Laurel Nokomis School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Laurel Nokomis School

1900 LAUREL RD E, Nokomis, FL 34275

www.sarasotacountyschools.net/laurelnokomis

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)
A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)
A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)
A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways: 1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%; 2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%; 3. Have a school grade of D or F; or 4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), https://www.floridacims.org, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

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 and overall well-being 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/guardians 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 from 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, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team
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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Wilson, Raymond	Principal	Develops, leads, evaluates, and facilitates data-based, decision-making, ensures that the MTSS Team, implements, documents, and communicates with staff and parents regarding school-based plans and activities. Develops master schedule and interventions within the schedule. 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. Helps to develop 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.
Sahhar, Elisabeth	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. Helps to develop master schedule and interventions within the schedule. Facilitates PLC initiative.
Reichman, Michael	School Counselor	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	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.
Falcone, Natalie	School Counselor	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

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		Tier 1, Tier 2 and Tier 3 behavioral and attendance interventions within the classroom.
Lazinski, Heidi	School Counselor	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	Other	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
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
Hassler, Lindsay	Teacher, K-12	Fifth Grade Team Leader
Music, Miranda	Reading Coach	Providing instructional support, curriculum development, coaching, data analysis.
Wardlaw, Laura	ELL Compliance Specialist	ELL compliance liaison and provides reading intervention support.
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.

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		Facilitates IEP meetings and compliance for students with disabilities.
Johnson, Lindsey	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.
Senarens, Karen	Other	Teacher on special assignment to provide support with the MTSS process and 504 facilitator.
Dembinski, Shari	Teacher, K-12	Middle school reading team leader.
Mussler, Kerri	Teacher, ESE	Autism Cluster team leader.
Lowe, Aja	Teacher, K-12	Grade 4 team leader.
Porvaznik, Susan	Teacher, K-12	Grade 2 team leader.

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development
Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

School data and SIP information is shared with Team Leaders, Department Chairs and School Advisory Committee members at the start of the school year and reviewed monthly with specific agenda items and budget requests that align specifically to our school improvement efforts.

SIP Monitoring
Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

School Improvement efforts will be monitored monthly via monthly data chats, quarterly planning days, and monthly team leaders meetings. Data will be monitored using iReady diagnostics, FAST progress monitoring data and common grade level assessments. The SIP plan will be revised at the semester to ensure continuous improvement.

Demographic Data Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024	
2023-24 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
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	25%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	38%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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	
Absent 10% or more days	8	27	31	22	18	32	24	51	44	257
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	2	6	19	17	16	29	89
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	11	6	0	2	12	31
Course failure in Math	0	0	3	2	11	6	1	8	2	33
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	9	31	26	31	19	120
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	4	13	27	25	14	10	93
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	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 that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	21	8	74	64	62	75	304

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	8	28	16	17	16	27	32	37	44	225
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	1	2	12	9	24	49
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	4	2	8	9	0	7	30
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	3	3	2	7	1	2	18
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	6	11	16	30	9	28	100
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	4	10	18	44	13	16	105
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	2	2	10	17	20	21	20	23	115

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	3	4	0	13	3	0	3	0	0	26
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)
Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	8	28	16	17	16	27	32	37	44	225
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	1	2	12	9	24	49
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	4	2	8	9	0	7	30
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	3	3	2	7	1	2	18
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	6	11	16	30	9	28	100
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	4	10	18	44	13	16	105
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	2	2	10	17	20	21	20	23	115

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	3	4	0	13	3	0	3	0	0	26
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	67	65	53	71	69	55	74		
ELA Learning Gains				63			68		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				44			48		
Math Achievement*	75	68	55	76	37	42	78		
Math Learning Gains				66			71		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				48			64		
Science Achievement*	65	68	52	59	69	54	73		
Social Studies Achievement*	87	81	68	92	66	59	92		
Middle School Acceleration	85	77	70	90	45	51	90		
Graduation Rate		91	74		63	50			
College and Career Acceleration		62	53		82	70			
ELP Progress	45	43	55	80	79	70	44		

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	71
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	498
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	69

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	689
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	32	Yes	2	
ELL	59			
AMI				
ASN	89			
BLK	55			
HSP	68			
MUL	74			
PAC				
WHT	76			
FRL	58			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	39	Yes	1	
ELL	62			
AMI				
ASN	80			
BLK	50			
HSP	70			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
MUL	61			
PAC				
WHT	69			
FRL	60			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	67			75			65	87	85			45
SWD	25			39			21	58	20		6	
ELL	54			75			44	80			6	45
AMI												
ASN	82			91			93				3	
BLK	52			57							2	
HSP	62			73			51	90	86		7	31
MUL	64			72			64	87	83		6	
PAC												
WHT	68			76			68	87	84		6	
FRL	50			60			46	78	70		7	41

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	71	63	44	76	66	48	59	92	90			80
SWD	24	41	34	31	45	40	15	56				64
ELL	54	67	56	63	59	56	45	82				80
AMI												
ASN	84	67		84	75		77		90			

| 2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
BLK	62	48		62	46	30						
HSP	65	60	45	72	70	73	49	82	89			92
MUL	73	58	27	77	61	27	56	93	73			
PAC												
WHT	71	64	46	77	66	46	60	94	92			75
FRL	58	54	35	62	62	46	39	81	80			80

| 2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	74	68	48	78	71	64	73	92	90			44
SWD	29	47	46	41	56	51	45	83	45			
ELL	54	73	57	64	70	65	70					44
AMI												
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					
PAC												
WHT	75	68	45	80	74	71	75	93	90			
FRL	61	61	51	63	62	55	63	88	88			

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)
The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

| ELA | | | | | | |
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	69%	67%	2%	54%	15%
07	2023 - Spring	68%	55%	13%	47%	21%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	66%	55%	11%	47%	19%
04	2023 - Spring	63%	67%	-4%	58%	5%
06	2023 - Spring	65%	54%	11%	47%	18%
03	2023 - Spring	74%	61%	13%	50%	24%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	80%	61%	19%	54%	26%
07	2023 - Spring	85%	67%	18%	48%	37%
03	2023 - Spring	78%	70%	8%	59%	19%
04	2023 - Spring	69%	70%	-1%	61%	8%
08	2023 - Spring	63%	54%	9%	55%	8%
05	2023 - Spring	63%	66%	-3%	55%	8%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	67%	55%	12%	44%	23%
05	2023 - Spring	61%	67%	-6%	51%	10%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	96%	65%	31%	50%	46%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	100%	59%	41%	48%	52%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	87%	79%	8%	66%	21%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection
Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

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

In ELA from SY2022-SY2023, Grades 4 and 6 were at 64% proficiency. In Grade 4, there was a decline of 8%age points as compared to 2021-22 FSA ELA. In Grade 6, there was a decline of 11%age points as compared to 2021-22 FSA ELA.

In MATH from SY2022-SY2023, Grade 5 performed at 63% proficiency. In Grade 5, there was an increase of 2%age points as compared to 2021-22 FSA Math.

In Science from SY2022-SY2023, Grade 5 performed at 61% proficiency, an increase of 7%age points as compared to 2021-22 scores.

In Civics from SY2022-SY2023, Grade 8 performed at 87% proficiency, a decrease of 4%age points as compared to 2021-22 scores.

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

In ELA from SY2022-SY2023, Grade 6 showed a decline of 11%age points as compared to 2021-22 FSA ELA.

In MATH from SY2022-SY2023, Grade 4 showed a decrease of 8%age points as compared to 2021-22 FSA Math.

For Science, there was no decline for grades 5 and 8. There was only an increase in student proficiency.

In Civics from SY2022-SY2023, Grade 8 showed a decrease of 4%age points as compared to 2021-22 scores.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

LNS performed higher than the state in all content areas by a minimum of 11%age points or more.

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

In Math, Grade 8 showed the most improvement by increasing proficiency by 23%age points as compared to FSA Math 21-22. This increase was made possible based on highly qualified staffing. The master schedule supported inclusionary practices for Students With Disabilities throughout more course offerings.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

In the 2022-23 SY, there was a total of 257 students Kindergarten through Grade 8 that showed absent 10% or more days which had a negative impact on the overall ELA performance which resulted in 100 Level 1's in Grades 3-8.

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

1. Increasing overall proficiency for ESSA Students with Disabilities
2. Decrease our Level 1's in ELA and Math
3. Improve attendance for students who show absences 10% or more days.

Area of Focus
(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority 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 crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

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 2024, 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
- Coaching through Literacy Coach and Data Chats

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Raymond Wilson (raymond.wilson@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Implement Reading interventions/training throughout grade levels such as Orton-Gillingham
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.
Coaching through Administration, District Level Support and Literacy Coach
Addition of Intervention Teacher for Grades K-8
Increased training for phonics based instruction utilizing UFLI (University of Florida Literacy Institute)

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

- Build teacher capacity to support the needs of students
- Regularly progress monitor SWD in their FAST/STAR/iReady diagnostic
assessments to inform instruction
- Science Based Reading Interventions (OG/UFLI) to increase overall reading fluency for all grade levels
- Quarterly Collaborative Planning for instruction and interventions will take place.
- Additional Services for before/after school tutoring for students in need.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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 Literacy Coach to support instruction for teachers
- Classroom Walkthrough and feedback
- Addition of Quarterly Planning Days funded through JumpStart for Grades PK-8 to support planning, Standards Based Instruction, resource alignment, and review of quarterly progress monitoring to create targeted interventions
- Addition of Intervention Teacher to support lowest quartile students

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

By When: May of 2024

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

According to Early Warning Signs, LNS has a total of 89 Out of School Suspensions for Grades K-8. Many of these students include our SWD population.

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

The goal for the 2023-24 SY, is to decrease the number of Out of School Suspensions to less than 50.

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

The school-wide data will be reviewed monthly with administration, support staff, and grade level alike to determine student needs in relation to tiered interventions.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Elisabeth Sahhar (elisabeth.sahhar@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

-MindSet
-Positive Behavior Support
-Student Awards of Achievement
-Mentoring
-Student Clubs
-Community Relationships (i.e. ABA Therapy Companies, Laurel Civic Center)
-School Counselor, Resiliency Lessons
- Addition of a part-time Middle School Counselor
- Addition of a Behavior Specialist

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

MindSet is replacing CPI as positive de-escalation (verbal/physical) to minimize student behaviors. Positive Behavior Support is the lifeline of a safe and orderly school by rewarding staff and students for following all environmental expectations. Research shows building relationships amongst students, staff and the community have a positive outcome in overall student achievement and engagement.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

1. Training of all mandatory staff for De-escalation Techniques through MindSet training
2. Training for Paraprofessionals and Staff utilizing PBIS

3. Training for Paraprofessionals in Behavior Modification

4. Staff Mentoring for Students in Need (meet with students a minimum of 15-minutes a week).

5. Parent/Teacher/Student Conferences

6. Resiliency Lessons (K-8)

Person Responsible: Elisabeth Sahhar (elisabeth.sahhar@sarasotacountyschools.net)

By When: May 2024

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Science in Grade 5 and 8 showed an increase in proficiency. In Grade 5, there was an increase of 7 percentage points from 54% proficiency to 61% proficiency as compared to NGSSS 21-22 to NGSSS 22-23. In Grade 8, there was an increase of 5 percentage points from 62% proficiency to 67% proficiency as compared to NGSSS 21-22 to NGSSS 22-23.

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

By the end of the 2024 school year, there will be a minimum of 70% proficiency for grade 5, 73% for grade 8 on State Science Assessment (NGSSS).

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 Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Use of ongoing spiral review and quick checks to build upon student learning; specifically with scientific vocabulary and Nature of Science content strands. Incorporate us of Gizmos and Virtual Labs, Utilize Virtual
Reality Sets for instructional support and TechActive resources. Tutoring provided during lunches, before and after school. Quarterly Collaborative Planning for instruction and interventions will take place. Additional services for before and after school tutoring for students in need.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific 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.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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 Fluency Building through supplemental resources
- Secured additional funding for before/after school tutoring
- Invite District Program Specialists to Quarterly Planning dates with use of jumpstart funding 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
- Monthly data chats to review ESSA (highlights of SWD)

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

By When: End of March 2024.

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

ELA in Grade 4 and 6 showed the largest decrease in proficiency. In Grade 4, there was a decrease of 8 percentage points from 72% proficiency to 64% proficiency as compared to FSA 21-22 to PM3 22-23. In Grade 6, there was a decrease of 11 percentage points from 75% proficiency to 64% proficiency as compared to FSA 21-22 to PM3 22-23.

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

ELA in Grades 4 and 6 will show an increase of 4 percentage points from 64% proficiency to 68% proficiency.

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 Planning Meetings with Grade levels and Content Area
- Analysis of FAST/STAR/i-Ready progress monitoring assessments
- Classroom walkthrough and feedback
- Monthly Data Chats w/Teachers
-School-wide Support Team Meetings
-Literacy Coach to support instruction and monitor data

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Miranda Music (miranda.music@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

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 funded by Jumpstart to support students in need based on data and observation. Quarterly Collaborative Planning for instruction and interventions will take place.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

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

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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 for Integration of Knowledge and Ideas
- Invite District Program Specialists to Quarterly Planning dates with use of jumpstart funding to support teams of teacher with Standards Based Instruction and resource alignment.
-Monthly Data Chats (ESSA highlights SWD)

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

By When: End of March 2024.

#5. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Math in grade 4 showed the largest decrease in percent proficient. In Grade 4, there was a decrease of 8 percentage points from 76% proficiency to 68% proficiency as compared to FSA 21-22 to PM3 22-23.

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

By the year 2024, there will be an increase of at least 4 percentage points from 68% to 72% proficiency for all
students in Grade 4 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/DreamBox progress monitoring assessments
- Classroom walkthrough and feedback
- Monthly Data Chats w/Teachers
- Quarterly planning days
- SWST meetings

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Raymond Wilson (raymond.wilson@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

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 Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

A significant number of students struggle with various MATH standards such as geometric functions and algebraic reasoning.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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 jumpstart funding for additional tutoring/academic support
- Invite District Program Specialists to Quarterly Planning dates with use of jumpstart funding to support teams of teacher with Standards Based Instruction and resource alignment.
-Monthly Data Chats (ESSA highlights SWD)

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

By When: End of March 2024.

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review
Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

We look at current student performance data to build resources around student need(s). We then meet with School-wide Leadership Team, Team Leaders, School Advisory Council, Parent Teacher Organization, and District personnel to create a individualized budget plan to address student deficits. For example, we have funding set aside for Afterschool Academic Program to provide supports for struggling students. There have been additional positions added in our school budget to provide direct intervention support in the academics and behavior to close the achievement gap and decrease the percentage of Out of School Suspensions. With these additional staff members, we are increasing the percent of time Students with Disabilities are included in the General Education environment.

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

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

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities				$65,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
	Quarterly Planning Days		1211 - Laurel Nokomis School	Other Federal		$65,000.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System				$5,700.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
	MTSS		1211 - Laurel Nokomis School	Other Federal		$5,700.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science				$14,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
	After School		1211 - Laurel Nokomis School	Other Federal		$14,000.00

	Academic Support					
4	**III.B.**	**Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA**				**$14,000.00**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
	After School Academic Support		1211 - Laurel Nokomis School	Other		$14,000.00
			Notes: JumpStart funding			
5	**III.B.**	**Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math**				**$14,000.00**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
	After School Academic Support		1211 - Laurel Nokomis School	Other Federal		$14,000.00
			Notes: JumpStart funding			
					Total:	**$112,700.00**

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

Yes