

Sarasota County Schools

Englewood Elementary School



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

| | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| School Demographics | 3 |
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 9 |
| Planning for Improvement | 14 |
| Title I Requirements | 23 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 24 |

Englewood Elementary School

150 N MCCALL RD, Englewood, FL 34223

www.sarasotacountyschools.net/englewood

Demographics

Principal: Curtis Schwartz

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2010

| | |
|--|---|
| 2019-20 Status (per MSID File) | Active |
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | Elementary School KG-5 |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| 2018-19 Title I School | No |
| 2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 54% |
| 2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: A (65%) 2017-18: A (63%) 2016-17: B (61%) 2015-16: A (66%) 2014-15: A (75%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| SI Region | Central |
| Regional Executive Director | Lucinda Thompson |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle | N/A |
| Year | |
| Support Tier | |
| ESSA Status | TS&I |

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

| | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 9 |
| Planning for Improvement | 14 |
| Title I Requirements | 23 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 24 |

Englewood Elementary School

150 N MCCALL RD, Englewood, FL 34223

www.sarasotacountyschools.net/englewood

School Demographics

| | | |
|---|-------------------------------|---|
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | 2018-19 Title I School | 2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) |
| Elementary School KG-5 | No | 55% |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | Charter School | 2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
| K-12 General Education | No | 22% |

School Grades History

| | | | | |
|--------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Year | 2018-19 | 2017-18 | 2016-17 | 2015-16 |
| Grade | A | A | B | A |

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

<https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The mission of Englewood Elementary School is to provide students with a solid educational foundation to promote active, lifelong learning in a safe, respectful environment. This mission will be accomplished through the commitment of staff, students, parents, and the community.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Englewood Elementary School students will experience a safe, respectful environment which promotes active learning in a supportive, community atmosphere.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

| Name | Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|---------------------|---------------------|---|
| Grossenbacher, Mark | Principal | Manage, reflect and revise SIP plan as it is being implemented throughout the 2019-2020 school year. |
| shaer, penny | School Counselor | Penny is a member of the PBS and Data/Assessment team. Penny will identify students needed tier 2/3 support. Penny will also offer social/emotional trainings/workshops as needed. |
| lugar, pamela | Teacher, ESE | Pam is our ESE Liaison. She is also a member of our team leader and data/assessment teams. Pam is responsible for monitoring our ESE K-5 student progress and providing support for our K-5 inclusion model. Pam also keeps teachers informed about their students IEP goals in reading/math. She also provides strategies for teachers to reach these goals. |
| ziarnicki, ellen | Assistant Principal | Ellen is our assistant principal. She is responsible for leading the Data/Assessment team and tracking all behaviors as they related to affecting academics. Ellen will work in tandem with our school social worker to provide specific and targeted assistant for those students needing specialized and immediate care. Ellen also helps to support the principal in managing and maintaining SIP. |
| godzer, deana | Other | Deana is our school social worker. She works with our assistant principal and swst team to provide targeted and immediate care/resources for those students in need. She also will provide home visits for those students who are in attendance, academic, behavioral concern. |

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---------------------------------|-------------|----|----|----|----|-----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Number of students enrolled | 107 | 98 | 93 | 89 | 95 | 103 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 585 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 5 | 13 | 13 | 6 | 8 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 51 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 6 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 |

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 6 | 6 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)

41

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/19/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---------------------------------|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 10 | 16 | 11 | 11 | 21 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 77 |
| One or more suspensions | 8 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 7 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 19 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38 |

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Prior Year - Updated

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---------------------------------|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 10 | 16 | 11 | 11 | 21 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 77 |
| One or more suspensions | 8 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 7 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 19 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38 |

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

| School Grade Component | 2019 | | | 2018 | | |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement | 76% | 68% | 57% | 74% | 68% | 55% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 63% | 62% | 58% | 67% | 63% | 57% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 33% | 53% | 53% | 52% | 54% | 52% |
| Math Achievement | 80% | 73% | 63% | 71% | 72% | 61% |
| Math Learning Gains | 69% | 67% | 62% | 50% | 68% | 61% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 60% | 53% | 51% | 42% | 57% | 51% |
| Science Achievement | 72% | 65% | 53% | 68% | 64% | 51% |

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

| Indicator | Grade Level (prior year reported) | | | | | | Total |
|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------|---------|--------|--------|---------|---------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | |
| Number of students enrolled | 107 (0) | 98 (0) | 93 (0) | 89 (0) | 95 (0) | 103 (0) | 585 (0) |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 5 (10) | 13 (16) | 13 (11) | 6 (11) | 8 (21) | 6 (8) | 51 (77) |
| One or more suspensions | 0 (8) | 3 (0) | 4 (2) | 1 (5) | 2 (7) | 4 (2) | 14 (24) |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 (0) | 5 (5) | 2 (1) | 0 (1) | 2 (0) | 0 (0) | 9 (7) |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 5 (7) | 6 (19) | 14 (12) | 25 (38) |

Grade Level Data

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

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

| ELA | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2019 | 74% | 70% | 4% | 58% | 16% |
| | 2018 | 83% | 68% | 15% | 57% | 26% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -9% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 72% | 67% | 5% | 58% | 14% |
| | 2018 | 59% | 67% | -8% | 56% | 3% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 13% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -11% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 75% | 68% | 7% | 56% | 19% |
| | 2018 | 79% | 66% | 13% | 55% | 24% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -4% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 16% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2019 | 76% | 73% | 3% | 62% | 14% |
| | 2018 | 84% | 72% | 12% | 62% | 22% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -8% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 82% | 72% | 10% | 64% | 18% |
| | 2018 | 82% | 71% | 11% | 62% | 20% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -2% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 81% | 70% | 11% | 60% | 21% |
| | 2018 | 84% | 72% | 12% | 61% | 23% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -3% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -1% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2019 | 70% | 65% | 5% | 53% | 17% |
| | 2018 | 67% | 67% | 0% | 55% | 12% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 3% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |

Subgroup Data

| 2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|----------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------------|
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2017-18 | C & C 2017-18 |
| SWD | 43 | 29 | 6 | 46 | 44 | 38 | 36 | | | | |

| 2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|----------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2017-18 | C & C Accel 2017-18 |
| ELL | 50 | 31 | | 71 | 82 | 73 | | | | | |
| HSP | 57 | 46 | 23 | 73 | 67 | 64 | 36 | | | | |
| MUL | 78 | 71 | | 78 | 64 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 79 | 65 | 37 | 81 | 69 | 61 | 76 | | | | |
| FRL | 65 | 55 | 27 | 74 | 62 | 56 | 58 | | | | |
| 2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2016-17 | C & C Accel 2016-17 |
| SWD | 38 | 41 | 26 | 57 | 63 | 56 | 25 | | | | |
| ELL | 48 | 57 | 50 | 52 | 64 | 50 | | | | | |
| HSP | 50 | 52 | 33 | 55 | 60 | 53 | 50 | | | | |
| MUL | 75 | | | 81 | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 78 | 57 | 29 | 89 | 74 | 63 | 69 | | | | |
| FRL | 70 | 55 | 37 | 77 | 65 | 55 | 56 | | | | |
| 2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2015-16 | C & C Accel 2015-16 |
| SWD | 39 | 33 | 21 | 38 | 42 | 41 | 31 | | | | |
| ELL | 43 | 36 | | 48 | 30 | | | | | | |
| HSP | 47 | 50 | 36 | 53 | 50 | 50 | 31 | | | | |
| MUL | 91 | | | 82 | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 78 | 69 | 58 | 73 | 50 | 39 | 74 | | | | |
| FRL | 63 | 61 | 47 | 62 | 48 | 39 | 54 | | | | |

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

| ESSA Federal Index | |
|---|------|
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I) | TS&I |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 65 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 1 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 63 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 516 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 |
| Percent Tested | 99% |

Subgroup Data

| Students With Disabilities | |
|--|-----|
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 35 |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | |
| English Language Learners | |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | 62 |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Native American Students | |
| Federal Index - Native American Students | |
| Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Asian Students | |
| Federal Index - Asian Students | |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Black/African American Students | |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students | |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Hispanic Students | |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | 52 |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Multiracial Students | |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students | 73 |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Pacific Islander Students | |
| Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students | |
| Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32% | |

| White Students | |
|--|----|
| Federal Index - White Students | 67 |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students | |
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students | 57 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% | |

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

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

Bottom Quartile Reading Learning Gain: Although this improved by 1%, only 33% of our bottom quartile readers demonstrated a learning gain. We have noticed a declining trend over the past 5 years in this component. Transiency and lack of consistent attendance have contributed to this. We have looked at ways to improve attendance for our bottom quartile students and provide free after school tutoring in ELA for all bottom quartile readers. Our school also instituted Reading Recovery at 1st grade to help identify and provide scaffolded support for all non readers. We also started a K-5 full inclusion model to provide models and high expectations exposure to our students identified with significant deficiencies in reading.

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

3rd Grade ELA Proficiency: Our 3rd grade readers declined 9 percent going from 83% to 74% in 2019 of our students scoring a 3 or higher on the FSA. Although 74% is still a very high scoring approximately 33% of this class in 3rd grade needed academic and/or behavioral support through an IEP or 504. We were very proud of the 74% considering these factors and the dedicated effort our 3rd grade team and support staff put in to achieve such a high proficiency score.

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

3rd Grade Math: Our 3rd Grade Math proficiency score came in very high at 76%. This came in 3% above the district and 14% above the state average.

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

Grade 4 ELA Proficiency: Grade 4 jumped 13 points going from 59% to 72% scoring at or above proficiency. During the 2018-19 school year we provided free after school tutoring for our 4th grade bottom quartile students. We also provided free tutoring for our 4th grade ESOL students.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

Students with Disabilities: Our SWD subgroup scored at 35% at or above proficiency.

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

1. Bottom Quartile Readers
2. Students with Disabilities in Reading
3. Both Quartile Math
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

| | |
|---|--|
| #1 | |
| Title | ELA-Learning Gains of the Lowest 25% |
| Rationale | EES Data has demonstrated a steady decline over the past years in ELA-Learning Gains of the Lowest 25% with only a 1% increase from last year. 2018 Data within this sub category was 33%. |
| State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve | By the End of SY 2019-2020 62% of the Lowest 25% students will be successful in making a learning gain in FSA ELA.. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome | Mark Grossenbacher (mark.grossenbacher@sarasotacountyschools.net) |
| Evidence-based Strategy | Bottom 25% of students shared with staff so they can "own" the students as well. After school reading groups for lower 25%, ESE and ESOL and reading buddies implemented for all tier 3 students. Bi-weekly data checks to track progress of students whole grade, homeroom, lower 25%, ESE and ESOL. Adjusted master schedule to utilize staff resources insuring that many students have access to small group and individualized support. Provide 1st-3rd instructional reg. ed. push in support for all Tier 2/Tier 3. ELA PD offerings centered around Visible Learning, I-Ready, High Expectations Teaching during CPT Schedule, Classroom Discussions and Feedback Practices. Specific ESOL and ESE groups created and monitored by both departments. |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy | Our 2019-2020 problem of practice is if the principal and leadership team consistently communicate and model classroom discussion, feedback practices and teacher clarity in all subject areas we will continue to demonstrate growth and proficiency K-5 ELA learning gains for lower 25%. |
| Action Step | |
| Description | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Bi-Weekly data checks for grade level, homeroom, lower 25%, ESE and ESOL. 2. ELA PD offerings. 3. Free after school enrichment and intervention provided to support ELA Bottom 25%, ESE and ESOL. 4. Follow up at Team Leader and Data/Assessment teams to revise plan if necessary. 5. Social/Emotional strategies modeled, practiced and reflected on at PBS meetings. |
| Person Responsible | Mark Grossenbacher (mark.grossenbacher@sarasotacountyschools.net) |

| | |
|---|---|
| #2 | |
| Title | ELA-Achievement |
| Rationale | Even though EES Students continue to score within the 70s and our students made our goal with a 2% increase from last year going from 74% to 76% proficient, it is our goal to continue to maintain a steady 2% increase each year. |
| State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve | By the End of SY 2019-2020, 78% of EES students will be successful in reaching proficiency on the FSA ELA assessment. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome | Mark Grossenbacher (mark.grossenbacher@sarasotacountyschools.net) |
| Evidence-based Strategy | All student data shared with Data/Assessment team so K-5 staff can "own" the students. After school reading groups and reading buddies implemented. Bi-weekly data checks to track progress of students. Adjusted master schedule to utilize staff resources insuring that many students have access to small group and individualized support. ELA PD offerings centered around Visible Learning, I-Ready, Classroom Discussions, Feedback Practices, High Expectations Teaching during CPT Schedule. District ELA PD training for grades 3-5. |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy | Our 2019-2020 problem of practice is if the principal and leadership team consistently communicate and model classroom discussion, feedback practices and teacher clarity in all subject areas we will continue to demonstrate growth and proficiency K-5 ELA achievement. |
| Action Step | |
| Description | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Bi-Weekly data checks for all homeroom, grade level students in ELA. 2. ELA PD offerings. 3. Free after school enrichment and intervention provided to support ELA Bottom 25%, ESE, ESOL and when needed students identified as tier 3. 4. Follow up at Team Leader and Data/Assessment teams to revise plan if necessary. 5. Social/Emotional strategies modeled, practiced and reflected on at PBS meetings. |
| Person Responsible | Mark Grossenbacher (mark.grossenbacher@sarasotacountyschools.net) |

| | |
|---|--|
| #3 | |
| Title | ELA-Learning Gains |
| Rationale | EES showed a significant increase of 6% in ELA Learning Gains going from 57% to 63%. Our goal is to maintain a steady increase in ELA Learning Gains of at least 2%. |
| State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve | By the End of SY 2019-2020, 65% of EES students will be successful in demonstrating a learning gain on the FSA ELA assessment. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome | Mark Grossenbacher (mark.grossenbacher@sarasotacountyschools.net) |
| Evidence-based Strategy | All student data shared with Data/Assessment team so K-5 staff can "own" the students. After school reading groups for lower 25%, ESE and ESOL and reading buddies implemented for all tier 3 students. Reading mentors also implemented by all 5th grade students to all K students during reading. Bi-weekly data checks to track progress of students. Adjusted master schedule to utilize staff resources insuring that many students have access to small group and individualized support. ELA PD offerings centered around Visible Learning, I-Ready, Classroom Discussions, Feedback Practices, High Expectations Teaching during CPT Schedule. District ELA PD training for grades 3-5. |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy | Our 2019-2020 problem of practice is if the principal and leadership team consistently communicate and model classroom discussion, feedback practices and teacher clarity in all subject areas we will continue to demonstrate growth and proficiency K-5 ELA learning gains. |
| Action Step | |
| Description | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Bi-Weekly data checks for all grade levels, homerooms, tier 2, tier 3 students. 2. ELA PD offerings. 3. Free after school enrichment and intervention provided to support ELA Bottom 25% 4. Follow up at Team Leader and Data/Assessment teams to revise plan if necessary. 5. Social/Emotional strategies modeled, practiced and reflected on at PBS meetings. |
| Person Responsible | Mark Grossenbacher (mark.grossenbacher@sarasotacountyschools.net) |

| | |
|---|--|
| #4 | |
| Title | Math-Learning Gains of the Lowest 25% |
| Rationale | By the End of SY 2019-2020, 62% of the Lowest 25% students will be successful in making a learning gain on FSA Math. |
| State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve | Our Math Learning Gains of the Lowest 25% have decreased over the past years. We were excited, however, to see a significant increase of 2% percent in 2018. Our goal is to have systems in place to help us continue to maintain Lowest 25% Learning Gains at or above 62% consistently. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome | Mark Grossenbacher (mark.grossenbacher@sarasotacountyschools.net) |
| Evidence-based Strategy | All student data shared with Data/Assessment team so K-5 staff can "own" the students. After school math groups and math buddies/mentors implemented targeting all tier 3, ESE, ESOL and lower 25%. Bi-weekly data checks to track progress of students. Adjusted master schedule to utilize staff resources insuring that many students have access to small group and individualized support. This involves full K-5 inclusion model in math as well as reg. ed teacher push-in support built within master schedule for all tier 2/3 1st-3rd grade students. PD offerings centered around Visible Learning, Feedback Practices, Classroom Discussions, I-Ready, High Expectations Teaching during CPT Schedule. District PD training for all new employees. After school club provided free to students who are also in lowest 25%, ESE and ESOL. |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy | Our 2019-2020 problem of practice is if the principal and leadership team consistently communicate and model classroom discussion, feedback practices and teacher clarity in all subject areas we will continue to demonstrate growth and proficiency K-5 math learning gains of those students in the lower 25%. |
| Action Step | |
| Description | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Bi-Weekly data checks for all students, grade level, homeroom, ESE, ESOL and lower 25%. 2. Math PD offerings. 3. Free after school enrichment and intervention provided to support Math Bottom 25% 4. Follow up at Team Leader and Data/Assessment teams to revise plan if necessary. 5. Social/Emotional strategies modeled, practiced and reflected on at PBS meetings. |
| Person Responsible | Mark Grossenbacher (mark.grossenbacher@sarasotacountyschools.net) |

| | |
|---|---|
| #5 | |
| Title | Math-Achievement |
| Rationale | We are very proud to have our math achievement consistently 80% of all students at or above proficiency. Our goal is to maintain and/or improve this number by 2%. |
| State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve | By the End of SY 2019-2020, 82% of EES students will be successful in math proficiency on the FSA Math assessment. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome | Mark Grossenbacher (mark.grossenbacher@sarasotacountyschools.net) |
| Evidence-based Strategy | All student data shared with Data/Assessment team so K-5 staff can "own" the students. Our goal is to specifically target those students in danger of "dropping" using I-Ready as our identification tool. After school math groups and math buddies implemented for students designated as tier 2 or tier 3.. Bi-weekly data checks to track progress of these students. Adjusted master schedule to utilize staff resources insuring that many students have access to small group and individualized support. Math PD offerings centered around Visible Learning, I-Ready, Classroom Discussions, Feedback Practices, High Expectations Teaching during CPT Schedule. District Math PD trainings and workshops. Full inclusion in math for ESE students K-5. |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy | Our 2019-2020 problem of practice is if the principal and leadership team consistently communicate and model classroom discussion, feedback practices and teacher clarity in all subject areas we will continue to demonstrate growth and proficiency in K-5 math achievement. |
| Action Step | |
| Description | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Bi-Weekly data checks for all grade levels and homerooms at data/assessment meeting. 2. Math PD offerings. 3. Free after school enrichment and intervention provided to support Math Bottom 25%, tier 3, ESE and ESOL students demonstrating the need. 4. Follow up at Team Leader and Data/Assessment teams to revise plan if necessary. 5. Social/Emotional strategies modeled, practiced and reflected on at PBS meetings. |
| Person Responsible | Mark Grossenbacher (mark.grossenbacher@sarasotacountyschools.net) |

| | |
|---|---|
| #6 | |
| Title | Math-Learning Gains |
| Rationale | Our Math Learning Gains have been very dynamic. Our goal would be to remain consistently higher than the 62% benchmark. |
| State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve | By the End of SY 2019-2020, 69% of EES students will be successful in making a Learning Gain on the FSA Math assessment. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome | Mark Grossenbacher (mark.grossenbacher@sarasotacountyschools.net) |
| Evidence-based Strategy | All student data shared with Data/Assessment team so K-5 staff can "own" the students, specifically their student who are in tier 3 process and/or lower 25%. After school math groups and math buddies/mentors implemented for targeted students. Bi-weekly data checks to track progress of lower 25% of students. Adjusted master schedule to utilize staff resources insuring that many students have access to small group and individualized support. PD offerings centered around Visible Learning, Feedback Practices, Classroom Discussions, I-Ready, High Expectations Teaching during CPT Schedule. District PD training for all new employees. After school club provided free to students who are also in lowest 25%, including ESE and ESOL if necessary. |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy | Our 2019-2020 problem of practice is if the principal and leadership team consistently communicate and model classroom discussion, feedback practices and teacher clarity in all subject areas we will continue to demonstrate growth and proficiency in K-5 math learning gains. |
| Action Step | |
| Description | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Bi-Weekly data checks for students in the lower 25% as well as tier 2/3 in math. 2. Math PD offerings. 3. Free after school enrichment and intervention provided to support Math Bottom 25% 4. Follow up at Team Leader and Data/Assessment teams to revise plan if necessary. 5. Social/Emotional strategies modeled, practiced and reflected on at PBS meetings. |
| Person Responsible | Mark Grossenbacher (mark.grossenbacher@sarasotacountyschools.net) |

| | |
|---|--|
| #7 | |
| Title | Science-Achievement |
| Rationale | 2018-2019 showed a significant 5 percent increase on the Science Achievement Test improving to 72%. We want to continue to maintain Science Achievement at or above 70% |
| State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve | By the End of SY 2019-2020, 74% of EES students will be successful in reaching proficiency on the Science assessment. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome | Mark Grossenbacher (mark.grossenbacher@sarasotacountyschools.net) |
| Evidence-based Strategy | Science Boot Camp, School-Wide Monthly K-5 STEM Challenges, Science Benchmark Testing data review. Science Buddies and STEM Fair opened to all grades K-5 for class and/or individual projects. Science Chair and Science Lab teachers participate in district PD offerings. |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy | Our 2019-2020 problem of practice is if the principal and leadership team consistently communicate and model classroom discussion, feedback practices and teacher clarity in all subject areas we will continue to demonstrate growth and proficiency K-5 science. |
| Action Step | |
| Description | Science data checks. Science PD offerings for select staff. After school enrichment provided to support Science enrichment and practice such as robotics. Follow up at Team Leader and Data/Assessment teams to revise plan if necessary. Add District Science Chair Cheri Dame as part of our CPT Trainings. Science Fair 3rd-5th Grade Participation |
| Person Responsible | Mark Grossenbacher (mark.grossenbacher@sarasotacountyschools.net) |

| | |
|---|--|
| #8 | |
| Title | ESE- ELA Achievement |
| Rationale | Only 35% of ESE were at or above proficiency. Our goal is to increase ESE achievement to at or above 41% proficiency. |
| State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve | 2019-2020 ESE students will score at or above 41% proficient in the FSA ELA assesement. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome | Mark Grossenbacher (mark.grossenbacher@sarasotacountyschools.net) |
| Evidence-based Strategy | Full inclusion model implemented K-5 in ELA. All ESE student data shared with Data/ Assessment team so K-5 staff can "own", monitor, and track ESE students per IEP goals in reading as well as progress toward meeting grade level standards. After school reading groups and reading buddies implemented for ESE students. Bi-weekly data checks to track progress of students. Adjusted master schedule to utilize staff resources insuring that ESE students have access to small group and individualized support per IEP goals. ELA PD offerings centered around Visible Learning, I-Ready, Classroom Discussions, Feedback Practices, High Expectations Teaching during CPT Schedule. District ELA PD training. We are proud to say we are at full K-5 reading inclusion for 2019-2020. |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy | Our 2019-2020 problem of practice is if the principal and leadership team consistently communicate and model classroom discussion, feedback practices and teacher clarity in all subject areas we will continue to demonstrate growth and proficiency K-5 ESE ELA Achievement. |
| Action Step | |
| Description | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Bi-Weekly data checks for K-5 ESE students at Data and Assessment team meetings. 2. ELA PD offerings. 3. Free after school enrichment and intervention provided to support ELA Bottom 25% 4. Follow up at Team Leader and Data/Assessment teams to revise plan if necessary. 5. Social/Emotional strategies modeled, practiced and reflected on at PBS meetings. 6. Full inclusion for ESE students ELA K-5 |
| Person Responsible | Mark Grossenbacher (mark.grossenbacher@sarasotacountyschools.net) |

| | |
|---|--|
| #9 | |
| Title | 5 Star School Goal-Increased Membership and Participation in PTA |
| Rationale | EES has a very strong PTA but we would like to see parent, community and staff membership increase. |
| State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve | By the end of 2019-2020 PTA membership will show a 4% increase in membership. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome | Mark Grossenbacher (mark.grossenbacher@sarasotacountyschools.net) |
| Evidence-based Strategy | An increased membership in PTA would help with parent communication and school support. |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy | We feel that the more our parents are informed and actively involved in their children's school functioning then the more successful our children will be. |
| Action Step | |
| Description | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. PTA visible at all major events including K Round Up, K screening, Meet and Greet and Open House 2. Online Access to membership 3. Speak at 1st faculty meeting and demonstration how to register online. 4. 5. |
| Person Responsible | Mark Grossenbacher (mark.grossenbacher@sarasotacountyschools.net) |

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).

Our 2019-2020 problem of practice is if the principal and leadership team consistently communicate and model classroom discussion, feedback practices and teacher clarity in all subject areas we will continue to demonstrate growth and proficiency K-5.

Part IV: Title I Requirements

Additional Title I Requirements
 This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Schoolwide Improvement Plan to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, Â§ 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students.

On average 85% of EES parents participate in school activities, volunteer and/or provide input throughout the year.

PFEP Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services.

A guidance counselor is available to all students, should they need social or emotional support. Many classrooms have volunteers who are working with individual students. All Instructional Staff training in Mental Health. All staff training in CHAMPS management system. The Big Brothers/Big Sisters Program also reaches out to those students who may need a mentor.

Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another.

Parent orientation/s are held each year to instruct, inform and provide support for all new families. PTA also hosts parent workshops and information sessions. New students are introduced to the school body during an ETV session. Administration and 5th Grade Teachers work with area middle schools to ensure smooth transition into middle school.

Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact.

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. Team members then work with grade level PLCs to support individual and group needs for students.

SAC approved funds will be used to to support goals requiring professional development.

Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations.

Robotics Team, 5 3-D printers on campus. Technical nonfiction writing practice in Science Lab and Science classes. Biz-Town experience provided at 5th Grade.

Part V: Budget

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

| | | | |
|---|--------|---|--------|
| 1 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: ELA-Learning Gains of the Lowest 25% | \$0.00 |
| 2 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: ELA-Achievement | \$0.00 |
| 3 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: ELA-Learning Gains | \$0.00 |
| 4 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Math-Learning Gains of the Lowest 25% | \$0.00 |
| 5 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Math-Achievement | \$0.00 |
| 6 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Math-Learning Gains | \$0.00 |

| | | | |
|---|--------|--|----------------------|
| 7 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Science-Achievement | \$0.00 |
| 8 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: ESE- ELA Achievement | \$0.00 |
| 9 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: 5 Star School Goal-Increased Membership and Participation in PTA | \$0.00 |
| | | | Total: \$0.00 |