

Sarasota County Schools

Laurel Nokomis School



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	13
Planning for Improvement	18
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

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
2021-22 Title I School	No
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	38%
2021-22 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	2021-22: A (68%) 2018-19: A (70%) 2017-18: A (75%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	ATSI
* 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	13
Planning for Improvement	18
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Laurel Nokomis School

1900 LAUREL RD E, Nokomis, FL 34275

www.sarasotacountyschools.net/laurelnokomis

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2021-22 Title I School	2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Combination School PK-8	No	38%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	25%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	A	A	A	A

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

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

WE BELIEVE

? Students have the right to learn, and teachers have the right to teach.

? 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 physical, academic, social, and emotional needs of all students.

? Students also have a responsibility to work cooperatively, supporting one another with respect for adults and peers in the learning community.

? Academic excellence and continuous improvement by both staff and students are promoted and celebrated.

? Active, supportive participation of parents and the community is essential for the success of our students

and our school and is encouraged in any way possible.

? Students learn best and teachers instruct best in an environment free of disruption.

? Students should be respectful and held accountable for their own behavior.

? A rigorous curriculum is being implemented for all students as the staff maintains high expectations.

? Every child can learn when a variety of instructional methods are used to present, assess, and evaluate learning.

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

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
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. Facilitates PLC initiative.
Cimillo, Paula	Assistant Principal	Provides information about core content, identifies and analyzes key student data points to assist with Tier 1, Tier 2 and Tier 3, behavioral, academic, and attendance interventions within the classroom. Helps to develop master schedule and interventions within the schedule. Facilitates PLC initiative.
Ellis, Jade	Assistant Principal	Provides information about core content, identifies and analyzes key student data points to assist with Tier 1, Tier 2 and Tier 3, behavioral, academic, and attendance interventions within the classroom. Leads and monitors school health and safety policies and procedures. Facilitates PLC initiative.
Sahhar, Elisabeth	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, Tier 2 and Tier 3, behavioral, academic, and attendance interventions within the classroom. Facilitates PLC initiative.
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. Provides information about core content, identifies and analyzes key student data points to assist with Tier 1, Tier 2 and Tier 3 behavioral and attendance interventions within the classroom.
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. Provides information about core content, identifies and analyzes key student data points to assist with Tier 1, Tier 2 and Tier 3 behavioral and attendance interventions within the classroom.
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. Testing coordinator for grades K-8.
Fortune, Julie	Teacher, K-12	ELA Department Chair and Content Leader

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
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
Carter, Amanda	Teacher, K-12	Kindergarten Team Leader
Glass, Ashley	Teacher, K-12	First Grade Team Leader
Stritz, Katie	Teacher, K-12	Third Grade Team Leader
Pettibone, Andrea	Teacher, K-12	Fifth Grade Team Leader
Wardlaw, Laura	Reading Coach	ELL compliance liaison and provides reading intervention support.
Chin-Yee, Joshua	Teacher, K-12	Fourth grade team leader.
Davis, Tracy	Other	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. Facilitates IEP meetings and compliance for students with disabilities.
Palmer, Donna	Other	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. Facilitates IEP meetings and compliance for students with disabilities.
Lazinski, Heidi	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. Provides information about core content, identifies and analyzes key student data points to assist with Tier 1, Tier 2 and Tier 3 behavioral and attendance interventions within the classroom.
Senarens, Karen	Instructional Coach	Teacher on special assignment to provide support with the MTSS process.
Dembinski, Shari	Teacher, K-12	Middle school reading team leader.
Petz, Rebecca	Teacher, ESE	Team Leader, Elem ESE

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Smolker, Janya	Teacher, K-12	Team Leader, Grade 2

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Sunday 5/1/2016, Raymond Wilson

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.*

10

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.*

15

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

112

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,406

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

11

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

21

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	113	129	102	155	148	166	198	178	199	0	0	0	0	1388
Attendance below 90 percent	8	28	16	17	16	27	32	37	44	0	0	0	0	225
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	1	2	12	9	24	0	0	0	0	49
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	4	2	8	9	0	7	0	0	0	0	30
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	3	3	2	7	1	2	0	0	0	0	18
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	6	11	16	30	9	28	0	0	0	0	100
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	4	10	18	44	13	16	0	0	0	0	105
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	2	2	10	17	20	21	20	23	0	0	0	0	115

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	4	0	13	3	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	26
Students retained two or more times		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/29/2022

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	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	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	0	8
Students retained two or more times				0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	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	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	0	8
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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	71%	69%	55%				71%	67%	61%
ELA Learning Gains	63%						59%	60%	59%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	44%						45%	52%	54%
Math Achievement	76%	37%	42%				80%	70%	62%
Math Learning Gains	66%						71%	65%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	48%						59%	55%	52%
Science Achievement	59%	69%	54%				69%	63%	56%
Social Studies Achievement	92%	66%	59%				97%	88%	78%

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	78%	70%	8%	58%	20%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	58%	67%	-9%	58%	0%
Cohort Comparison		-78%				

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	71%	68%	3%	56%	15%
Cohort Comparison		-58%				
06	2022					
	2019	69%	63%	6%	54%	15%
Cohort Comparison		-71%				
07	2022					
	2019	73%	64%	9%	52%	21%
Cohort Comparison		-69%				
08	2022					
	2019	70%	66%	4%	56%	14%
Cohort Comparison		-73%				

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	76%	73%	3%	62%	14%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	61%	72%	-11%	64%	-3%
Cohort Comparison		-76%				
05	2022					
	2019	69%	70%	-1%	60%	9%
Cohort Comparison		-61%				
06	2022					
	2019	82%	67%	15%	55%	27%
Cohort Comparison		-69%				
07	2022					
	2019	89%	73%	16%	54%	35%
Cohort Comparison		-82%				
08	2022					
	2019	80%	65%	15%	46%	34%
Cohort Comparison		-89%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	61%	65%	-4%	53%	8%
Cohort Comparison						
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-61%				
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019	74%	62%	12%	48%	26%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	95%	85%	10%	71%	24%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	98%	73%	25%	61%	37%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	100%	69%	31%	57%	43%

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	24	41	34	31	45	40	15	56			
ELL	54	67	56	63	59	56	45	82			
ASN	84	67		84	75		77		90		
BLK	62	48		62	46	30					
HSP	65	60	45	72	70	73	49	82	89		
MUL	73	58	27	77	61	27	56	93	73		
WHT	71	64	46	77	66	46	60	94	92		
FRL	58	54	35	62	62	46	39	81	80		
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				
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		

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)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	69
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	80
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	689

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	39
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	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	80
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	50
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	61
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	69
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	60
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?

In ELA from SY2021-SY2022-- increased percent proficient in grades 4 and 6 increasing by 3 and 1 point respectively. Grades 3, 5, 6, 7, & 8 showed a decrease in percent proficient, with grades 5 and 8 each showing the biggest decline of 8 points. Grade 3 showed a total loss of 6 points.

ELA learning gains decreased from 68% to 63%, a total loss of 5 points.

ELA learning gains for the lowest 25% decreased from 48% to 44%, a total loss of 4 points.

In MATH from SY2021-SY2022--increased percent proficient in grades 3, 4, & 6 by 1, 6, and 12 points respectively. Grades 5, 7, 8 showed a decrease in percent proficient by 19, 4, and 14 points respectively.

MATH learning gains decreased from 71% to 66%, a total loss of 5 points.

MATH learning gains for the lowest 25% decreased from 64% to 48%, a total loss of 16 points.

In Science from SY2021-SY2022, grade 5 decreased from 67% to 54%, a total loss of 13 points. Grade 8 decreased from 73% to 62%, a total loss of 11 points.

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

- 1) MATH in grades 5 and 8 showed the largest decrease in percent proficient. MATH learning gains for the lowest 25% decreased from 64% to 48%, a total loss of 16 points.
- 2) ELA in grades 5 and 8 showed the largest decrease in percent proficient. ELA learning gains for the lowest 25% decreased from 48% to 44%, a total loss of 4 points.
- 3) Students with Disabilities (SWD) subgroup went from 49% to 39% as it pertains to the Federal Index.

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

We experienced unsuspected accelerated student growth that led to oversized classes. This growth continued throughout the entire school year. The large class sizes impacted opportunities to have consistent targeted interventions. We also experienced long term subs in key positions such as ESE Resource teachers, specifically for 5th-8th grade. We experienced an increase with students who moved from the alternative assessment curriculum to general education curriculum/standardized testing.

* The new action includes securing adequate instructional staffing to meet the demands of a growing population.

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

In ELA from SY2021-SY2022-- increased percent proficient in grades 4 and 6 increasing by 3 points in 4th grade and 1 point in 6th grade. In MATH from SY2021-SY2022--increased percent proficient in grades 3, 4, & 6 by 1, 6, and 12 points respectively.

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

In ELA, grades 4 & 6 increased focus on intervention support and likewise in Math for grades 3, 4, & 6.

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

Keep a laser focus on the PLC Four Key Questions:

1. What do we want students to know and be able to do?
2. How will we know when they have learned it?
3. What will we do when they haven't learned it?
4. What will we do if they already know it?

- All grade levels K-5 have a dedicated grade level ESE resource teacher to pull intervention groups.
- Added an additional resource teacher at middle school - with strategic scheduling of students in Math and ELA

based on level of support needed for SWD.

- Paraprofessionals added into specific Reading classes at the middle level to help support SWD
- Additional teachers at K-4 being trained in Orton-Gillingham(OG) reading strategies
- Additional teacher training in Literature Lessons and Reading Recovery specifically for SWD/ELL students
- Added Just Words Reading section for Grade 6 SWD and ELL striving readers
- Grade level interventions by TOSA, working with students receiving Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions
- Middle School OG trained teacher working with 5th grade reading interventions
- K-3 CPT data chats specific to students Reading below expectations
- Added Middle School Reading planning team

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.

- 1) Incorporate concepts of Learn by Doing PLC initiative such as The 3 Big Ideas of PLCs (A focus on learning, A collaborative culture, and A results-driven team) through the PLC guiding coalition work group, monthly team leader meetings, and data chats.
- 2) Implement the learning from the 20HR Inclusionary Practices PD

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

Before School Math Support

After School Academic Program (ASAP)

Differentiated Instruction

Enrichment (Partnership with Laurel Civic Association)

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

Areas of Focus

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

:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus

Description and

Rationale:

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

Our SWD population performed 2 percentage points below the 41% Federal Index (ESSA) threshold at 39%.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By the year 2023, there will be an increase of at least 4 percentage points to reach the goal of 43% proficiency for Students with Disabilities (SWD) in the areas of ELA and MATH.

Monitoring:

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

- Analysis of FAST/STAR/iReady progress monitoring assessments
- Classroom walkthrough and feedback
- Review lesson plans (purposeful targeted small group instruction)
- Quarterly Progress Monitoring for goals & objectives for SWD

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Paula Cimillo (paula.cimillo@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Implement Reading interventions/training throughout grade levels such as Orton-Gillingham reading intervention, Reading Recovery and Literature Lessons at the K-5 level. Small group instruction based on progress monitoring data K-8. Addition of ESE resource teachers to have 1 ESE teacher per grade level at K-5 and additional ESE teacher at Middle school to support SWD.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

- Build teacher capacity to support the needs of students
- Regularly progress monitor SWD in their FAST/STAR/iReady diagnostic assessments to inform instruction

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.

Data chats around the following questions:

1. What do we want students to know and be able to do?
2. How will we know when they have learned it?
3. What will we do when they haven't learned it?

- Focus on the implementation of 20Hrs Inclusionary practices professional development K-8
- Implementation of Middle School Co-Teaching Model (ESE & Gen Ed Teachers)
- Securing Quarterly Planning Days school-wide to continue to progress monitor student data, address student needs and create plans for quality instruction
- Intentional Scheduling of students into reading/math intervention k-8

- Added a MTSS Facilitator (TOSA) to support and guide interventions
- Classroom Walkthrough and feedback

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

Progress monitor assessment data to determine intervention support and possible additional screeners/assessments for ELA and Math.

Person Responsible Nicole Nguyen (nicole.nguyen@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Allow autonomy for dispersing elementary students to high expertise teachers during the intervention block.

Person Responsible Karen Senarens (karen.senarens@sarasotacountyschools.net)

#2. 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.

ELA in grades 5 and 8 showed the largest decrease in percent proficient. ELA learning gains for the lowest 25% decreased from 48% to 44%, a total loss of 4 points.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By the year 2023, there will be an increase of at least 2 percentage points from 71% to 73% proficiency for all students in the area of ELA.

Monitoring:

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

- Review classroom performance data for areas in need of growth.
- Analysis of FAST/STAR/iReady progress monitoring assessments
- Classroom walkthrough and feedback
- Monthly Data Chats w/Teachers

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Raymond Wilson (raymond.wilson@sarasotacountyschools.net)

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

Implement Reading interventions/training throughout grade levels such as Orton-Gillingham reading intervention, Reading Recovery and Literature Lessons at the K-5 level. Small group instruction based on progress monitoring data K-8. After school academic programs based on student data/ teacher recommendations.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

A significant number of students struggle with various ELA standards such as integration of knowledge and ideas.

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.

Data chats around the following PLC key questions:

1. What do we want students to know and be able to do?
2. How will we know when they have learned it?
3. What will we do when they haven't learned it?

- Grade Conferencing with students
- Goal setting with students
- ESE resource teacher support/small group instruction
- After school academic program (teacher recommendation)
- Targeted instruction for B.E.S.T. standards for areas in need of improvement based on PLC work
- Writing practices across grade levels (Top Score)
- Best Practices Professional Development for K-1 teachers by Reading Recovery teachers
- Invite district program specialists to support teacher understanding and work of BEST standards; specifically for Integration of Knowledge and Ideas

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

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Math in grades 5, 7, and 8 showed the largest decrease in percent proficient.
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. - 5th grade (80% to 61%)
 - 7th grade (83% to 79%)
 - 8th grade (61% to 47%)

Measurable Outcome:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome. By the year 2023, there will be an increase of at least 4 percentage points from 76% to 80% proficiency for all students in the area of Math.

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

- Review classroom performance data for areas in need of growth.
- Analysis of FAST/Aleks/DreamBox progress monitoring assessments
- Classroom walkthrough and feedback
- Monthly Data Chats w/Teachers

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Raymond Wilson (raymond.wilson@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:
Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus. Provide robust BEST standards instruction (standards-based instruction). Utilize small group instruction to support student learning needs. Provide before/after school tutoring and support.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy. A significant number of students struggle with various MATH standards such as geometric functions and algebraic reasoning.

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.

- Data chats around the following PLC key questions:
1. What do we want students to know and be able to do?
 2. How will we know when they have learned it?
 3. What will we do when they haven't learned it?

- Grade conferencing with students
- Goal setting with students
- Secured funding for additional tutoring/academic support

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

#4. 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.

Science in grades 5 and 8 showed a decrease in percent proficient.

- 5th grade (67% to 54%)
- 8th grade (73% to 62%)

Measurable Outcome:

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

By the year 2023, there will be a minimum of 70% proficiency for grade 5, 73% for grade 8 on State Science Assessment (NGSS).

Monitoring:

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

- Review classroom performance data for areas in need of growth.
- Quarterly benchmark assessments
- Utilization of PENDA for ongoing practice
- Classroom walkthrough and feedback
- Monthly Data Chats w/Teachers

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Shannon Rasbury (shannon.rasbury@sarasotacountyschools.net)

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

Use of ongoing spiral review and quick checks to build upon student learning; specifically with scientific vocabulary and Nature of Science content strands. Incorporate use of Gizmos and Virtual Labs, Utilize Virtual Reality Sets for instructional support and TechActive resources. Tutoring provided during lunches, before and after school.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

A significant number of students struggle in the area nature of science. This could be the result of teachers lack of reteaching foundational knowledge throughout the school year to promote scientific literacy.

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.

Data chats around the following PLC key questions:

1. What do we want students to know and be able to do?
2. How will we know when they have learned it?
3. What will we do when they haven't learned it?

- Departmentalization (5th Grade)
- Ensure that all grade levels (K-5) are following IFG for Science Instruction
- Incorporate IXL lessons (Fluency Building)
- Secured additional funding for before/after school tutoring
- Invite District Program Specialists to support individual teachers with regards to note-taking and Science standards instruction
- Collaborate with 6-8 Science teachers on interactive notebooks and spiral review bell-work

Person Responsible

Shannon Rasbury (shannon.rasbury@sarasotacountyschools.net)

#5. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Attendance

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
 Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

We have approximately 225 students across K-8 that attendance below 90% based on SY2021-22.

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

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

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

- Attendance records
- Project10
- SWST referrals

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Michael Reichman
 (michael.reichman@sarasotacountschools.net)

LNS attendance procedures starting with teacher initial outreach with School-wide PBIS overview and implementation.

- Guidance support (professional development, referral process, student support, etc.)
- Weekly support team meeting discussions
- School-Wide Support Team referrals
- First-Step Referrals Grades 4-8;
- Outside Agency Referrals Grades K-8 (Youth At-Risk referrals when needed)
- On-going parent contact, conferences, communication
- Monthly team leader meetings and discussion to review behavior trends, responses and interventions.
- Utilize District Dashboard data/SIS data
- Lightning Pride Reward
- Truancy/Social worker home visit referral
- 3/5/9 letter notifications
- Wellness checks Address verification

Evidence-based Strategy:
 Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this 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.

In order to increase student achievement/learning gains, students need to be present for instruction.

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 – Take attendance daily and notify counselor of any concerns.
 Attendance Secretary – Run attendance reports every 2 weeks and notify the School Counselors as to which students have received letters. The attendance spreadsheet will be updated each time letters are sent out. All attendance documentation mailed home will be filed in the office attendance binder. At the end of the school year, all attendance documentation will be placed in the student’s cumulative record.

3-5-10 days unexcused days unexcused/no contact – Teachers – Make phone call and begin/continue attendance interventions, document contact/ attempts on the Attendance Conference Form. Attendance Secretary – Generate 3-5-10 day letter and mail home. School Counselor – Document attendance

interventions.

Person Responsible Michael Reichman
(michael.reichman@sarasotacountschools.net)

No description entered

Person Responsible [no one identified]

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.

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 Character Strong as part of the Positive Behavior Intervention 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. Character Strong 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 school culture and environment.

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.