

FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION



School Improvement Plan (SIP) Form SIP-1

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

2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

PART I: SCHOOL INFORMATION

School Name: Waterford Elementary	District Name: Orange
Principal: Charles Lindlau	Superintendent: Dr. Barbara Jenkins
SAC Chair: Tracy Fagan	Date of School Board Approval: January 29, 2013

Student Achievement Data:

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](#)

Highly Effective Administrators

List your school’s highly effective administrators and briefly describe their certification(s), number of years at the current school, number of years as an administrator, and their prior performance record with increasing student achievement at each school. Include history of school grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment performance (Percentage data for Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) progress.

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	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	Charles Lindlau	Bachelor of Science in Elementary Education; Master’s degree in Educational Leadership	3	6	<p>2011-2012 Waterford Elementary School – earned “A” grade; 75% met high standards in reading; 69% met high standards in math; 73% met high standards for writing; 60% met high standards in science. 74% of students made learning gains in reading and 67% of students made learning gains in math. 66% of the lowest 25% of students in reading made learning gains. 47% of the lowest 25% of students in math made learning gains.</p> <p>2010-2011 Waterford Elementary School – earned “A” grade; 87% of AYP standards met; 86% meeting high standards in reading; 87% in Math; 86% of students met high standards for writing; 65% of students met Science standards. 71% of students made learning gains in reading and 79% of students</p>

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

					<p>made learning gains in math. 61% of the lowest 25% of students in reading made adequate progress. 85% of the lowest 25% of students in math made adequate progress.</p> <p>2009-2010 Waterford Elementary School – earned “A” grade; 92% of AYP standards met; 89% meeting high standards in reading; 83% in Math; 67% of students met high standards for writing; 67% of students met Science standards. 68% of students made learning gains in reading and 66% of students made learning gains in math. 50% of the lowest 25% of students in reading made adequate progress. 57% of the lowest 25% of students in math made adequate progress.</p>
Assistant Principal	Denise Bainbridge	Bachelor of Arts in English 6-12; Middle Grades Endorsement; Athletic Coaching Endorsement; Master’s degree in Educational Leadership	2	12	<p>2011-2012 Waterford Elementary School – earned “A” grade; 75% met high standards in reading; 69% met high standards in math; 73% met high standards for writing; 60% met high standards in science. 74% of students made learning gains in reading and 67% of students made learning gains in math. 66% of the lowest 25% of students in reading made learning gains. 47% of the lowest 25% of students in math made learning gains.</p> <p>2010-2011 Waterford Elementary School – earned “A” grade; 87% of AYP standards met; 86% meeting high standards in reading; 87% in Math; 86% of students met high standards for writing; 65% of students met Science standards. 71% of students made learning gains in reading and 79% of students made learning gains in math. 61% of the lowest 25% of students in reading made adequate progress. 85% of the lowest 25% of students in math made adequate progress</p> <p>2009-2010 Waterford Elementary School – earned “A” grade; 92% of AYP standards met; 89% meeting high standards in reading; 83% in Math; 67% of students met high standards for writing; 67% of students met Science standards. 68% of students made learning gains in reading and 66% of students made learning gains in math. 50% of the lowest 25% of students in reading made adequate progress. 57% of the lowest 25% of students in math made adequate progress.</p>

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

Highly Effective Instructional Coaches

List your school's highly effective instructional coaches and briefly describe their certification(s), number of years at the current school, number of years as an instructional coach, and their prior performance record with increasing student achievement at each school. Include history of school grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment performance (Percentage data for Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress. Instructional coaches described in this section are only those who are fully released or part-time teachers in reading, mathematics, or science and work only at the school site.

Subject Area	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	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)
All	Debbie Marshall	Bachelor of Arts in Early Childhood Education; Master's Degree in Early Childhood Education	21	9	<p>2011-2012 Waterford Elementary School – earned “A” grade; 75% met high standards in reading; 69% met high standards in math; 73% met high standards for writing; 60% met high standards in science. 74% of students made learning gains in reading and 67% of students made learning gains in math. 66% of the lowest 25% of students in reading made learning gains. 47% of the lowest 25% of students in math made learning gains.</p> <p>2010-2011 Waterford Elementary School – earned “A” grade; 87% of AYP standards met; 86% meeting high standards in reading; 87% in Math; 86% of students met high standards for writing; 65% of students met Science standards. 71% of students made learning gains in reading and 79% of students made learning gains in math. 61% of the lowest 25% of students in reading made adequate progress. 85% of the lowest 25% of students in math made adequate progress</p> <p>2009-2010 Waterford Elementary School – earned “A” grade; 92% of AYP standards met; 89% meeting high standards in reading; 83% in Math; 67% of students met high standards for writing; 67% of students met Science standards. 68% of students made learning gains in reading and 66% of students made learning gains in math. 50% of the lowest 25% of students in reading made adequate progress. 57% of the lowest 25% of students in math made</p>

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

					adequate progress.
--	--	--	--	--	--------------------

Highly Effective Teachers

Describe the school-based strategies that will be used to recruit and retain high quality, highly effective teachers to the school.

Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date	Not Applicable (If not, please explain why)
1. Recruitment of HQ Teachers and Pre-Qualification of Instructional applicants: All instructional applicants are pre-qualified as Highly Qualified before they are called in for an interview.	Charles Lindlau, Denise Bainbridge and Debbie Marshall	8/31/2012	Recruitment of HQ Teachers and Pre-Qualification of Instructional applicants: All instructional applicants are pre-qualified as Highly Qualified before they are called in for an interview.
2. Retaining of HQ Teachers: All teachers participate and contribute to Professional Learning Communities, focusing on student achievement and professional development.	Charles Lindlau, Denise Bainbridge and Debbie Marshall	6/10/2013	Retaining of HQ Teachers: All teachers participate and contribute to Professional Learning Communities, focusing on student achievement and professional development.
3. Identification of Teacher Leaders: Building a solid base of common skills by supporting teaching and learning through maximizing expertise in leadership, content and pedagogy among community stakeholders in order to implement and sustain the OCPS framework.	Charles Lindlau, Denise Bainbridge and Debbie Marshall	6/10/2013	Identification of Teacher Leaders: Building a solid base of common skills by supporting teaching and learning through maximizing expertise in leadership, content and pedagogy among community stakeholders in order to implement and sustain the OCPS framework.

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

List all instructional staff and paraprofessionals who are teaching out-of-field and/or who are NOT highly effective.

Name	Certification	Teaching Assignment	Professional Development/Support to Become Highly Effective
100% (49)			Training will be provided in Marzano's Art and Science of Teaching and highly effective instructional strategies.

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

--	--	--	--

Staff Demographics

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

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

Total Number of Instructional Staff	% of First-Year Teachers	% of Teachers with 1-5 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 6-14 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 15+ Years of Experience	% of Teachers with Advanced Degrees	% Highly Effective Teachers	% Reading Endorsed Teachers	% National Board Certified Teachers	% ESOL Endorsed Teachers
100% (49)	0% (0)	16% (8)	53% (26)	31% (15)	33% (16)	100% (49)	6% (3)	2% (1)	98% (48)

Teacher Mentoring Program

Please describe the school's teacher mentoring program by including the names of mentors, the name(s) of mentees, rationale for the pairing, and the planned mentoring activities.

Mentor Name	Mentee Assigned	Rationale for Pairing	Planned Mentoring Activities
Vanessa Arana	Jennifer Coker	Proximity, Clinical Education Training, teaching style, past team leader, years of experience	<p>Planned Mentoring Activities – All beginning teachers September – CIA Blueprints, Curriculum Order of Instruction, Beginning Teacher Portfolio Information, Open House Procedures, Parent Communication, Progress Reports, IPDP, Edusoft and FAIR Testing Procedures</p> <p>Other topics: Parent Conferences, MTSS Procedures, Intervention Groups, Classroom and Time Management, Classroom Routines, Marzano's High Yield Strategies, Thinking Maps, Morale Boosters, Best Practices in Instruction, Teaching with Rigor</p> <p>School tour, overview of school programs and procedures, curriculum materials, lesson planning, best practices, team collaboration time, model lessons as needed, reflection</p>

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

--	--	--	--

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 N/A
Title I, Part C- Migrant
Title I, Part D
Title II
Title III
Title X- Homeless
Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)
Violence Prevention Programs
Nutrition Programs
Housing Programs
Head Start
Adult Education
Career and Technical Education
Job Training
Other

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

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

School-Based MTSS/Rtl Team
<p>Identify the school-based MTSS Leadership Team. Principal: Provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making; ensures that the school-based team is implementing MTSS; conducts assessment of MTSS skills of school staff; ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation; ensures adequate professional development to support MTSS implementation; and communicates with parents regarding school-based MTSS plans and activities. Select General Education Teachers (Primary and Intermediate): Provides information about core instruction; participates in student data collection; delivers Tier 1 instruction/intervention; collaborates with other staff to implement Tier 2 interventions; and integrates Tier 1 materials/instruction with Tier 2/3 activities. Exceptional Student Education (ESE) Teachers: Participates in student data collection; integrates core instructional activities/materials into Tier 3 instruction; and collaborates with general education teachers through such activities as co-teaching. Instructional Coaches Reading/Math/Science: Develops, leads and evaluates school core content standards/programs; identifies and analyzes existing literature on scientifically based curriculum/behavior assessment and intervention approaches; identifies systematic patterns of student need while working with district personnel to identify appropriate, evidence-based intervention strategies; assists with whole school screening programs that provide early intervening services for children to be considered "at risk"; assists in the design and implementation for progress monitoring, data collection and data analysis; participates in the design and delivery of professional development; and provides support for assessment and implementation monitoring. School Psychologist: Participates in collection, interpretation, and analysis of data; facilitates development of intervention plans; provides support for intervention fidelity and documentation; provides professional development and technical assistance for problem-solving activities including data collection, data analysis, intervention planning, and program evaluation; facilitates data-based decision-making activities. Speech Language Pathologist: Educates the team in the role language plays in curriculum, assessment, and instruction, as a basis for appropriate program design; assists in the selection of screening measures; and helps identify systemic patterns of student need with respect to language skills. Student Services Personnel: Provides quality services and expertise on issues ranging from program design to assessment and intervention with individual students. In addition to providing interventions, school social workers continue to link child-serving and community agencies to the schools and families to support the child's academic, emotional, behavioral, and social success. Technology Specialist: Develops or brokers technology necessary to manage and display data; provides professional development and technical support to teachers and staff regarding data management and display.</p>
<p>Describe how the school-based MTSS Leadership Team functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions). How does it work with other school teams to organize/coordinate MTSS efforts? The Leadership Team will focus meetings around one question: How do we develop and maintain a problem-solving system to bring out the best in our school, our teachers and our students? The entire team (or select team members, as needed) will meet once a month to engage in the following activities: Review universal screening data and link to instructional decisions; review progress monitoring data at the grade level and the classroom level to identify students who are meeting/exceeding benchmarks, at moderate risk or at high risk for not meeting benchmarks. Based on the above information, the team will identify professional development and resources. The team will collaborate regularly, problem solve, share effective practices, evaluate implementation, make decisions and practice new processes and skills. The team will facilitate the process of building consensus, increasing infrastructure and making decisions about implementation.</p>
<p>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: Baseline data: Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network (PMRN); FAIR; Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT). Progress Monitoring: PMRN; FCAT Simulation; Curriculum Based Assessments Midyear: Florida Assessments for Instruction in Reading (FAIR) End of Year: FAIR; FCAT Frequency of Data Days: Once a month for data analysis</p>
<p>Describe the role of the school-based MTSS Leadership Team in the development and implementation of the school improvement plan. Describe how the MTSS Problem-solving process is used in developing and implementing the SIP?: The MTSS Leadership Team met with the principal and select team members met with the School Advisory Council (SAC) to help develop the SIP. The team provided data on: Tier 1, 2, and 3 targets; academic and social/emotional areas that needed to be addressed; helped set clear expectations for instruction (Rigor, Relevance, Relationship); facilitated the development of a systemic approach to teaching (Essential Questions, High-Yield Teaching Strategies) and aligned processes and procedures.</p>

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

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team
Identify the school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT). Principal, Charles Lindlau, Assistant Principal. Denise Bainbridge, CRT, Debbie Marshall, CCT, Robin Blackwell, Tiffany Angstadt, Reading Specialist
Describe how the school-based LLT functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions). The school-based LLT is a collaborative team who meets bi-weekly 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.
What will be the major initiatives of the LLT this year? Using the Florida Continuous Improvement Model, the LLT will work with teachers to analyze student data, plan focused instruction, monitor progress through state and school assessments, adjust instruction in response to data, 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.

***Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition**

Describe plans for assisting preschool children in transition from early childhood programs to local elementary school programs as applicable.

N/A

***Grades 6-12 Only** Sec. 1003.413 (b) F.S

For schools with Grades 6-12, describe the plan to ensure that teaching reading strategies is the responsibility of every teacher.

N/A

***High Schools Only**

Note: Required for High School-Sec. 1003.413(g)(j) F.S.

How does the school incorporate applied and integrated courses to help students see the relationships between subjects and relevance to their future?

N/A

How does the school incorporate students' academic and career planning, as well as promote student course selections, so that students' course of study is personally meaningful?

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

N/A

Postsecondary Transition

Note: Required for High School- Sec. 1008.37(4), F.S.

Describe strategies for improving student readiness for the public postsecondary level based on annual analysis of the [High School Feedback Report](#).

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						
<p>1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading. Reading Goal #1: Based on district expectations, 33% of students at Waterford in grades 3 through 5 will score a Level 3 on the 2012 FCAT Reading subtest.</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>Reading Goal #1a:</td> <td>2012 Current Level of Performance: *</td> <td>2013 Expected Level of Performance: *</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Based on district expectations, 33% of students at Waterford in grades 3 through 5 will score a Level 3 on the 2012 FCAT Reading subtest.</td> <td>30% (109)</td> <td>33% (118)</td> </tr> </table>		Reading Goal #1a:	2012 Current Level of Performance: *	2013 Expected Level of Performance: *	Based on district expectations, 33% of students at Waterford in grades 3 through 5 will score a Level 3 on the 2012 FCAT Reading subtest.	30% (109)	33% (118)	1a.1. An anticipated barrier to students achieving proficiency in reading is lack of parental involvement.	1a.1. Some strategies to increase parental involvement are having two mandatory parent-teacher conferences per school year, utilizing Progressbook to communicate student progress to parents.	1a.1. Principal, Assistant Principal and CRT	1a.1. Review of data with leadership team, discussion of data with teachers during team meetings, following the PLC Guiding Questions. Daily completion of Common Board Configurations which includes, student friendly objectives, assessments, and homework for each day.	1a.1. Student assessment results, conference attendance documentation
Reading Goal #1a:	2012 Current Level of Performance: *	2013 Expected Level of Performance: *										
Based on district expectations, 33% of students at Waterford in grades 3 through 5 will score a Level 3 on the 2012 FCAT Reading subtest.	30% (109)	33% (118)										
		1a.2. An anticipated barrier to students achieving proficiency in reading is lack of resources at home.	1a.2. A strategy to counteract lack of resources is to implement the "Ticket to Read" program.	1a.2. Principal, Assistant Principal and CRT	1a.2. Review of data with leadership team, discussion of data with teachers during team meetings, following the PLC Guiding Questions.	1a.2. Student assessment results and data meetings.						
		1a.3. An anticipated barrier to students achieving proficiency in reading lack of student motivation.	1a.3. To increase student motivation, we will recognize students for their academic efforts on the morning news and through various awards. We will provide before school Sunshine State book clubs with guest hosts.	1a.3. Principal, Assistant Principal and CRT	1a.3. Review of data with leadership team, discussion of data with teachers during team meetings, following the PLC Guiding Questions.	1a.3. Student assessment results, classroom walk throughs, data meetings, and student interviews.						
<p>1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading.</p>		1b.1. N/A	1b.1.	1b.1.	1b.1.	1b.1.						

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

Reading Goal #1b: No students at Waterford Elementary took the alternative assessment.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.					
			1b.2.	1b.2.	1b.2.	1b.2.	1b.2.
			1b.3.	1b.3.	1b.3.	1b.3.	1b.3.
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 reading. Reading Goal #2: 48% of students will score a Level 4 or 5 on the Reading Subtest of the FCAT.			2a.1. An anticipated barrier to students achieving above proficiency in reading is lack of parental involvement.	2a.1. Some strategies to increase parental involvement are having two parent-teacher conferences per school year, utilizing Progressbook to communicate student progress to parents.	2a.1. Principal, Assistant Principal and CRT	2a.1. Review of data with leadership team, discussion of data with teachers during team meetings, following the PLC Guiding Questions. Daily completion of Common Board Configurations which includes, student friendly objectives, assessments, and homework for each day.	2a.1. Student assessment results, conference attendance documentation
Reading Goal #2a:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
48% of students at Waterford in grades 3 through 5 will score a Level 4 or 5 on the 2012 FCAT Reading subtest.	45% (164)	48% (172)					
			2a.2. An anticipated barrier to students achieving above proficiency in reading is lack of resources at home.	2a.2. A strategy to counteract lack of resources is to implement the "Ticket to Read" program.	2a.2. Principal, Assistant Principal and CRT	2a.2. Review of data with leadership team, discussion of data with teachers during team meetings, following the PLC Guiding Questions.	2a.2. Student assessment results and data meetings.
			2a.3 An anticipated barrier to students achieving above proficiency in reading is adequate instructional time provided for gifted level students.	2a.3 To increase student s performing at levels 4 and 5 on FCAT reading, gifted students will receive daily services from the gifted teacher applying highly effective reading strategies and extension lessons.	2a.3 Principal, Assistant Principal and CRT	2a.3 Review of data with leadership team, discussion of data with teachers during team meetings, following the PLC Guiding Questions.	2a.3 Student assessment results, classroom walk throughs, lesson plan reviews and data meetings.
2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in reading.			2b.1. N/A	2b.1.	2b.1.	2b.1.	2b.1.

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

Reading Goal #2b: No students at Waterford Elementary took the alternative assessment.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.		Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.				
			2b.2.	2b.2.	2b.2.	2b.2.	2b.2.
		2b.3	2b.3	2b.3	2b.3	2b.3	2b.3
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. Reading Goal #3: 77% of students at Waterford will make Learning Gains in Reading.			3a.1. An anticipated barrier to students making learning gains is lack of parental involvement.	3a.1. Some strategies to increase parental involvement are having two parent-teacher conferences per school year, utilizing Progressbook to communicate student progress to parents.	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. Daily completion of Common Board Configurations which includes, student friendly objectives, assessments, and homework for each day.	3a.1. Student assessment results, conference attendance documentation
Reading Goal #3a: Based on District expectations, 77% (276) of students at Waterford will make Learning Gains on the 2012 FCAT Reading subtest.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	74% (269)	77% (276)					
			3a.2. An anticipated barrier to students making learning gains is lack of resources at home.	3a.2. A strategy to counteract lack of resources is to implement the "Ticket to Read" program.	3a.2. Principal, Assistant Principal and CRT	3a.2. Review of data with leadership team, discussion of data with teachers during team meetings, following the PLC Guiding Questions.	3a.2. Student assessment results and data meetings.
			3a.3. An anticipated barrier to students making learning gains is lack of student motivation.	3a.3. To increase student motivation, we will recognize students for their efforts in reading on the morning news and through various awards. We will provide before school Sunshine State book clubs with guest hosts.	3a.3. Principal, Assistant Principal and CRT	3a.3. Review of data with leadership team, discussion of data with teachers during team meetings, following the PLC Guiding Questions.	3a.3. Student assessment results, classroom walk throughs, lesson plan reviews and data meetings.

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

3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading.			3b.1.	3b.1.	3b.1.	3b.1.	3b.1.
Reading Goal #3b: No students at Waterford Elementary took the alternative assessment.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*	N/A				
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.					
			3b.2.	3b.2.	3b.2.	3b.2.	3b.2.
			3b.3.	3b.3.	3b.3.	3b.3.	3b.3.
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
4a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #4: 66% of students in the lowest 25% will make Learning Gains in Reading.			4a.1. An anticipated barrier to the lowest 25% of students making learning gains is lack of parental involvement.	4a.1. Some strategies to increase parental involvement are having two parent-teacher conferences per school year, utilizing Progressbook to communicate student progress to parents, and making computer labs available to students before school for additional reading practice and completion of literacy activities.	4a.1. Principal, Assistant Principal and CRT	4a.1. Review of data with leadership team, discussion of data with teachers during team meetings, following the PLC Guiding Questions. Daily completion of Common Board Configurations which includes, student friendly objectives, assessments, and homework for each day.	4a.1. Student assessment results, classroom walk throughs, lesson plan reviews and data meetings
Reading Goal #4a: Based on District Expectations, 66% of the lowest 25% of students at Waterford will make Learning Gains on the 2012 FCAT Reading subtest.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*	4a.2. An anticipated barrier to the lowest 25% of students making learning gains is lack of resources at home.	4a.2. A strategy to counteract lack of resources is to implement the "Ticket to Read" program. Also, we would like to utilize our own resources to help the lowest 25% of students make learning gains by providing them with school-based tutoring in reading.	4a.2. Principal, Assistant Principal and CRT	4a.2. Review of data with leadership team, discussion of data with teachers during team meetings, following the PLC Guiding Questions.	4a.2. Student assessment results and data meetings.
	66% (24)	69% (30)					
			4a.3. An anticipated barrier to the lowest 25% of students making learning	4a.3. To increase student learning gains in the lowest 25%, we will provide additional instruction in foundational reading skills through pull out intervention	4a.3. Principal, Assistant Principal and CRT	4a.3. Review of data with leadership team, discussion of data with teachers during team meetings, following the PLC Guiding Questions.	4a.3. Student assessment results, classroom walk throughs, lesson plan reviews and data meetings.

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

		gains is lack of foundational reading skills.	time with the reading specialist.				
4b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.		4b.1.	4b.1.	4b.1.	4b.1.	4b.1.	
Reading Goal #4b: No students at Waterford Elementary took the alternative assessment.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	N/A					
	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*						
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>						
		4b.2.	4b.2.	4b.2.	4b.2.	4b.2.	
		4b.3.	4b.3.	4b.3.	4b.3.	4b.3.	
Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), Reading and Math Performance Target		2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Baseline data 2010-2011 <i>Data will be provided by the State.</i> 68% of all students scored satisfactory.	71%	73%	76%	79%	81%	84%
Reading Goal #5A: In six years, we will reduce the achievement gap for all students by 50%.							
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		
5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading.	5B.1. White: Black:	5B.1. The attendance rate of our black students, is lower that the school wide average of 96.26%.	5B.1. Principal, Assistant Principal and CRT	5B.1. Review of data with leadership team, discussion of data with teachers during team meetings.	5B.1. Student assessment results, attendance data.		

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

<p>Reading Goal #5B:</p> <p>We will decrease the percentage of non-proficient students in each subgroup by 10%.</p>	<p>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</p> <p><i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i></p> <p>White: NA Black:34% Hispanic: NA Asian: NA American Indian: NA</p>	<p>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</p> <p><i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i></p> <p>White: NA Black:28% Hispanic: NA Asian: NA American Indian: NA</p>	<p>Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:</p> <p>An anticipated barrier for black students scoring at or above level in reading is low attendance.</p>	<p>To overcome this barrier, we can motivate these students by implementing perfect attendance "party" every 9 weeks.</p>			
<p>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:</p>			<p>Anticipated Barrier</p>	<p>Strategy</p>	<p>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</p>	<p>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</p>	<p>Evaluation Tool</p>
<p>5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading.</p>			<p>5C.1. An anticipated barrier for ELL students not scoring at or above grade level in reading is lack of parental involvement due to limited English proficient parents.</p>	<p>5C.1. Some strategies to decrease the percentage of non-proficient ELL students is having PLC's to determine what resources are needed to provide to parents to assist their students at home.</p>	<p>5C.1. Principal, Assistant Principal and CRT</p>	<p>5C.1. Review of data with leadership team, discussion of data with teachers during team meetings, following the PLC Guiding Questions. Daily completion of Common Board Configurations which includes, student friendly objectives, assessments, and homework for each day.</p>	<p>5C.1. Student assessment results, PLC sign in sheets.</p>
<p>Reading Goal #5C:</p> <p>We will decrease the percentage of non-proficient ELL students in reading by 10%.</p>	<p>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</p> <p>43% (20)</p>	<p>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</p> <p>39% (20)</p>	<p>5C.2. An anticipated barrier for ELL students not scoring at or above grade level in reading is lack of resources at home.</p>	<p>5C.2 A strategy to counteract lack of resources in the home is to implement the "Ticket to Read" program, which could be accessible at home.</p>	<p>5C.2. Principal, Assistant Principal and CRT</p>	<p>5C.2. Review of data with leadership team, discussion of data with teachers during team meetings, following the PLC Guiding Questions.</p>	<p>5C.2. Student assessment results, classroom walk throughs, and data meetings.</p>
			<p>5C.3 An anticipated barrier for ELL students scoring at or</p>	<p>5C.3. The attendance rate of our ELL students (95.24%), is lower that the school wide average of 96.26%. To overcome</p>	<p>5C.3. Principal, Assistant Principal and CRT</p>	<p>5C.3. Review of data with leadership team, discussion of data with teachers during team meetings, following the PLC Guiding Questions.</p>	<p>5C.3. Student assessment results, classroom walk throughs, lesson plan reviews and data meetings.</p>

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

			above level in reading is low attendance by ELL students.	this barrier, we can motivate students by implementing perfect attendance "party" every 9 weeks.			
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. An anticipated barrier for SWD students not scoring at or above grade level in reading is lack of parental involvement of our SWD students.	5D.1. Some strategies to increase parental involvement are having two parent-teacher conferences per school year, utilizing Progressbook to communicate student progress to parents, and utilizing student planners to communicate with parents.	5D.1. Principal, Assistant Principal and CRT	5D.1. Review of data with leadership team, discussion of data with teachers during team meetings, following the PLC Guiding Questions. Daily completion of Common Board Configurations which includes, student friendly objectives, assessments, and homework for each day.	5D.1. Student assessment results, conference documentation.
Reading Goal #5D: We will decrease the percentage of non-proficient SWD students in reading by 10%.	2012 Current Level of Performance: *	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	59% (23)	53% (16)					
			5D.2. An anticipated barrier for SWD students not scoring at or above grade level in reading is lack of resources at home.	5D.2. A strategy to counteract lack of resources in the home is to implement the "Ticket to Read" program, which could be accessible at home.	5D.2. Principal, Assistant Principal and CRT	5D.2. Review of data with leadership team, discussion of data with teachers during team meetings, following the PLC Guiding Questions. .	5D.2. Student assessment results, classroom walk throughs, and data meetings.
		5D.3. An anticipated barrier for SWD students not scoring at or above grade level in reading is lack of student motivation.	5D.3. To increase student motivation, we will recognize students for their efforts in reading on the morning news and through various awards. We will provide before school Sunshine State book clubs with guest hosts.	5D.3. Principal, Assistant Principal and CRT	5D.3. Review of data with leadership team, discussion of data with teachers during team meetings, following the PLC Guiding Questions. .	5D.3. Student assessment results, classroom walk throughs, lesson plan reviews and data meetings.	
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. An anticipated barrier for ED students not scoring at or above grade level in reading is lack of parental involvement of our ED students.	5E.1. Some strategies to increase parental involvement are having two parent-teacher conferences per school year, utilizing Progressbook to communicate student progress to parents, and utilizing student planners to communicate with parents.	5E.1. Principal, Assistant Principal and CRT	5E.1. Review of data with leadership team, discussion of data with teachers during team meetings, following the PLC Guiding Questions. Daily completion of Common Board Configurations which includes, student friendly objectives, assessments, and homework for each day.	5E.1. Student assessment results, conference documentation.
Reading Goal #5E: We will decrease the percentage of non-proficient economically disadvantaged students in reading by 10%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	38% (62)	34% (56)					
			5E.2. An	5E. A strategy to counteract lack	5E.2. Principal,	5E.2. Review of data with leadership	5E.2. Student assessment results, classroom

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

		anticipated barrier for ED students not scoring at or above grade level in reading lack of resources at home.	of resources in the home is to implement the "Ticket to Read" program, which could be accessible at home.	Assistant Principal and CRT	team, discussion of data with teachers during team meetings, following the PLC Guiding Questions.	walk throughs, and data meetings.
		5E.3 An anticipated barrier for ED students not scoring at or above grade level in reading is lack of student motivation.	5E. To increase student motivation, we will recognize students for their efforts in reading on the morning news and through various awards. We will provide before school Sunshine State book clubs with guest hosts.	5E.3 Principal, Assistant Principal and CRT	5E.3 Review of data with leadership team, discussion of data with teachers during team meetings, following the PLC Guiding Questions.	5E.3 Student assessment results, classroom walk throughs, lesson plan reviews and data meetings.

Reading 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 and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
ELA Common Core	K - 5	PLC Leader	K - 5	1 st and 3 rd Wed. of every month	Teacher lesson plans, PLC Agendas and Meeting notes	Principal, Assistant Principal, CRT and Team Leaders
Data Analysis	K - 5	PLC Leader	K - 5	1 st and 3 rd Wed. of every month	Collection and analysis of student data, PLC Agendas and Meeting notes	Principal, Assistant Principal, CRT and Team Leaders
Providing Enrichment	K - 5	PLC Leader	K - 5	1 st and 3 rd Wed. of every month	Collection and analysis of student data, PLC Agendas and Meeting notes	Principal, Assistant Principal, CRT and Team Leaders

Reading 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
Vocabulary Instruction	Elements of Reading: Vocabulary	General/SAI	\$4,000.00
			Subtotal:\$4,000.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Leveled Reading Practice	Ticket to Read	General	\$3,000.00

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

			Subtotal:\$3,000.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:\$0
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Before/After school tutoring	Hourly certified teachers	SAI	\$10,000.00
			Subtotal:\$10,000.00
			Total:\$17,000.00

End of Reading Goals

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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. CELLA Goal #1: Based on 2011-2012 CELLA results, 50% of Waterford students demonstrated proficiency in speaking and listening. In 2012-2013, 53% of students will demonstrate proficiency on CELLA speaking and listening.	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking: 50% (115) 53%	1.1. An anticipated barrier for ELL students in listening and speaking proficiency is the lack of or limited English proficiency spoken by family members in the home.	1.1. Some strategies to increase ELL students in listening and speaking proficiency is having PLC meetings and providing resources in Spanish on how to assist their students at home with reading skills.	1.1. Principal, Assistant Principal, CRT and CCT	1.1. Review of data with leadership team, discussion of data with teachers during team meetings.	1.1. Student assessment results, PLC sign In sheets.
		1.2. An anticipated barrier for ELL students in listening and speaking proficiency is the lack of resources at home.	1.2. Some strategies to increase listening and speaking for ELL's are having PLC's to determine what resources are needed to provide to parents to assist their students at home.	1.2. Principal, Assistant Principal, CRT and CCT	1.2. Review of data with leadership team, discussion of data with teachers during team meetings.	1.2. Student assessment results, PLC sign In sheets.
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Students read in English at grade level text 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. An anticipated barrier	2.1. Some strategies to	2.1. Principal, Assistant	2.1. Review of data with	2.1. Student assessment

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

CELLA Goal #2: Based on 2011-2012 CELLA results, 43% of Waterford students demonstrated proficiency in reading. In 2012-2013, 46% of students will demonstrate proficiency on CELLA reading.	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading :	for ELL students in reading proficiency is the lack of or limited English proficiency spoken by family members in the home.	increase ELL reading proficiency is having PLC meetings and providing resources in Spanish to them on how to assist their students at home with reading skills.	Principal, CRT and CCT	leadership team, discussion of data with teachers during team meetings.	results, PLC sign In sheets.
	43% (115) 46%					
CELLA Goal #3: Based on 2011-2012 CELLA results, 30% of Waterford students demonstrated proficiency in writing. In 2012-2013, 33% of students will demonstrate proficiency on CELLA writing.	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing :	2.1. An anticipated barrier for ELL students to scoring at writing proficiency is the lack of or limited English proficiency spoken by family members in the home.	2.1. Some strategies to increase writing proficiency for ELL students is having PLC meetings and providing resources in Spanish to them.	2.1. Principal, Assistant Principal, CRT and CCT	2.1. Review of data with leadership team, discussion of data with teachers during team meetings	2.1. Student assessment results, PLC sign In sheets.
	30% (115) 33%					
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.		2.2. An anticipated barrier for ELL students in reading proficiency is lack of resources at home.	2.2 Some strategies to increase reading for ELL's is having PLC's to determine what resources are needed to provide to parents to assist their students at home.	2.2. Principal, Assistant Principal, CRT and CCT	2.2. Review of data with leadership team, discussion of data with teachers during team meetings.	2.2. Student assessment results, PLC sign In sheets.
2.2. An anticipated barrier for ELL students scoring at writing proficiency is the lack of support in the home with writing because of their limited English proficiency.		2.2. Some strategies to increase writing proficiency for ELL students is having PLC's to determine what resources are needed to provide to parents to assist their students at home.	2.2. Principal, Assistant Principal, CRT and CCT	2.2. Review of data with leadership team, discussion of data with teachers during team meetings	2.2. Student assessment results, PLC sign In sheets.	

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) NA			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
	NA	No funds needed	
			Subtotal:
Technology			

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

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Ticket to Read			
Subtotal:			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
PLC's			
Subtotal:			
Total: \$0			

End of CELLA Goals

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. 35% of students will score a Level 3 or above on the Math subtest of the 2011 FCAT.			1a.1. An anticipated barrier to achieving proficiency in mathematics is the rate of language acquisition by our ELL students.	1a.1. Some strategies we can utilize to overcome this barrier are to implement school-based interventions and provide ESOL support to students, parents and teachers. For students we will provide tutoring in math and math vocabulary before and after school. For parents, we will conduct parent education seminars and hold parent-teacher conferences regularly.	1a.1. Principal, Assistant Principal and CRT	1a.1. Review of data with leadership team, discussion of data with teachers during team meetings, following the PLC Guiding Questions. Daily completion of Common Board Configurations which includes, student friendly objectives, assessments, and homework for each day.	1a.1. Student assessment results, classroom walk throughs, lesson plan reviews and data meetings. Conference documentation.
Mathematics Goal #1a: Based on district expectations, 35% of students at Waterford in grades 3 through 5 will score a level 3 on the 2012 FCAT Math subtest.	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</td> <td>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</td> </tr> <tr> <td>32% (115)</td> <td>35% (125)</td> </tr> </table>	2012 Current Level of Performance:*					
2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*						
32% (115)	35% (125)						
			1a.2. An anticipated barrier to achieving proficiency in mathematics is a lack of resources for students classified as economically disadvantaged.	1a.2. Some ways we can reduce the impact of being economically disadvantaged and achieve math proficiency is to provide children extra time in computer labs before and after school to practice math facts.	1a.2. Principal, Assistant Principal and CRT	1a.2. Review of data with leadership team, discussion of data with teachers during team meetings.	1a.2. Student assessment results, classroom walk throughs, and data meetings

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

			1a.3 An anticipated barrier to achieving proficiency in math is lack of math fluency.	1a.3. Some ways we can increase math proficiency is having mandatory V-Math goals. Use of FASST Math with prior year level 1's.	1a.3. Principal, Assistant Principal and CRT	1a.3. Review of data with leadership team, discussion of data with teachers during team meetings, following the PLC Guiding Questions.	1a.3. Student assessment results, classroom walk throughs, lesson plan reviews and data meetings.
1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.			1b.1.	1b.1.	1b.1.	1b.1.	1b.1.
Mathematics Goal #1b:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
No students at Waterford Elementary took the alternative assessment.	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			1b.2.	1b.2.	1b.2.	1b.2.	1b.2.
			1b.3.	1b.3.	1b.3.	1b.3.	1b.3.
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 mathematics 38%.			2a.1. One barrier to overcome with students achieving above proficiency in mathematics is obtaining the resources and teaching strategies to meet their individual learning needs.	2a.1. To overcome this barrier, we will provide students with differentiated instruction in classroom, provide Gifted Support Services to classroom teachers, and offer online programs to engage and challenge students (Set higher V-math levels, Riverdeep etc.) to score above proficiency level.	2a.1. Principal, Assistant Principal and CRT	2a.1. Review of data with leadership team, discussion of data with teachers during team meetings, following the PLC Guiding Questions.	2a.1. Student assessment results, classroom walk throughs, lesson plan reviews and data meetings.
Mathematics Goal #2a:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
38% of students will achieve above proficiency in mathematics on the 2012 FCAT Math subtest.	35% (127)	38% (136)					
			2a.2. One barrier to overcome with students achieving above proficiency in mathematics is providing enrichment to meet their	2a.2 One way we will provide math enrichment to our students is to create a competitive math team.	2a.2. Principal, Assistant Principal and CRT	2a.2. Review of data with leadership team, discussion of data with teachers during team meetings, following the PLC Guiding Questions.	2a.2. Student assessment results, classroom walk throughs, and data meetings.

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

			individual learning needs.				
			2a.3	2a.3	2a.3	2a.3	2a.3
2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.			2b.1.	2b.1.	2b.1.	2b.1.	2b.1.
Mathematics Goal #2b: No students at Waterford Elementary took the alternative assessment.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			2b.2.	2b.2.	2b.2.	2b.2.	2b.2.
			2b.3	2b.3	2b.3	2b.3	2b.3
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. 70% of students will make Learning Gains in Mathematics.			3a.1. Hispanic and ELL populations did not make adequate learning gains in math because of language barriers and their parents having language barriers as well. A barrier to students making learning gains is Limited English Proficiency of ELL learners and families.	3a.1 A strategy to increase learning gains in math for Hispanic and ELL students is having PLC meetings and providing math resources in their native languages to them.	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, PLC meeting sign in sheets.
Mathematics Goal #3a: Based on district expectations, 70% (251) of students at Waterford will make Learning Gains on the 2012 FCAT Math subtest.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	67% (244)	70% (251)					
			3a.2.	3a.2.	3a.2.	3a.2.	3a.2.
			3a.3.	3a.3.	3a.3.	3a.3.	3a.3.

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

3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics.			3b.1.	3b.1.	3b.1.	3b.1.	3b.1.
Mathematics Goal #3b: No students at Waterford Elementary took the alternative assessment.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.					
			3b.2.	3b.2.	3b.2.	3b.2.	3b.2.
			3b.3.	3b.3.	3b.3.	3b.3.	3b.3.
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
4a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics. 50% of students in the lowest 25% will make Learning Gains in Mathematics.			4.1. One barrier to overcome with students achieving math learning gains in the lowest 25% is the lack of resources at home.	4.1. Some ways we increase the lowest 25% learning gains in math is to provide math resources at home. Teachers will also ask volunteers to work with struggling students.	4a.1. Principal, Assistant Principal and CRT	4.1. Review of data with leadership team, discussion of data with teachers during team meetings, following the PLC Guiding Questions.	4.1. Student assessment results, classroom walk throughs, and data meetings.
Mathematics Goal #4a: Based on District expectations, 50% (31) of the lowest 25% of students at Waterford will make learning Gains in Mathematics, based on the 2012 FCAT Math.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> 47% (28)	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> 50% (31)					
			4a.2.	4a.2.	4a.2.	4a.2.	4a.2.
			4a.3	4a.3.	4a.3.	4a.3.	4a.3.
4b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.			4b.1.	4b.1.	4b.1.	4b.1.	4b.1.

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

Mathematics Goal #4b: No students at Waterford Elementary took the alternative assessment.	2012 Current Level of Performance: * <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	2013 Expected Level of Performance: * <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>						
			4b.2.	4b.2.	4b.2.	4b.2.	4b.2.	
			4b.3	4b.3.	4b.3.	4b.3.	4b.3.	
Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), Reading and Math Performance Target			2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce the student achievement gap by 50%.	Baseline data 2010-2011 Data will be provided by the state. 70% of all students scored satisfactory.		73%	75%	78%	80%	83%	85%
Mathematics Goal #5A: In six years, we will reduce the student achievement gap for all students by 50%.								
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	
5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not			5B.1. White:	5B.1. The attendance rate of our black students, is lower that the	5B.1. Principal, Assistant Principal and CRT	5B.1. Review of data with leadership team, discussion of data with teachers	5B.1. Student assessment results, attendance data.	

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

making satisfactory progress in mathematics.			Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	school wide average of 96.26%. To overcome this barrier, we can motivate these students by implementing perfect attendance "party" every 9 weeks.		during team meetings.	
<u>Mathematics Goal</u> #5B:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:</u> White:20% Black:39% Hispanic: NA Asian: NA American Indian: NA	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:</u> White:14% Black:34% Hispanic: NA Asian: NA American Indian: NA	An anticipated barrier for black students scoring at or above level in reading is low attendance.				
We will decrease the percentage of non-proficient students in each subgroup in math by 10%.							
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. An anticipated barrier for ELL students not scoring at or above grade level in math is lack of limited vocabulary.	5C.1. Some strategies that we can use to overcome this barrier are that we will provide tutoring in math and math vocabulary before and after school.	5C.1. Principal, Assistant Principal and CRT	5C.1. Review of data with leadership team, discussion of data with teachers during team meetings, following the PLC Guiding Questions.	5C.1. Student assessment results, classroom walk throughs, lesson plan reviews and data meetings.
<u>Mathematics Goal</u> #5C:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:</u> * 59%	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:</u> * 53%					
We will decrease the percentage of non-proficient ELL students in math by 10%.							
			5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.
			5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.
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. An anticipated barrier for SWD students not scoring at or above grade level in math is lack of parental support at home.	5D.1. Some strategies that we can use to overcome this barrier are that we will provide tutoring in math and math vocabulary before and after school.	5D.1. Principal, Assistant Principal and CRT	5D.1. Review of data with leadership team, discussion of data with teachers during team meetings, following the PLC Guiding Questions. Daily completion of Common Board Configurations which includes, student friendly objectives, assessments, and homework for each day.	5D.1. Student assessment results, classroom walk throughs, lesson plan reviews and data meetings.
<u>Mathematics Goal</u> #5D:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:</u> * 64%	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:</u> * 58%					
We will decrease the percentage of non-proficient SWD students in math by 10%.							
			5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.
			5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.

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

			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:							
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.			5E.1.	5E.1	5E.1.	5E.1. .	5E.1
<u>Mathematics Goal</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
#5E:	NA	NA					
NA			5E.2.	5E.2	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.
			5E.3	5E.3	5E.3	5E.3	5E.3

End of Elementary School Mathematics Goals

Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

Middle School 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.			1a.1.	1a.1.	1a.1.	1a.1.	1a.1.
<u>Mathematics Goal</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
#1a:							
N/A			1a.2.	1a.2.	1a.2.	1a.2.	1a.2.
			1a.3.	1a.3.	1a.3.	1a.3.	1a.3.

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.			1b.1.	1b.1.	1b.1.	1b.1.	1b.1.
Mathematics Goal #1b: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			1b.2.	1b.2.	1b.2.	1b.2.	1b.2.
			1b.3.	1b.3.	1b.3.	1b.3.	1b.3.
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 mathematics.			2a.1.	2a.1.	2a.1.	2a.1.	2a.1.
Mathematics Goal #2a: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			2a.2.	2a.2.	2a.2.	2a.2.	2a.2.
			2a.3	2a.3	2a.3	2a.3	2a.3

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

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.			2b.1.	2b.1.	2b.1.	2b.1.	2b.1.
Mathematics Goal #2b: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:* Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.					
			2b.2.	2b.2.	2b.2.	2b.2.	2b.2.
			2b.3	2b.3	2b.3	2b.3	2b.3
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.			3a.1.	3a.1.	3a.1.	3a.1.	3a.1.
Mathematics Goal #3a: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:* Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.					
			3a.2.	3a.2.	3a.2.	3a.2.	3a.2.
			3a.3.	3a.3.	3a.3.	3a.3.	3a.3.

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

3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics.			3b.1.	3b.1.	3b.1.	3b.1.	3b.1.
Mathematics Goal #3b: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			3b.2.	3b.2.	3b.2.	3b.2.	3b.2.
			3b.3.	3b.3.	3b.3.	3b.3.	3b.3.
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
4a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.			4a.1.	4a.1.	4a.1.	4a.1.	4a.1.
Mathematics Goal #4a: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			4a.2.	4a.2.	4a.2.	4a.2.	4a.2.
			4a.3	4a.3.	4a.3.	4a.3.	4a.3.

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

4b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.		4b.1.	4b.1.	4b.1.	4b.1.	4b.1.	
Mathematics Goal #4b: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			4b.2.	4b.2.	4b.2.	4b.2.	4b.2.
		4b.3.	4b.3.	4b.3.	4b.3.	4b.3.	
Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), Reading and Math Performance Target		2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Baseline data 2010-2011						
Mathematics Goal #5A: N/A							
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	

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

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.			5B.1. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.
Mathematics Goal #5B: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:				
	Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.						
			5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.
			5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.
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.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.
Mathematics Goal #5C: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.				
	Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.						
			5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.
			5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool

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

subgroup:							
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.			5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.
<u>Mathematics Goal</u> #5D:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
N/A	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.
			5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.
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.			5E.1.	5E.1.	5E.1.	5E.1.	5E.1.
<u>Mathematics Goal</u> #5E:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
N/A	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.
			5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.

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

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

End of Middle School Mathematics Goals

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals

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

High School 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
1. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
<u>Mathematics Goal #1:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
N/A	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
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
2. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.			2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
<u>Mathematics Goal #2:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
N/A	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.

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

		2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3
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
3. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics.		3.1.	3.1.	3.1.	3.1.	3.1.
<u>Mathematics Goal #3:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>				
N/A	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.				
		3.2.	3.2.	3.2.	3.2.	3.2.
		3.3.	3.3.	3.3.	3.3.	3.3.
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. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.		4.1.	4b.1.	4b.1.	4b.1.	4b.1.
<u>Mathematics Goal #4:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>				
N/A	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.				
		4.2.	4.2.	4.2.	4.2.	4.2.

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

		4.3	4.3.	4.3.	4.3.	4.3.
--	--	-----	------	------	------	------

End of Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals

Algebra End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

Algebra EOC 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
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Algebra.			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
Algebra Goal #1: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
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
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra.			2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
Algebra Goal #2: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.					
			2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.

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

		2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3														
Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), Reading and Math Performance Target		2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016 2016-2017														
3A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Baseline data 2010-2011																			
Algebra Goal #3A: N/A																				
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															
3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra.		3B.1. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.														
Algebra Goal #3B: N/A	<table border="1"> <tr> <td><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></td> <td><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i></td> <td><i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i></td> </tr> <tr> <td>White:</td> <td>White:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Black:</td> <td>Black:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Hispanic:</td> <td>Hispanic:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Asian:</td> <td>Asian:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>American Indian:</td> <td>American Indian:</td> </tr> </table>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>	White:	White:	Black:	Black:	Hispanic:	Hispanic:	Asian:	Asian:	American Indian:	American Indian:					
<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>																			
<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>																			
White:	White:																			
Black:	Black:																			
Hispanic:	Hispanic:																			
Asian:	Asian:																			
American Indian:	American Indian:																			
		3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.														
		3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.														

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
3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra.			3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.
Algebra Goal #3C: N/A	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.
		3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.
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
3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra.			3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.
Algebra Goal #3D: N/A	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.
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

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

3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra.			3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1.
Algebra Goal #3E: N/A	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			3E.2.	3E.2	3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.
			3E.3	3E.3	3E.3	3E.3	3E.3

End of Algebra EOC Goals

Geometry End-of-Course Goals

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

Geometry EOC 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
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Geometry.			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
Geometry Goal #1: N/A	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			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

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	
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Geometry.			2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	
Geometry Goal #2: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*						
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>		<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	
		2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3		
Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), Reading and Math Performance Target			2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
3A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Baseline data 2010-2011							
Geometry Goal #3A: N/A								
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	
3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.			3B.1. White: Black:	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	

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

Geometry Goal #3B: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*	Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:				
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:					
			3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.
			3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.
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
3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.			3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.
Geometry Goal #3C: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:					
			3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.
			3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.
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

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

3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.			3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.
Geometry Goal #3D: N/A	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.
			3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.
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
3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.			3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1.
Geometry Goal #3E: N/A	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.
			3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.

End of Geometry EOC Goals

Mathematics Professional Development

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

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

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 and Schedules (e.g., Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Data Analysis	K - 5	PLC Leader	K - 5	1 st and 3 rd Wed. of every month	Collection and analysis of student data, PLC Agendas and Meeting notes	Principal, Assistant Principal, CRT and Team Leaders
Providing Enrichment	K - 5	PLC Leader	K - 5	1 st and 3 rd Wed. of every month	Collection and analysis of student data, PLC Agendas and Meeting notes	Principal, Assistant Principal, CRT and Team Leaders

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
Core Math curriculum	Envision Math	General	\$2,000.00
			Subtotal:\$2,000.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Fact Fluency	V-Math Live	SAC	\$3,000.00
Extend Brain Pop License	Brain Pop	General	\$1800.00
			Subtotal:\$4,800.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Curriculum trainings			
			Subtotal:

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

Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Family Math Night	Supplies, Information	General, PTA	\$1,000.00
Before/after school tutoring	Hourly certified tutors	SAI	\$10,000.00
			Subtotal:\$10,000.00
			Total:\$16,800.00

End of Mathematics Goals

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents next to the percentage (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. 37% of students will score a Level 3 on the Science subtest of the FCAT.			1a.1. An anticipated barrier to having students score at proficiency level or higher on science is the lack of basic science vocabulary and using the scientific method at all grade levels consistently.	1a.1. Teachers will diligently utilize the scientific method and will place an emphasis on vocabulary that supports the scientific method starting in K. We use computer program, Speed Bag, to assist with science vocabulary acquisition.	1a.1. Principal, Assistant Principal and CRT	1a.1. Review of data with leadership team, discussion of data with teachers during team meetings, following the PLC Guiding Questions.	1a.1. Student assessment results, classroom walk throughs, lesson plan reviews and data meetings.
Science Goal #1a: Based on District expectations, 37% of students at Waterford in grade 5 will score a Level 3 on the 2012 FCAT Science subtest.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 34% (35)	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 37% (51)					
			1a.2. An anticipated barrier to having students score at proficiency level or higher on science is the lack of non-fiction text materials.	1a.2. We will utilize outside resources and non-fiction texts to develop cross-curricular units based on science topics.	1a.2. Principal, Assistant Principal and CRT	1a.2. Review of data with leadership team, discussion of data with teachers during team meetings, following the PLC Guiding Questions.	1a.2. Student assessment results, classroom walk throughs, lesson plan reviews and data meetings.
			1a.3. There is a lack of reliable data regarding performance in science.	1a.3. Students will take a science benchmark test 4 times a year and the data will be used to inform instruction.	1a.3. Principal, Assistant Principal and CRT	1a.3. Review of data with leadership team, discussion of data with teachers during team meetings.	1a.3. Student assessment results.
1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Level 4, 5, and 6 in science.			1b.1.	1b.1.	1b.1.	1b.1.	1b.1.

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

Science Goal #1b: No students at Waterford Elementary took the alternative assessment.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			1b.2.	1b.2.	1b.2.	1b.2.	1b.2.
			1b.3.	1b.3.	1b.3.	1b.3.	1b.3.
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. 30% of Waterford students will score a 4 or 5 on FCAT Science.			2a.1. An anticipated barrier to having students score a 4 or 5 on science is the lack of basic science vocabulary and using the scientific method at all grade levels consistently.	2a.1. Teachers will diligently utilize the scientific method and will place an emphasis on vocabulary that supports the scientific method starting in K. We use computer program, Speed Bag, to assist with science vocabulary acquisition.	2a.1. Principal, Assistant Principal and CRT	2a.1. Review of data with leadership team, discussion of data with teachers during team meetings, following the PLC Guiding Questions.	2a.1. Student assessment results, classroom walk throughs, lesson plan reviews and data meetings.
Science Goal #2a: Based on District expectations, 30% of students at Waterford in grade 5 will score a Level 4 or 5 on the 2012 FCAT Science subtest.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 27% (28)	2013Expected Level of Performance:* 30% (41)					
			2a.2 An anticipated barrier to having students score a 4 or 5 on science is the lack of non-fiction text materials.	2a.2. We will utilize outside resources and non-fiction texts to develop cross-curricular units based on science topics.	2a.2. . Principal, Assistant Principal and CRT	2a.2. Review of data with leadership team, discussion of data with teachers during team meetings, following the PLC Guiding Questions. Daily completion of Common Board Configurations which includes, student friendly objectives, assessments, and homework for each day.	2a.2. Student assessment results, classroom walk throughs, lesson plan reviews and data meetings.
2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science.			2b.1.	2b.1.	2.1.	2b.1.	2b.1.
Science Goal #2b: No students at Waterford Elementary took the alternative assessment.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in</i>	2013Expected Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in</i>					

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

	<i>this box.</i>	<i>this box.</i>					
			2b.2.	2b.2.	2b.2.	2b.2.	2b.2.
			2b.3	2b.3	2b.3	2b.3	2b.3

End of Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals

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

High School 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
1. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Level 4, 5, and 6 in science.			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
Science Goal #1: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
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
2. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science.			2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
Science Goal #2:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					

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

N/A	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.					
			2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
			2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3

End of Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals

Biology End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

Biology EOC 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
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Biology.			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
Biology Goal #1: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	
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
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Biology.			2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
Biology Goal #2:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					

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

N/A	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.					
			2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
			2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3

End of Biology EOC Goals

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 and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Data Analysis	K - 5	PLC Leader	K - 5	1 st and 3 rd Wed. of every month	Collection and analysis of student data, PLC Agendas and Meeting notes	Principal, Assistant Principal, CRT and Team Leaders
Providing Enrichment	K - 5	PLC Leader	K - 5	1 st and 3 rd Wed. of every month	Collection and analysis of student data, PLC Agendas and Meeting notes	Principal, Assistant Principal, CRT and Team Leaders

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:\$0
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Science Enrichment	Brain pop	General	\$1,500.00
Science Enrichment	Speed Bag		

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

Subtotal:\$1,500.00			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Total:\$1,500.00			

End of Science Goals

Writing Goals

* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents next to the percentage (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. 76% of students will score a 3.0 or higher on FCAT Writes.			1a.1. An anticipated barrier to achieving proficiency in writing is English language acquisition by our ELL students.	1a.1. To overcome this barrier we will teach vocabulary during the daily enrichment.	1a.1. Principal, Assistant Principal and CRT	1a.1. Review of data with leadership team, discussion of data with teachers during team meetings, following the PLC Guiding Questions. Daily completion of Common Board Configurations which includes, student friendly objectives, assessments, and homework for each day.	1a.1. Student assessment results, classroom walk throughs, lesson plan reviews and data meetings.
Writing Goal #1a:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
Based on district expectations, 76% of students will meet state standards in writing based on the 2012 FCAT writing subtest.	73% (100)	76% (84)					
			1a.2. An anticipated barrier to achieving proficiency in writing is that students do not have a strong foundation of writing in primary grades.	1a.2. To overcome this barrier we will have daily writing in primary grades.	1a.2. Principal, Assistant Principal and CRT	1a.2. Review of data with leadership team, discussion of data with teachers during team meetings, following the PLC Guiding Questions.	1a.2. Student assessment results, classroom walk throughs, lesson plan reviews and data meetings. Student journal reviews.
1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing.			1b.1.	1b.1.	1b.1.	1b.1.	1b.1.
Writing Goal #1b:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					

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

No students at Waterford Elementary took the alternative assessment.	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.					
			1b.2.	1b.2.	1b.2.	1b.2.	1b.2.
			1b.3.	1b.3.	1b.3.	1b.3.	1b.3.

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 and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Scoring of prompts	K - 5	PLC Leader	K - 5	1 st and 3 rd Wed. of every month	Collection and analysis of student data, PLC Agendas and Meeting notes	Principal, Assistant Principal, CRT and Team Leaders
Data Analysis	K - 5	PLC Leader	K - 5	1 st and 3 rd Wed. of every month	Collection and analysis of student data, PLC Agendas and Meeting notes	Principal, Assistant Principal, CRT and Team Leaders
Providing Enrichment	K - 5	PLC Leader	K - 5	1 st and 3 rd Wed. of every month	Collection and analysis of student data, PLC Agendas and Meeting notes	Principal, Assistant Principal, CRT and Team Leaders

Writing 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
Writing Progress Monitoring	Write Score	General	\$3,000.00
Grammar Instruction	SRA Specific Skills series Oxford-Elements of Reading Grammar	General	\$1,000.00
			Subtotal:\$4,000.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount

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

Subtotal:			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Parent Information Night	Teachers presenting writing strategies and resources	General	\$500.00
Subtotal:\$500.00			
Total:\$4,500.00			

End of Writing Goals

Civics End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

Civics EOC 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
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Civics.			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
Civics Goal #1: N/A	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			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

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
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Civics.			2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
Civics Goal #2: N/A	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
			2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3

Civics 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 and Schedules (e.g., Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring

Civics 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

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

				Subtotal:
Professional Development				
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount	
				Subtotal:
Other				
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount	
				Subtotal:
				Total: \$0

End of Civics Goals

U.S. History End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

U.S. History EOC 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
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in U.S. History.			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
U.S. History Goal #1: N/A	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
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

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

2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in U.S. History.			2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
U.S. History Goal #2:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
N/A	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.					
			2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
			2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3

U.S. History 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 and Schedules (e.g., Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring

U.S. History 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:

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

Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
			Total: \$0

End of U.S. History Goals

Attendance Goal(s)

* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents next to the percentage (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. An anticipated barrier to students having better attendance rates is their lack of motivation.	1.1. <u>Attendance Rates</u> School Wide – 96.26% Hispanic – 95.28% White – 96.75% ELL – 95.24 To overcome this barrier, we can motivate students by implementing perfect attendance "party" every 9 weeks.	1.1. Attendance clerk, Teachers, Principal, Assistant Principal, CRT	1.1. Attendance data after teacher contact and child study meetings if needed.	1.1. Attendance reports
Attendance Goal #1:	<u>2012 Current Attendance Rate:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Attendance Rate:*</u>					
Increase the attendance rate from 96% to 97%. The number of students with 10 or more absences was 166.	96%	97%					
	<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>					
	166 students had 10 or more absences.	We will decrease the number of students to 155 students with 10 or more absences.					
	<u>2012 Current Number of</u>	<u>2013 Expected Number of</u>					

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

	Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)					
	112 students had 10 or more tardies.	We will decrease the number of students to 100 students with 10 or more tardies.					
			1.2 An anticipated barrier to students having better attendance rates is lack of parent knowledge and involvement.	1.2 We will improve knowledge and involvement in attendance by sending home a formal attendance form after an absence. We will also send a "Pre-letter" at six absences. We will also send tardy letters to students who are habitually tardy and communicate with parents frequently through email.	1.2 Attendance clerk, Teachers, Principal, Assistant Principal, CRT	1.2 Attendance data after teacher contact and child study meetings if needed.	1.2 Attendance reports
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

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 and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring

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

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

Subtotal:			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Student Incentives	Quarterly	General	\$2,000.00
Subtotal:\$2,000.00			
Total: \$2,000.00			

End of Attendance Goals

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 Goal To decrease the number of In-school and Out of School suspensions by 1%.			1.1. An anticipated barrier to decreasing suspensions is that students and parents are unaware of consequences.	1.1. To improve awareness we will implement a grade-level discipline plan for each grade.	1.1. Principal, Assistant Principal, CRT, Teachers	1.1. Student behavior during CWTs, behavior in hallways, lunchroom and classrooms	1.1. Teacher referrals and calls to the office
Suspension Goal #1: To decrease the number of In-school and Out of School suspensions by 1%.	2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions					
	There were 2 In-school suspensions.	There will be 0 In-School Suspensions.					
	2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School					
	There were 2 students who had In-School Suspension.	There will be 0 students who are suspended In-School.					
	2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions					

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

	<u>Suspensions</u>						
	There were 26 Out of School Suspensions.	There will be 18 Out of School Suspensions.					
	<u>2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School</u>	<u>2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School</u>					
	There were 13 students suspended Out-of-School.	There will be 10 students who receive Out-of-School suspension.					
		1.2. An anticipated barrier to decreasing suspensions is teachers' lack of knowledge regarding particular students.	1.2. To improve teacher knowledge we will invite increased communication between teachers for students on behavior plans (from one grade to the next). We will also recommend that teachers share "what works" for these children and utilize the OCPS Behavior Specialist for additional support.	1.2. Principal, Assistant Principal, CRT, Teachers	1.2. Student behavior during CWTs, behavior in hallways, lunchroom and classrooms	1.2. Teacher referrals and calls to the office	
		1.3. An anticipated barrier to decreasing suspensions is lack of behavior management strategies.	1.3. Provide staff with professional development on behavior management strategies	1.3. Principal, Assistant Principal, CRT	1.3. Student behavior during CWTs, behavior in hallways, lunchroom and classrooms	1.3. Teacher referrals and calls to the office	

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 and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Behavior Management Strategies	K - 5	PLC Leader	K - 5	1 st and 3 rd Wed. of every month	Collection and analysis of referral data	Principal, Assistant Principal, CRT and Team Leaders

Suspension Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

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
	NA	No funds needed	
			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 Suspension Goals

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 <u>Dropout Prevention Goal #1:</u> Waterford Elementary will reduce the percentage of retained students for the 2012-2013 school year.		1.1. An anticipated barrier to student grade progression is lack of parent knowledge about curriculum goals and involvement in school activities.	1.1. To improve parental knowledge, we will increase communication between teachers and parents about grade level curriculum requirements.	1.1. Principal, Assistant Principal, CRT, Teachers	1.1. Review yearend data assessments and FCAT results and on-going progress monitoring.	1.1. Open House and Curriculum Night sign in sheets, newsletters.
1.5% of students or 11 or fewer students will be retained at Waterford Elementary at the end of	<u>2012 Current Dropout Rate:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Dropout Rate:*</u>				
	2% (16)	1.5% (11)				
	<u>2012 Current</u>	<u>2013 Expected</u>				

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

the 2012-2013 school year.	Graduation Rate:*	Graduation Rate:*					
	<i>Enter numerical data for graduation rate in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected graduation rate in this box.</i>					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

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 and Schedules (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
	NA	No funds needed	
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:

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

Subtotal:			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Total: \$0			

End of Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

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 <u>Parent Involvement Goal #1:</u> 87% of parents will be involved in school activities through the 2012-2013 school year.			1.1. An anticipated barrier to increased parent involvement is scheduling conflicts for family events.	1.1. To reduce this barrier we will schedule activities on different days and at different times during the week (not always on Thursday), so as not to exclude certain parents who have fixed schedules.	1.1. Principal, Assistant Principal, CRT, Teachers	1.1. Send home hard copies of survey to all parents, provide incentives for students who bring in completed surveys (free recess time), send out a connect ed message to all Waterford families.	1.1. Number of completed surveys, levels of participation from sign in sheets at various activities throughout the year.
87% of parents will be involved in school activities through the 2012-2013 school year.		<table border="1"> <tr> <td>2012 Current Parental Involvement Rate:</td> <td>2013 Expected Parental Involvement Rate:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>86%</td> <td>87%</td> </tr> </table>					
2012 Current Parental Involvement Rate:	2013 Expected Parental Involvement Rate:						
86%	87%						
			1.2. An anticipated barrier to increased parent involvement is lack of parental commitment.	1.2. To reduce this barrier we will increase communication with parents which will demonstrate an increased effort to include them in our school community. We will communicate with the parent's preferred method (phone, email, and letter to build trust and commitment. We will ensure PTA communication given in a timely manner so parents have more of an opportunity to become involved and thereby committed to their	1.2. Principal, Assistant Principal, CRT, Teachers	1.2. Send home hard copies of survey to all parents, provide incentives for students who bring in completed surveys (free recess time), send out a connect ed message to all Waterford families.	1.2. Number of completed surveys, levels of participation from sign in sheets at various activities throughout the year.

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

			child's education.			
		1.3 Parents say that do not know soon enough about upcoming events.	1.3. Provide parents a calendar 2 times a year regarding upcoming scheduled events.	1.3. Principal, Assistant Principal, CRT	1.3. Provide the calendar of upcoming events 2 times a year. SAC parent survey.	1.3. Number of completed parent surveys.
		1.4. Non-English speaking families are not aware of school events.	1.4. Increase the amount of communication regarding family events in Spanish.	1.4. Principal, Assistant Principal, CRT	1.4. Provide the calendar of upcoming events in Spanish 2 times a year and SAC parent survey.	1.4. Number of completed parent surveys.

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 and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring

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
	NA	No funds needed	
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Other			

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

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
			Total: \$0

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

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
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:					
STEM Goal #1: Initiate STEM PLC to guide future planning.	1.1 Teachers lack experience integrating STEM into the curriculum.	1.1. Review best practices and other references to inform the planning process.	1.1. Principal, Assistant Principal, CRT, Teachers	1.1 Provide updates on PLC meetings to staff and SAC.	1.1. The professional development plan developed by STEM PLC.
	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

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 PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Providing Enrichment about STEM	K - 5	PLC Leader	K - 5	1 st and 3 rd Wed. of every month	Collection and analysis of student data, PLC Agendas and Meeting notes	Principal, Assistant Principal, CRT and Team Leaders

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
	NA	No funds needed	

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

				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 STEM Goal(s)

Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)

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

CTE 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
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:					
CTE Goal #1:	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
NA	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

CTE Professional Development

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

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 and Schedules (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
NA						

CTE 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
	NA	No funds needed	
			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 CTE 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 Goals							
Additional Goal #1: Waterford Elementary will increase the enrollment percentage and participation in fine arts programs.	<u>2012 Current Level</u> .* 2 grade level s participate in grade level performances.	<u>2013 Expected Level</u> .* 4 grade levels will participate in grade level performances.	1.1. An anticipated barrier to increasing more the participation in fine arts performances is the compromised instructional time needed for rehearsal.	1.1. Integrate content area focus into rehearsal time. (If students are reading a play, they can work on decoding and reading fluency.)	1.1. Music teacher, and classroom teachers, CRT, Assistant Principal, Principal	1.1. Edusoft benchmark tests, formative and informal assessment	1.1. Edusoft benchmark tests, formative and informal assessment
Additional Goal #2: Waterford Elementary will increase the percentage of minority students referred for gifted screening.	<u>2012 Current Level</u> .* 70 students	<u>2013 Expected Level</u> .* 75 students	1.1. An anticipated barrier to increasing the percentage of minority students for gifted screening is teacher misconceptions about gifted characteristics.	1.1. Provide staff development focused on serving the needs of gifted students and the characteristics of gifted students who represent minority groups	1.1. Gifted teacher, and classroom teachers, Staffing Specialist, Assistant Principal, Principal	1.1. Comparing the gifted screening referrals for minority students in 2011-2012 to the number of gifted screening referrals in 2012-2013 for minority students.	1.1. Gifted screening referral list
Additional Goal #3: Waterford Elementary will Increase the % of VPK students by 3% who will enter elementary school ready based on FLKRS data (student who score 70% and above).	<u>2012 Current Level</u> .* 70%	<u>2013 Expected Level</u> .* 73%	1.1 An anticipated barrier to increasing VPK attendance is the lack parents understanding the importance of the VPK program.	1.1 Provide parents with information about the importance early reading strategies and the VPK program.	1.1 CRT, Assistant Principal, Principal	1.1 Comparing the 2011 FLKRS report for school ready students to the 2012 FLKRS report for school ready students.	1.1 FLKRS Report
Additional Goal #4: Waterford Elementary will Increase by 3 to 5% - Students who read on grade level by age 9 - Address reading progress monitoring for K-2 in action plan.	<u>2012 Current Level</u> .* See Goal 1A	<u>2013 Expected Level</u> .*					
Additional Goal #5: Waterford Elementary will increase by 3 to 5% - students who become fluent in math operations - Address math progress monitoring for K-3 in action plan.	<u>2012 Current Level</u> .* See Goal 2A	<u>2013 Expected Level</u> .*					

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

Additional Goal #6: Waterford Elementary will decrease the achievement gap for each identified subgroup by 10% by June 30, 2016.	2012 Current Level :.* See Goal math and reading 5B,C,D, E	2013 Expected Level :.*					
Additional Goal #7: Waterford Elementary will increase college and career readiness.	2012 Current Level :.* 0	2013 Expected Level :.* 350	1.1 An anticipated barrier is lack of experience teaching CCSS for ELA and Math in K-2. 2.	1.1 The staff will implement the CCSS for ELA and Math in K-2 to develop students that are college and career ready.	1.1 Classroom teachers, CRT, Assistant Principal, Principal	1.1 Edusoft benchmark tests, formative and informal assessment	1.1 Edusoft benchmark tests, formative and informal assessment

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 and Schedules (e.g., Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Provide staff development focused on serving the needs of gifted students and the characteristics of gifted students who represent minority groups.	K - 5	Gifted Teacher and Staffing specialist	K - 5	January of 2013	Reviewing the number of minority who were screened for gifted.	Staffing Specialist

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

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

Subtotal:
Total: \$0

End of Additional Goal(s)

Final Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Please provide the total budget from each section.	
Reading Budget	Total: \$17,000.00
Mathematics Budget	Total: \$16,800.00
Science Budget	Total: \$1,500.00
Writing Budget	Total: \$4,500.00
Attendance Budget	Total: \$2,000.00
Suspension Budget	Total: \$0
Dropout Prevention Budget	Total: \$0
Parent Involvement Budget	Total: \$0
Additional Goals	Total: \$0
Grand Total: \$41,800.00	

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

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

- 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.
Assist in development of the SIP. Assist in the planning and implementation of family learning events.

Describe the projected use of SAC funds.	Amount
Purchase VMath Live for Math Intervention Program.	\$3,000.00