

FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN



Gerard Robinson, Commissioner
Florida Department of Education
325 West Gaines Street
Tallahassee, Florida 32399

Dr. Mike Grego, Chancellor
K-12 Public Schools
Florida Department of Education
325 West Gaines Street
Tallahassee, Florida 32399

School Name: EDISON PARK CREATIVE AND EXPRESSIVE ARTS SCHOOL

District Name: Lee

Principal: Dr. Carl Brunick

SAC Chair: Rebecca Jones

Superintendent: Joseph Burke, Ed. D.

Date of School Board Approval: Pending

Last Modified on: 9/22/2012

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

Note: The following links will open in a separate browser window.

School Grades Trend Data
Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT)/Statewide Assessment Trend Data
High School Feedback Report
K-12 Comprehensive Research Based Reading Plan

ADMINISTRATORS

List your school's administrators and briefly describe their certification(s), number of years at the current school, number of years as an administrator, and their prior performance record with increasing student achievement at each school. Include history of school grades, FCAT/Statewide assessment performance (percentage data for achievement levels, learning gains, Lowest 25%), and Ambitious but achievable annual measurable objective (AMO) progress.

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO Progress along with the associated school year)
Principal	Dr. Carl Brunick	Bachelor's Degree in Elementary Education Master's Degree in Elementary Education/Psychology Doctorate Degree in Educational Leadership	2	34	* Gateway Magnet School-No grade at that time * Tanglewood Elementary "A" school. Prior year to becoming a principal " D" school. * Fort Myers Beach Elementary "A" school all four years. Made AYP all four years. All third grade students met reading standards 3 of 4 years. Only one student did not meet state standard (FCAT) one year. Prior year school was a "B" *Edison Park was listed "B" 2009-2010; 2010-2011 years. I became principal in 2011-2012, school grade was listed as an "A".

INSTRUCTIONAL COACHES

List your school's instructional coaches and briefly describe their certification(s), number of years at the current school, number of years as an instructional coach, and their prior performance record with increasing student achievement at each school. Include history of school grades, FCAT/Statewide assessment performance (Percentage data for achievement levels, learning gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress. Instructional coaches described in this section are only those who are fully released or part-time teachers

in reading, mathematics, or science and work only at the school site.

Name	Degree(s)/ Certification (s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Instructional Coach	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)
No data submitted				

EFFECTIVE AND HIGHLY EFFECTIVE TEACHERS

Describe the school-based strategies that will be used to recruit and retain high quality, effective teachers to the school.

	Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date	Not Applicable (If not, please explain why)
1	Regular meetings of teachers with Principal to ensure all needs are met.	Principal	Ongoing	
2	Professional Development aligned with School Goals	Principal & Beth Sitterson	Ongoing	
3	The ongoing refining of a positive, collaborative and supportive climate.	All Staff	Ongoing	

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

Provide the number of instructional staff and paraprofessionals that are teaching out-of-field and/or who received less than an effective rating (instructional staff only).

*When using percentages, include the number of teachers the percentage represents (e.g., 70% [35]).

Number of staff and paraprofessional that are teaching out-of-field/ and who are not highly effective.	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective
No data submitted	

Staff Demographics

Please complete the following demographic information about the instructional staff in the school.

*When using percentages, include the number of teachers the percentage represents (e.g., 70% (35)).

Total Number of Instructional Staff	% of First-Year Teachers	% of Teachers with 1-5 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 6-14 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 15+ Years of Experience	% of Teachers with Advanced Degrees	% Highly Effective Teachers	% Reading Endorsed Teachers	% National Board Certified Teachers	% ESOL Endorsed Teachers
34	2.9%(1)	26.5%(9)	32.4%(11)	38.2%(13)	32.4%(11)	94.1%(32)	8.8%(3)	5.9%(2)	58.8%(20)

Teacher Mentoring Program/Plan

Please describe the school's teacher mentoring program/plan by including the names of mentors, the name(s) of mentees, rationale for the pairing, and the planned mentoring activities.

Mentor Name	Mentee Assigned	Rationale for Pairing	Planned Mentoring Activities

ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS

Coordination and Integration

Note: For Title I schools only

Please describe how federal, state, and local services and programs will be coordinated and integrated in the school. Include other Title programs, Migrant and Homeless, Supplemental Academic Instruction funds, as well as violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start, adult education, career and technical education, and/or job training, as applicable.

Title I, Part A

Title I, Part C- Migrant

Title I, Part D

Title II

Title III

Title X- Homeless

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

Violence Prevention Programs

Nutrition Programs

Housing Programs

Head Start

Adult Education

Career and Technical Education

Job Training

Other

Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS)/Response to Instruction/Intervention (RtI)

School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

The MTSS Leadership Team for Edison Park Elementary consists of the following members: Carl Brunick (Principal), Beth Sitterson (Reading Specialist), Linda Bruner (Guidance Counselor), school psychologist, various classroom teachers; anyone else necessary to meet the needs of the student (speech pathologist, ESOL contact, school nurse, behavior specialist, social worker).

Describe how the school-based MTSS Leadership Team functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions). How does it work with other school teams to organize/coordinate MTSS efforts?

The MTSS Leadership team at Edison Park Elementary meets on an as needed basis to analyze school and/or student progress data in order to monitor the progress of students receiving interventions and to identify students in need of more support. The team uses the five-step problem solving process as outlined in the district's Response to Multi-Tiered system of Support Manual. The roles of each member are as follows:

Classroom Teachers

- Keep ongoing progress monitoring notes in a MTSS folder (FAIR, curriculum assessments, SAT 10 or FCAT scores, work samples, anecdotal) to be filed in cumulative folder at the end of each school year or if transferring/withdrawing
- Attend MTSS Team meetings to collaborate on & monitor students who are struggling
- Implement interventions designed by RTI Team for students in Tier 2 & 3
- Deliver instructional interventions with fidelity

Reading or Math Coach/Specialist

- Attend MTSS Team meetings
- Train teachers in interventions, progress monitoring, differentiated instruction
- Implement Tier 2 & 3 interventions
- Keep progress monitoring notes & anecdotal of interventions implemented
- Administer screenings
- Collect school-wide data for team to use in determining at-risk students

Principal/Principal Designee

- Facilitate implementation of MTSS in your building
- Provide or coordinate valuable and continuous professional development
- Assign paraprofessionals to support MTSS implementation when possible
- Attend MTSS Team meetings to be active in the RTI change process
- Conduct classroom Walk-Throughs to monitor fidelity

Guidance Counselor/Curriculum Specialist

- Often MTSS Team facilitators
- Schedule and attend MTSS Team meetings
- Maintain log of all students involved in the RTI process
- Send parent invites
- Complete necessary MTSS forms
- Conduct social-developmental history interviews when requested

School Psychologist

- Attend MTSS Team meetings on some students in Tier 2 & on all students in Tier 3
- Monitor data collection process for fidelity
- Review and interpret progress monitoring data
- Collaborate with MTSS Team on effective instruction & specific interventions
- Incorporate MTSS data when guiding a possible ESE referral and when making eligibility decisions

ESE Teacher/Staffing Specialist

- Consult with MTSS Team regarding Tier 3 interventions
- Incorporate MTSS data when making eligibility decisions
- Specialist (Behavior, IA, OT, PT)
- Consult with MTSS Team
- Provide staff trainings

Social Worker

- Attend MTSS Team meetings when requested
- Conduct social-developmental history interviews and share with MTSS team
- ESOL/ELL Representative
- Attend all MTSS Team meetings for identified ELL students, advising and completing LEP paperwork
- Conduct language screenings and assessments
- Provide ELL interventions at all Tiers

Describe the role of the school-based MTSS Leadership Team in the development and implementation of the school improvement plan. Describe how the RtI Problem-solving process is used in developing and implementing the SIP?

The MTSS Leadership Team assists with the analysis of school, classroom, and student level data in order to identify areas for school improvement. Additionally, the team assists with the evaluation of the student response to current interventions, curricula, and school systems.

MTSS Implementation

Describe the data source(s) and the data management system(s) used to summarize data at each tier for reading, mathematics, science, writing, and behavior.

Edison Park Elementary utilizes the district adopted data management system, Pinnacle Analytics. This allows the school comprehensive access to all school and district databases, thereby assisting with the detailed analysis of district, school, classroom, and student level data. These analysis assist with the tracking of student progress, management of diagnostic, summative, and formative assessment data, and the response of students to implemented interventions.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

The Lee County School District has developed a comprehensive training and support plan for schools. District teams have been established to support schools in the implementation of the RtI process for all students. The teams provide training, coaching, modeling, data analysis, and guidance to assist schools with the implementation of supplemental and intensive strategies designed to improve the educational outcomes for students with academic and behavioral needs. The teams are comprised of teachers with knowledge in effective instructional practices, data analysis, behavior management techniques, and ESOL strategies. All team members are provided on-going staff development training regarding the MTSS process and research based practices to support the academic and behavioral needs of students.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

Identify the school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT).

The Literacy Leadership Team consists of Linda O'Connell, Linda Bruner, Beth Sitterson, and Carl Brunick.

Describe how the school-based LLT functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions).

The Literacy Team meetings are held once a month to review progress and implement changes as needed. The Principal serves as the instructional leader and primary resource contact person. The Curriculum Specialist is the professional development support information source. The remaining members are representatives from each grade level.

What will be the major initiatives of the LLT this year?

- *Monitor progress of lowest 25% to obtain AYP
- *Provide support for the reading process across the content, academic and specials
- *Provide training and report data to grade level team

Public School Choice

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification
No Attachment

*Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition

Describe plans for assisting preschool children in transition from early childhood programs to local elementary school programs as applicable.

*Grades 6-12 Only

For schools with Grades 6-12, describe the plan to ensure that teaching reading strategies is the responsibility of every teacher.

*High Schools Only

Note: Required for High School - Sec. 1003.413(g)(j) F.S.

How does the school incorporate applied and integrated courses to help students see the relationships between subjects and relevance to their future?

How does the school incorporate students' academic and career planning, as well as promote student course selections, so that students' course of study is personally meaningful?

Postsecondary Transition

Note: Required for High School - Sec. 1008.37(4), F.S.

Describe strategies for improving student readiness for the public postsecondary level based on annual analysis of the [High School Feedback Report](#)

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents (e.g., 70% (35)).

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:

1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading. Reading Goal #1a:	In 2011-2012, 39% of students in the Black subgroup scored a level 3-5 on the FCAT Reading Test as reported by the AYP report. In 2011-2012, the percentage of students in the Black subgroup scoring levels 3-5 on the FCAT Reading Test will increase from 39% to 46% to meet AYP through Safe Harbor Criteria as reported by the AYP report.
---	---

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
------------------------------------	-------------------------------------

In 2010-2011, 39% (19 students) of students in the Black subgroup scored a level 3-5 on the FCAT Reading Test as reported by the AYP report.	In 2010-2011, the percentage of students in the Black subgroup scoring levels 3-5 on the FCAT Reading Test will increase from 39% to 46% (19 students of 42) to meet AYP through Safe Harbor Criteria as reported by the AYP report.
--	--

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1					

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading. Reading Goal #1b:	
---	--

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
------------------------------------	-------------------------------------

--	--

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading. Reading Goal #2a:	
---	--

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment:
Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in reading.
Reading Goal #2b:

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.
Reading Goal #3a:

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:

3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading. Reading Goal #3b:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #4:	In 2011-12, 68% of students in the lowest 25% (29 of 43 students) made learning gains on FCAT Reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In 2012, 65% (15 students) of students in the lowest 25% made learning gains on FCAT Reading.	In 2012-13, we will improve to 69% as measured by the FCAT 2.0 Reading Report.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), AMO-2, Reading and Math Performance Target

5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Reading Goal #					
	5A :					
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5B:	In 2010-2011, 39% of students in the Black subgroup scored a level 3-5 on the FCAT Reading Test as reported by the AYP report. In 2011-2012, the percentage of students in the Black subgroup scoring levels 3-5 on the FCAT Reading Test will increase from 39% to 46% to meet AYP through Safe Harbor Criteria as reported by the AYP report.
---	---

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
------------------------------------	-------------------------------------

In 2010-2011, 39% (19 students) of students in the Black subgroup scored a level 3-5 on the FCAT Reading Test as reported by the AYP report.	In 2010-2011, the percentage of students in the Black subgroup scoring levels 3-5 on the FCAT Reading Test will increase from 39% to 46% (19 students of 42) to meet AYP through Safe Harbor Criteria as reported by the AYP report.
--	--

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Inconsistent 2011-2012 FAIR administration and data	1)EPCEA will implement the FAIR assessment to monitor student progress 2)EPCEA will implement Treasures and SRA reading programs with fidelity 3) Literacy center training for classroom teachers (focus on differentiated instruction.	Administrators, Reading Coach, classroom teachers	1)Review FAIR data reports to ensure teachers are assessing students 2)Quarterly meeting with principal and reading coach to monitor student progress. 3)Lesson plans will be submitted weekly to principal and teaching will be assessed for alignment to the academic plan during	1)FAIR assessments 2)Lessons plans 3)CWT 4)GL meetings

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5C:	
---	--

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
------------------------------------	-------------------------------------

--	--

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading.	In 2010-2011, 29% of students in the Students with Disabilities subgroup scored a level 3-5 on the FCAT Reading Test as reported by the AYP report. In 2011-2012, the percentage of students in the Student with Disabilities
---	---

Reading Goal #5D:	subgroup scoring levels 3-5 on the FCAT Reading Test will increase from 29% to 37% to meet AYP through Safe Harbor Criteria as reported by the AYP report.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In 2010-2011, 29% (15 students) of students in the Students with Disabilities subgroup scored a level 3-5 on the FCAT Reading Test as reported by the AYP report.	In 2011-2012, the percentage of students in the Student with Disabilities subgroup scoring levels 3-5 on the FCAT Reading Test will increase from 29% to 37% (13 students of 36) to meet AYP through Safe Harbor Criteria as reported by the AYP report.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Inconsistent 2010-2011 FAIR administration and data	1)EPCEA will implement the FAIR assessment to monitor student progress 2)EPCEA will implement Treasures and SRA reading programs with fidelity 3) Literacy center training for classroom teachers (focus on differentiated instruction.	Administrators, Reading Coach, classroom teachers	1)Review FAIR data reports to ensure teachers are assessing students 2)Quarterly meeting with principal and reading coach to monitor student progress. 3)Lesson plans will be submitted weekly to principal and teaching will be assessed for alignment to the academic plan during	1)FAIR assessments 2)Lessons plans 3)CWT 4)GL meetings

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5E:	In 2010-2011, 53% of students in the Economically Disadvantaged subgroup scored a level 3-5 on the FCAT Reading Test as reported by the AYP report. In 2011-2012, the percentage of students in the Economically Disadvantaged subgroup scoring levels 3-5 on the FCAT Reading Test will increase from 53% to 58% to meet AYP through Safe Harbor Criteria as reported by the AYP report.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In 2009-2010, 53% (46 students) of students in the Economically Disadvantaged subgroup scored a level 3-5 on the FCAT Reading Test as reported by the AYP report.	In 2011-2012, the percentage of students in the Economically Disadvantaged subgroup scoring levels 3-5 on the FCAT Reading Test will increase from 53% to 58% (38 students of 66) to meet AYP through Safe Harbor Criteria as reported by the AYP report.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Inconsistent 2011-2012 FAIR administration and data	1)EPCEA will implement the FAIR assessment to monitor student progress 2)EPCEA will implement Treasures and SRA reading programs with fidelity 3) Literacy center training for classroom teachers (focus on differentiated instruction.	Administrators, Reading Coach, classroom teachers	1)Review FAIR data reports to ensure teachers are assessing students 2)Quarterly meeting with principal and reading coach to monitor student progress. 3)Lesson plans will be submitted weekly to principal and teaching will be assessed for alignment to the academic plan during	1)FAIR assessments 2)Lessons plans 3)CWT 4)GL meetings

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity

Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
No Data Submitted						

Reading Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$0.00

End of Reading Goals

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents next to the percentage (e.g., 70% (35)).

Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	
1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking.	
CELLA Goal #1:	
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:	

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

Students read in English at grade level text in a manner similar to non-ELL students.

2. Students scoring proficient in reading.

CELLA Goal #2:

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.

3. Students scoring proficient in writing.

CELLA Goal #3:

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

CELLA Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$0.00

End of CELLA Goals

Elementary School Mathematics Goals

* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents (e.g., 70% (35)).

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:

1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #1a:	In 2010-2011, 79% of students in the total subgroup scored a level 3-5 on the FCAT Math Test as reported by the AYP report. In 2011-2012, the percentage of students in the total subgroup scoring levels 3-5 on the FCAT Math Test will increase from 79% to 82% to meet AYP through Safe Harbor Criteria as reported by the AYP report.
---	---

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
------------------------------------	-------------------------------------

In 2010-2011, 79% (161 of 204 students) of students in the total subgroup scored a level 3-5 on the FCAT Math Test as reported by the AYP report.	In 2011-2012, the percentage of students in the total subgroup scoring levels 3-5 on the FCAT Math Test will increase from 79% to 82% (161 of 42 students) to meet AYP through Safe Harbor Criteria as reported by the AYP report.
---	--

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1					
2					

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #1b:	
---	--

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
------------------------------------	-------------------------------------

--	--

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
---------------------	----------	---	---	-----------------

No Data Submitted

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2a:	
---	--

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
------------------------------------	-------------------------------------

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2b:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3a:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:

3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3b:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #4:	In 2011-12, 38% of students in the lowest 25% (16 of 43 students)made learning gains on FCAT Math.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In 2012, 38% (9 students) of students in the lowest 25% made learning gains on FCAT Math.	In 2012-13, we will improve to 44% as measured by the FCAT 2.0 report.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Inconsistency in the 2012-2013 data and Differentiating instruction	1) Differentiated instruction (small group, intervention block, centers) 2)Cooperative learning (Kagan) 3) Students Engagement Tools (kagan, Mimeo, Manipulatives 4)District Envision Math specialist and curriculum specialist will assist in answering ongoing questions for teachers 5) Differentiate instruction using a variety of approved programs; AM, Compass, Math Fact and a Flash, Envision Intervention, STAR	Administration/ Teacher	1)Review Distrcit Assessment data reports to ensure teachers are assessing students 2)Quarterly meeting with principal monitor student progress. 3)Lesson plans will be submitted weekly to principal and teaching will be assessed for alignment to the academic plan during	1)District Assessments 2) FCAT Scores 3) District Assessment
2					

Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), AMO-2, Reading and Math Performance Target

5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.		Elementary School Mathematics Goal #				
5A :						
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5B:	In 2010-2011, 47% of students in the Black subgroup scored a level 3-5 on the FCAT Math Test as reported by the AYP report. In 2011-2012, the percentage of students in the Black subgroup scoring levels 3-5 on the FCAT Math Test will increase from 47% to 53% to meet AYP through Safe Harbor Criteria as reported by the AYP report.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In 2010-2011, 47% (24 of 51 students) of students in the Black subgroup scored a level 3-5 on the FCAT Math Test as reported by the AYP report.	In 2011-2012, the percentage of students in the Black subgroup scoring levels 3-5 on the FCAT Math Test will increase from 47% to 53% (23 of 42 students) to meet AYP through Safe Harbor Criteria as reported by the AYP report.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Inconsistency in the 2011-2012 data and Differentiating instruction	1) All teachers will take follow-up training in math series through Staff Development 2) District Envision Math specialist and curriculum specialist will assist in answering ongoing questions for teachers 3) Differentiate instruction using a variety of approved programs; AM, Study Island, Math Fact and a Flash, Envision Intervention, STAR	Administration/Teacher	1)Review District Assessment data reports to ensure teachers are assessing students 2)Quarterly meeting with principal monitor student progress. 3)Lesson plans will be submitted weekly to principal and teaching will be assessed for alignment to the academic plan during	1) FCAT Scores 2) District Assessment

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5C:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5D:	In 2010-2011, 38% of students in the Students with Disabilities subgroup scored a level 3-5 on the FCAT Math Test as reported by the AYP report. In 2011-2012, the percentage of students in the Students with Disabilities subgroup scoring levels 3-5 on the FCAT Math Test will increase from 38% to 45% to meet AYP through Safe Harbor Criteria as reported by the AYP report.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In 2010-2011, 38% (20 students) of students in the Students with Disabilities subgroup scored a level 3-5 on the FCAT Math Test as reported by the AYP report.	In 2011-2012, the percentage of students in the Students with Disabilities subgroup scoring levels 3-5 on the FCAT Math Test will increase from 38% to 45% (17 students of 36 to meet AYP through Safe Harbor Criteria as reported by the AYP report.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Inconsistency in the 2011-2012 data and Differentiating instruction	1) All teachers will take follow-up training in math series through Staff Development 2) District Envision Math specialist and curriculum specialist will assist in answering ongoing questions for teachers 3) Differentiate instruction using a variety of approved programs; AM, Study Island, Math Fact and a Flash, Envision Intervention, STAR	Administration/Teacher	1)Review District Assessment data reports to ensure teachers are assessing students 2)Quarterly meeting with principal monitor student progress. 3)Lesson plans will be submitted weekly to principal and teaching will be assessed for alignment to the academic plan during	1)FCAT scores 2)District Assessments

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5E:	In 2010-2011, 57% of students in the Economically Disadvantaged subgroup scored a level 3-5 on the FCAT Math Test as reported by the AYP report. In 2011-2012, the percentage of students in the Economically Disadvantaged subgroup scoring levels 3-5 on the FCAT Math Test will increase from 57% to 62% to meet AYP through Safe Harbor Criteria as reported by the AYP report.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In 2010-2011, 57% (50 students) of students in the Economically Disadvantaged subgroup scored a level 3-5 on the FCAT Math Test as reported by the AYP report.	In 2011-2012, the percentage of students in the Economically Disadvantaged subgroup scoring levels 3-5 on the FCAT Math Test will increase from 57% to 62% (41 students of 66 students) to meet AYP through Safe Harbor Criteria as reported by the AYP report.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

			Person or	Process Used to	
--	--	--	-----------	-----------------	--

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Position Responsible for Monitoring	Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Inconsistency in the 2011-2012 data and Differentiating instruction	1) All teachers will be continue training in new math series through Staff Development 2) District Envision Math specialist and curriculum specialist will assist in answering ongoing questions for teachers	Administration/Teacher	1)Review District Assessment data reports to ensure teachers are assessing students 2)Quarterly meeting with principal monitor student progress. 3)Lesson plans will be submitted weekly to principal and teaching will be assessed for alignment to the academic plan during	1)FCAT scores 2)District Assessments

End of Elementary School Mathematics Goals

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity

Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC,subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , early release) and Schedules (e.g. , frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
No Data Submitted						

Mathematics Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$0.00

End of Mathematics Goals

* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents (e.g., 70% (35)).

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:

1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science. Science Goal # 1a:	Edison Park Elementary School: 2011-12 59% of students scored at or above level 3 on FCAT 2.0 science.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In 2012-2013, we will improve to 63% as measured by the FCAT 2.0 Science Test.	In 2012-2013, we will improve to 63% as measured by the FCAT 2.0 Science Test.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Scheduling	1) Science lab is scheduled for all students. 2) Kagan Identify "big idea" key concepts, knowledge and skills that describe what students will understand. 3) Engage students in science inquiry to develop understanding of science concepts and the nature of science. 4) small group hands-on activities 5) science word wall	Administrator, teachers	observation, lesson plans	1)FCAT scores 2)District Assessments

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science. Science Goal # 1b:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in science.				
Science Goal #2a:				
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in science.				
Science Goal #2b:				
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity

Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC,subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
No Data Submitted						

Science Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$0.00

End of Science Goals

Writing Goals

* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents (e.g., 70% (35)).

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:					
1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing. Writing Goal # 1a:		In 2011-2012, 95% of students scored Level 3.5 or higher on FCAT Writing. In 2012-2013, the percentage of students meeting high standards on the FCAT Writing Test will be 96%.			
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
In 2012, _____% of students met High Standards in Writing(meeting standards is 4.0 and above) as reported by the School Accountability Report.		In 2012-2013, the percentage of students meeting high standards on the FCAT Writing Test(meeting standards is 4.0 and above) will be 96% or greater.			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Writing is not considered to be problematic at this time. Student proficiency has exceeded 90% in the past 2 years. However, new changes in State writing requirements will be a barrier.	1)EPCEA has implemented strong developmental writing curriculum. The 6 Traits of Writing and Kathy Robinson are highly structured and scaffolded writing programs (Writer's in Control). 2)Teachers have	Administrators, Reading Coach, Classroom teachers	1)Review common assessment reports to ensure teachers are assessing students 2)Lesson plans will be submitted weekly 3)Administration will observe during CWT	1)Common Assessments 2)CWT 3)GL Meetings

	participated in a school based in-service to align common rubrics throughout each grade level		
--	---	--	--

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing. Writing Goal #1b:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity

Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
No Data Submitted						

Writing Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$0.00

End of Writing Goals

Attendance Goal(s)

* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents (e.g., 70% (35)).

Based on the analysis of attendance data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:

1. Attendance				
Attendance Goal #1:				
2012 Current Attendance Rate:		2013 Expected Attendance Rate:		
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)		2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)		
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)		2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity

Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC,subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
No Data Submitted						

Attendance Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$0.00

End of Attendance Goal(s)

Suspension Goal(s)

* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents (e.g., 70% (35)).

Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Suspension Suspension Goal #1:	
2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions

2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School		2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity

Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC,subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , early release) and Schedules (e.g. , frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
No Data Submitted						

Suspension Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents (e.g., 70% (35)).

Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:

1. Parent Involvement					
Parent Involvement Goal #1: <i>*Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.</i>		In 2011-2012, Edison Park's parent volunteers logged 4,257 hours of volunteer time at the school.			
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:		2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:			
In 2011-2012, Edison Park's parent volunteers logged 4,257 hours of volunteer time at the school		In the 2012-2013, parent volunteer hours will increase to 5,257 as measured by the volunteer sign-in sheet.			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Getting parents involved	Offer extended hours for conferences, increasing PTA membership, Reaching out to parents via Social Media (facebook)	Administration, Secretary	Parent Participation	Sign in log

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity

Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC,subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
No Data Submitted						

Parent Involvement Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00

Subtotal: \$0.00			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
Subtotal: \$0.00			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
Subtotal: \$0.00			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
Subtotal: \$0.00			
Grand Total: \$0.00			

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) Goal(s)

* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents (e.g., 70% (35)).

Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:				
1. STEM				
STEM Goal # 1:				
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity

Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
No Data Submitted						

STEM Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$0.00

End of STEM Goal(s)

Additional Goal(s)

Bully Prevention Goal:

In 2012-2013 100% of fourth and fifth graders will participate in "Anti-Bullying" classes, and all students in K-3 will receive instruction on peer conflict strategies through Peacemaking Skills curriculum at guidance classes to help prevent bullying incident reports

Goal:

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:					
1. Bully Prevention Goal: In 2012-2013 100% of fourth and fifth graders will participate in "Anti-Bullying" classes, and all students in K-3 will receive instruction on peer conflict strategies through Peacemaking Skills curriculum at guidance classes to help prevent bullying incident reports Goal		Bully Prevention Goal: In 2012-2013 100% of fourth and fifth graders will participate in "Anti-Bullying" classes, and all students in K-3 will receive instruction on peer conflict strategies through Peacemaking Skills curriculum at guidance classes to help prevent bullying incident reports Goal #1:			
Bully Prevention Goal: In 2012-2013 100% of fourth and fifth graders will participate in "Anti-Bullying" classes, and all students in K-3 will receive instruction on peer conflict strategies through Peacemaking Skills curriculum at guidance classes to help prevent bullying incident reports Goal #1:					
2012 Current level:		2013 Expected level:			
100% of fourth grade students participate in bully prevention		Bully Prevention Goal: In 2012-2013 100% of fourth and fifth graders will participate in "Anti-Bullying" classes, and all students in K-3 will receive instruction on peer conflict strategies through Peacemaking Skills curriculum at guidance classes to help prevent bullying incident reports Goal #1:			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Scheduling	PBS Program initiated schoolwide, PBS team to deal with any concerns (meets twice a month), Guidance classes scheduled school wide, Love and Logic strategies implemented	Administrator, Guidance Counselor	Observation	Reduced incident reports, Bully Prevention quiz

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity

Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC,subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
No Data Submitted						

Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$0.00

End of Bully Prevention Goal:

In 2012-2013 100% of fourth and fifth graders will participate in "Anti-Bullying" classes, and all students in K-3 will receive instruction on peer conflict strategies through Peacemaking Skills curriculum at guidance classes to help prevent bullying incident reports
Goal(s)

FINAL BUDGET

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$0.00
Other				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$0.00
				Grand Total: \$0.00

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Priority	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Focus	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Prevent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NA	
--	---	---	--	--

Are you a reward school: Yes No

A reward school is any school that improves their letter grade or any school graded A.

No Attachment

School Advisory Council

School Advisory Council (SAC) Membership Compliance

The majority of the SAC members are not employed by the school district. The SAC is composed of the principal and an appropriately balanced number of teachers, education support employees, students (for middle and high school only), parents, and other business and community citizens who are representative of the ethnic, racial, and economic community served by the school. Please verify the statement above by selecting "Yes" or "No" below.

Yes. Agree with the above statement.

Describe projected use of SAC funds	Amount
No data submitted	

Describe the activities of the School Advisory Council for the upcoming year

Meeting dates:
October 25, 2012

January 31, 2013
May 16, 2013

AYP DATA

Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Trend Data 2011-2012
 Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Trend Data 2010-2011
 Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Trend Data 2009-2010

SCHOOL GRADE DATA

No Data Found

Lee School District EDISON PARK CREATIVE AND EXPRESSIVE ARTS SCHOOL 2010-2011						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	89%	93%	95%	76%	353	Writing and Science: Takes into account the % scoring 4.0 and above on Writing and the % scoring 3 and above on Science. Sometimes the District writing and/or science average is substituted for the writing and/or science component.
% of Students Making Learning Gains	71%	55%			126	3 ways to make gains: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	61% (YES)	43% (NO)			104	Adequate Progress based on gains of lowest 25% of students in reading and math. Yes, if 50% or more make gains in both reading and math.
FCAT Points Earned					583	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					B	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Lee School District EDISON PARK CREATIVE AND EXPRESSIVE ARTS SCHOOL 2009-2010						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	92%	92%	92%	83%	359	Writing and Science: Takes into account the % scoring 4.0 and above on Writing and the % scoring 3 and above on Science. Sometimes the District writing and/or science average is substituted for the writing and/or science component.
% of Students Making Learning Gains	65%	67%			132	3 ways to make gains: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	42% (NO)	50% (YES)			92	Adequate Progress based on gains of lowest 25% of students in reading and math. Yes, if 50% or more make gains in both reading and math.
FCAT Points Earned					583	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					B	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested