

# 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: TRAFALGAR ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

District Name: Lee

Principal: Ann Fainer

SAC Chair: Jennifer Andoscia

Superintendent: Dr. Joseph Burke Ed.D

Date of School Board Approval:

Last Modified on: 9/21/2012

## PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

### STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

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

<a href="#">School Grades Trend Data</a>
<a href="#">Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT)/Statewide Assessment Trend Data</a>
<a href="#">High School Feedback Report</a>
<a href="#">K-12 Comprehensive Research Based Reading Plan</a>

### ADMINISTRATORS

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

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO Progress along with the associated school year)
Principal	Ann Fainer	Masters in Educational Leadership - 1998	5	8	Joined the staff as Assistant Principal at Trafalgar Elementary in 2007. Received an A from the state and AYP every year since. TES made PBS school for our outstanding discipline program since 2004. We achieved Kagan model school status in 2010. Mrs. Fainer has been trained along with the entire faculty and is a certified Kagan coach.
Assis Principal	Jennifer Milstein	Masters in Special Ed. Behavior Disorders - 2002 Specialist in Ed. Leadership - 2006	1	1	A Social Communication teacher at Trafalgar Middle School 2010-2011. Prior to that a Behavior Specialist from 2008-2010. Trafalgar Middle has been an A+ school since 2005 consistently making great learning gains. Ms.Milstein joined Trafalgar Elementary in 2011 and we earned an A school. Ms.Milstein is trained as a Kagan coach.

### 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.

Subject Area	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)
All	Jill Zaiser	BS	9	9	2003-2012: Grade A Made AYP
All	Kathy Eva	Masters	8	4	2004-2012: Grade A Made AYP

### 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	Incentives STAR Awards Staff Development Mentor new teachers Sunshine Committee	Staff	Ongoing	

### Non-Highly Effective Instructors

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

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

Number of staff and paraprofessional that are teaching out-of-field/ and who are not highly effective.	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective
NA	NA

### 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
60	1.7%(1)	5.0%(3)	73.3%(44)	20.0%(12)	26.7%(16)	100.0%(60)	10.0%(6)	3.3%(2)	98.3%(59)

### 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
Jane Perry	Ashley Cerbone	Jane is a veteran Kindergarten teacher close in proximity	Shared Planning Grade Level Meetings Modeling Kagan Coaching

# ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS

## Coordination and Integration

Note: For Title I schools only

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

Title I, Part A

Title I, Part C- Migrant

Title I, Part D

Title II

Title III

Title X- Homeless

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

Violence Prevention Programs

Nutrition Programs

Housing Programs

Head Start

Adult Education

Career and Technical Education

Job Training

Other

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

School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

The MTSS Leadership Team for Trafalgar Elementary consists of the following members:

Ann Fainer - Principal  
Jennifer Milstein - Assistant Principal  
Jill Muller - Speech Pathologist  
Karen Friebe - School Psychologist  
Jill Zaiser - Curriculum Specialist/ESOL Specialist  
Kathy Eva - Curriculum Specialist  
Sara Primrose - Social worker  
Jenny Powless - Guidance Counselor  
Classroom Teacher  
School Nurse - When needed  
ESE Teacher - When needed  
Kym Bisbe - Media Specialist/504  
On call behavior specialists from the district office Tammy Miller

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 Trafalgar meets on a weekly, monthly, as needed basis to analyze school and/or student progress data in order to monitor the progress of students receiving interventions and to identify students in need of more support. The team uses the five-step problem solving process as outlined in the district's Response to Intervention Manual. 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

Reading Specialist

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

Speech-Language Pathologist

- Attend MTSS Team meetings for some Tier 2 & Tier 3 students
- Complete 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 curriculum coaches to implement intervention
- Attend MTSS Team meetings to be active in the MTSS change process
- Conduct classroom Walk-Throughs to monitor fidelity

Curriculum Specialists

- 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

Assists with planning and/or implementation of intervention strategies

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

- Consult with MTSS Team regarding Tier 3 interventions
- Incorporate MTSS data when making eligibility decisions

Specialist (Behavior, OT, PT, ASD)

- Consult with MTSS Team
- Provide staff trainings

#### Social Worker

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

#### ESOL/ELL Representative

- Attend all MTSS Team meetings for identified ELL students, advising and completing LEP paperwork
- Conduct language screenings and assessments

Provide ELL interventions at all tiers

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

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

#### MTSS Implementation

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

Trafalgar Elementary utilizes the district adopted data management system, and 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.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

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

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

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

Teachers coteach with supporting teachers in our classrooms with struggling readers. Jill Zaiser, Kathy Eva, Kym Bisbe, and Kelle Brooks support these students and teachers using SRA, triumphs, and intensive reading strategies.

#### Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

##### School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

Jill Zaiser, the curriculum specialist, leads this team for improvement and focuses in the area of reading. The other members of this team include one or more persons from each grade level, an ESE representative, the media specialist, and administration.

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

This team meets monthly after the district's LLT meeting to update the team members of district initiatives. We monitor data current and past to make changes as needed. The LLT Chair meets quarterly with grade levels to analyze recent data and recommend strategies for student improvement. This data driven decision making team drives reading instruction in classrooms.

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

Common Core Standards, text complexity, and close reading will be a focuses of study this year. We will also be monitoring closely the lowest 25% in all grade levels as well as the economically disadvantaged students and the "bubble" kids. Implementation of Common Core at Trafalgar Elementary will be done earlier, school wide, than the district mandate.

## 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:				
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:

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

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

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

2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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

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

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.  Reading Goal #3a:		In 2011-2012, 66% of students made learning gains in Reading. This year, 70% (190 students) of our students will make learning gains in Reading.			
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
66% of our student made learning gains in 2012		70% of students (190 students) will make learning gains in 2013.			
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	Small group instruction time is limited.	Kit Cat Club after school for tutoring targeted students and skills.	Ann Fainer	Teacher observation and formative assessment.	FCAT 2.0

2	Standards changes.	2nd-5th grade teachers and students become familiar with the Common Core standards in reading by creating and completing thematic units.	A+ Team	Formative assessment and unit assessment	FCAT 2.0
3	Lack of parent involvement	Increase communication with parents about FCAT tests using informative parent nights at school including 2 parent teacher conference nights, ESOL parent nights and FCAT night	A+ Team, classroom teachers	FCAT scores and parent feedback	Sign in logs

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.  Reading Goal #4:	
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 #					
	5A : <input type="text"/>					
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

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

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5B:				
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
<input type="text"/>		<input type="text"/>		
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:

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5C:				
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
<input type="text"/>		<input type="text"/>		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading. 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:				
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Common Core training	All grades. Most trainings will be split into primary and intermediate	A+ team plus Kristina Rendon, Colleen Brown, and Donna Berry	School-wide	Trainings will be held during preschool and on 2 Wednesday training blocks every month.	Lesson plans and teacher feedback including end of year survey monkey	Principal

Compass Learning	All classroom teachers	Jill Zaiser and Kathy Eva	school-wide	Initial training in October and then ongoing training as needed during the year	Lesson plans and reports generated by Compass Learning	Ann Fainer
SAMs Club-Ongoing Kagan Training	All teachers	Nancy Feather and Kthy Eva	School-wide	once every month	coaching in classrooms and lesson plans	Darlene Martin and Ann Fainer

Reading Budget:

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

End of Reading Goals

## Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.				
1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking.				
CELLA Goal #1:				
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:				
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool

No Data Submitted

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

2. Students scoring proficient in reading.

CELLA Goal #2:

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3. Students scoring proficient in writing.

CELLA Goal #3:

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

CELLA Budget:

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

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

*End of CELLA Goals*

# Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal # 1a:	
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:

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:	In 2011-2012, 68% of our students made learning gains in Math. This year, 71% of our students (192 students) will make learning gains in Math.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
68% of students made learning gains in math in 2012.	71% of students (192 students) will make learning gains in math in 2013.

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	Students lack basic fact knowledge	FASTT Math and 24 game played in grades 2-5 followed by tournaments	Ann Fainer	weekly assessments completion of levels	FCAT 2.0
2	Critical thinking in math	Superstar math	Lisa Blanco and classroom teachers	Increased achievement with word problems	Topic tests and FCAT 2.0

3	New standards	K-5th grade teachers and students become familiar with the Common Core standards in reading by creating and completing thematic units.	A+ Team	Unit assessment and formative assessment	FCAT 2.0
4	In 2011-12, 4th grade math students scored poorly on the FCAT math test.	Math coach/tutor working with our lowest students in 5th grade in math daily	Kym Bisbe and Jill Zaiser	weekly assessments	FCAT 2.0
5	Solving multi-step problems	Writing across the curriculum- writing to explain process in response to FCAT style prompts	Classroom teachers	Topic and district tests. Short and extended response answers	FCAT 2.0
6	Lack of parent involvement	Increase communication with parents about FCAT tests using informative parent nights at school	A+ Team	FCAT 2.0	Sign in logs
7	Lack of vocabulary knowledge	School wide use of math journals	Classroom teachers	Topic tests	FCAT 2.0
8	Critical thinking in math	Kagan	Classroom teachers	Formative assessments	Structures
9	Fifth grade students taking the FCAT test online	Practice using the laptops for topic tests and mid-year assessment	Classroom teachers	Test scores and observation	FCAT 2.0
10	Lack of Parent involvement	Increase communication with parents about FCAT tests using informative parent nights at school including 2 parent teacher conference nights, ESOL parent nights and FCAT night	A+ Team, classroom teachers	FCAT scores and parent feedback	Sign in logs
11	Promote math learning and practice in students homes	New this year: "Fall into Family Math" night for parents and students	Nancy Feather	Topic test and FCAT scores	Parent survey and sign in sheets
12	Small group instruction time is limited.	Kit Cat Club after school tutoring for targeted students and skills.	Ann Fainer	Teacher observation and formative assessment.	FAT 2.0

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

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

Mathematics Goal #3b:

2012 Current Level of Performance:

2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

No Data Submitted

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.  Mathematics Goal #4:	
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 # 5A : <input style="width: 100%; height: 30px;" type="text"/>					
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017

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

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.  Mathematics Goal #5B:	
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:

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5D:	
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 mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5E:	
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				

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
Common Core training	All grades. Most trainings will be split into primary and intermediate	A+ team plus, Lori Mazon and Nancy Feather	School-wide	Trainings will be held during preschool and on 2 Wednesday training blocks every month.	Lesson plans and teacher feedback including end of year survey monkey	Principal
SAMs Club-Ongoing Kagan Training	All teachers	Kathy Eva and Nancy Feather	School-wide	Once every month	Coaching in classrooms and lesson plans	Darlen Martin and Ann Fainer
Compass Larning	All classroom teachers	Jill Zaiser and Kathy Eva	School-wide	Initial training in October and then ongoing training as needed during the year	Lesson plans and reports generated by Compass Learning	Ann Fainer

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 2012, 71% of our standard curriculum students met or exceeded standards in Science. In 2013, 74% of our fifth grade students (112 students) will score a level 3 or higher on the Science FCAT 2.0.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In 2012, 71% of our standard curriculum students met or exceeded standards in Science.	In 2013, 74% of our fifth grade students (112 students) will meet or exceed the standard on the science FCAT.

## 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	Short and Extended responses	Trafalgar Writes utilizing short and extended response	Fifth grade teachers and administration	Analyze common assessments	FCAT Scores District Science assessments
2	Materials available for use in the lab	Use inventory list of available equipment and materials in the Science lab.	Fifth Grade teachers	The schedule for the science Lab	FCAT scores
3	Students have insufficient background knowledge or experience.	Ecology Club will be offered to 4th and 5th grade students to provide experiences. Digital text which provides word meanings will be utilized.	Suzy Corace Classroom teachers	Observation	Common Assessments
4	Lack of parent involvement	Increase communication with parents about FCAT tests using informative parent nights at school	A+ team	Parent attendance	FCAT scores
5	FCAT 2.0 provides new questions that students are not familiar with	Use writing across the curriculum. Students respond to FCAT style prompt using expository format	Ann Fainer	Monitoring Trafalgar Writes, lesson plans, and walk throughs	FCAT Scores
6	ESE and ESOL students have limited knowledge of science vocabulary meaning	Preview vocabulary or key points.	Classroom teacher, ESE teacher	Observation, formal and informal vocabulary assessments.	FCAT Scores Common Course Exams
7	Need for a study tool for multiple science concepts	Use of science journals in every classroom	Classroom teachers	Observations	FCAT and science topic scores
8	New Science curriculum in fifth grade- P-Sell	Hands on science	Carlos Negron from the district	Observations	Topic tests

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science.  Science Goal #1b:	

2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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

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

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

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

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
SAMs Club-Ongoing Kagan Training	All teachers	Nancy Feather and Kthy Eva	School-wide	once every month	Coaching in classrooms and lesson plans	Darlene Martin and Ann Fainer
P-Cell training	Fifth grade teachers	District	All fifth grade teachers	Initial trainings in August and September and ongoing through the school year	District walk throughs to see the program in action	Carl Negron

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, 60% of our 4th grade students scored a 3.5 or above on the FCAT 2.0 Writing test. This year, 64% of our 4th grade students (93 students) will score a 3.5 or higher.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
60% of our fourth grade students scored a 3.5 or above on the FCAT 2.0 Writing test in 2012.	64% of our 4th grade students (93 students) will score a 3.5 or higher on the FCAT 2.0 Writing test in 2013. This goal will require that we continue to excel in the area of 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
1	Students with disabilities require more one-on-one instruction to master skills.	Ongoing remediation for fourth grade ESE students by support team.	Fourth grade teachers and ESE teachers	Analyze common writing assessments using common prompts and data charts	Rubric
2	Schoolwide implementation of Core Connections	Continue school wide implementation of Core Connections and continue professional development for teachers	Writing Team Administration	Administer monthly Trafalgar Writes	Trafalgar Writes

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Core Curriculum to show clear transition from FCAT writing to CCSS and PARCC	All classroom teachers	Casey Stearns, Michaela Zwisa, Laura Darley, Debbie suhrie, Linda Skidd, Lori Mazon, Lisa Blanco, Lizette Sardinias, Mary Rea, Suzanne Wallace, Colleen Brown, Peg Cooper, and Chris Lewis	School-wide	Initial training in preschool (and the week before)and continuous through the year	Lesson plans and Trafalgar Writes Grades	Ann Fainer
Compass Learning	All Classroom teachers	Jill Zaiser and Kathy Eva	School-wide	Initial training in October and then ongoing training as needed during the year	Lesson plans and reports generated by Compass Learning	Ann Fainer
SAMs Club-Ongoing Kagan Training	All Teachers	Nancy Feather and Kthy Eva	School-wide	Once every month	Coaching in classrooms and lesson plans	Darlene Martin and Ann Fainer
Common Core training	All grades. Most trainings will be split into primary and intermediate	A+ team plus Kristina Rendon, Colleen Brown, and Donna Berry	School-wide	Trainings will be held during preschool and on 2 Wednesday training blocks every month.	Lesson plans and teacher feedback including end of year survey monkey	Principal

Writing Budget:

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

End of Writing Goals

Attendance Goal(s)

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

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

1. Attendance Attendance Goal #1:	
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
<b>Professional Development</b>			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Writing across the curriculum follow up training for all teachers	Core Connections	Title II	\$5,064.00
			Subtotal: \$5,064.00
<b>Other</b>			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			<b>Grand Total: \$5,064.00</b>

*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 hours averaged 11 hours per student (9513 hours & 840 students). This year, our average volunteer hours will be 12 per student (10,080 hours & 840 students).
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:

In 2011-2012, our volunteer hours averaged 11 hours per student (9513 hours & 840 students).	In 2013 our average volunteer hours will be 12 hours per student (10,080 hours & 840 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
No Data Submitted						

Parent Involvement Budget:

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

*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



## Additional Goal(s)

### Bullying Goal 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. Bullying Goal Goal Bullying Goal Goal #1:			Trafalgar Elementary had no bullying incidents reported last year. We will maintain bullying incidents at 0 for the 2012-13 school year. We will reduce "peer conflict" incidents to support this endeavor.		
2012 Current level:			2013 Expected level:		
Zero bullying incidents reported.			Maintain zero bullying.		
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	Students not knowing what to do when a peer conflict arises.	Guidance classes to include lessons to avoid and deal with peer conflict in a positive way and anti-bullying	Jenny Powless	Teacher and student feedback on the end of year surveys.	Reported bullying incidents
2	Students not knowing what to do when a peer conflict arises.	PBS expectation assemblies	Administration	Teacher and student feedback	Reported bullying incidents

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

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

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

Budget:

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

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

*End of Bullying Goal 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
Attendance	Writing across the curriculum follow up training for all teachers	Core Connections	Title II	\$5,064.00
				Subtotal: \$5,064.00
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: \$5,064.00

## 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

## School Advisory Council

### School Advisory Council (SAC) Membership Compliance

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

Yes. Agree with the above statement.

Describe projected use of SAC funds	Amount
No data submitted	

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

Meetings this year:

- August 23, 2012
- September 27, 2012
- October 25, 2012
- November 29, 2012
- January 31, 2013
  - February 28, 2013
  - April 25, 2013
  - May 23, 2013

# AYP DATA

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

## SCHOOL GRADE DATA

No Data Found

Lee School District TRAFALGAR ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 2010-2011						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	90%	91%	94%	52%	327	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	73%	71%			144	3 ways to make gains: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Improve FCAT Levels</li> <li>● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5</li> <li>● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2</li> </ul>
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	61% (YES)	73% (YES)			134	Adequate Progress based on gains of lowest 25% of students in reading and math. Yes, if 50% or more make gains in both reading and math.
FCAT Points Earned					605	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Lee School District TRAFALGAR ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 2009-2010						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	88%	87%	89%	65%	329	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%	59%			123	3 ways to make gains: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Improve FCAT Levels</li> <li>● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5</li> <li>● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2</li> </ul>
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	60% (YES)	61% (YES)			121	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					573	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested