FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM
2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

School Name: ENGLEWOOD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

District Name: Sarasota

Principal: Mark Grossenbacher

SAC Chair: Lori Emery

Superintendent: Lori White

Date of School Board Approval: 10/2012

Last Modified on: 10/15/2012

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	Mark Grossenbacher	B.A. English; English 6-12 Masters Educational Leadership; Ed. Leadership K-12	2	7	2011-2012 School Grade: A 75% scored level 3 or higher in Reading 61% scored level 3 or higher in Math 95% scored level 3 or higher in Writing 62% scored 3 or higher in Science 74% made learning gains in Reading 70% made learning gains in Math 61% of bottom Quartile made learning gains in Reading 52% of bottom Quartile made learning gains in Math

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 with new teachers Partnering new teachers with highly-qualified veteran staff	Principal	On-going	

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
32	3.1%(1)	3.1%(1)	65.6%(21)	28.1%(9)	90.6%(29)	100.0%(32)	9.4%(3)	3.1%(1)	81.3%(26)

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
Michaelene Brame	Karen Dowd	Experience at multiple grade levels and expertise in core subject areas.	Paried observations, pre/post meetings, lesson plan sharing and development, off campus observation.

ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS

Coordination and Integration

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 school-based RtI Leadership Team is comprised of general education personnel that facilitate PS/RtI as a related but distinct process from the CARE (Children At-Risk in Education) eligibility determination process. At Englewood Elementary the

RtI Leadership Team is composed of:

The Principal: Provides support in instructional resources, strategies and overall data demographics.

Select General Education Teachers: Provides information about classroom instructional strategies, daily monitoring and progress.

Exceptional Student Education (ESE) Liaison: Provides information about current IEP, related strategies and on-going review.

School Guidance Counselor: Provides information about related services, groups and basic strategies.

School Social Worker & Psychologist: Provides information related to social services, strategies and topics related.

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 team meets once a week to engage in the following activities: The team will review summative and formative data to identify school, grade, class and individual academic/behavioral needs. Student information will be reviewed. Based on data review, instructional strategies will be identified and a timeline of implementation will be constructed. Student progress will be graphed and monitored. Individual cases reviewed periodically to determine progress and reassess further instructional interventions.

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 school-based RtI Leadership Team will employ a continuous improvement process to create the SIP as outlined in this document. Input will be gathered from the grade level teams, the SAC and district teams composed of specialists in the areas of instructional/behavioral need. The district-based leadership team in collaboration with the school-based leadership team will oversee the implementation of the SIP Plan.

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.

Englewood Elementary School uses a variety of reports produced by the distict office of Research, Assessment and Evaluation on the academic achievement of students at all Tiers. Disaggregated AYP subgroup data by reading, math, science and writing is utilized. Further, EES participates in FAIR reading assessments as well as district Math Benchmark Assessments, Writing assessments and Science assessments to summarize data for students at Tier 1, 2, and 3.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

The school administrative and Data/Assessment team participated in MTSSS-Multi-Tiered System of Student Support (PSRtI) in the summer of 2011. Also, school-based PSRtI specialist/s have provided training to Englewood Elementary teachers and to date 100% have participated.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

The school does not have an identified LLT. We utilize our RTI/SWST to review and discuss all areas of curriculum development, implementation and assessment.

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

> not applicable

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

> not applicable

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

Sec. 1003.413(b) F.S.

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:	By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase for Level 3 students, when less than 70% are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5). There will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for Level 3 students where 70% or more are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5). If 90% or more students are proficient, the school can maintain or demonstrate an increase in the percent proficient. No overall proficiency target will be less than 35% (across Levels 3,4,5) for any subgroup.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Level 3 - 27%(55) Level 3,4,5 - 75%(151)	Level 3 - 31% Level 3,4,5 - 77%

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	1. Technology/network usage and support	1. EES will implement FAIR/District Benchmark assessments to monitor student progress. Discussions will be held at PLC and SWST meetings to review data	1. Principal	1. Review FAIR data reports and Benchmark assessment progress monitoring spreadsheets to ensure teachers are assessing students according to the established schedule.	1. Printout of FAIR assessments and Benchmark Progress Monitoring Spreadsheets.
2	2. Familiarity with the depth and complexity of the curriculum.	2. Evidence of objective-based lesson plan design focusing on curriculum, IFCs and assessment data.	2. Principal	2. Discussions during PLC will focus on objective-based lesson plan design following IFCs for grade level curriculum.	2. Focused classroom walkthroughs and PLC minutes/notes
3	3. Time Management	3. Utilize the Instructional Focus Calendars for grade level curriculum.	3. Data/Assessment Team Leaders & Principal	3. Principal will be aware of the IFCs upcoming focus and monitor implementation through classroom walkthroughs.	3. Effectiveness will be determined through FAIR, benchmark assessments and core reading comprehension 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 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:	By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for Level 4,5 students, when less than 70% are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5). There will be a minimum of a one percentage point increase for Level 4,5 students where 70% or more are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5). If 90% or more students are proficient, the school can maintain or demonstrate an increase in the percent proficient. No overall proficiency target will be less than 35% (across Levels 3,4,5) for any subgroup.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Level 4,5 - 48%(96) Level 3,4,5 - 75%(151)	Level 4,5 - 52% Level 3,4,5 - 77%

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	1. Technology/network usage and support	1. EES will implement FAIR/District Benchmark assessments to monitor student progress. Discussions will be held at PLC and SWST meetings to review data	1. Principal	1. Review FAIR data reports and Benchmark assessment progress monitoring spreadsheets to ensure teachers are assessing students according to the established schedule.	1. Printout of FAIR assessments and Benchmark Progress Monitoring Spreadsheets.
2	2. Familiarity with the depth and complexity of the curriculum.	2. Evidence of objective-based lesson plan design focusing on curriculum, IFCs and assessment data.	2. Principal	2. Discussions during PLC will focus on objective-based lesson plan design following IFCs for grade level curriculum.	2. Focused classroom walkthroughs and PLC minutes/notes
3	Time Management	3. Utilize the Instructional Focus Calendars for grade level curriculum.	3. Data/Assessment Team Leaders & Principal	3. Principal will be aware of the IFCs upcoming focus and monitor implementation through classroom walkthroughs.	3. Effectiveness will be determined through FAIR, benchmark assessments and/or core reading comprehension assessments and/or Science FOCUS 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:

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:	By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase for all student subgroups when less than 70% are currently demonstrating an annual learning gain. There will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for all student groups where 70% or more are currently demonstrating an annual learning gain.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
74%(82)	76%

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	1. Technology/network usage and support	1. EES will implement FAIR/District Benchmark assessments to monitor student progress. Discussions will be held at PLC and SWST meetings to review data	1. Principal	1. Review FAIR data reports and Benchmark assessment progress monitoring spreadsheets to ensure teachers are assessing students according to the established schedule.	1. Printout of FAIR assessments and Benchmark Progress Monitoring Spreadsheets.
2	2. Familiarity with the depth and complexity of the curriculum.	2. Evidence of objective-based lesson plan design focusing on curriculum, IFCs and assessment data.	2. Principal	2. Discussions during PLC will focus on objective-based lesson plan design following IFCs for grade level curriculum.	2. Focused classroom walkthroughs and PLC minutes/notes
3	3. Time Management	3. Utilize the Instructional Focus Calendars for grade level curriculum.	3. Data/Assessment Team Leaders & Principal	3. Principal will be aware of the IFCs upcoming focus and monitor implementation through classroom walkthroughs.	3. Effectiveness will be determined through FAIR, benchmark assessments and core reading comprehension

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:

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:

<div align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</div>

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:	By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase in the number of students demonstrating a learning gain in the lowest quartile.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
61%(17)	65%

<div align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</div>

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1. Technology/network usage and support	1. EES will implement FAIR/District Benchmark assessments to monitor student progress. Discussions will be held at PLC and SWST meetings to review data	1. Principal	1. Review FAIR data reports and Benchmark assessment progress monitoring spreadsheets to ensure teachers are assessing students according to the established schedule.	1. Printout of FAIR assessments and Benchmark Progress Monitoring Spreadsheets.
2	2. Familiarity with the depth and complexity of the curriculum	2. Evidence of objective-based lesson plan design focusing on curriculum, IFCs and assessment data.	2. Principal	2. Discussions during PLC will focus on objective-based lesson plan design following IFCs for grade level curriculum.	2. Focused classroom walkthroughs and PLC minutes/notes
3	3. Time Management	3. Utilize the Instructional Focus Calendars for grade level curriculum.	3. Data/Assessment Team Leaders & Principal	3. Principal will be aware of the IFCs upcoming focus and monitor implementation through	3. Effectiveness will be determined through FAIR, benchmark

				classroom walkthroughs.	assessments and core reading comprehension assessments.

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 #
	The FLDOE has identified the target goals for the AMOs each year from SY 2012-1013 to 2016-1017 for this population. The target for your school's total population for SY 2012-2013 and the 5 year project ion (2016-2017) is ▼
	5A :

Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	77	79	81	83	85	

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:	The FLDOE has identified the target goals for the AMOs each year from SY 2012-1013 to 2016-1017 for this population. The target for your this subpopulation(s) for SY 2012-2013 i indicated below. If your schools percent proficient is at or above 95%, the school can maintain that percentage. Your school can also achieve their goal by reducing the percent non-proficient within this population by 10% (Safe Harbor).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Hispanic 61%(10) White 77%(129)	Hispanic 83% White 80%

	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	1. Technology/network usage and support	1. EES will implement FAIR/District Benchmark assessments to monitor student progress. Discussions will be held at PLC and SWST meetings to review data	1. Principal	1. Review FAIR data reports and Benchmark assessment progress monitoring spreadsheets to ensure teachers are assessing students according to the established schedule.	1. Printout of FAIR assessments and Benchmark Progress Monitoring Spreadsheets.
2	2. Familiarity with the depth and complexity of the curriculum	2. Evidence of objective-based lesson plan design focusing on curriculum, IFCs and assessment data.	2. Principal	2. Discussions during PLC will focus on objective-based lesson plan design following IFCs for grade level curriculum.	2. Focused classroom walkthroughs and PLC minutes/notes
3	3. Time Management	3. Utilize the Instructional Focus Calendars for grade level curriculum.	3. Data/Assessment Team Leaders & Principal	3. Principal will be aware of the IFCs upcoming focus and monitor implementation through classroom walkthroughs.	3. Effectiveness will be determined through FAIR, benchmark assessments and core reading comprehension 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:

	The FLDOE has identified the target goals for the AMOs each

	5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5C:	year from SY 2012-1013 to 2016-1017 for this population. The target for your this subpopulation(s) for SY 2012-2013 i indicated below. If your schools percent proficient is at or above 95%, the school can maintain that percentage. Your school can also achieve their goal by reducing the percent non-proficient within this population by 10% (Safe Harbor).
2012 Current Level of Performance:		**2013 Expected Level of Performance:**
N/A		N/A

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	1. Technology/network usage and support	1. EES will implement FAIR/District Benchmark assessments to monitor student progress. Discussions will be held at PLC and SWST meetings to review data	1. Principal	1. Review FAIR data reports and Benchmark assessment progress monitoring spreadsheets to ensure teachers are assessing students according to the established schedule.	1. Printout of FAIR assessments and Benchmark Progress Monitoring Spreadsheets.
2	2. Familiarity with the depth and complexity of the curriculum	2. Evidence of objective-based lesson plan design focusing on curriculum, IFCs and assessment data.	2. Principal	2. Discussions during PLC will focus on objective-based lesson plan design following IFCs for grade level curriculum.	2. Focused classroom walkthroughs and PLC minutes/notes
3	3. Time Management	3. Utilize the Instructional Focus Calendars for grade level curriculum.	3. Data/Assessment Team Leaders & Principal	3. Principal will be aware of the IFCs upcoming focus and monitor implementation through classroom walkthroughs.	3. Effectiveness will be determined through FAIR, benchmark assessments and/or core reading comprehension assessments and/or math district benchmark 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:

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5D:	The FLDOE has identified the target goals for the AMOs each year from SY 2012-1013 to 2016-1017 for this population. The target for your this subpopulation(s) for SY 2012-2013 i indicated below. If your schools percent proficient is at or above 95%, the school can maintain that percentage. Your school can also achieve their goal by reducing the percent non-proficient within this population by 10% (Safe Harbor).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	**2013 Expected Level of Performance:**
32%	68%

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

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1. Technology/network usage and support	1. EES will implement FAIR/District Benchmark assessments to monitor student progress. Discussions will be held at PLC and SWST meetings to review data	1. Principal	1. Review FAIR data reports and Benchmark assessment progress monitoring spreadsheets to ensure teachers are assessing students according to the established schedule.	1. Printout of FAIR assessments and Benchmark Progress Monitoring Spreadsheets.
2	2. Familiarity with the depth and complexity of the curriculum	2. Evidence of objective-based lesson plan design focusing on curriculum, IFCs and assessment data.	2. Principal	2. Discussions during PLC will focus on objective-based lesson plan design following IFCs for grade level curriculum.	2. Focused classroom walkthroughs and PLC minutes/notes
3	3. Time Management	3. Utilize the Instructional Focus Calendars for grade level curriculum.	3. Data/Assessment Team Leaders & Principal	3. Principal will be aware of the IFCs upcoming focus and monitor implementation through classroom walkthroughs.	3. Effectiveness will be determined through FAIR, benchmark assessments and core reading comprehension 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 reading. Reading Goal #5E:	The FLDOE has identified the target goals for the AMOs each year from SY 2012-1013 to 2016-1017 for this population. The target for your this subpopulation(s) for SY 2012-2013 i indicated below. If your schools percent proficient is at or above 95%, the school can maintain that percentage. Your school can also achieve their goal by reducing the percent non-proficient within this population by 10% (Safe Harbor).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
63%	73%

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	1. Technology/network usage and support	1. EES will implement FAIR/District Benchmark assessments to monitor student progress. Discussions will be held at PLC and SWST meetings to review data	1. Principal	1. Review FAIR data reports and Benchmark assessment progress monitoring spreadsheets to ensure teachers are assessing students according to the established schedule.	1. Printout of FAIR assessments and Benchmark Progress Monitoring Spreadsheets.
2	2. Familiarity with the depth and complexity of the curriculum	2. Evidence of objective-based lesson plan design focusing on curriculum, IFCs and assessment data.	2. Principal	2. Discussions during PLC will focus on objective-based lesson plan design following IFCs for grade level curriculum.	2. Focused classroom walkthroughs and PLC minutes/notes
3	3. Time Management	3. Utilize the Instructional Focus Calendars for grade level curriculum.	3. Data/Assessment Team Leaders & Principal	3. Principal will be aware of the IFCs upcoming focus and monitor implementation through classroom walkthroughs.	3. Effectiveness will be determined through FAIR, benchmark assessments and/or core reading comprehension assessments

						and/or math district benchmark assessments.

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
Implementation and application of Successmaker4 ILL system	K-5	TGIF-PD and District Support	School-Wide	May 2013	Cumulative Reports	Principal
Florida Assessments for Instruction in Reading & Understanding the results	K-5	TGIF-PD and District Support	School-Wide	May 2013	Evidence of professional development in instructional lessons and progress monitoring	Principal
Using Progress Monitoring Assessments and Data to Improve Instruction and Learing	K-5	TGIF-PD and District Support	School-Wide	May 2013	Evidence of professional development in instructional lessons and progress monitoring	Principal

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 Goa

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:	By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase for Level 3 students, when less than 70% are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5). There will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for Level 3 students where 70% or more are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5). If 90% or more students are proficient, the school can maintain or demonstrate an increase in the percent proficient. No overall proficiency target will be less than 35% (across Levels 3,4,5) for any subgroup.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Level 3 - 24%(48) Level 3,4,5 - 61%(122)	Level 3 - 28% Level 3,4,5 - 65%

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	1. Technology/network usage and support	1. EES will implement FAIR/District Benchmark assessments to monitor student progress. Discussions will be held at PLC and SWST meetings to review data	1. Principal	1. Review FAIR data reports and Benchmark assessment progress monitoring spreadsheets to ensure teachers are assessing students according to the established schedule.	1. Printout of FAIR assessments and Benchmark Progress Monitoring Spreadsheets.
2	2. Familiarity with the depth and complexity of the curriculum.	2. Evidence of objective-based lesson plan design focusing on curriculum, IFCs and assessment data.	2. Principal	2. Discussions during PLC will focus on objective-based lesson plan design following IFCs for grade level curriculum.	2. Focused classroom walkthroughs and PLC minutes/notes
3	3. Time Management	3. Utilize the Instructional Focus Calendars for grade level curriculum.	3. Data/Assessment Team Leaders & Principal	3. Principal will be aware of the IFCs upcoming focus and monitor implementation through classroom walkthroughs.	3. Effectiveness will be determined through FAIR, benchmark assessments and core reading comprehension 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 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:	By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for Level 4,5 students, when less than 70% are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5). There will be a minimum of a one percentage point increase for Level 4,5 students where 70% or more are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5). If 90% or more students are proficient, the school can maintain or demonstrate an increase in the percent proficient. No overall proficiency target will be less than 35% (across Levels 3,4,5) for any subgroup.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Level 4,5 - 37%(74) Level 3,4,5 -61%(122)	Level 4,5 - 39% Level3,4,5 - 63%

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	1. Technology/network usage and support	1. EES will implement FAIR/District Benchmark assessments to monitor student progress. Discussions will be held at PLC and SWST meetings to review data	1. Principal	1. Review FAIR data reports and Benchmark assessment progress monitoring spreadsheets to ensure teachers are assessing students according to the established schedule.	1. Printout of FAIR assessments and Benchmark Progress Monitoring Spreadsheets.
2	2. Familiarity with the depth and complexity of the curriculum.	2. Evidence of objective-based lesson plan design focusing on curriculum, IFCs and assessment data.	2. Principal	2. Discussions during PLC will focus on objective-based lesson plan design following IFCs for grade level curriculum.	2. Focused classroom walkthroughs and PLC minutes/notes
3	Time Management	3. Utilize the Instructional Focus Calendars for grade level curriculum.	3. Data/Assessment Team Leaders & Principal	3. Principal will be aware of the IFCs upcoming focus and monitor implementation through classroom walkthroughs.	3. Effectiveness will be determined through FAIR, benchmark assessments and/or core reading comprehension assessments and/or Science FOCUS 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:

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:	By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase for all student subgroups when less than 70% are currently demonstrating an annual learning gain. There will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for all student groups where 70% or more are currently demonstrating an annual learning gain.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
70% (78)	72%

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	1. Technology/network usage and support	1. EES will implement FAIR/District Benchmark assessments to monitor student progress. Discussions will be held at PLC and SWST meetings to review data	1. Principal	1. Review FAIR data reports and Benchmark assessment progress monitoring spreadsheets to ensure teachers are assessing students according to the established schedule.	1. Printout of FAIR assessments and Benchmark Progress Monitoring Spreadsheets.
2	2. Familiarity with the depth and complexity of the curriculum.	2. Evidence of objective-based lesson plan design focusing on curriculum, IFCs and assessment data.	2. Principal	2. Discussions during PLC will focus on objective-based lesson plan design following IFCs for grade level curriculum.	2. Focused classroom walkthroughs and PLC minutes/notes
3	3. Time Management	3. Utilize the Instructional Focus Calendars for grade level curriculum.	3. Data/Assessment Team Leaders & Principal	3. Principal will be aware of the IFCs upcoming focus and monitor implementation through classroom walkthroughs.	3. Effectiveness will be determined through FAIR, benchmark assessments and core reading comprehension 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:

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:

<table>
<tr><td colspan="5" align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</td></tr>
<tr><td>Anticipated Barrier</td><td>Strategy</td><td>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</td><td>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</td><td>Evaluation Tool</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="5" align="center">No Data Submitted</td></tr>
</table>

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:	By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase in the number of students demonstrating a learning gain in the lower quartile.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
52% (15)	52%

<table>
<tr><td colspan="6" align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>Anticipated Barrier</td><td>Strategy</td><td>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</td><td>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</td><td>Evaluation Tool</td></tr>
<tr><td>1</td><td>1. Technology/network usage and support</td><td>1. EES will implement FAIR/District Benchmark assessments to monitor student progress. Discussions will be held at PLC and SWST meetings to review data</td><td>1. Principal</td><td>1. Review FAIR data reports and Benchmark assessment progress monitoring spreadsheets to ensure teachers are assessing students according to the established schedule.</td><td>1. Printout of FAIR assessments and Benchmark Progress Monitoring Spreadsheets.</td></tr>
<tr><td>2</td><td>2. Familiarity with the depth and complexity of the curriculum</td><td>2. Evidence of objective-based lesson plan design focusing on curriculum, IFCs and assessment data.</td><td>2. Principal</td><td>2. Discussions during PLC will focus on objective-based lesson plan design following IFCs for grade level curriculum.</td><td>2. Focused classroom walkthroughs and PLC minutes/notes</td></tr>
<tr><td>3</td><td>3. Time Management</td><td>3. Utilize the Instructional Focus Calendars for grade level curriculum.</td><td>3. Data/Assessment Team Leaders & Principal</td><td>3. Principal will be aware of the IFCs upcoming focus and monitor implementation through classroom walkthroughs.</td><td>3. Effectiveness will be determined through FAIR, benchmark assessments and core reading comprehension assessments.</td></tr>
</table>

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 : The FLDOE has identified the target goals for the AMOs each year from SY 2012-1013 to 2016-1017 for this population. The target for your school's total population for SY 2012-2013 and the 5 year project ion (2016-2017) is

Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	69	72	75	77	80	

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:	The FLDOE has identified the target goals for the AMOs each year from SY 2012-1013 to 2016-1017 for this population. The target for your this subpopulation(s) for SY 2012-2013 i indicated below. If your schools percent proficient is at or above 95%, the school can maintain that percentage. Your school can also achieve their goal by reducing the percent non-proficient within this population by 10% (Safe Harbor).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
White: 63%(105) Black: NA Hispanic: 50%	White: 73%% Black: NA Hispanic: 67%

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	1. Technology/network usage and support	1. EES will implement FAIR/Distrtct Benchmark assessments to monitor student progress. Discussions will be held at PLC and SWST meetings to review data	1. Principal	1. Review FAIR data reports and Benchmark assessment progress monitoring spreadsheets to ensure teachers are assessing students according to the established schedule.	1. Printout of FAIR assessments and Benchmark Progress Monitoring Spreadsheets.
2	2. Familiarity with the depth and complexity of the curriculum	2. Evidence of objective-based lesson plan design focusing on curriculum, IFCs and assessment data.	2. Principal	2. Discussions during PLC will focus on objective-based lesson plan design following IFCs for grade level curriculum.	2. Focused classroom walkthroughs and PLC minutes/notes
3	3. Time Management	3. Utilize the Instructional Focus Calendars for grade level curriculum.	3. Data/Assessment Team Leaders & Principal	3. Principal will be aware of the IFCs upcoming focus and monitor implementation through classroom walkthroughs.	3. Effectiveness will be determined through FAIR, benchmark assessments and core reading comprehension 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:

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.	The FLDOE has identified the target goals for the AMOs each year from SY 2012-1013 to 2016-1017 for this population. The target for your this subpopulation(s) for SY 2012-2013 i indicated below. If your schools percent proficient is at or

	Mathematics Goal #5C:			above 95%, the school can maintain that percentage. Your school can also achieve their goal by reducing the percent non-proficient within this population by 10% (Safe Harbor).	

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

<p align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</p>

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1. Technology/network usage and support	1. EES will implement FAIR/District Benchmark assessments to monitor student progress. Discussions will be held at PLC and SWST meetings to review data	1. Principal	1. Review FAIR data reports and Benchmark assessment progress monitoring spreadsheets to ensure teachers are assessing students according to the established schedule.	1. Printout of FAIR assessments and Benchmark Progress Monitoring Spreadsheets.
2	2. Familiarity with the depth and complexity of the curriculum	2. Evidence of objective-based lesson plan design focusing on curriculum, IFCs and assessment data.	2. Principal	2. Discussions during PLC will focus on objective-based lesson plan design following IFCs for grade level curriculum.	2. Focused classroom walkthroughs and PLC minutes/notes
3	3. Time Management	3. Utilize the Instructional Focus Calendars for grade level curriculum.	3. Data/Assessment Team Leaders & Principal	3. Principal will be aware of the IFCs upcoming focus and monitor implementation through classroom walkthroughs.	3. Effectiveness will be determined through FAIR, benchmark assessments and/or core reading comprehension assessments and/or math district benchmark 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:	
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5D:	The FLDOE has identified the target goals for the AMOs each year from SY 2012-1013 to 2016-1017 for this population. The target for your this subpopulation(s) for SY 2012-2013 i indicated below. If your schools percent proficient is at or above 95%, the school can maintain that percentage. Your school can also achieve their goal by reducing the percent non-proficient within this population by 10% (Safe Harbor).

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
27%	53%

<p align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</p>

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	1. Technology/network usage and support	1. EES will implement FAIR/District Benchmark assessments to monitor	1. Principal	1. Review FAIR data reports and Benchmark	1. Printout of FAIR assessments and

1		student progress. Discussions will be held at PLC and SWST meetings to review data		assessment progress monitoring spreadsheets to ensure teachers are assessing students according to the established schedule.	Benchmark Progress Monitoring Spreadsheets.
2	2. Familiarity with the depth and complexity of the curriculum	2. Evidence of objective-based lesson plan design focusing on curriculum, IFCs and assessment data.	2. Principal	2. Discussions during PLC will focus on objective-based lesson plan design following IFCs for grade level curriculum.	2. Focused classroom walkthroughs and PLC minutes/notes
3	3. Time Management	3. Utilize the Instructional Focus Calendars for grade level curriculum.	3. Data/Assessment Team Leaders & Principal	3. Principal will be aware of the IFCs upcoming focus and monitor implementation through classroom walkthroughs.	3. Effectiveness will be determined through FAIR, benchmark assessments and core reading comprehension 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:	The FLDOE has identified the target goals for the AMOs each year from SY 2012-1013 to 2016-1017 for this population. The target for your this subpopulation(s) for SY 2012-2013 is indicated below. If your schools percent proficient is at or above 95%, the school can maintain that percentage. Your school can also achieve their goal by reducing the percent non-proficient within this population by 10% (Safe Harbor).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
52%	63%

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	1. Technology/network usage and support	1. EES will implement FAIR/District Benchmark assessments to monitor student progress. Discussions will be held at PLC and SWST meetings to review data	1. Principal	1. Review FAIR data reports and Benchmark assessment progress monitoring spreadsheets to ensure teachers are assessing students according to the established schedule.	1. Printout of FAIR assessments and Benchmark Progress Monitoring Spreadsheets.
2	2. Familiarity with the depth and complexity of the curriculum	2. Evidence of objective-based lesson plan design focusing on curriculum, IFCs and assessment data.	2. Principal	2. Discussions during PLC will focus on objective-based lesson plan design following IFCs for grade level curriculum.	2. Focused classroom walkthroughs and PLC minutes/notes
3	3. Time Management	3. Utilize the Instructional Focus Calendars for grade level curriculum.	3. Data/Assessment Team Leaders & Principal	3. Principal will be aware of the IFCs upcoming focus and monitor implementation through classroom walkthroughs.	3. Effectiveness will be determined through FAIR, benchmark assessments and/or core reading comprehension assessments and/or math district benchmark assessments.

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
Implementation and application of Successmaker4 ILL system & Math Facts in a Flash	K-5	TGIF-PD and District Support	School-Wide	May 2013	Cumulative Reports	Principal
Using Progress Monitoring Assessments and Data to Improve Instruction and Learing	K-5	TGIF-PD and District Support	School-Wide	May 2013	Evidence of professional development in instructional lessons and progress monitoring	Principal

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

Elementary and Middle School Science 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:

By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a four

	1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science. Science Goal #1a:	percentage point increase for all student subgroups when less than 70% are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5). There will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for all student groups where 70% or more are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5) Any subgroup that is 90% or higher can maintain or demonstrate an increase in the percent proficient. No proficiency target will be less than 35% (across Levels 3,4,5) for any subgroup.
	2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
	Level 3 - 42% (27) Level 3,4,5 - 62% (40)	Level 3 - 46% Level 3,4,5 - 66%

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	1. Technology/network usage and support	1. EES will implement FAIR/District Benchmark assessments to monitor student progress. Discussions will be held at PLC and SWST meetings to review data	1. Principal	1. Review FAIR data reports and Benchmark assessment progress monitoring spreadsheets to ensure teachers are assessing students according to the established schedule.	1. Printout of FAIR assessments and Benchmark Progress Monitoring Spreadsheets.
2	2. Familiarity with the depth and complexity of the curriculum.	2. Evidence of objective-based lesson plan design focusing on curriculum, IFCs and assessment data.	2. Principal	2. Discussions during PLC will focus on objective-based lesson plan design following IFCs for grade level curriculum.	2. Focused classroom walkthroughs and PLC minutes/notes.
3	3. Time Management	3. Utilize the Instructional Focus Calendars for grade level curriculum.	3. Data/Assessment Team Leaders & Principal	3. Principal will be aware of the IFCs upcoming focus and monitor implementation through classroom walkthroughs.	3. Effectiveness will be determined through FAIR, benchmark assessments and core reading comprehension 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:	By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase for all student subgroups when less than 70% are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5). There will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for all student groups where 70% or more are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5) Any subgroup that is 90% or higher can maintain or demonstrate an increase in the percent proficient. No proficiency target will be less than 35% (across Levels 3,4,5) for any subgroup.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Level 4,5 - 20% (13) Level 3,4,5 - 62% (40)	Level 4, 5 - 24% Level 3,4,5 - 66%

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	1. Technology/network usage and support	1. EES will implement FAIR/District Benchmark assessments to monitor student progress. Discussions will be held at PLC and SWST meetings to review data	1. Principal	1. Review FAIR data reports and Benchmark assessment progress monitoring spreadsheets to ensure teachers are assessing students according to the established schedule.	1. Printout of FAIR assessments and Benchmark Progress Monitoring Spreadsheets.
2	2. Familiarity with the depth and complexity of the curriculum.	2. Evidence of objective-based lesson plan design focusing on curriculum, IFCs and assessment data.	2. Principal	2. Discussions during PLC will focus on objective-based lesson plan design following IFCs for grade level curriculum.	2. Focused classroom walkthroughs and PLC minutes/notes.
3	Time Management	3. Utilize the Instructional Focus Calendars for grade level curriculum.	3. Data/Assessment Team Leaders & Principal	3. Principal will be aware of the IFCs upcoming focus and monitor implementation through classroom walkthroughs.	3. Effectiveness will be determined through FAIR, benchmark assessments and/or core reading comprehension assessments and/or Science FOCUS 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:
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
Using Progress Monitoring Assessments and Data to Improve Instruction and Learning	K-5	TGIF-PD and District Support	School-Wide	May 2013	Evidence of professional development in instructional lessons and progress monitoring	Principal
Vertical Alignment K-5 Science	K-5	Grade Level Science Rep, Science Lab Rep, and District Support	School-Wide	May 2013	Evidence of professional development in instructional lessons and progress monitoring	Principal

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:	By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase for all student subgroups when less than 75% are currently demonstrating 4.0 or higher on the writing essay. There will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for all student groups where 75% or more are currently demonstrating 4.0 or higher on the writing essay. Any subgroup that is 90% or higher must maintain or demonstrate an increase in the percent proficient. No proficiency target will be less than 35% for any subgroup.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
95%(56)	95%

	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	Familiarity with the writing standards and scoring rubrics both vertically and horizontally articulated.	Utilize expertise of Writing Teachers modeling best practices at all grades.	Principal	Evaluation of progress with monthly writing prompts & district writing benchmark assessments.	Monthly writing prompt data & district benchmark writing 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 group:

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing. Writing Goal #1b:	By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase for all student subgroups when less than 75% are currently demonstrating 4.0 or higher on the writing essay. There will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for all student groups where 75% or more are currently demonstrating 4.0 or higher on the writing essay. Any subgroup that is 90% or higher must maintain or demonstrate an increase in the percent proficient. No proficiency target will be less than 35% for any subgroup.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
61%(36)	65%

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
Using Progress Monitoring Assessments and Data to Improve Instruction and Learning.	K-5	TGIF-PD and District Support	Staff & PLC	May 2013	Evidence of professional development in instructional lessons and progress monitoring data.	Principal

---

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:	ATTENDANCE GOAL – RATE For the attendance year 2012-2013, the attendance rate will increase.If the current attendance rate is less than 90%, there will be a minimum 4% increase. If the current percentage of attendance is 90% or greater, the school will maintain or increase the percentage. ATTENDANCE GOAL- ABSENCES By the year 2013, there will be a decrease of students who are absent ten or more days. When 40% or more of the students have ten or more absences annually, there will be a minimum of a 4 percentage point decrease. If less than 40% of the students have ten or more absences annually, there will be a minimum of a 2 percentage point decrease ATTENDANCE GOAL- TARDY By the year 2013, there will be a decrease of students who are Tardy ten or more days. When 30% or more of the students have ten or more Tardies annually, there will be a minimum of a 4 percentage point decrease. If less than 30% of the students have ten or more Tardies annually, there will be a minimum of a 2 percentage point decrease. If the current percent of Tardies is 10% or less, the school can maintain or decrease the percentage.
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
95.3% (449/471)	97.3%
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)
146	137
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)
42	33

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	Funding Sources	Implement a positive attendance reward system to recognize increases in student attendance for targeted students.	Principal and Guidance Counselor	Monitor attendance data on a monthly basis.	Attendance Data

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
Positive Behavior Support	K-5	TGIF-PD and District Support	School-Wide	May 2013	Attendance Data	Principal

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:	By the year 2013, there will be a reduction of suspensions from the previous year. If the current percentage of suspensions is 10% or less, the school will maintain or decrease the percentage. If the current percentage is between 11-49%, the school will reduce the percentage by 5%. If the current percentage is 50% or higher than the previous year, the school will reduce the percentage by 10%.
2012 Total Number of In–School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
0	0
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School
0	0

2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions
10	10
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School
10	10

	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	Finances	Recognize and reward positive behavior	PBS/C of C Committee, classroom teachers and Principal	Monthly review of discipline data.	Discipline Data
2		Clearly communicate School-Wide Expectations by Setting	PBS/C of C Committee, classroom teachers, Principal	Monthly review of discipline data.	Discipline Data

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
Positive Behavior Support	K-5	TGIF-PD and District Support	School-Wide	May 2013	Discipline Data	Principal

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
			Grand Total: $0.00

End of Suspension Goal(s)

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: *Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.*	The average percentage of parents who participate in school activities and provide input throughout the year will increase.
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:
On Average 80% of EES parents participated in school activities and provided input throughout the school year.	The average percentage of parents who will participate in school activities and provide input will increase to 85%.

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	Accommodating to parents' schedule/s.	EES will host a variety of parent involvement activities before, during and after school hours.	PBS/C of C Committee, Principal	Participation logs & climate survey	Climate Survey, FRN Survey

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
Community of Caring & Positive Behavior Support	K-5	TGIF-PD & Principal	School-Wide	May 2013	Evidence of professional development by school and district climate survey/s.	Principal

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)

Continue to promote and grow Community Health and Wellness through our Family Mileage Club Program. The goal is to maintain and/or increase parental participation and overall mileage. 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. Continue to promote and grow Community Health and Wellness through our Family Mileage Club Program. The goal is to maintain and/or increase parental participation and overall mileage. Goal Continue to promote and grow Community Health and Wellness through our Family Mileage Club Program. The goal is to maintain and/or increase parental participation and overall mileage. Goal #1:	Continue to promote and grow Community Health and Wellness through our Family Mileage Club Program. The goal is to maintain and/or increase parental participation and overall mileage.
2012 Current level:	2013 Expected level:
1	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	Finances	Recognize and reward mileage earned using token system	PE Coach, Principal	Monthly review of sign-in sheets and individual, grade level and whole school mileage.	End of Year Mileage Comparison

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 Continue to promote and grow Community Health and Wellness through our Family Mileage Club Program. The goal is to maintain and/or increase parental participation and overall mileage. 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

jn Priority	jn Focus	jn Prevent	jn NA	

Are you a reward school: jn Yes jn 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.

Projected use of SAC Funds	Amount
Sub. Teachers for FCAT Testing Support	$2,271.83

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

Oversee and coordinate the function of school events,
Oversee and assist with the function of school Family Night Events,
Assist with organizational opportunities to increase parent involvement,

Review fund allocations, schedules and professional development activities to ensure alignment with SIP focus area goals.

AYP DATA

SCHOOL GRADE DATA

No Data Found

Sarasota School District
ENGLEWOOD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
2010-2011

	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	89%	82%	98%	81%	350	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	68%	65%			133	3 ways to make gains: ● 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?	67% (YES)	43% (NO)			110	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					593	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					B	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Sarasota School District
ENGLEWOOD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
2009-2010

	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	89%	81%	89%	78%	337	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	76%	65%			141	3 ways to make gains: ● 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?	68% (YES)	66% (YES)			134	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					612	
Percent Tested = 99%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested