

FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN



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

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

School Name: TANGLEWOOD ELEMENTARY

District Name: Lee

Principal: Ms. Sherri M. Wipf

SAC Chair: Pat Hartig

Superintendent: Dr. Joseph Burke

Date of School Board Approval: pending

Last Modified on: 9/28/2012

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)
Assis Principal	Shane E. Musich	Degrees: BS – Accounting, Penn State BA – Elementary Education , Mercyhurst College MS – Special Education, Mercyhurst College BA – Early Childhood, Mercyhurst College MA – Ed Leadership - FGCU Certification: Educational Leadership (All Levels) Elementary	3	5	August 2007- June 2009 Assistant Principal at Three Oaks Elementary Please use the following link to access all previous performance Records for Three Oaks Elementary: http://schoolgrades.fldoe.org/ August 2009 – Present Tanglewood Elementary Please use the following link to access all previous performance Records for Tanglewood Elementary: http://schoolgrades.fldoe.org/ 2011-2012 Principal Tanglewood Elementary: Grade: A

		Education (1-6) ESOL Endorsed			
Principal	Sherri M. Wipf	Degrees: BS- Elementary Education, Winona State University MA- Educational Leadership, Nova University Certification: Educational Leadership (All Levels) Elementary Education (1-6) ESOL Endorsed School Principal (All Levels)	1	5	2011-2012 Principal Tanglewood Elementary: Grade: A Assistant Principal of Villas Elementary 2010-2011: Grade: A Reading Mastery: 71% Math Mastery: 76% Science Mastery: 57% Writing Mastery: 88% AYP: Whites, Hispanics and Economically Disadvantaged did not make AYP in Reading. Assistant Principal of Villas Elementary in 2009-2010. Grade: A Reading Mastery: 81% Math Mastery: 79% Science Mastery: 71% Writing Mastery: 82% AYP: Hispanic students did not make AYP in Reading and Economically Disadvantaged Students in Math did not make AYP. Assistant Principal of Sunshine Elementary in 2008-2009. Grade: A Reading Mastery: 79% Math Mastery: 78% Science Mastery: 54% Writing Mastery: 90% AYP: SWD did not make AYP in Reading and Math. Assistant Principal of Sunshine Elementary in 2007-2008: Grade: A Reading Mastery: 83% Math Mastery: 77% Science Mastery: 50% Writing Mastery: 86% AYP: AYP was met in all categories

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	Meetings of new teachers and new to Tanglewood teachers with Principal / Assistant Principal	Administration	ongoing	
2	Partnering new teachers or teachers with less than 3 years' experience with veteran staff	Teachers with Clinical Education Training and Administration	ongoing	
3	Professional Learning Communities amongst grade level teams as well as with administration	Grade Level Chairs and Administration	ongoing	
4	Professional Development is aligned with school goals to meet the District, State, and Federal guidelines.	Administration	ongoing	

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

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

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

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

Staff Demographics

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

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

Total Number of Instructional Staff	% of First-Year Teachers	% of Teachers with 1-5 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 6-14 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 15+ Years of Experience	% of Teachers with Advanced Degrees	% Highly Effective Teachers	% Reading Endorsed Teachers	% National Board Certified Teachers	% ESOL Endorsed Teachers
56	8.9%(5)	39.3%(22)	32.1%(18)	19.6%(11)	33.9%(19)	100.0%(56)	5.4%(3)	1.8%(1)	71.4%(40)

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
Grade Level PLC	All teachers	All grade levels within our school work as professional learning communities (PLC) to create common lesson plans, assessments, etc. They support one another in all aspects of the school.	All grade levels meet weekly and present minutes from their meetings. All grade levels meet with administration monthly to evaluate the data.
Sue Valentine	Shannon Gentile	APPLES Mentor for Beginning Teacher that has not had a complete first year of teaching.	APPLES Beginning Teacher Program TWES new teacher orientation Monthly Meetings with APPLES teachers Meetings with APPLES administrator as needed
Jessica Bedwell	Andrea Gigliotti	APPLES Mentor for Beginning Teacher that has not had a complete first year of teaching.	APPLES Beginning Teacher Program TWES new teacher orientation Monthly Meetings with APPLES teachers Meetings with APPLES administrator as needed

ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS

Coordination and Integration

Note: For Title I schools only

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

Title I, Part A

Title I, Part C- Migrant

Title I, Part D

Title II

Title III

Title X- Homeless

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

Violence Prevention Programs

Nutrition Programs

Housing Programs

Head Start

Adult Education

Career and Technical Education

Job Training

Other

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

School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

The MTSS Leadership Team consists of the following members:

Sue Valentine-Curriculum Specialist
Tracey Short-Gifted resource Teacher
Laura Haskell-Speech pathalogist
Jennifer Axelberd-School Psychologist
Robin Pitura-Social Worker
Jan Gindele-ESE Resource Teacher
Sherri Wipf-Principal
Shane Musich-Assistant Principal
Melissa Wallace-School Nurse

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

The MTSS Leadership Team at Tanglewood meets on a weekly basis to analyze school or student progress data in order to monitor the progress of students receiving interventions and to identify students in need of more support.

The team uses the five-step problem solving process as outlined in the district's Response to Intervention Manual.

The roles of each member are as follows:

Classroom Teacher:

The roles of each member are as follows:

Classroom Teacher

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

Technology/Curriculum Specialist

- Attend MTSS Team meetings
- Train teachers in interventions, progress monitoring, differentiated instruction
- Monitors Tier 2 & 3 interventions
- Keep progress monitoring notes & anecdotal of interventions implemented
- Administer screenings

Speech-Language Pathologist

- Attend MTSS Team meetings for some Tier 2 & Tier 3 students
- Completes Communication Skills screening for students unsuccessful with Tier 2 interventions
- Assist with Tier 2 & 3 interventions through collaboration, training, and/or direct student contact
- Incorporate MTSS data when guiding a possible Speech/Language referral & when making eligibility decisions

Principal/Assistant Principal

- Facilitate implementation of MTSS in your building
- Provide or coordinate valuable and continuous professional development
- Assign paraprofessionals to support MTSS implementation when possible
- Attend MTSS Team meetings to be active in the MTSS change process
- Conduct classroom Walk-Throughs to monitor fidelity
- Collect school-wide data for team to use in determining at-risk students

Reading Specialist/Curriculum Specialist

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

School Psychologist

- Attend MTSS Team meetings on some students in Tier 2 & on all students in Tier 3
- Monitor data collection process for fidelity

- Review & interpret progress monitoring data
- Collaborate with MTSS Team on effective instruction & specific interventions
- Incorporate MTSS data when guiding a possible ESE referral & when making eligibility decisions

ESE Teacher/Staffing Specialist

- Consult with MTSS Team regarding Tier 3 interventions
- Incorporate MTSS data when making eligibility decisions
- Consults and advises team to additional specialist that may be needed at a meeting to help assist in intervention ideas etc. for a student.

Specialist (Behavior, OT, PT, ASD)

- Consult with MTSS Team

Social Worker

- Attend MTSS Team meetings when requested
- Conduct social-developmental history interviews and share with MTSS Team

ESOL/ELL Representative

- Attend all MTSS Team meetings for identified ELL students, advising and completing LEP paperwork
- Conduct language screenings and assessments
- Assists in scheduling services for ELL students who are identified as needing additional support

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

The MTSS Leadership Team assists with the analysis of school, classroom, and student level data in order to identify areas for school improvement

Additionally, the team assists with the evaluation of the student response to current interventions curricula and school systems.

MTSS Implementation

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

Tanglewood Elementary utilizes the district adopted data management system, Pinnacle Analytics. This allows the school comprehensive access to all school and district databases, thereby assisting with the detailed analysis of district, school, classroom, and student level data. These analyses assist with the tracking of student progress, management of diagnostic, summative, and formative assessment data, and the response of students to implemented interventions. Additionally, Tanglewood school has created a unique data management system housed on the school Sharepoint site that documents student progress and achievement in many areas including Oral Reading Fluency, Comprehension and Math.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

The Lee County School District has developed a comprehensive training and support plan for schools. District teams have been established to support schools in the implementation of the RTI process for all students. The teams provide training, coaching, modeling, data analysis, and guidance to assist schools with the implementation of supplemental and intensive strategies designed to improve the educational outcomes for students with academic and behavioral needs.

The teams are comprised of teachers with knowledge in effective instructional practices, data analysis, behavior management techniques, and ESOL strategies. All team members are provided on-going staff development training regarding the RTI process and research based practices to support the academic and behavioral needs of students.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

Administration (Principal / Assistant Principal)
Curriculum Specialist / Reading Specialist
Grade level representative for each grade
ESE resource teacher
MTSS Liaison/Guidance Counselor

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

Each month the SLT team meets to review and discuss the school's Reading goal and monitoring of AYP subgroups. Each grade level representative shares their grade level's progress towards these goals. School wide data is discussed and desegregated by AYP groups and Male/Female. Discussion centers around needs which include training, movement of students, iii groups, or individual assistance.

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

Monitoring the lowest 25% in Reading and Math to ensure learning gains are being met will be the major initiative of the LLT team this year.

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:	On the 2011-2012 Reading FCAT 23% (80) of our 347 students scored a level 3 on FCAT. On the 2011-2012 Reading FCAT 45% (156) students scored a level 4 or higher. In 2012-2013 26% (91) students will score a minimum of a level 3 on the FCAT Reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Total: 23% (80 students)	Total: 26% (91 students)

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	1.1 Data shows that Standards are not being met based on 23% of students being proficient based on FCAT data	1.1 Data monitoring of subgroup using weekly MacMillan assessments, unit assessments, and grade level common assessments	1.1 Administration/Teachers/Reading Specialists, and Curriculum Specialists	1.1 Evaluation of data of subgroup through TWES Sharepoint site, data notebooks, classroom walk-throughs, Achievement Series, Pinnacle Analytics	1.1 PMRN data, classroom walk-through data, assessments
2	1.2. Training availability for teachers not yet trained.	1.2. Teachers will include Kagan strategies within lesson plans to ensure higher order thinking processes be implemented into the classroom	1.2. Administration	1.2. Lesson will be reviewed during classroom walk-throughs and lesson plans will be submitted weekly with Kagan strategies	1.2. Classroom Walk-through log and focused walkthroughs to determine frequency of Kagan strategies.
3	1.3. Student participation because of transportation requirement	1.3. Extended Day program available for all students who struggled on the 2011-2012 FCAT Reading test.	1.3. Administration	1.3. Monitoring of team data through TWES Sharepoint site	1.3. 2012-2013 FCAT evaluation report / AYP report
4	1.4 Unavailability of parents	1.4 Meet will bottom 25% parents to provide guidance and strategies for home support and to encourage participation in extended day opportunity. Student-Led Conferences two times a year.	1.4 Administration/Teacher	1.4 Monthly calendar signed by parent indicating participation in home activities. Attendance Report	1.4 2012-2013 FCAT evaluation report / AYP report, sign in sheet

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment:	
-----------------------------------	--

Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading. Reading Goal #1b:				
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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

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

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

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in reading. Reading Goal #2b:		b		
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
43		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
No Data Submitted				

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading. Reading Goal #3b:	In 2011-2012 no data was available due to less than 10 students taking the Florida Alternate Assessment. In 2012-2013 no goal due to less than 10 students whom take the Florida Alternate Assessment.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
no data due to less than 10 students	no data due to less than 10 students

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.	*
---	---

Reading Goal #4:	
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 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 #					
	In six years we will reduce our achievement gap by 50%. 68% of 3rd-5th graders were proficient on the FCAT Reading test in 2011-2012 and 32% were non-proficient. The proficiency target in 2016-2017 is (68% + 16% = 84%) 84%.					
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	68%	71%	74%	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 reading.	On the 2011-2012 FCAT Reading, 42% (18) of 3rd-5th grade Black students were proficient. In 2012-2013 47% (21) of 3rd-5th grade Black students will be proficient based on proficiency target.
Reading Goal #5B:	On the 2011-2012 FCAT Reading, 53% (44) of 3rd-5th grade Hispanic students were proficient. In 2012-2013 57% (47) of 3rd-5th grade Hispanic students will be proficient based on proficiency target.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Black students 42% (18) Hispanic students 53% (44)	Black students 47% (21) Hispanic students 57% (47)

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	5.B.1 Data shows that Standards are not being met based on % of students being proficient on FCAT Reading	Data monitoring of subgroup using weekly MacMillan assessments, unit assessments, Compass Learning, and grade level common assessments	Administration/Teachers/Reading Specialists, and Curriculum Specialists	Evaluation of data of subgroup through TWES Sharepoint site, Compass Learning data, data notebooks, classroom walk-throughs, Achievement Series	PMRN data, classroom walk-through data, assessments
	5.B.2 Training availability for teachers not yet	Teachers will include Kagan strategies	Administration, Teachers	Lesson will be reviewed during	Classroom Walk-through log and

2	trained.	within lesson plans to ensure higher order thinking processes be implemented into the classroom		classroom walk-throughs and lesson plans will be submitted weekly with Kagan strategies	focused walkthroughs to determine frequency of Kagan strategies.
3	5.B.3 Student participation because of transportation requirement	Extended Day program available for all students who scored in the lowest 25% on the 2011-2012 FCAT Reading test.	Administration	Monitoring of team data through TWES Sharepoint Site	2012-2013 FCAT evaluation report
4	5.B.4 Unavailability of parents	Meet will all parents of the bottom 25% to provide guidance and strategies for home support and to encourage participation in extended day opportunity. Student-Led Conferences two times a year.	Administration/Teacher	Monthly calendar signed by parent indicating participation in home activities. Attendance Report	2012-2013 FCAT evaluation report

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

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5C:	On the 2011-2012 FCAT Reading, 10% (1) of 3rd-5th grade ELL students was proficient. In 2012-2013 18% (3) of 3rd-5th grade ELL students will be proficient based on proficiency target.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
10% (1)	18% (3)

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	5.C.1 Limited English	Identify ESOL students to work with ELL para reading strategies including vocabulary development	Teccher/ELL para/Administration/Curriculum Specialist	Student binders, data on school SharePoint Site, teacher feedback	CELLA Achievement, Renaissance Place, Compass Learning

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5E:	On the 2011-2012 FCAT Reading, 56% (114) of 3rd-5th grade ED students were proficient. In 2012-2013 60% (123) of 3rd-5th grade ED students will be proficient based on proficiency target.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
56% (114)	60% (123)

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	5.E.1 Data shows that Standards are not being met based on 56% of students being proficient based on FCAT Reading.	Data monitoring of subgroup using weekly MacMillan assessments, unit assessments, and grade level common assessments	Administration/Teachers/Reading Specialists, and Curriculum Specialists	Evaluation of data of subgroup through TWES Sharepoint site, data notebooks, classroom walk-throughs, Achievement Series	PMRN data, SharePoint data, classroom walk-through data, assessments
2	5.E.2 Training availability for teachers not yet trained.	Teachers will include Kagan strategies within lesson plans to ensure higher order thinking processes be implemented into the classroom	Administration/ Teachers	Lesson will be reviewed during classroom walk-throughs and lesson plans will be submitted weekly with Kagan strategies	Classroom Walk-through log and focused walkthroughs to determine frequency of Kagan strategies.
3	5.E.3 Student participation because of transportation requirement	Extended Day program available for all students who scored in the lowest 25% on the 2011-2012 FCAT Reading test.	Administration	Monitoring of team data through TWES Sharepoint site	2012-2013 FCAT evaluation report
4	5.E.4 Unavailability of parents	Meet with all parents of the bottom 25% to provide guidance and strategies for home support and to encourage participation in extended day opportunity. Student-Led Conferences two times a year.	Administration/Teacher	Monthly calendar signed by parent indicating participation in home activities. Attendance Report	2012-2013 FCAT evaluation report

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
Phonemic Awareness Training	K-1st and ESE Primary Teachers	Kindergarten Lead-Teacher	Kindergarten and 1st grade teachers	September 2012	Student data, classroom walk-through, lesson plans	Classroom teachers and Administration
Earobic Training	K-2nd grades	Kindergarten, First and Second Grade Teachers	Kindergarten, first and second grades	October 2012	Student data, walk-throughs, lesson plans	classroom teachers and Administration
Kagan Cooperative Learning Structures	K-5th, ESE and Special Area Teachers	5th grade lead teacher	School-wide	Monthly Meetings	Classroom walk-throughs and lesson plans	Classroom Teacher and Administration
Compass Learning for Reading	K-5th, Special Area Teachers, and ESE	Reading Specialist and teachers	School-wide	All year September-May 2013	Weekly analysis of data, classroom walk throughs, lesson plans	Classroom teachers, Curriculum Specialist, Administration
Renaissance Learning	K-5th and ESE	Reading Specialist and classroom teachers	School-wide	August 2012 PLC Mtgs and December PLC mtgs	weekly analysis of data, student data folders, classroom walk-throughs	Classroom teachers, Curriculum Specialist and Administration
FCAT Explorer Training	3rd-5th	Classroom teacher and Curriculum Specialist	third, fourth and 5th grade teachers	October 2012	Student data, lesson plans, FCAT Explorer data analysis	Classroom teacher, Curriculum Specialist, Administration

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

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:	In 2011-2012, 31% (13) of our 42 ELL students scored proficient in listening/speaking as reported by the Florida Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) report. In 2012-2013 we will improve to 36% (18 students) as measured by the Florida Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) report.
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:	
In 2011-2012, 31% (13) of our 42 ELL students scored proficient in listening/speaking as reported by the Florida Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) report.	

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of the English language.	Identify students to work with ESOL para on reading strategies.	Curriculum Specialist, ESOL, Teacher, Administration	Student data, data binders, teacher feedback.	CELLA, Achievement Series, Renaissance, Sharepoint data
2	Unavailability of parents	Working with school parent liason to provide guidance in strategies for home support.	Curriculum Specialist, ESOL Teacher, Administration, Parent Liason	Monthly conference with classroom teacher, data binders, parent signatures on student planners.	FCAT scores, CELLA report.

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

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:	On the 2011-2012 FCAT Math 68% (236) students scored a level 3 or higher on the FCAT Mathematics and 28% (97) scored a level 3. In 2012-2013 31% (108) of students will score a level 3 as measured by the FCAT Report.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
28% (97 students)	31% (108 students)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1					
2	5.2 Parent involvement	5.2 Meet with all parents to provide guidance and strategies for home support and to encourage participation in extended day opportunity. Student-Led Conferences two times a year.	5.2 Administration/ Teachers	5.2 2012-2013 FCAT evaluation report	5.2 Monthly calendar signed by parent indicating participation
3	5.4 Lack of instructional time	5.4 60 minutes of Math (K-2) and 90 minutes of Math (3-5)	5.4 Classroom teacher / Administration	5.4 Monitoring of data through PLCs, Data from Compass Learning, TWES Sharepoint, topic tests, common assessments, classroom walk-throughs, and Pearson Successnet	5.4 2012-2013 FCAT data results, and classroom/common assessments
4	5.1 Data shows that standards are not being met based on 68% of students being proficient based on	5.1 Higher Order Thinking questions, and create a dashboard to monitor students on common assessments	5.1 Administration/ Teachers	5.1 Classroom walk-through and data recording of level of questions used during instruction	5.1 On-going data collection
5	5.3 Attendance of students because of transportation requirement	5.3 Extended day program available for all students who struggled on the 2011-2012 FCAT Math Test	5.3 Administration/ Teachers	5.3 2012-2013 FCAT evaluation report	5.3 Attendance Sheets compared to FCAT results.

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

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

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

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2a:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

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

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

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

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

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.

Mathematics Goal #3a:

2012 Current Level of Performance:

2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics.

Mathematics Goal #3b:

In 2011-2012 no data was available due to less than 10 students taking the Florida Alternate Assessment. In 2012-2013 no goal due to less than 10 students will take the Florida Alternate Assessment.

2012 Current Level of Performance:

2013 Expected Level of Performance:

no data due to less than 10 students

no data due to less than 10 students

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.

Mathematics Goal #4:

*

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 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 # In six years we will reduce our achievement gap in Math by 50%. 68% of our 3rd-5th grade students were proficient and 32% were non-proficient on the FCAT Mathematics in 2011-2012. Our proficiency target in 2016-2017 is (68% + 16% =				
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	68%	71%	74%	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:	On the 2011-2012 FCAT Math, 25% (11) of 3rd-5th grade Black students were proficient. In 2012-2013 31% (13) of 3rd-5th grade Black students will be proficient based on proficiency target. On the 2011-2012 FCAT Math, 60% (50) of 3rd-5th grade Hispanic students were proficient. In 2012-2013 63% (52) of 3rd-5th grade Hispanic students will be proficient based on proficiency target.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Black Students 25% (11) Hispanic students 60% (50)	Black Students 31% (13) Hispanic students 63% (52)

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	5.B.1 Lack of instructional time	60 minutes of Math (K-2) and 90 minutes of Math (3-5)	Classroom teacher / administration	Monitoring of data through PLCs, TWES Sharepoint, topic tests, Compass Learning, common assessments, classroom walk-throughs, and Pearson Successnet	2012-2-13 FCAT data results, and classroom/common assessments
2	5.B.2 Data shows that standards are not being met based on % of students being proficient based FCAT Math test	Higher Order Thinking questions, and create a dashboard to monitor students on common assessments	Administration/ Teachers	Classroom walk-through and data recording of level of questions used during instruction	On-going data collection
3	5.B.3 Parent involvement	Meet will all parents of the bottom 25% to provide guidance and strategies for home support and to encourage participation in extended day	Administration/ Teachers	2012-2012 FCAT evaluation report	Monthly calendar signed by parent indicating participation

		opportunity. Student-Led Conferences two times a year. Pearson Successnet at home.			
4	5.B.4 Attendance of students because of transportation requirement	Extended day program available for all students who scored in the lowest 25% on the 2011-2012 FCAT Math Test	Administration/ Teachers	2012-2013 FCAT evaluation report	Attendance Sheets compared to FCAT results.

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

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5C:	On the 2011-2012 FCAT Math, 10% (1) of 3rd-5th grade ELL students was proficient. In 2012-2013 18% (3) of 3rd-5th grade ELL students will be proficient based on proficiency target.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
10% (1)	18% (3)

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	5.C.1 Limited English	Identify ELL students to work with ELL Para on Math Computation, Math Vocabulary and Math Problem Solving Skills.	Teacher/ELL Para/ Administration/Curriculum Specialist	Data Binders, TWES SharePoint data, Unit Assessments, Compass Learning Data, Teacher Feedback	Data Collection, monthly PLC meetings, 2012-2013 FCAT Results
2	5.C.2 Parent Involvement	Meet with ELL parents with ELL Para/ELL School Liason to provide guidance and strategies for home support. Encourage parents to have students attend extended day opportunity.	Teacher/ELL Para/ Administration/Curriculum Specialist	2012-2013 FCAT Math report	Attendance sheets to compare FCAT results with ELL student attendance in Extended Day

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:	
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
---------------------	----------	---	---	-----------------

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:	On the 2011-2012 FCAT Math, 56% (115) of 3rd-5th grade ED students were proficient. In 2012-2013 60% (123) of 3rd-5th grade ED students will be proficient based on proficiency target.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
56% (115)	60% (123)

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	5.E.1 Data shows that standards are not being met based on 70% of students being	Higher Order Thinking questions, and create a dashboard to monitor students on common assessments	Administration/ Teachers	Classroom walk-through and data recording of level of questions used during instruction	On-going data collection
2	5.E.2 Parent involvement	Meet will all parents of the bottom 25% to provide guidance and strategies for home support and to encourage participation in extended day opportunity. Student-Led Conferences two times a year. Pearson Successnet at home.	Administration/ Teachers	2012-2013 FCAT evaluation report	Monthly calendar signed by parent indicating participation
3	5.E.3 Attendance of students because of transportation requirement	Extended day program available for all students who scored in the lowest 25% on the 2012-2013 FCAT Math Test	Administration/ Teachers	2012-2013 FCAT evaluation report	Attendance Sheets compared to FCAT results.
4	5.E.4 Lack of instructional time	60 minutes of Math (K-2) and 90 minutes of Math (3-5)	Classroom teacher / administration	Monitoring of data through PLCs, TWES Sharepoint, topic tests, common assessments, classroom walk-throughs, and Pearson Successnet	2012-2013 FCAT data results, and classroom/common assessments

End of Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring

Kagan Cooperative Learning Structures	K-5th, ESE, and Special Area Teachers	5th Grade Lead Teacher	School-Wide	Once a month	Classroom Walk-throughs, lesson plans	Classroom teachers and Administration
FCAT Explorer Training	3rd-5th Grade and ESE Teachers	Curriculum Specialist and classroom teachers	3rd, 4th, 5th and ESE teachers	October 2012	FCAT Explorer data, student data binders, lesson plans	Classroom teachers and administration
Compass Learning for Math	K-5th, ESE and Special Area teachers	Curriculum Specialist, and classroom teachers	School-wide	All year September-May	Lesson plans, Compass Learning Data, Walk-throughs	Classroom teachers and Administration
Math Centers Training	2nd-4th grades	District personnel	2nd, 3rd and 4th grade teachers	December-January	Lesson plans, Classroom walk-throughs, student data	Classroom Teachers and Administration

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:	
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science. Science Goal #1a:	In 2011-2012 77% (84 students) of our 109 students scored a Level 3 or higher on the FCAT 2.0 Science. 58% (63) of the students score a level 3 in 2011-2012. In 2012-2013 we will improve to 68% (83 students) of our 122 students as measured by the FCAT Science.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
58% (63 students)	68% (83 students)
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	1.1 New Science Series and P Sell Participation	1.1 Provide training on the NGSSS and opportunities to plan instruction	1.1 Administration/Teachers/P Sell Personell	1.1 Progress Monitoring of Monthly Data	1.1 2012-2013 FCAT Science Results
2	1.2 Lack of classroom instructional time	1.2 Science special area class available to all students in kdg through 5th	1.2 Administration/ Teachers	1.2 Progress Monitoring of Common Assessments	1.2 2012-2013 FCAT Science Results
3	1.3 Funding	1.3 Use of hands-on Science materials	1.3 Administration/ Teachers	1.3 Monitoring of lesson plans Classroom Walk-Through Data	1.3 2012-2013 FCAT Science Results

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment:
Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science.

Science Goal #1b:

2012 Current Level of Performance:

2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in science.

Science Goal #2a:

2012 Current Level of Performance:

2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in science. Science Goal #2b:	In 2011-2012 no data was available due to less than 10 students taking the Florida Alternate Assessment. In 2012-2013 no goal due to less than 10 students whom take the Florida Alternate Assessment.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
no data due to less than 10 students	no data due to less than 10 students

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
Compass Learning-Science	K-5th, ESE and Special Area Teachers	Curriculum Specialist and Teacher Lead from each grade level	School-wide	Monthly PLC Grade Level Meetings	Lesson plans, student data, Analysis of data from Compass, Classroom Walk-Throughs	Classroom Teachers and Administration
P-Sell Science Training	5th grade teachers	District Personnel	5th grade teachers and IA teacher	Monthly meetings and district meetings	Lesson plans, student data, Classroom Walk-throughs	5th Grade Classroom, District Personnel and Administration

Science Budget:

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

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

End of Science Goals

Writing Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:					
1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing. Writing Goal #1a:		IN 2011-2012 94% (108 students) scored a level 3 or higher on the FCAT Writing. IN 2012-2013 we will improve to 95% (116 students) as measured by the School Accountability Report.			
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
94% (108 students)		95% (116 students)			
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	1.1 Low writing scores of students on Monthly prompts.	1.1 Monitor writing prompts for all students at TWES. Create a writing group to provide enrichment in writing for lowest performing writers	1.1 Administration/ Teacher	1.1 The % of students scoring 3.0 or higher on the monthly TWES Writes!	1.1 The 2012-2013 FCAT Writes! results
2	1.2 Changes in FCAT Writes expectations at State Level	1.2 Provide additional training and classroom instruction on conventions (grammar, punctuation, and spelling)	1.2 Administration/Teachers	1.2 The % of students scoring 3.0 or higher on the monthly TWES Writes and 2011-2012 FCAT Writes	1.2 The 2012-2013 FCAT Writes! results.

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:	In 2011-2012 no data was available due to less than 10 students taking the Florida Alternate Assessment. In 2012-2013 no goal due to less than 10 students whom take the Florida Alternate Assessment.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

no data due to less than 10 students		no data due to less than 10 students		
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
Team PLC Writing Meetings	k-5th and ESE teachers	Grade Level Chair and Curriculum Specialist	K-5th grade teachers, ESE teachers and Curriculum Specialist	On-going all year at monthly meetings	Student writing data, lesson plans, student samples, classroom walk-throughs	Classroom teachers and Administration
Writing Training for Primary grades	1st-2nd grade	District Personnel	1st and 2nd grade teachers	December-January	Student writing data, lesson plans, student samples and Classroom Walk-Throughs	Classroom Teachers

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

Attendance Goal(s)

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

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

1. Attendance Attendance Goal #1:	
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

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

Attendance Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)

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

End of Attendance Goal(s)

Suspension Goal(s)

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

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

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

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

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

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

Suspension Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			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: <i>*Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.</i>	In 2011-2012 our volunteer school hours was 3,721. In 2012-2013 we will increase by 5% (186 hours) with the total being 3,907 hours.
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:
(3,721 hours)	5% increase (186 hours)

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	1.2 Parent's schedules	1.2 Provide various activities for parent involvement: FCAT night, AR night, Student Led Conferences, PTA events, Academic Fair etc.	1.2 Administration / Teachers / PTA	1.2 Evaluation of each event's attendance	1.2 Attendance collection tool
2	1.1 Awareness of school-wide events	1.1 Use ParentLink to notify parents of events, school newsletter, and school website to advertise and relay school news.	1.1 Administration/Teachers	1.1 Attendance collection tool	1.1 Attendance collection tool
3	1.3 Volunteer Schedules	1.3 Promote within the school, the community, and with business partners to increase volunteers within school to assist students' academic needs.	1.3 Administration, Teachers, PTA, Volunteer Coordinator	1.3 Annual School Volunteer Report	1.3 Annual School Volunteer Report and the Five-Star Award

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

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

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

Parent Involvement Budget:

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)

In 2011-2012 24 sited peer conflicts occurred. In 2012-2013 we will decrease the number of peer conflicts by 10% (21 sited peer conflicts. 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. In 2011-2012 24 sited peer conflicts occurred. In 2012-2013 we will decrease the number of peer conflicts by 10% (21 sited peer conflicts. Goal	In 2011-2012 24 sited peer conflicts occurred with 0 Bully incidents. In 2012-2013 we will decrease the number of peer conflicts by 10% (21 sited peer conflicts) along with 0 Bully incidents.
In 2011-2012 24 sited peer conflicts occurred. In 2012-2013 we will decrease the number of peer conflicts by 10% (21 sited peer conflicts. Goal #1:	
2012 Current level:	2013 Expected level:
24 sited peer conflicts with 0 Bully incidents.	10% reduction (21) in sited peer conflicts with 0 Bully incidents.

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	Lack of social skills	Developing social skills through monthly guidance classes and peer practice in conflict resolution.	Guidance teacher, classroom teacher, Administration.	Decrease in school incident reports.	Pinnacle Analytics Data source: mainframe
2	Lack of overall knowledge relating to Bully Prevention	Bully training for staff members and students	Guidance, teachers, Administration	Reduction in incidences	Pre/Post Test of Bully Training

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
Staff Bully Training	K-5th, ESE and Special Area Teachers	Guidance Counselor, Administration	School-Wide	August 2012	Classroom walk-throughs, on-line training	Classroom teachers and Administration

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 In 2011-2012 24 sited peer conflicts occurred. In 2012-2013 we will decrease the number of peer conflicts by 10% (21 sited peer conflicts. Goal(s)

FINAL BUDGET

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

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

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

Are you a reward school: Yes No

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

No Attachment (Uploaded on 9/11/2012)

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.



If NO, describe the measures being taken to Comply with SAC Requirement

Describe projected use of SAC funds	Amount
No data submitted	

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

AYP DATA

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

SCHOOL GRADE DATA

No Data Found

Lee School District TANGLEWOOD ELEMENTARY 2010-2011						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	83%	85%	90%	65%	323	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	64%	61%			125	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?	46% (NO)	59% (YES)			105	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					553	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					B	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Lee School District TANGLEWOOD ELEMENTARY 2009-2010						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	89%	85%	96%	54%	324	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	69%	70%			139	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?	62% (YES)	74% (YES)			136	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					599	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested