

FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION



School Improvement Plan (SIP) Form SIP-1

2012-2013

2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

School Information

School Name: Westbrooke Elementary	District Name: Orange
Principal: Michelle M. Couret	Superintendent: Barbara Jenkins
SAC Chair: Joan Casamento	Date of School Board Approval: January 29, 2013

Student Achievement Data and Reference Materials:

The following links will open in a separate browser window.

[School Grades Trend Data](#) (Use this data to complete Sections 1-4 of the reading and mathematics goals and Sections 1 and 2 of the writing and science goals.)

[Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test \(FCAT\)/Statewide Assessment Trend Data](#) (Use this data to inform the problem-solving process when writing goals.)

[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.

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	Number of Years at Current School	Number 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	Michelle M. Couret	Bachelor of Arts and Masters in Elementary Education; Specialist degree in Educational Leadership/ Certifications held: Elementary Education, ESOL, Educational Leadership	2	6	<p>2011-2012 Westbrooke Elementary- earned an "A" grade; 72% of students reading at or above grade level; 71% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in reading; 70% of students at or above grade level in math; 74% of students making a year's worth of progress in math; 73% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in math; 87% of students meeting state standards in writing; 76% of students at or above grade level in Science.</p> <p>2010-2011 Westbrooke Elementary School - earned "A" grade; 90% of AYP criteria met; 88% of students reading at or above grade level; 83% of students making a year's worth of progress in reading; 75% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in reading; 86% of students at or above grade level in math 77% of students making a year's worth of progress in math; 69% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in math; 93% of students are meeting state standards in writing; 87% of students at or above grade level in Science.</p> <p>2009-2010 Palmetto Elementary School - earned "D" grade; 79% of AYP standards met; 55% meeting high standards in Reading, 44% and Math, 76% meeting high standards in writing, 18% meeting high standards in science; 57% of students made learning gains in reading and 58% in math; 51% of students in the lowest 25% made learning gains in reading and 71% of students in the lowest 25% made learning gains in Math;</p> <p>2006-2009 Endeavor Elementary School: 2008-9: "A" Grade School; 100% of AYP standards met; 89% meeting high standards in Reading, 86% meeting high standards in math, 91% mtg high standards in writing, 65% mtg high standards in science; 79% of students made learning gains in reading 67% of students made learning gains in math; 2007-8: 97% of AYP standards met; 80% meeting high standards in Reading, 82% mtg high standards in Math, 69% mtg high standards in writing, 63% mtg high standards in science; 65% of students made learning gains in reading and 67% of students made learning gains in math; 2006-7 100% of AYP standards met; 84% meeting high standards in Reading, 84% mtg high standards in</p>

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

					Math, 73% mtg high standards in writing, 63% mtg high standards in science; 78% of students made learning gains in reading and 59% of students made learning gains in math
Assistant Principal	Carl Sousa	Bachelor of Science and Masters in Communicative Disorders; Specialist degree in Educational Leadership/Certifications held; Speech-Language Impaired K-12 and Educational Leadership	1	1	<p>2011-2012 Westbrooke Elementary- earned an "A" grade; 72% of students reading at or above grade level; 71% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in reading; 70% of students at or above grade level in math; 74% of students making a year's worth of progress in math; 73% of struggling students making a year's worth of progress in math; 87% of students meeting state standards in writing; 76% of students at or above grade level in Science.</p> <p>Hunter's Creek Elementary: School Grades – A's 2000 - 2010</p> <p>2010-2011 - 87% of students meeting high standards in reading and 90% of students meeting high standards in math; 73% of students making learning gains in reading and 69% of students making learning gains in math; 61% of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in reading and 68% of students in the lowest 25% making learning gains in math.</p> <p>2009-2010 - 87% of students meeting high standards in reading and 87% of students meeting high standards in math; 73% of students making learning gains in reading and 75% of students making learning gains in math; 51% of students in the lowest 25% making learning gains in reading and 77% of students in the lowest 25% making learning gains in math</p> <p>2008-2009 - 88% of students meeting high standards in reading and 88% of students meeting high standards in math; 71% of students making learning gains in reading and 78% of students making learning gains in math; 71% of students in the lowest 25% making learning gains in reading; 67% of students in the lowest 25% making learning gains in math</p> <p>2007-2008 - 89% of students meeting high standards in reading and 90% of students meeting high standards in math; 75% of students making learning gains in reading and 66% of students making learning gains in math; 72% of students in the lowest 25% making learning gains in reading and 59% of students in the lowest 25% making learning gains in math</p>

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

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 ambitious but achievable annual measurable objective (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)	Number of Years at Current School	Number 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)
CRT	Joan Casamento	Bachelor of Arts in Elementary Education/Psychology Masters of Arts in Special Education Certification in Elementary Education, ESOL, and Gifted	1	6	Pershing Elementary 2011-2012 B school grade; 69% met high standards in reading, 43% met high standards in math, 68% met high standards in writing, 41% made satisfactory progress in science; 61% made learning gains in reading, 47% made learning gains in math, KEENE'S CROSSING: 2010-2011 B school grade; 87% met high standards in reading, 84% met high standards in math, 80% met high standards in writing; 66% made learning gains in reading; 51% made learning gains in math; 65% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in reading; 47% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in math; AYP-No-92%

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
1. Recruitment of highly qualified Teachers: Instructional applicants are to be determined highly qualified by district and state standards prior to the interview process.	Michelle M. Couret	8/20/2012
2. Retaining of highly qualified Teachers: Teachers participate, contribute, and support each other through	Michelle M. Couret	6/5/2013

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Professional Learning Communities, focusing on student achievement and instructional growth through professional development opportunities.		
3. Identification of instructional leaders: Teacher Team Leaders, Administrative Team, Leadership Appointment, and Academic Professional Learning Community Leaders.	Michelle M. Couret	6/5/2013

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

Provide the number of instructional staff and paraprofessionals that are teaching out-of-field and 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 instructional staff and paraprofessionals that are teaching out-of-field and/or who received less than an effective rating (instructional staff only).	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective
12% (5)	District is providing courses to meet compliance requirements for being out of field.

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	% of teachers with an Effective rating or higher	% of Reading Endorsed Teachers	% of National Board Certified Teachers	% of ESOL Endorsed Teachers
42	2% (1)	55% (23)	33% (14)	12% (5)	38% (16)	98% (41)	7% (3)	0% (0)	93% (39)

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.

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Mentor Name	Mentee Assigned	Rationale for Pairing	Planned Mentoring Activities
Kari Freeman	Michelle Smith	Master Teacher-Same Grade Level	Weekly collaboration meetings to review lessons and student progress.
Nancy Golden	Magen Dorgan	Master Teacher-Same Grade Level	Weekly collaboration meetings to review lessons and student progress.

Additional Requirements

Coordination and Integration-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

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Career and Technical Education
Job Training
Other

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

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

School-Based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

The school-based MTSS leadership team consists of the following personnel: Principal (Michelle Couret, Assistant Principal (Carl Sousa), CRT/ Instructional Coach (Joan Casamento), Speech-Language Pathologist (Melissa Levano-Gomes), School Psychologist (Terri Bartlett), classroom teachers (when applicable), and VE teacher (Kim Owens).

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?

Step 1: General whole group instruction is provided for all students and progress of students monitored weekly using formative assessment data. Teachers also provide differentiated, intervention and enrichment, instruction with flexible grouping for 45 minutes each day. This process is designed to decrease any disproportionate classification of students in special education.

- Step 2: If the data suggests that there is minimal progress or regression for any student, the teacher inputs data on MTSS/RtI documentation and provides this information to the MTSS /RtI team (Principal, Assistant Principal, CRT, speech/language pathologist, school psychologist, classroom teacher, ESE teacher (when applicable), subject area/intervention teacher). The teacher analyzes problem to determine if instructional or behavioral interventions are needed using appropriate evidence-based Tier II interventions.

Step 3: If a Tier II intervention is necessary, a highly qualified teacher provides specific supplemental instruction to student in a flexible small group setting (3-6 students) to support student's specific instructional or behavioral needs. Progress monitoring continues on a weekly basis. Teachers collect 5-6 weeks of data.

Step 4: After Tier II instruction has been implemented and there is 5-6 data points, teacher meets with MTSS/RtI team(Principal, Assistant Principal, CRT, speech/language pathologist, school psychologist, classroom teacher, ESE teacher (when applicable), subject area/intervention teacher) to reanalyze student progress data and review newly implemented strategies.

Step 5: If targeted students are not making expected progress at the Tier II level, teachers must change instruction after 5 data points and continue the MTSS/RtI process. At this point, continued documentation/evidence (graph) is required to show the student's limited progress. The team analyzes continuing problem with teacher to determine if more intense, individualized instructional or behavioral modifications are necessary through Tier III Intervention and Support.

Step 6: Individualized, intense more focused Tier III

intervention is provided by a highly qualified teacher, in a small group setting (1-3 students). Teachers continue to collect data weekly and monitor progress of student for an additional 5-6 weeks.

- Step 7: During this time the school psychologist may schedule an informal meeting with the MTSS/RTI team and the classroom teacher to get to know the student if she feels it is necessary. Further evaluation and discussion of the student is completed and sent on to the staffing specialist to schedule a "Consent Meeting" if team feels additional information on the student is required of the school psychologist. The RtI process (including interventions and progress monitoring) continues throughout the school year to meet the needs of the student.

- Step 8: All RtI documentation is turned in to be attached to the student cards to be turned over to the next year's teacher or sent in the cum if a child transfers mid-year.

Describe the role of the school-based MTSS leadership team in the development and implementation of the school improvement plan (SIP). Describe how the RtI problem-solving process is used in developing and implementing the SIP?

Throughout the school year, district and school MTSS/RtI team members are training and supporting the school staff throughout the

August 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

entire RtI process. The MTSS/RtI team looks at progress monitoring data, assists classroom teacher in developing instructional or behavioral plan for students with minimal progress, develops schedule for intervention time during school day, provides assistance in data management, and provides teachers with professional development opportunities when necessary. The RtI problem-solving process supports the SIP by providing differentiated evidence based instruction by highly qualified teachers to meet the specific needs of all students and attain specified SIP goals in Reading, Math, Science and Writing. Ongoing progress monitoring of student achievement data guides purposeful decision making and allows RtI team to effectively monitor progression toward school SIP goals.

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. FCAT, Envision topic assessments and bench mark tests, OCPS benchmark and mini-benchmark assessments, Grade Level developed, common assessments to assess student learning of NGSSS and Common Core, program-specific progress monitoring tools/assessments, FAIR, Education Data Warehouse Data, Edusoft Data, Teacher Data Charts.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

During the 2012-2013 school year, WES will focus on providing students with quality Tier II and Tier III interventions that are engaging, active and measurable. Staff will receive training on the RtI process to support the goals established in the SIP. This school year's initial training was conducted during pre-planning (8/15/2012) to review overview of RtI structure and expectations. Continuing professional development on the RtI process will be completed during special area/planning times by the district and school RtI team as needed throughout the year.

RtI staff training will include the following information:

- 1) Review of the roles and expectations of each RtI team member
- 2) Training on core reading and math programs, and their applications when reviewing data, progress monitoring and planning instruction
- 3) Training on Interventions programs, and their applications when reviewing data, progress monitoring and planning instruction

Teachers and RtI team members are to trained and supported on the following parts of the RtI process:

- o Identifying problems
- o Problem Analysis and hypothesis development.
- o Review, interview, observe, and assess process.
- o Data collection and review.
- o The main components of the plan: targeting the skill, effective instructional strategies, and implementation arrangements/logistics.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

The MTSS will participate in several professional developments incorporating Marzano's High Yield Strategies.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team
Identify the school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT). Principal, Assistant Principal, CRT (curriculum resource teacher), CCT (Curriculum Compliance Teacher-ESOL), Media Specialist, and Reading PLC team members
Describe how the school-based LLT functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions). The school based LLT is a collaborative team who meets monthly to ensure that all teachers are involved in acquiring students' proficiency of literacy skills. The school based LLT will also collaborate with the district Reading Leadership Team to support the reading related goals and objectives stated in this School Improvement Plan, the school professional development plan (including professional learning communities and lesson study), and reading initiatives throughout the school with the goal to increase student achievement in reading across all grade levels.
What will be the major initiatives of the LLT this year? Using the current curriculum, NGSSS, Common Core Standards, and technology resources, the LLT will work with teachers to properly align curriculum, analyze student data, plan focused instruction, monitor progress through state and school assessments, adjust instruction in response to data, implement new technology, and address reading benchmarks in all content areas.

Public School Choice

- **Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification**
Upload a copy of the SES Notification to Parents in the designated upload link on the "Upload" page.

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

Reading Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
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:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading.			1A.1 Some teachers lack a common understanding and implementation of instructional goals, rigor and relevance.	1A.1. Administrative and leadership team members will analyze this past year's reading data and meet with grade level teams to discuss rigorous and relevant instructional plans, following the Professional Learning Communities guiding questions. Grade Level curriculum Writing Teams develop instructional pacing guides to include specific benchmarks and materials to be used to teach those benchmarks by all members of the grade level team, as well as common assessments to be used for data analysis. Teacher Leaders (K-2) will participate in PLCs	1A.1. Principal, Assistant Principal, and CRT/Instructional Coach	1A.1. Review of data with leadership team, discussion of data with teachers during team meetings, following the PLC guiding questions. Weekly submission of grade level Common Board Configurations	1A.1. Student Assessment results, i-Observation, Lesson Plan reviews and Grade level Common Board Configurations.
Reading Goal #1A:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
<i>We expect a 3% increase or 26% (80) of the students in 3rd-5th grades at Westbrooke Elementary School will achieve proficiency (FCAT Level 3) in reading on the 2013 FCAT.</i>	<i>During the 2011-2012 school year, 23% (72) of students in 3rd-5th grades at Westbrooke Elementary School achieved proficiency (FCAT Level 3) in reading on the 2012 FCAT.</i>	<i>We expect 26% (80) of students in 3rd-5th grades at Westbrooke Elementary School will achieve proficiency (FCAT Level 3) in reading on the 2012 FCAT.</i>					

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

				focused on the developing a plan to implement common core standards while using best practices.			
			1A.2. There exists a lack of consistency of data analysis between teachers within a grade level.	1A.2. Individual student progress monitoring based on school-wide, district and/or state assessments will occur regularly with students in all 3rd, 4th and 5 th grade classes as well as with all 3rd, 4th and 5th grade teachers during grade level data meetings	1A.2. Principal, Assistant Principal and CRT	1A.2 Student data reviewed by teachers during scheduled data meetings	1A.2. Student data, Teacher Data Notebooks IMS reports
			1A.3. Varying levels of student proficiency require differentiated instruction.	1A.3. Grade Level Wide Intervention/Enrichment Reading block will be scheduled daily with all available resource teachers to assist classroom teachers. Reading Plus, FCAT Explorer, Accelerated Reader and Lexia Instructional technologies will be used for additional individualized support. Utilize parent volunteers in the classroom during reading block, continue reading mentor program.	1A.3. Principal & Assistant Principal	1A.3. Informal and formal instructional rounds (observations) will be conducted to assess the fidelity of the implementation of the intervention/enrichment block. Data will be reviewed with teachers during team meetings, following the PLC guiding questions.	1A.3. Student data , i-Observation and Lesson Plan Checks

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<p>2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 in reading.</p> <p>Reading Goal #2A:</p> <p><i>We expect a 3 % increase or 49% (154) of the students in 3rd-5th grades at Westbrooke Elementary School will achieve proficiency (FCAT Levels 4 and 5) in reading on the 2013 FCAT.</i></p>	<p>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</p> <p><i>During the 2011-2012 school year, 46% (150) of students in 3rd-5th grades at Westbrooke Elementary School achieved proficiency level of 4 or above on FCAT.</i></p>	<p>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</p> <p><i>We expect a 3 % increase or 49% (154) of the students in 3rd-5th grades at Westbrooke Elementary School will achieve proficiency (FCAT Levels 4 and 5) in reading on the 2013 FCAT.</i></p>	<p>2A.1. Varying levels of student proficiency require differentiated instruction.</p>	<p>2A.1. Grade Level Wide Intervention/Enrichment Reading Block will be scheduled daily with all available resource teachers to assist classroom teachers. Science lab will offer enrichment for students during this time. Parent Volunteers will be utilized during the reading block to work with individual teacher to address student needs.</p>	<p>2A.1. Principal, Assistant Principal, and CRT</p>	<p>2A.1. Informal and formal instructional rounds (observations) will be conducted to assess the fidelity of the implementation of the intervention/enrichment block. Data will be reviewed with teachers during team meetings, following the PLC guiding questions.</p>	<p>2A.1. Student data, i-Observation and Lesson Plan Checks</p>
			<p>2A.2. There is a lack of Common understandings of essential, instructional goals among teachers with vertical grade levels to continue the same rigor, relevance, and best practices from grade level to grade level.</p>	<p>2A.2. Teachers will participate in professional development sessions throughout the school year focusing on Marzano best practices.</p>	<p>2A.2. Principal, Assistant Principal, and CRT</p>	<p>2A.2. Informal and formal instructional rounds (observations) will be conducted to assess rigor of posted learning goals.</p>	<p>2A.2. Student data, i-Observation and Lesson Plan Checks</p>
			<p>2A.3. Students struggle to relate to curriculum</p>	<p>2A.3. Individual student AR goals will be promoted in an effort to stimulate recreational reading with accountability. Additional promotional programs like a “read-at-thon” will coincide with the school’s book fairs. Student chosen books and poetry will be presented on the morning TV show to spark interest in new genres and authors.</p>	<p>2A.3. Principal, Assistant Principal, and Media Specialist</p>	<p>2A.3. Informal instructional rounds (observations) will be conducted to assess the implementation of reading club, closed circuit TV promotions programs, and school wide events.</p>	<p>2A.3. Student Data, student/parent surveys and analysis of AR results/program usage</p>

**August 2012
Rule 6A-1.099811
Revised April 29, 2011**

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

			Book club and themes reading activities based on students' interests will be incorporated to provide additional reading practice.			
--	--	--	---	--	--	--

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.			3A.1. There is a lack of common instructional goals among teachers within the same grade levels to ensure they have the same rigor, relevance, and the utilization of best practices.	3A.1. Administrative and leadership team members will analyze this past year's reading data and meet with grade level teams to discuss rigorous and relevant instructional plans that utilize best practices, following the Professional Learning Communities guiding questions. Grade Level curriculum writing teams develop instructional pacing guides to include specific benchmarks and materials to be used to teach those benchmarks by all members of the grade level team, as well as common assessments to be used for data analysis. Teacher leaders will participate in professional development activities throughout the year focusing on Marzano's best practices.	3A.1. Principal, Assistant Principal, and CRT	3A.1. Review of data with leadership team, discussion of data with teachers during team meetings, following PLC guiding questions.	3A.1. Student Assessment results, i- Observation, Lesson Plan review and data meetings.
Reading Goal #3A: <i>We expect a 3% increase or 79% (223) of the students at Westbrooke Elementary School will make learning gains in reading on the 2013 FCAT.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:* <i>During the 2011-2012 school year, 76% (214) of the students at Westbrooke Elementary School made Learning Gains in reading on the 2012 FCAT.</i>	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* <i>We expect a 3% increase or 79% (223) of the students at Westbrooke Elementary School will make learning gains in reading on the 2013 FCAT.</i>	3A.2. Students struggle to relate to curriculum	3A.2. Individual student AR goals will be promoted in an effort to stimulate recreational reading with accountability. Additional promotional programs like a "readathon" will coincide with the school's book fairs. Student chosen books and poetry will be presented on the morning TV show to spark interest in new genres and authors. Book club and themes reading activities based on students' interests will be incorporated to provide additional reading practice	3A.2. Principal, Assistant Principal, and Media Specialist	3A.2. Informal instructional rounds (observations) will be conducted to assess the implementation of reading club, closed circuit TV promotions programs, and school wide events.	3A.2. Student data, student/parent surveys
			3A.3. Students reading needs are not being met through specific intervention	3A.3. Progress monitoring through specific common assessment to guide interventions or small group instruction	3A.3. Principal, Assistant Principal, and CRT	3A.3. Administrative and leadership team members will analyze common assessment data and meet with grade level teams to guide instructional plans, following the Professional Learning Communities guiding questions.	3A.3. Student Assessment results, i- Observation, Lesson Plan reviews and data meetings.

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.			4A.1. Inconsistent assistance from volunteers to support achievement of lower performing students from one grade level to another.	4A.1. Have teacher leaders collaborate referencing strategies for utilizing parent volunteers in the classroom with lower performing students. Develop structured volunteer protocols to ensure that volunteers are scheduled to support struggling students on a consistent basis.	4A.1. Principal, Assistant Principal, Team Leaders, and CRT	4A.1. Schedules will be reviewed with teachers during grade level data meetings and student data will be analyzed.	4A.1. Student performance on common assessments
<u>Reading Goal #4:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
<i>We expect a 3% increase or 74% (58) of students in the Lowest 25% will make learning gains in reading on the 2013 FCAT.</i>	<i>During the 2011-2012 school year, 71% (58) of students at Westbrooke Elementary in the Lowest 25% made learning gains in Reading on the 2012 FCAT.</i>	<i>We expect a 5% increase or 74% (62) of students in the Lowest 25% will make learning gains in reading on the 2013 FCAT.</i>					
			4A.2. Inconsistent assistance at home from parents to support achievement of lower performing students.	4A.2. Monthly newsletters will provide information about specific instructional strategies and curriculum expectations to parents.	4A.2. Principal, Assistant Principal, Team Leaders, and CRT	4A.2. Grade Level and/or School Wide Newsletters will be submitted following a schedule and will be reviewed for content	4A.2. Newsletters, teacher feedback regarding parental involvement and student achievement
			4A.3. Parents of the lowest 25% may not be aware of grade level expectations and FCAT expectations.	4A.3. Teachers will communicate in writing, via phone conferences, emails and one on one personal conference. Teachers will also utilize the services of translators and the school social worker as needed.	4A.3. Principal and Assistant Principal	4A.3. Communication practices will be discussed during Grade level and Team leader meetings.	4A.3. Teacher and Parent Feedback on Survey

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years		2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
5A. In six years school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%. Reading Goal #5A: <i>Decrease the achievement gap for each identified subgroup by 50% by June 30, 2017.</i>	Baseline data 2010-2011 77% of all students	79% of all students Students scoring at Level 3 or above on FCAT, by Subgroups:	81% of all students Percentage goal of students scoring at Level 3 or above on FCAT, by Subgroups:	83% of all students Percentage goal of students scoring at Level 3 or above on FCAT, by Subgroups:	85% of all students Percentage goal of students scoring at Level 3 or above on FCAT, by Subgroups:	87% of all students Percentage goal of students scoring at Level 3 or above on FCAT, by Subgroups:	89% of all students Percentage goal of students scoring at Level 3 or above on FCAT, by Subgroups:
		Black 45% White 85% Hispanic 74% Asian 86% ELL 46% SWD 33% Econ. Dis. 54%	Black 63% White 89% Hispanic 70% Asian 94% ELL 56% SWD 44% Econ. Dis. 61%	Black 66% White 90% Hispanic 73% Asian 95% ELL 60% SWD 50% Econ. Dis. 65%	Black 70% White 91% Hispanic 76% Asian 95% ELL 65% SWD 55% Econ. Dis. 69%	Black 74% White 92% Hispanic 79% Asian 96% ELL 69% SWD 61% Econ. Dis. 73%	Black 78% White 94% Hispanic 82% Asian 97% ELL 74% SWD 67% Econ. Dis. 77%
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5B: <i>We expect an increase in the minimum percentages of students in 3rd-5th grades at Westbrooke making satisfactory progress in reading on the 2013 FCAT.</i> Black from 45% to 63% White 85% to 89% Hispanic 74% to 70%	2012 Current Level of Performance:* <i>The following percentages of students in 3rd-5th grades made satisfactory progress in reading on the 2012 FCAT:</i> Black 45% White 85% Hispanic 74%	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* <i>We expect an increase or a minimum percentages of students in 3rd-5th grades at Westbrooke will make satisfactory progress in reading on the 2013 FCAT.</i> Black 63% White 89% Hispanic 70%	5B.1. Black: The majority of our Black students live a significant distance away from school and are unable to stay for after school tutoring.	5B.1. Grade Level Wide Intervention/Enrichment Reading block will be scheduled daily with all available resource teachers to assist classroom teachers. Instructional technologies will be used for additional individualized support-Reading Plus, Lexia, SuccessMaker, and FCAT Explorer. Parent volunteers will be utilized to assist these students during instruction.	5B.1. Principal, Assistant Principal, and CRT	5B.1. Informal and formal instructional rounds (observations) will be conducted to assess the fidelity of the implementation of the intervention/enrichment block. Data will be reviewed with teachers during team meetings, following the PLC guiding questions.	5B.1. Student data, i-Observation and Lesson Plan Checks
				5B.2. Black: The majority of our Black students live a significant distance away from school and families are unable to participate in curriculum	5B.2. Parents will be provided with curriculum information via written form, email, or telephone conference and with assistance	5B.2. Principal and Assistant Principal	5B.2. Discussions during grade level meetings to determine the effectiveness of school to home communication

August 2012
Rule 6A-1.099811
Revised April 29, 2011

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

		nights or parent conference nights. Hispanic: A majority of our Hispanic students' parents have limited literacy ability in English and are unable to assist students at home.	from a Spanish-speaking interpreter as needed.			
		5B.3. Black and Hispanic: A majority of our Black and Hispanic students have some difficulties adjusting to a new school atmosphere.	5B.3. Develop a mentoring program offered to students who may need additional encouragement academically, socially, or behaviorally	5B.3. Principal and Assistant Principal	5B.3. Feedback from both parents, teachers, and volunteers regarding mentoring program	5B.3. Student, teacher, and volunteer feedback on survey

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading.			5C.1. Varying levels of student proficiency require differentiated instruction.	5C.1. Grade Level Wide Intervention/Enrichment Reading Block will be scheduled daily with all available resource teachers to assist classroom teachers.	5C.1. Principal, Assistant Principal, and CRT	5C.1. Informal and formal instructional rounds (observations) will be conducted to assess the fidelity of the implementation of the intervention/enrichment block. Data will be reviewed with teachers during team meetings, following the PLC guiding questions.	5C.1. Student data, i-Observation and Lesson Plan Checks
Reading Goal #5C: <i>We expect t 56% of our ELL students will make satisfactory progress for the 2012-2013 school year.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:* <i>During the 2011-2012 school year, Westbrooke Elementary had 46% (13) of ELL students make satisfactory progress in reading.</i>	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* <i>During the 2012-2013 school year, we expect 56% of our ELL students to make satisfactory progress in reading as measured by the 2013 FCAT.</i>					
			5C.2. ELL students have limited vocabulary	5C.2. ELL strategies will be implemented during the classroom lessons on a daily basis	5C.2. Principal, Assistant Principal, and CRT	5C.2. Informal and formal instructional rounds (observations) will be conducted to assess the ELL strategies and to review lesson plans	5C.2. Lesson Plans and student achievement data
			5C.3. ELL students have limited help with practice at home.	5C.3. Parents will be provided, at teacher's request, the support of student's home language translator when available, for conferences to provide information on strategies that can be incorporated at home.	5C.3. Principal and Assistant Principal	5C.3. Discussions during team leader and grade level meetings to determine effectiveness of strategies.	5C.3. Student, parent, and teacher feedback on survey
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:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading.			5D.1. Students with disabilities have a various range of learning strengths and weaknesses. Some teachers have a difficult time trying to meet the varying needs.	5D.1. School Wide Intervention/Enrichment Reading Block will be scheduled daily with all available resource teachers to assist classroom teachers. Science and Math lab will offer enrichment for students during this time	5D.1. Principal, Assistant Principal, and CRT	5D.1. Informal and formal instructional rounds (observations) will be conducted to assess the effect of differentiated instruction during the intervention/enrichment block. Data will be reviewed with teachers during team meetings, following the PLC guiding questions.	5D.1. Student data, i-Observation and Lesson Plan Checks
Reading Goal #5D: <i>NA (< 10 Students)</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:* <i>NA (< 10 Students)</i>	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* <i>NA (<10Students)</i>					
			5D.2. Students with disabilities may require additional classroom	5D.2. Teachers will implement appropriate accommodations and	5D.2. Principal, Assistant Principal and VE Teacher	5D.2. Informal and formal instructional rounds (observations) will be	5D.2. Student data, i-Observation and Lesson Plan Checks

**August 2012
Rule 6A-1.099811
Revised April 29, 2011**

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

		accommodations.	strategies based on identified learning difference.		conducted to assess the fidelity and implementation of accommodations and strategies.	
		5D.3. Students with disabilities may require additional school to home communication regarding progress.	5D.3. Teachers will implement, as appropriate, increased communication with parents via conference, weekly planner, email, or telephone.	5D.3. Principal and Assistant Principal	5D.3. Team Leader and Team Meeting discussions regarding school to home communication	5D.3. Student, teacher, and parent feedback on survey

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading.			5E.1 Varying levels of student proficiency require differentiated instruction.	5E.1. Grade Level Wide Intervention/Enrichment Reading Block will be scheduled daily with all available resource teachers to assist classroom teachers. Science and Math lab will offer enrichment for students during this time	5E.1. Principal, Assistant Principal, and CRT	5E.1. Informal and formal instructional rounds (observations) will be conducted to assess the fidelity of the implementation of the intervention/enrichment block. Data will be reviewed with teachers during team meetings, following the PLC guiding questions.	5E.1. Student data, i-Observation and Lesson Plan Checks
Reading Goal #5E: <i>We expect a 61% of our Economically Disadvantaged students in 3rd-5th grades at Westbrooke Elementary School will t make satisfactory progress in reading on the 2012 FCAT.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:* <i>During the 2011-2012 school year, Westbrooke Elementary had 54% of Economically Disadvantaged students in 3rd-5th grades make satisfactory progress in reading on the 2012 FCAT</i>	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* <i>We expect 61% of our Economically Disadvantaged Elementary School will make satisfactory progress in reading on the 2013 FCAT.</i>					
			5E.2. A majority of our Economically Disadvantaged students live a significant distance from school and families are unable to participate in curriculum nights and parent conference nights.	5E.2. Parents will be provided with curriculum and student progress information via telephone, in writing or email.	5E.2 Principal and Assistant Principal	5E.2. Team Leader and Grade Level Team Meeting discussions regarding curriculum and student progress information to be communicated to home	5E.2. Student, teacher, and parent feedback on survey
			5E.3. A majority of our Economically Disadvantaged students live a significant distance from school and have difficulties adjusting to a new and different school atmosphere.	5E.3. Develop and Start a mentoring program offered to students who may need additional encouragement academically, socially, or behaviorally	5E.3. Principal and Assistant Principal	5E.3. Feedback from both parents, teachers, and volunteers regarding mentoring program	5E.3. Student, teacher, and volunteer feedback on survey

Reading Professional Development

August 2012
 Rule 6A-1.099811
 Revised April 29, 2011

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activities						
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	K-1	Principal, assistant principal and CRT	K-1 & 2 nd (later in year)	2x month during planning times	Lesson Plans, observations, student data	Leadership Team
Interventions	K-5	Principal, assistant principal, VE Teacher and CRT	K-5 Teachers	During Planning Time and Wednesday PLC	Lesson Plans, observations, student data and discussions with teachers	Leadership Team
Running Records	K-5	CRT	K-5 Teachers	Wednesday Afternoons	Student Data	CRT
Marzano High Yield Strategies	K-5	Principal, assistant principal and CRT	All Staff	Wednesday PLC Meetings	Observations	Principal and Assistant principal
Response to Literature	K-5	CRT & Media	K-5	Professional Learning Communities	Observations, Discussions, and Data	CRT & Media

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Reading Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities/materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Running Records	DRA, Houghton Mifflin Assessment	Previously Purchased	
Interventions	Kaleidoscope/Early Intervention Readiness/Corrective Reading	Previously Purchased	
Response to Literature	Binder/Books	Title II Funds	1700.00
			Subtotal:1700.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
LEXIA	Online Reading Program	Previously Purchased	
Reading Plus	Online Reading Program	Previously Purchased	
Successmaker	Online Resource	School budget	3283.00
			Subtotal:3283.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Various Activities with Common Core	CIA, Common Core Standards and IMS	Web Based Materials	
			Subtotal:0
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:0
			Total:4983.00

End of Reading Goals

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

CELLA Goals		Problem-Solving Process to Increase Language Acquisition				
Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking.		1.1. Varying levels of student proficiency require differentiated instruction. Some teachers may struggle in meeting needs of all learners. 1.2. ELL students have limited expressive vocabulary skills. 1.3. ELL students have limited help with practice at home	1.1. School Wide Intervention/Enrichment Language Arts Block will be scheduled daily with all available resource teachers to assist classroom teachers. Science and Math lab will offer enrichment for students during this time 1.2. ELL strategies (including dictionaries) will be implemented during the classroom lessons on a daily basis 1.3. Parents will be provided, at teacher's request, the support of student's home language translator, when available, for conferences to provide information on strategies and activities that can be incorporated at home.	1.1. Principal, Assistant Principal and CRT 1.2. Principal, Assistant Principal and CRT 1.3. Principal, Assistant Principal and CRT	1.1. Informal and formal instructional rounds (observations) will be conducted to assess the fidelity of the implementation of the intervention/enrichment block. Data will be reviewed with teachers during team meetings, following PLC guiding questions. 1.2. Informal and formal instructional rounds (observations) will be conducted to assess the fidelity of the ELL strategies and to review lesson plans 1.3. Informal and formal discussions during team leader and grade level meetings to determine effective of strategy.	1.1. Student data, i-Observation and Lesson Plan Checks 1.2. Lesson Plans and student achievement data 1.3. Student, parent and teacher feedback on survey
CELLA Goal #1:	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking: We expect a 3% increase to 94% (44) of students (KG-5 th Grade) will perform at the high or proficient level in listening/speaking on the 2013 CELLA evaluation.					
	At the start of the 2012-2013 school year, Westbrooke Elementary has 91% (43) of students (KG-5 th) who performed at the high or proficient level in listening/speaking on the 2012 CELLA evaluation.					
Students read grade-level text in English in a manner similar to non-ELL students.		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Students scoring proficient in reading.		2.1. Varying levels of student proficiency require differentiated instruction. Some teachers may struggle in meeting needs of all learners.	2.1. Grade Level wide Intervention/Enrichment Reading Block will be scheduled daily with all available resource teachers to assist classroom teachers. Science and Math lab will offer enrichment for students during this time	2.1. Principal, Assistant Principal and CRT	2.1. Informal and formal instructional rounds (observations) will be conducted to assess the fidelity of the implementation of the intervention/enrichment block. Data will be reviewed with teachers during team meetings, following PLC guiding questions.	2.1. Student data, i-Observation and Lesson Plan Checks
CELLA Goal #2:	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading: We expect a 3% increase to 82% (39) of students (KG-5 th Grade) will perform at the high or					
	At the start of the 2012-2013 school year, Westbrooke Elementary has 79% (37) of students (KG-5 th) who performed at					

**August 2012
Rule 6A-1.099811
Revised April 29, 2011**

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

<i>proficient level in reading on the 2013 CELLA evaluation.</i>	<i>the high or proficient level in reading on the 2012 CELLA evaluation.</i>					
		2.2. ELL students have limited expressive vocabulary	2.2. ELL strategies will be implemented during the classroom lessons on a daily basis	2.2. Principal, Assistant Principal and CRT	2.2. Informal and formal instructional rounds (observations) will be conducted to assess the fidelity of the ELL strategies and to review lesson plans	2.2. Lesson Plans and student achievement data
		2.3. ELL students have limited help with practice at home	2.3. Parents will be provided, at teacher's request, the support of student's home language translator, when available, for conferences to provide information on strategies and activities that can be incorporated at home.	2.3. Principal, Assistant Principal and CRT	2.3. Informal and formal discussions during team leader and grade level meetings to determine effective of strategy.	2.3. Student, parent and teacher feedback on survey

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3. Students scoring proficient in writing.		2.1. Varying levels of student proficiency require differentiated instruction. Some teachers may struggle in meeting needs of all learners.	2.1. Intervention/Enrichment Language Arts Block will be scheduled daily with all available resource teachers to assist classroom teachers.	2.1. Principal, Assistant Principal and CRT	2.1. Informal and formal instructional rounds (observations) will be conducted to assess the fidelity of the implementation of the intervention/enrichment block. Data will be reviewed with teachers during team meetings, following PLC guiding questions.	2.1. CELLA assessments
CELLA Goal #3:	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing :					
<i>We expect a 3% increase to 80% (38) of students (KG-5th Grade) will perform at the high or proficient level in writing on the 2013 CELLA evaluation.</i>	<i>At the start of the 2011-2012 school year, Westbrooke Elementary has 77% (36) of students (KG-5th) who performed at the high or proficient level in writing on the 2012 CELLA evaluation.</i>					
		2.2. ELL students may have difficulty understanding writing expectations.	2.2. Familiarize students with Write from the Beginning rubric for each form of writing	2.2. Principal, Assistant Principal and CRT	2.2. Formal and Informal classroom observations and analysis of student writing using rubric	2.2. Student Data and Writing Samples and Write Score Data
		2.3. ELL students have limited help with practice at home	2.3. Parents will be provided, at teacher's request, the support of student's home language translator, when available, for conferences to provide information on strategies and activities that can be incorporated at home.	2.3. Principal, Assistant Principal and CRT	2.3. Discussions during team leader and grade level meetings to determine effectiveness of strategies.	2.3. Student, parent and teacher feedback on survey

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

CELLA Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities/materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Write from Beginning Program	Organizational Writing Program	Previously Purchased	
Home Language Dictionaries	Second Language Resource	Previously Purchased	
			Subtotal:0
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
LEXIA	Online Language Arts Resource	Previously Purchased	
SuccessMaker	Online Resource	Previously Purchased	
			Subtotal:0
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Marzano High Yield Strategies	The Art and Science of Teaching Resource	Previously Purchased	
			Subtotal:0
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:0
			Total:0

End of CELLA Goals

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

Elementary Mathematics Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
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:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics.			IA.1. There exists a lack of common understanding of essential, instructional goals among teachers within the same grade levels to ensure they have the same rigor and relevance.	IA.1. Administrative and leadership team members will analyze this past year's reading and data and meet with grade level teams to discuss rigorous and relevant instructional plans, following the Professional Learning Communities guiding questions. Grade Level Curriculum Writing Teams develop instructional pacing guides to include specific benchmarks and materials to be used to teach those benchmarks by all members of the grade level team, as well as common assessments to be used for data analysis. Teachers will participate in ongoing professional development activities related to Marzano's Best Practices.	IA.1. Principal, Assistant Principal and CRT	IA.1. Review of data with leadership team, discussion of data with teachers during team meetings, following the PLC guiding questions.	IA.1. Student Assessment results, i- Observation, Lesson Plan reviews and data meetings.
Mathematics Goal #1A: <i>We expect a 3% increase or 28% (88) of students in 3rd-5th grades at Westbrooke Elementary School will achieve proficiency (FCAT Level 3) in math on the 2013 FCAT.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:* <i>During the 2011-2012 school year, Westbrooke Elementary had 25% (80) of students in 3rd-5th grades achieved proficiency (FCAT Level 3) in math on the 2012 FCAT.</i>	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* <i>We expect a 3% increase or 28% (88) of students in 3rd-5th grades at Westbrooke Elementary School will achieve proficiency (FCAT Level 3) in math on the 2013 FCAT.</i>					
IA.2. Some inconsistency of data analysis exists among teachers within a grade level.							
IA.3. We do not have a common school wide language regarding Best Practices			IA.3. Ongoing professional development activities regarding Marzano High Yield Strategies and their application to math concepts to increase student performance.	IA.3. Principal, Assistant Principal and CRT	IA.3. Staff Development, PDS Modules, Instructional Rounds and PLC discussions	IA.3. Staff Development Records, Lesson Plans and Instructional Rounds data	

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
<p>2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in mathematics.</p> <p>Mathematics Goal #2A:</p> <p><i>We expect a 3% increase or 43% (135) of students in 3rd-5th grades at Westbrooke Elementary School will achieve proficiency (FCAT Levels 4 and 5) in math on the 2013 FCAT.</i></p>			2A.1. Vary levels of student proficiency require differentiated instruction.	2A.1. Grade Level Wide Intervention/Enrichment block will be scheduled daily with all available resource teachers to assist classroom teachers. Science and Math lab will offer enrichment for students during this time.	2A.1. Principal, Assistant Principal and CRT	2A.1. Informal and formal instructional rounds (observations) will be conducted to assess the fidelity of the implementation of the intervention/enrichment block. Data will be reviewed with teachers during team meetings, following the Professional Learning Communities guiding questions.	2A.1. Student data, i-Observation and Lesson Plan Checks	
			2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
			<i>. During the 2011-2012 school year, Westbrooke Elementary had 40% (127) of students in 3rd-5th grades achieve above proficiency (FCAT Levels 4 and 5) in math on the 2012 FCAT.</i>	<i>We expect a 3% increase or 43% (135) of students in 3rd-5th grades at Westbrooke Elementary School will achieve above proficiency (FCAT Levels 4 and 5) in math on the 2013 FCAT.</i>	2A.2. There exists a lack of common understandings of essential, instructional goals among teachers within vertical grade levels to continue the same rigor and relevance from one grade level to the next	2A.2. Teacher Leaders will participate in ongoing school wide professional development related to Marzano's Best Practices and collaborate with team members when developing lessons.	2A.2. Principal, Assistant Principal and CRT	2A.2. Informal and formal instructional rounds (observations) will be conducted to assess the fidelity of the implementation of the intervention/enrichment block.
		2A.3. High performing students struggle to relate to curriculum	2A.3. Science and Math lab will offer enrichment based on students interests during intervention/enrichment block	2A.3. Principal, Assistant Principal and CRT	2A.3. Informal and formal instructional rounds (observations) will be conducted to assess the implementation of the intervention/enrichment block.	2A.3. Student data, student/parent feedback on survey		

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.							
Mathematics Goal #3A: <i>We expect a 3% increase or 83% of students at Westbrooke Elementary School will make learning gains in mathematics on the 2013 FCAT.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:* <i>During the 2011-2012 school year 80% of students in 3rd-5th grades made learning gains in math on the 2012 FCAT.</i>	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* <i>We expect a 3% increase or 83% of students at Westbrooke Elementary School will make learning gains in mathematics on the 2013 FCAT.</i>	3A.1. We lack a common understanding of essential, instructional goals among teachers within the same grade levels to ensure they have the same rigor and relevance.	3A.1. Administrative and leadership team members will analyze this past year's reading data and meet with grade level teams to discuss rigorous and relevant instructional plans, following the PLC guiding questions. Grade Level curriculum Writing Teams develop instructional pacing guides to include specific benchmarks and material to be used to teach those benchmarks by all member so the grade level team, as well as common assessments to be used for data analysis. Teacher leaders will participate in ongoing professional development activities related to Marzano's Best Practices and collaborate with PLC members to incorporate best practices into lesson plans and teaching	3A.1. Principal, Assistant Principal and CRT	3A.1. Review of data with leadership team, discussion of data with teachers during team meetings, following the PLC guiding questions.	3A.1. Student Assessment results, i-Observation, Lesson Plan Checks and data meetings.
			3A.2. Varying levels of student proficiency require differentiated instruction. Some teachers struggle to meet the needs of all learners.	3A.2. Grade Level Wide Intervention/Enrichment block will be scheduled daily with all available resource teachers to assist classroom teachers.	3A.2. Principal, Assistant Principal and CRT	3A.2. Informal and formal instructional rounds (observations) will be conducted to assess the fidelity of the implementation of the intervention/enrichment block. Data will be reviewed with teachers during team meetings, following the PLC guiding questions.	3A.2. Student data, i-Observation Data and Lesson Plan Checks
			3A.3. Student specific math needs are not being met through intervention	3A.3. Progress monitoring through curriculum-aligned common assessments to guide intervention or small group instruction, trained	3A.3. Principal and Assistant Principal	3A.3. Administrative and leadership team members analyze common assessment data and meet with grade level teams to guide	3A.3. Student assessment results, i-Observation, Lesson Plan Checks and data meetings.

**August 2012
 Rule 6A-1.099811
 Revised April 29, 2011**

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

			parent volunteers will work directly with students during intervention block		instructional plans, following PLC guiding questions.	
--	--	--	--	--	---	--

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:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.			4A.1. We do not have and established and consistent protocol for volunteers in the classroom to support the achievement of lower performing students.	4A.1. Develop structured volunteer protocols to ensure volunteers are trained and scheduled to work directly with low performing students in the classroom during intervention blocks or during small groups. Grade level team leaders will share information regarding the utilization of parent volunteers from one grade level to another.	4A.1. Principal, Assistant Principal and CRT	4A.1. Schedules will be reviewed with teachers during grade level data meetings and student data will be analyzed. Discussions will occur during team leader meetings designed to improve the effective of parent volunteers in the classroom.	4A.1. Student achievement on common assessments
Mathematics Goal #4: <i>We expect a 3% increase or 76% of students in the Lowest 25% will make learning gains in Mathematics on the 2013 FCAT.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:* <i>During the 2011-2012 school year, 73% of students at Westbrooke Elementary in the Lowest 25% made learning gains in Mathematics on the 2012 FCAT.</i>	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* <i>We expect a 3% increase or 76% of students in the Lowest 25% will make learning gains in Mathematics on the 2013 FCAT.</i>					
			4A.2. Inconsistent assistance at home from parents to support achievement of lower performing students.	4A.2. Monthly grade level newsletters will provide information about specialized instructional strategies and curriculum expectations to parents. Teachers will communicate information regarding curriculum and student progress via weekly planner, telephone or email	4A.2. Principal, Assistant Principal, CRT and Team Leaders	4A.2. Grade Level and/or School Newsletters are submitted following a schedule and will be reviewed for content	4A.2. Newsletters and Student Achievement Data
			4A.3. Students in the lowest 25% do not have basic math facts fluency.	4A.3. Grade Level wide math fact drill competition with positive incentives, incorporating programs such as Planet Turtle, B rain Pop Jr., VMath Live and Sum Dog	4A.3. Principal, Assistant Principal, CRT and Team Leaders	4A.3. Monitor progress of student fluency and memorization of basic math facts, monitoring use of programs.	4A.3. Student data

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years		2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
5A. In six years school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%. Mathematics Goal #5A: <i>Decrease the achievement gap for each identified subgroup by 50% by June 30, 2017.</i>	Baseline data 2010-2011 74% of all students	76% of all students Students scoring at Level 3 or above on FCAT, by Subgroups:	78% of all students Percentage goal of students scoring at Level 3 or above on FCAT, by Subgroups:	81% of all students Percentage goal of students scoring at Level 3 or above on FCAT, by Subgroups:	83% of all students Percentage goal of students scoring at Level 3 or above on FCAT, by Subgroups:	85% of all students Percentage goal of students scoring at Level 3 or above on FCAT, by Subgroups:	87% of all students Percentage goal of students scoring at Level 3 or above on FCAT, by Subgroups:
		Black 43% White 85% Hispanic 63% Asian 93% ELL 38% SWD 17% Econ. Dis. 50%	Black 55% White 88% Hispanic 68% Asian 100% ELL 61% SWD 65% Econ. Dis. 60%	Black 60% White 90% Hispanic 72% Asian 100% ELL 65% SWD 69% Econ. Dis. 64%	Black 64% White 91% Hispanic 75% Asian 100% ELL 69% SWD 72% Econ. Dis. 68%	Black 69% White 92% Hispanic 78% Asian 100% ELL 73% SWD 76% Econ. Dis. 72%	Black 73% White 93% Hispanic 81% Asian 100% ELL 77% SWD 79% Econ. Dis. 76%
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5B: <i>We expect an increase in the minimum percentages of students in 3rd-5th grades at Westbrooke making satisfactory progress in math on the 2013 FCAT.</i> Black 43 % to 55% White 85% to 88% Hispanic 63% to 68%	2012 Current Level of Performance:* <i>The following percentages of Westbrooke Elementary students in 3rd-5th grades made satisfactory progress in math on the 2012 FCAT:</i> Black 43% White 85% Hispanic 63%.	5B. Black: A majority of our Black students live in areas a significant distance away from the school and are unable to stay for after school tutoring.	5B.1. Grade Level Wide Intervention/Enrichment block will be scheduled daily with all available resource teachers to assist classroom teachers. Instructional technologies will be used for additional individualized support-Reading Plus, Lexia, SuccessMaker, and FCAT Explorer.	5B.1. Principal, Assistant Principal and CRT	5B.1. Informal and formal instructional rounds (observations) will be conducted to assess the fidelity of the intervention/enrichment block. Data will be reviewed with teachers during team meetings, following PLC guiding questions.	5B.1. Student data, i-Observation and Lesson Plan Checks	
	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* <i>We expect an increase or these minimum percentages of students in 3rd-5th grades at Westbrooke will make satisfactory progress in math on the 2013 FCAT.</i> Black 55 % White 88% Hispanic 68%						5B.2. Black: A majority of our Black students live a significant distance from school and families are unable to participate in curriculum nights or parent conference nights.

August 2012
Rule 6A-1.099811
Revised April 29, 2011

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

		5B.3. Black: A majority of our Black students have difficulties adjusting to a new and different school atmosphere.	5B.3. Develop and start a mentoring program for students that may need additional encouragement/support academically, socially or behaviorally	5B.3. Principal and Assistant Principal	5B.3. Feedback from parents, teachers, and volunteers regarding the mentoring program	5B.3. Teacher, student/parent and volunteer feedback on survey
--	--	--	---	--	--	---

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.			5C.1. Varying levels of student proficiency require differentiated instruction. Some teachers may struggle in meeting needs of all learners.	5C.1. Grade Level Wide Intervention/Enrichment Block will be scheduled daily with all available resource teachers to assist classroom teachers.	5C.1. Principal, Assistant Principal, and CRT	5C.1. Informal and formal instructional rounds (observations) will be conducted to assess the fidelity of the implementation of the intervention/enrichment block. Data will be reviewed with teachers during team meetings, following the PLC guiding questions.	5C.1. Student data, i-Observation and Lesson Plan Checks
<u>Mathematics Goal #5C:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
We expect a minimum 61% of ELL students will make satisfactory progress on the 2013 FCAT.	During the 2011-2012 school year, Westbrooke Elementary had 38% (10) of ELL students make satisfactory progress on the 2012 FCAT.	We expect a minimum of 61% of ELL students will make satisfactory progress on the 2013 FCAT.					
			5C.2. ELL students have limited knowledge of math facts/concepts	5C.2. ELL strategies will be implemented during classroom lessons on a daily basis	5C.2. Principal, Assistant Principal, and CRT	5C.2. Informal and formal instructional rounds (observations) will be conducted to assess the fidelity of the ELL strategies and to review lesson plans	5C.2. Lesson Plans, student achievement data and i-Observation
			5C.3. ELL students have limited help with practice at home due to second language.	5C.3. Parents will be provided, at teacher's request, the support of student's home language translator when available, for conferences to provide information on strategies that can be incorporated at home.	5C.3. Principal and Assistant Principal	5C.3. Discussions during team leader and grade level meetings to determine effectiveness of strategies.	5C.3. Student, parent, and teacher feedback on survey
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:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.			5D.1. Students with disabilities have a various range of learning strengths and weaknesses. Some teachers may struggle in meeting needs of all learners.	5D.1. School Wide Intervention/Enrichment Reading Block will be scheduled daily with all available resource teachers to assist classroom teachers. Science and Math lab will offer enrichment for students during this time	5D.1. Principal, Assistant Principal, and CRT	5D.1. Informal and formal instructional rounds (observations) will be conducted to assess the effectiveness of differentiated strategies during the intervention/enrichment block. Data will be reviewed with teachers during team meetings, following the PLC guiding questions.	5D.1. Student data, i-Observation and Lesson Plan Checks
<u>Mathematics Goal #5D:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
NA (<10 Students)	NA (<10Students)	NA (<10 Students)					

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

		5D.2. Students with disabilities may require additional classroom accommodations.	5D.2. Teachers will implement appropriate accommodations and strategies based on identified learning differences.	5D.2. Principal, Assistant Principal and VE Teacher	5D.2. Informal and formal instructional rounds (observations) will be conducted to assess the fidelity and implementation of accommodations and strategies.	5D.2. Student data, i-Observation and Lesson Plan Checks
		5D.3. Students with disabilities may require additional school to home communication regarding progress.	5D.3. Teachers will implement, as appropriate, increased communication with parents via conference, weekly planner, email, or telephone.	5D.3. Principal and Assistant Principal	5D.3. Team Leader and Team Meeting discussions regarding school to home communication	5D.3. Student, teacher, and parent feedback on survey

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.			5A.1. Varying levels of student proficiency require differentiated instruction. Some teachers may struggle in meeting needs of all learners.	5A.1. Grade Level Wide Intervention/Enrichment Block will be scheduled daily with all available resource teachers to assist classroom teachers. Science and Math lab will offer enrichment for students during this time.	5A.1. Principal, Assistant Principal, and CRT	5A.1. Informal and formal instructional rounds (observations) will be conducted to assess the fidelity of the implementation of the intervention/enrichment block. Data will be reviewed with teachers during team meetings, following the PLC guiding questions.	5A.1. Student data, i-Observation and Lesson Plan Checks
Mathematics Goal #5E: <i>We expect an increase or a minimum of 60% of Economically Disadvantaged students in 3rd-5th grades at Westbrooke Elementary School will make satisfactory progress in math on the 2013 FCAT.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:* <i>During the 2011-2012 school year, Westbrooke Elementary had 50% (54) of Economically Disadvantaged students in 3rd-5th grades make satisfactory progress in math on the 2012 FCAT.</i>	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* <i>We expect an increase or a minimum of 60% of Economically Disadvantaged students in 3rd-5th grades at Westbrooke Elementary School will make satisfactory progress in math on the 2013 FCAT.</i>					
			5B.2. A majority of our Economically Disadvantaged students live a significant distance from school or have families that are unable to participate in curriculum nights or parent conference nights.	5B.2. Parents will be provided with curriculum information via written form, email, or telephone conference.	5B.2. Principal and Assistant Principal	5B.2. Team Leader and Grade Level Team Meeting discussions regarding curriculum and student progress information to be communicated to home	5B.2. Teacher, student/parent feedback on survey
			5C.3. A majority of our Economically Disadvantaged students have difficulties adjusting to a new and different school atmosphere.	5C.3. Develop a mentoring program for students that may need additional encouragement/support academically, socially or behaviorally	5C.3. Principal and Assistant Principal	5C.3. Feedback from parents, teachers, and volunteers regarding the mentoring program	5C.3. Teacher, student/parent and volunteer feedback on survey

End of Elementary School Mathematics Goals

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Mathematics Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activities						
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 and CIA	K-5	Principal, Assistant Principal and CRT	School Wide	2x a month during PLC and as needed	Observations, Student Data and PLC Discussions	Leadership Team
38nvision	K-5	CRT and Team Leaders	School Wide	As Needed	Observations, Student Data and PLC Discussions	Leadership Team
Math Investigations	K-1	CRT	K-1	As Needed	Student Data and PLC Discussions	Leadership Team
Marzano High Yield Strategies	K-5	CRT	K-5	Monthly during PLC and as needed	Student Data and PLC Discussions	Leadership Team

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Mathematics Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Math Investigations	One kit per grade level	Previously Purchased	
Number Worlds	Teacher Edition and Classroom Kits	Previously Purchased	
SuccessMaker	Online Instructional Program	Previously Purchased	
			Subtotal:0
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Brain Pop	Online Resource	Previously Purchased	
Moby Math	Online Resource	Previously Purchased	
Sum Dog	Online Resource	Free/No Cost	
			Subtotal:0
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:0
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Use of Math manipulatives	Math Manipulatives	School Improvement Dollars	3641.70
			Subtotal:0
			Total:3641.70

End of Mathematics Goals

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

Elementary and Middle Science Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
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:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science.			1A.1. There is a lack of common understanding of essential, instructional goals among teachers within the same grade levels to ensure they have the same rigor and relevance.	1A.1. Leadership team members will analyze this past school year's science data and meet with grade level teams to discuss rigorous and relevant instructional plans, following PLC guiding questions. Grade level teams will follow district instructional pacing guides to include specific benchmarks and materials to be used to teach those benchmarks by all members of the grade level team, as well as common assessments to be used for data analysis. Teachers will participate in ongoing professional development regarding Marzano Best Practices.	1A.1. Principal, Assistant Principal, Team Leaders and CRT	1A.1. Review of data with leadership team, discussion of data with teachers during team meetings, following PLC guiding questions and submission of common board configurations	1A.1. Student Assessments results, i-Observation, Lesson Plan Checks and common board configurations
Science Goal #1A: <i>We expect a 3% increase or 35% of students in 5th grade at Westbrooke Elementary School will achieve proficiency (FCAT Level 3) in science on the 2012 FCAT.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:* <i>During the 2011-2012 school year, Westbrooke Elementary had 32% (33) of students in 5th grade achieved proficiency (FCAT Level 3) in science on the 2012 FCAT.</i>	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* <i>We expect a 3% increase or 35% (36) of students in 5th grade at Westbrooke Elementary School will achieve proficiency (FCAT Level 3) in science on the 2012 FCAT.</i>	1A.2. Inconsistency of data analysis between teachers within a grade level	1A.2. Individual student progress monitoring based on school-wide, district and/or state assessments will occur regularly with students in all 3 rd , 4 th , and 5 th grade teachers during grade level data meetings.	1A.2. Principal, Assistant Principal, Team Leaders and CRT	1A.2. Student data reviewed by teachers during scheduled data meetings	1A.2. Student data, teacher data notebooks and IMS reports
			1A.3. Teachers have a limited understanding of the newly adopted science curriculum and how to implement with rigor and relevance.	1A.3. Follow district instructional pacing guides to include specific benchmarks and hands-on science activities to be used to teach those benchmarks by all members of the grade level team, use common assessments for data analysis. Teachers will also participate in ongoing staff development related to New Fusion Science Program as needed.	1A.3. Principal, Assistant Principal, Team Leaders and CRT	1A.3. Informal and formal instructional rounds (observations) will be conducted to assess the fidelity of the implementation of science lessons and activities. Data will be reviewed with teachers during team and data meetings, following the PLC guiding questions.	1A.3. Student data, i-Observation and Lesson Plan Checks

**August 2012
Rule 6A-1.099811
Revised April 29, 2011**

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

End of Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in science.			2A.1. Varying levels of student proficiency require differentiated instruction. Some teachers may struggle in meeting needs of all learners.	2A.1. School Wide Intervention/Enrichment block will be scheduled daily with all available resource teachers to assist classroom teachers. Science and Math lab will offer enrichment for students during this time.	2A.1. Principal, Assistant Principal, Team Leaders and CRT	2A.1. Informal and formal instructional rounds (observations) will be conducted to assess the fidelity of the implementation of the intervention/enrichment block. Date will be reviewed with teachers during the team meetings, following the PLC guiding questions.	2A.1. Student data, Instructional Rounds and Lesson Plan Checks
Science Goal #2A:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
<i>During the 2011-2012 school year, 44% (45) of 5th grade students at Westbrooke Elementary achieved above proficiency (FCAT Levels 4 and 5) in science on the 2012 FCAT. We expect a 3% increase or 47% of students in 5th grade at Westbrooke Elementary School will achieve above proficiency (FCAT Levels 4 and 5) in science on the 2013 FCAT.</i>	<i>During the 2011-2012 school year, 44% (45) of 5th grade students at Westbrooke Elementary achieved above proficiency (FCAT Levels 4 and 5) in science on the 2012 FCAT.</i>	<i>We expect a 3% increase or 47% of students in 5th grade at Westbrooke Elementary School will achieve above proficiency (FCAT Levels 4 and 5) in science on the 2013 FCAT.</i>					
			2A.2. There is a lack of common understanding of essential instructional goals as it related to new curriculum among teachers within vertical grade levels to continue the same rigor and relevance throughout all grade levels	2A.2. Teacher leaders will participate in ongoing professional development related to Marzano Best Practices and New Fusion Program	2A.2. Principal, Assistant Principal, Team Leaders and CRT	2A.2. Informal and formal instructional rounds (observations) will be conducted to assess the fidelity of the implementation of the intervention/enrichment block. Date will be reviewed with teachers during the team meetings, following the PLC guiding questions.	2A.2. Student data, Instructional Rounds and Lesson Plan Checks
			2A.3. High performing students may have difficulty using acquired science and math knowledge to solve real word problems.	2A.3. Teacher leaders through professional development will develop design challenges related to STEM (i.e. science fair, math fair, math challenge, etc.)	2A.3. Principal, Assistant Principal, Team Leaders and CRT	2A.3. Informal and formal instructional rounds (observations) and grade level/team leader meeting discussions	2A.3. Student data, Instructional Rounds, Lesson Plan Checks, Teacher Feedback, Student Feedback and Parent Feedback

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Science Professional Development

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
Science Fusion Program	K-5	Science Resource Teacher, CRT and District Personnel	K-5	During PLC Vertical Teams and as available by District	Discussions, Observations and Student Data	Principal, Assistant Principal and CRT

Science Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities/materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal: 0

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

	Total:
--	---------------

End of Science Goals

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Writing Goals

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

Writing Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
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:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1A. FCAT: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing.			1A.1. Common understanding of essential instructional goals among teachers with vertical grade levels to ensure they have the same rigor and relevance	1A.1. Leadership team members will analyze this past year's writing data and meet with grade level teams to discuss rigorous and relevant instructional plans. Grade Level Curriculum Writing Teams will develop instructional pacing guides to include specific benchmarks and materials to be used to teach those benchmarks with fidelity by all members of the team. Teachers will also participate in ongoing professional development related to Marzano's Best Practices. Teachers will implement Write from the Beginning Program.	1A.1. Principal, Assistant Principal and CRT	1A.1. Review of data with leadership team, team meeting/team leader meeting discussions following the PLC guiding questions	1A.1. Common Assessment Results, i-Observation, Lesson Plan Reviews, Common Board Configuration and Write Score Data
Writing Goal #1A: <i>We expect a 3% increase or 90% of students will achieve proficiency (FCAT level 3 or above) on the 2013 FCAT.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:* <i>During the 2011-2012 school year, 87% (83) of the students in 4th grade at Westbrooke Elementary achieved proficiency (FCAT level 3 or above) in writing on the 2012 FCAT.</i>	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* <i>We expect a 3% increase or 90% (87) of students will achieve proficiency (FCAT level 3 or above) on the 2013 FCAT.</i>					
			1A.2. Varying levels of student proficiency require differentiated instruction. Some teachers may struggle in meeting needs of all learners.	1A.2. Small Group Writing Blitz class will be scheduled with available resource teachers to assist classroom teachers with writing curriculum for struggling students, Scheduled Writing Prompts will provide students with structured practice	1A.2. Principal, Assistant Principal and CRT	1A.2. Informal and Formal Instructional Rounds (observations) will be conducted to assess fidelity of the implementation of writing small groups. Discussions will be held during meeting following PLC guiding questions.	1A.2. Student data, i-Observation, Writing Prompt Results, Lesson Plan Reviews and Write Score Data
			1A.3 Students may have limited exposure to different genres and purposes of writing.	1A.3. Provide students frequent practice opportunities and provide feedback through the "Write Score"	1A.3. Principal, Assistant Principal and CRT	1A.3. Write Score Student Data Results	1A.3. Writing Score Data

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Writing Professional Development

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
Write from the Beginning	K-5	CRT and Media Specialist	School Wide	As Needed	Discussions, Observations and Writing Data using the Rubric	Principal, Assistant Principal and CRT
Thinking Maps Training	K-5	CRT	Select Teachers	As Needed	Discussions, Observations and Writing Data using the Rubric	

Writing Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities/materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
			Total: 0

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

End of Writing Goals

Attendance Goal(s)

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

Attendance Goal(s)			Problem-solving Process to Increase Attendance				
Based on the analysis of attendance data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Attendance			1.1. Parents may not be aware of attendance/tardy policies and the academic consequences when students miss school on a regular basis.	1.1. Inform parents of attendance policies during meet the teacher and make contact with parents if student misses regularly. Develop a structured plan to provide missed assignments and instruction. Formal letters from OCPS will be sent home twice during the first month of school regarding attendance and consequences of absences and tardiness.	1.1. Principal, Assistant Principal and Team Leaders	1.1. Attendance issues will be reviewed and discussed with teachers during grade level meetings and student attendance records will be monitored.	1.1. Attendance Records, Teacher and Parent Feedback on survey
Attendance Goal #1: <i>We expect Westbrook will increase this rate by 1% and have an attendance rate of 98% (632) for the 2012-2013 school year.</i>	<u>2012 Current Attendance Rate:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Attendance Rate:*</u>					
	<i>During the 2011-2012 School Year, our attendance rate was 97% (632).</i>	<i>We expect Westbrook will increase this rate by 1% and have an attendance rate of 98% (636) for the 2012-2013 school year.</i>					
	<u>2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)</u>	<u>2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)</u>					
	<i>During the 2011-2012 school year the number of students with excessive absences (10 or more) was 20% (124).</i>	<i>We expect the number of students with excessive absences (10 or more) will decrease to 15% (95)..</i>					
<u>2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)</u>	<u>2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)</u>						

**August 2012
Rule 6A-1.099811
Revised April 29, 2011**

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

	<p><i>During the 2011-2012 school year the number of students with excessive Tardies (10 or more) at Westbrooke was 6% (36).</i></p>	<p><i>During the 2012-2013 school year we expect to reduce the number of students with excessive Tardies at Westbrooke to 5% (32).</i></p>					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Attendance Professional Development

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
Marzano Strategies	K-5	CRT	All Teachers	Early Release	Professional Development	Principal & Assistant Principal

Attendance Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
			Total: 0

End of Attendance Goals

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Suspension Goal(s)

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

Suspension Goal(s)			Problem-solving Process to Decrease Suspension				
Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Suspension			I.1. Limited relationships with new students from outside the immediate neighborhood, and Limited Common Language and Practices regarding school behavior plan and discipline policies may contribute to suspensions.	I.1. PLC Discussions regarding consistent discipline best practices and procedures.	I.1. Principal, Assistant Principal and Teacher Leaders	I.1. School Wide Programs (Use Your PAWS- Practice Kindness, Accept Others, Watch for People who need Help, & Stand Tall and Strong), Project Wisdom (Character Education) Words of Wisdom (Morning Announcements), Classroom Visits to Review Code of Student Conduct	I.1. i-Observation, Teacher Feedback, Student Feedback Survey, Discipline Data on SMS
Suspension Goal #1: <i>We expect to decrease the total number of In-school and suspensions to 15, and out of school suspensions to 21 .</i>	2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions					
	<i>During the 2011-2012 school year, the total number of in school suspensions was 17.</i>	<i>We expect to decrease the total number of in school suspension to 15 or less for the 2012-2013 school year.</i>					
	2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School					
	<i>During the 2011-2012 school year the total number of students receiving in school suspensions was 2 % (12).</i>	<i>We expect to decrease the total number of students receiving in school suspensions to less than 2% during the 2012-2013 school year.</i>					
	2012 Total Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions					
	<i>During the 2011-2012 school year the total number of out of school suspensions was 24.</i>	<i>We expect to decrease the total number of suspensions to 19 during the 2012-2013 school year.</i>					
	2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out- of- School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out- of-School					
	<i>During the 2011-2012 school year the total number of students who received an out of school suspension was</i>	<i>We expect to decrease the total number of students who receive and out of school suspension to 10 for</i>					

**August 2012
Rule 6A-1.099811
Revised April 29, 2011**

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

	12.	the 2012-2013 school year.					
			1.2. There is inconsistent communication between school and home/home and school regarding student behavior.	1.2. Teacher newsletters will provide information about behavior expectations to parents. Parent conference weeks will be held to inform parents of student specific information regarding behavior. Teachers will keep parent communication log documenting school to home communication.	1.2. Principal, Assistant Principal and Teacher Leaders	1.2. Grade Level Newsletters are submitted following a schedule and will be reviewed for content, parent content logs are maintained and updated.	1.2. Newsletters, Teacher Feedback Survey, Parent Feedback Survey, Student Feedback Survey, Student Achievement Data
			1.3. We have a limited Common Language and Practices regarding school behavior plan and discipline policies.	1.3. PLC Discussions regarding consistent discipline best practices and procedures.	1.3. Principal, Assistant Principal and Teacher Leaders	1.3. School Wide Programs (Use Your PAWS- Practice Kindness, Accept Others, Watch for People who need Help, & Stand Tall and Strong), Project Wisdom (Character Education)	1.3. i-Observation, Teacher Feedback Survey, Student Feedback Survey Discipline Data on SMS

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Suspension Professional Development

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
Sticks and Stones	K-5	Dave Weber	All Staff	Preplanning Week	PLC Discussions	Principal, Assistant Principal and CRT
Use Your PAWS	K-5	Assistant Principal	K-5	Ongoing as Needed	PLC Discussions and Grade Level Meetings	Principal, Assistant Principal and CRT

Suspension Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Project Wisdom	Online Character Development Resource	General Budget	499.00
Sticks and Stones	National Speaker/Trainer	General Budget	
			Subtotal:499.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
			Total: 499.00

End of Suspension Goals

**August 2012
Rule 6A-1.099811
Revised April 29, 2011**

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

Note: Required for High School- F.S., Sec. 1003.53

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

Dropout Prevention Goal(s)		Problem-solving Process to Dropout Prevention				
Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Dropout Prevention		1.1. Many newly enrolled students at Westbrooke Elementary have significant academic deficiencies.	1.1. Administrative and leadership team members will analyze this past year's reading data and meet with grade level teams to discuss rigorous and relevant instructional plans, following the Professional Learning Communities guiding questions. Teacher leaders will participate in ongoing professional development related to Marzano's Best Practices.	1.1. Principal, Assistant Principal and CRT	1.1. Review of data with leadership team, discussion of data with teachers during team meetings, following PLC guiding questions, Weekly submission of grade level Common Board Configurations	1.1. Student Assessment results, Instructional Rounds, Lesson Plan reviews and data meetings, Weekly submission of Common Board configuration, Lesson Plan Reviews
<u>Dropout Prevention Goal #1:</u> <i>*Please refer to the percentage of students who dropped out during the 2011-2012 school year.</i>	<u>2012 Current Dropout Rate:*</u> <i>During the 2011-2012 school year 99% of students at Westbrooke Elementary were promoted to the next grade level at the end of the school year. We expect 1% (6) of students or less will be retained at the end of the 2012-2013 school year.</i>	<u>2013 Expected Dropout Rate:*</u> <i>We expect 1% (6) of students or less will be retained at the end of the 2012-2013 school year.</i>				
	<u>2012 Current Graduation Rate:*</u> <i>During the 2011-2012 school year 99% (626) of students were promoted to the next grade level at the end of the school year.</i>	<u>2013 Expected Graduation Rate:*</u> <i>We expect to maintain that 99% (630) of students will be promoted to the next grade level at the end of the 2012-2013 school year.</i>				
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Dropout Prevention Professional Development

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

Dropout Prevention Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
			Total: 0

End of Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

**August 2012
Rule 6A-1.099811
Revised April 29, 2011**

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

Upload Option-For schools completing the Parental Involvement Policy/Plan (PIP) please include a copy for this section.
Online Template- For schools completing the PIP a link will be provided that will direct you to this plan.

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

Parent Involvement Goal(s)			Problem-solving Process to Parent Involvement				
Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Parent Involvement			1.1. Some of our families live a significant distance from school making it difficult for them to participate in curriculum nights or parent conference night.	1.1. Parents will be provided with information regarding grade level expectations through newsletters, email, and via telephone conferences. Schedule and promote events in advance.	1.1. Principal and Assistant Principal	1.1. Parent Feedback, Teacher Feedback, Attendance Records and Survey Data Analysis	1.1. Newsletters submitted on a schedule for content review, communication logs, sign in sheets and survey results
Parent Involvement Goal #1: <i>*Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:*</u> <i>During the 2011-2012 school year 25% (160) of the Westbrooke families completed the Needs Assessment Parent Survey.</i>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:*</u> <i>We expect to increase that to at least 33% (210) of the Westbrooke Families will complete the Needs Assessment Parent Survey.</i>					
			1.3. Families may not have access to a computer or email	1.3. Information will be provide in hard copy, including surveys	1.3. Principal and Assistant Principal	1.3. Print hard copies of newsletters and surveys	1.3. Parent Feedback on Surveys, Teacher Feedback, and Survey Results

Parent Involvement Professional Development

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
Training on Utilizations of Volunteers	K-5	CRT and PLC Leaders	K-5	As Needed	PLC Discussions	Principal, Assistant Principal and CRT

August 2012
Rule 6A-1.099811
Revised April 29, 2011

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

--	--	--	--	--	--	--

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Parent Involvement Budget

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
			Total: 0

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

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

STEM Goal(s)	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
<p>Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:</p>					
<p>STEM Goal #1:</p> <p><i>During the 2011-2012 school year, 44% (45) of 5th grade students at Westbrooke Elementary achieved above proficiency (FCAT Levels 4 and 5) in science on the 2012 FCAT.</i></p> <p><i>We expect a 3% increase or 43% (135) of students in 3rd-5th grades at Westbrooke Elementary School will achieve proficiency (FCAT Levels 4 and 5) in math on the 2013 FCAT.</i></p>	<p>1.1. Students have difficulty understanding that STEM concepts apply to other areas of curriculum.</p>	<p>1.1. Teachers will use rigorous, integrated curriculum that makes meaningful connections with STEM across core subjects.</p>	<p>1.1. Principal, Assistant Principal and CRT</p>	<p>1.1. Informal and formal observations to assess the fidelity and rigor of STEM activities.</p>	<p>1.1. Student Data, i- Observation data, and PLC discussions</p>
	<p>1.2. Students have difficulty understanding that STEM concepts have real world applications.</p>	<p>1.2. Teachers will use OCPS STEM lessons consistently to help students understand how concepts work in the real world. Teachers will use the Destination College Program to relate STEM activities to real world jobs. Teachers and students will participate in Teach In.</p>	<p>1.2. Principal, Assistant Principal and CRT</p>	<p>1.2. Informal and formal observations to assess the fidelity and rigor of STEM activities.</p>	<p>1.2. Student Data and i-Observation data</p>
	<p>1.3. Students have difficulty using STEM concepts in new or unexpected situations.</p>	<p>1.3. Teachers will present students with opportunities to collaborate while investigating multiple methods of problem solving.</p>	<p>1.3. Principal, Assistant Principal, CRT and PLC Leaders</p>	<p>1.3. Informal and formal observations to assess the fidelity and rigor of STEM activities.</p>	<p>1.3. Student Data, observations, and PLC discussions</p>

STEM Professional Development

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	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g.,	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring

August 2012
Rule 6A-1.099811
Revised April 29, 2011

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

		PLC Leader	school-wide)	frequency of meetings)		
Science Fusion Program	K-5	CRT & Science Lead Teacher	All Teachers	During PLCs	Student data, PLC discussions, and observations	Principal, Assistant Principal, Team Leaders and CRT
Real World Problem Solving	K-5	Principal, Assistant Principal and CRT	All Teachers	During PLCs	Student data, PLC discussions, and observations	Principal, Assistant Principal, Team Leaders and CRT

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

STEM Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Science Fusion Program	K-5	CRT & Science Lead Teacher	
Real World Problem Solving	K-5	Principal, Assistant Principal and CRT	
			Subtotal: 0
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
			Total:0

End of STEM Goal(s)

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Additional Goal(s)

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

Additional Goal(s)			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Additional Goal			1.1. Students may struggle in relating to concepts using non-fiction text.	1.1. Teachers will be provided professional development regarding Common Core Activities and Response to Literature and Multiple Exposures	1.1. Principal, Assistant Principal, CRT and Media Specialist	1.1. Instructional Rounds (observations) PLC discussions	1.1. FAIR, common assessments and progress monitoring
Additional Goal #1: Increase by 3% students who read on grade level by age nine.	<u>2012 Current Level</u> :* <i>During the 2011-2012 school year, 23% (72) of students in 3rd-5th grades at Westbrooke Elementary School achieved proficiency (FCAT Level 3) in reading on the 2012 FCAT.</i>	<u>2013 Expected Level</u> :* <i>We expect 26% (80) of students in 3rd-5th grades at Westbrooke Elementary School will achieve proficiency (FCAT Level 3) in reading on the 2012 FCAT.</i>					
			1.2. Limited non-fiction text available for classrooms	1.2. PLC discussions to determine the need per grade level and purchase with scholastic book fair funds	1.2. Principal, Assistant Principal, CRT and Media Specialist	1.2. PLC Discussions	1.2. Grade Level Leader Feedback

Additional Goal(s)			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Additional Goal			2.1. First grade students may struggle with a deeper understanding of addition,	1.1. Select Teachers will be provided with professional development on the use of the Math Investigations Program	1.1. Principal, Assistant Principal and CRT	1.1. Instructional Rounds (observations) PLC discussions, and student data	1.1. Common Assessments & Assessments from Math Investigations and Teacher Observations
Additional Goal #2: Increase by 3% of students who become fluent in math operations.	<u>2012 Current Level</u> :* <i>During the 2011-2012 school year, Westbrooke Elementary had 25% (80) of students in 3rd-</i>	<u>2013 Expected Level</u> :* <i>We expect a 3% increase or 28% (88) of students in 3rd-5th grades at Westbrooke Elementary</i>					

**August 2012
Rule 6A-1.099811
Revised April 29, 2011**

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

	<i>5th grades achieved proficiency (FCAT Level 3) in math on the 2012 FCAT.</i>	<i>School will achieve proficiency (FCAT Level 3) in math on the 2013 FCAT.</i>					
			2.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			2.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Additional Goal(s)			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3. Additional Goal Increase College and Career Awareness through Destination College and school activities. -See STEM Goals			3.1 See STEM Goals	3.1 See STEM Goals	3.1 See STEM Goals	3.1 See STEM Goals	3.1 See STEM Goals
Additional Goal(s)			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
4. Additional Goal Decrease Disproportionate Classification in Special Education			4.1 See MTSS Statement	4.1 See MTSS Statement	4.1 See MTSS Statement	4.1 See MTSS Statement	4.1 See MTSS Statement

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

5. Additional Goal			5.1. Limited funding for additional musical resources	5.1. Develop a program to acquire additional funding sources	5.1. Principal and Assistant Principal	5.1. Student Enrollment Data	5.1. Student, Teacher and parent surveys
Increase enrollment in Fine Arts							
<u>Additional Goal #5</u>	<u>2012 Current Level :*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level :*</u>					
Increase enrollment in Fine Arts 100% of students at Westbrooke will continue to participate in the music program through the special area rotation.	100% of students participated in the music program through the special area rotation.	Westbrooke Elementary will maintain 100% of students participating in the music program.					

Additional Goals Professional Development

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
Math Investigations	K-1	CRT	Selected Teachers	During PLCs	PLC Discussions	Principal, Assistant Principal and CRT

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Additional Goal(s) Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Use of Math Manipulatives	Math Manipulatives	School Improvement Funds	3641.70 (Previously listed under math budget)
			Subtotal:
			Total: 3641.70

End of Additional Goal(s)

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Final Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Please provide the total budget from each section.	
Reading Budget	Total: 4983.00
CELLA Budget	Total:
Mathematics Budget	Total:
Science Budget	Total:
Writing Budget	Total:
Civics Budget	Total:
U.S. History Budget	Total:
Attendance Budget	Total:
Suspension Budget	Total: 499.00
Dropout Prevention Budget	Total:
Parent Involvement Budget	Total:
STEM Budget	Total:
CTE Budget	Total:
Additional Goals	Total: 3641.70
	Grand Total: 9123.70

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability (DA) Compliance

Please choose the school’s DA Status. (To activate the checkbox: 1. Double click the desired box; 2. When the menu pops up, select *Checked* under “Default value” header; 3. Select *OK*, this will place an “x” in the box.)

School Differentiated Accountability Status		
<input type="checkbox"/> Priority	<input type="checkbox"/> Focus	<input type="checkbox"/> Prevent
NA	NA	NA

Are you reward school? Yes No

(A reward school is any school that has improved their letter grade from the previous year or any A graded school.)

- Upload a copy of the Differentiated Accountability Checklist in the designated upload link on the *Upload* page

School Advisory Council (SAC)

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 members 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 No

If No, describe the measures being taken to comply with SAC requirements.

Describe the activities of the SAC for the upcoming school year.
Review SIP goals, activities, review formative student data and progress towards SAC and SIP goals.

Describe the projected use of SAC funds.	Amount
Purchase of Math Manipulatives	3641.70