

### Subgroup Data Review

| 2022 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 2020-21 | C & C Accel 2020-21 |
| SWD                                       | 34       | 53     | 48          | 55        | 51      | 53           | 24       |         |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 44       | 57     | 47          | 59        | 48      | 36           | 27       |         |           |                   |                     |
| ASN                                       | 82       | 59     |             | 88        | 91      |              | 64       |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 56       | 50     | 40          | 56        | 60      | 53           | 75       |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 67       | 71     | 48          | 75        | 77      | 61           | 70       |         |           |                   |                     |
| MUL                                       | 85       | 70     |             | 100       | 90      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 81       | 73     | 57          | 87        | 74      | 57           | 78       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 59       | 60     | 44          | 67        | 73      | 57           | 62       |         |           |                   |                     |
| 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       |         |           |                   |                     |

### ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

| ESSA Federal Index  |     |
|---|-----|
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)  | N/A |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students  | 73  |
| 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 | 96  |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index                                       | 587 |

| ESSA Federal Index   |      |
|--|------|
| Total Components for the Federal Index   | 8    |
| Percent Tested   | 100% |
| Subgroup Data  |      |
| Students With Disabilities   |      |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities                                     | 45   |
| 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                                      | 52   |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?              | NO   |
| 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   | 77   |
| 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                                | 56   |
| 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  | 70   |
| 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   | 86   |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                   | NO   |

| Multiracial Students   |     |
|--|-----|
| 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   | 72  |
| 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                                | 64  |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?        | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0   |

### Part III: Planning for Improvement

#### 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 achievement has shown an upward scale score trend since 2019. Proficiency increased from , 68% in 2019, to 72% in 2021, and to 75% in 2022.

#### What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Overall ELA achievement decreased from 2019 to 2022. Proficiency decreased from 82% in 2019, to 78% in 2021, and to 76% in 2022. Overall math proficiency also decreased from 2019 to 2022. Proficiency decreased from 88% in 2019 to 83% in both 2021 and 2022.

#### 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 included challenges faced by students during the 2020-2021 and 2021-2022 school years. Many students who participated in virtual learning or home-schooling demonstrated social and academic declines. Actions will include a renewed focus on collaborative planning for ELA instruction using progress monitoring data to create spiral reviews throughout the year. There will also be an increased focus on individual student data analysis and the use of this data for instructional shifts and planning.

**What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?**

Grade 5 Science achievement increased from 2019 to 2022. Proficiency increased from 68% in 2019, to 72% in 2021, to 75% in 2022.

**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 and engaging lesson plans based on student needs. Fluid grouping practices allowed teachers to meet individual student needs. Our after school enrichment program was focused on ELA, but incorporated science content into reading passages. Fifth grade science lesson plans consistently reflected standards-aligned application of the 5E instructional model. Our teachers implemented weekly science lesson plans with fidelity. Resource teachers provided targeted support in the area of science to fifth grade classrooms. Administration attended team planning meetings to provide additional support.

**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, will be used to plan rigorous, engaging lessons based on student needs. Facilitating fluid grouping will also be part of the instructional plan. Students' individual needs will be addressed through differentiated instruction occurring during designated blocks. We will continue to implement on grade level content with all students in all content areas. Teachers will prioritize high-level skills and content and create teaching and learning pathways for acceleration based on student performance data in all content areas.

**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.**

Professional development opportunities will include individual quarterly "Data Digs" with teachers focusing on Progress Monitoring Data, benchmark assessments, and other district assessments. During these meetings, teachers will plan differentiated support for all levels of learners. The Reading Coach will provide targeted professional development 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.**

Weekly collaborative planning meetings and monthly vertical curriculum committees will continue. The purpose remains to monitor student progress, make adjustments, and support School Improvement Plan goals. Bi-monthly MTSS meetings will help teachers collaborate to create and implement Student Success Plans.

**Areas of Focus**

Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:



**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA****Area of Focus****Description and****Rationale:**

**Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**

SY22 student performance in English Language Arts (ELA) indicated a three-year downward trend in proficiency. This area of focus will improve student learning and success as reading proficiency impacts all content areas.

**Measurable****Outcome:****State the****specific****measurable****outcome the****school plans****to achieve.****This should****be a data****based,****objective****outcome.**

Laurel Oak Elementary will increase the percent of 3rd through 5th grade student proficiency in English Language Arts by at least 4% from 76% to 80% when comparing results on the 2022 English Language Arts (ELA) Florida Standards Assessment (FSA) to the 2023 end of the year Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (FAST) English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

**Monitoring:****Describe how****this Area of****Focus will be****monitored for****the desired****outcome.**

Teachers will implement weekly lesson plans with a focus on Question-Answer Relationships. Classroom walkthroughs and observations will occur with thorough feedback provided to teachers. Utilization of district curriculum guides and resources with fidelity will occur in all grade levels. School administrators will analyze data of students in the lowest 25%, on district progress monitoring assessments, iReady diagnostics, and through teacher "Data Digs." All teachers, K-5, will complete our school-specific "Data Dig" data-tracking sheets, followed by quarterly individual meetings with administration. The "Data Digs" will include a section related to progress on the use of the Question-Answer Relationships.

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

Brian Castellani (castelbr@collierschools.com)

**Evidence-****based****Strategy:****Describe the****evidence-****based****strategy****being****implemented****for this Area****of Focus.**

Laurel Oak Elementary teachers will use Question-Answer Relationships as the evidenced-based strategy to support the ELA area of focus.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**  
**Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.**  
**Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.**

When reviewing 2021-22 grade level planning and Focused Teacher Evaluation Model (FTEM) data the leadership team determined that the use of Question-Answer Relationships would be the priority strategy for the 2022-23 school year.

#### **Action Steps to Implement**

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Professional Development will be provided by the Reading Coach to support the use of Question-Answer Relationships within planning and instruction. This Professional Development will be provided during Professional Learning Community (PLC) Meetings and on Early Release Days (ERD).

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

Quarterly "Data Digs" will be conducted by administrators with individual teachers to discuss student data and progress towards increased use of Question-Answer Relationships.

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

Administration will conduct formal and informal observations during English Language Arts (ELA) instruction to provide specific, focused feedback on the effective use of Question-Answer Relationships.

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

Administration will select teacher leaders to share best practices related to Question-Answer Relationships during Professional Learning Community (PLC) Meetings and Early Release Day (ERD) Meetings.

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

**#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math****Area of Focus  
Description and****Rationale:**

**Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**

SY22 student performance in overall proficiency in math indicated a three-year downward trend. This area of focus will ensure that we keep improving our math proficiency.

**Measurable Outcome:**

**State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**

Laurel Oak Elementary will increase the percent of 3rd through 5th grade student proficiency in math by at least 3% from 83% to 86% when comparing results on the 2022 Math Florida Standards Assessment (FSA) to the 2023 end of the year Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (FAST) Math assessment.

**Monitoring:**

**Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**

School administrators will analyze data for all students through district progress monitoring, benchmark assessments and teacher "Data Digs." Teachers will complete our school-specific "Data Dig" data-tracking sheets, followed by quarterly individual meetings with administration. Specific plans for improvement will be discussed with each teacher.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Jennifer Scrant (scranj@collierschools.com)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

**Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**

Laurel Oak Elementary teachers will Elicit and Use Evidence of Student Thinking as the evidenced-based strategy to support the area of math.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

**Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**

Based on 2021-22 administrative review of FTEM observation data, it was determined that teachers should increase the use of the evidenced-based strategy Elicit and Use Evidence of Student Thinking.

**Action Steps to Implement**

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Administrators and teachers will collaborate during weekly grade-level planning/Professional Learning Community (PLC) meetings and during individual Florida Teacher Evaluation Model (FTEM) conferences to deliberately plan for the use of the evidenced-based strategy Elicit and Use Evidence of Student Thinking. Monitoring for successful implementation will occur during formal and informal observations by administration and through informal feedback during planning meetings.

**Person Responsible**

Brian Castellani (castelbr@collierschools.com)

Teachers will use evidence of students' mathematical thinking to make instructional shifts for extension and acceleration during collaborative planning meetings and classroom instruction.

**Person Responsible**

Brian Castellani (castelbr@collierschools.com)

Additional support will be provided for Students With Disabilities (SWD) and English Language Learners (ELL) subgroups. Resource teachers will push into classrooms with identified needs based on assessment results. Resource teachers will participate in collaborative grade-level planning to increase consistency for all students.

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

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

**Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**

SY22 student performance in Science indicated a three-year upward trend in proficiency. This area of focus will ensure that we keep improving our science proficiency.

**Measurable****Outcome:**

**State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**

Laurel Oak Elementary will increase the percent of 5th grade student proficiency in science by at least 3% from 75% to 78% when comparing results on the 2022 statewide science assessment that measures the Next Generation Sunshine State Standards (NGSSS) to the 2023 end of the year science assessment.

**Monitoring:**

**Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**

Teachers will implement weekly lesson plans with fidelity. Classroom walkthroughs and observations will occur with thorough feedback provided to teachers. Teachers will use District curriculum guides and resources with fidelity. Grade 5 teachers will complete our school-specific "Data Dig" data-tracking sheets, followed by quarterly individual meetings with administration focusing on science instruction and assessment data analysis.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Dena Antonetti (antond@collierschools.com)

**Evidence-based****Strategy:**

**Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**

Laurel Oak Elementary teachers will use the following evidenced-based strategy to support the area of focus for science: Teacher lesson plans and instruction will consistently reflect standards-aligned application of the 5E instructional model.

**Rationale for Evidence-based****Strategy:**

**Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**

Following discussion during our school curriculum committee meeting in May 2022, it was determined that all grades need to implement the 5E Instructional Model for science with fidelity. This vertical committee, along with an administrative review of Next Generation Sunshine State Standards (NGSSS) assessment data, determined that Nature of Science is a priority for the 2022-23 school year.

**Action Steps to Implement**

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Teachers will engage in standards-aligned, collaborative planning that incorporates the 5E model of instruction. Administration will attend weekly collaborative planning.

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

Administrative feedback will be given to ensure all instructional staff members are supported as they increase their use of the 5E Instructional Model.

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

Teacher leaders are implementing a fourth and fifth grade science club targeting Nature of Science using the 5E Instructional Model as a planning and implementation guide.

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

Nature of Science will be a specific focus for all grades during grade-level planning meetings. Planning leaders will incorporate a spiral review throughout the year to ensure that Nature of Science remains a priority.

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

## RAISE

The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

### Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

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

N/A

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

N/A

**Measurable Outcomes:**

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

**Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)**

N/A

**Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)**

N/A

**Monitoring:**

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

N/A

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

**Evidence-based Practices/Programs:**

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. Â§7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

N/A

**Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:**

Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

N/A

**Action Steps to Implement:**

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

**Action Step****Person Responsible for Monitoring**

N/A

**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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

**Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.**

Our Laurel Oak Elementary 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 continue implementing Connect for Success twice a week. In addition, we will implement the Leader in Me program under the direction of our Lighthouse team which includes instructional, non-instructional, and administrative representation. This initiative will provide students the opportunity to develop meaningful relationships with their school staff and peers, with the goal of increasing their sense of belonging and connectedness. Our goal is for each student to find their genius and hold a leadership role either within their classroom or school. In partnership with our families and community, we create a culture where every child is a digital learner and a leader. Laurel Oak also offers incentive programs through Positive Behavioral Interventions and Support (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). Our large 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 an 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. At Laurel Oak Elementary, we also use a multi-faceted approach to prevent problem behavior, teach and encourage appropriate behavior, and respond to problem behavior effectively. We have a PBIS committee that meets monthly to review office discipline referrals. We look at the problem behaviors and locations of those behaviors and then we implement interventions as necessary. Some of our Tier 1 programs include: Recess/lunch Assistance, Buddy Bench, Student Friendship Ambassadors, Class Dojo, Kiwanis Terrific Kid program, and School News Program to teach expectations daily.

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

At Laurel Oak Elementary, it is important for our families and all stakeholders at the school work together and share responsibility for student success. We value family members' expertise about their children. Laurel Oak has an engaged and dedicated Parent Teacher Organization (PTO) and School Advisory Council (SAC) with representatives from all stakeholder groups. Our guidance counselors play a large role in creating a positive school culture and environment with our students. Incentive programs through PBIS recognition and positive referrals are also encouraged and celebrated when received.