

# FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION



## School Improvement Plan (SIP) Form SIP-1

Proposed for 2012-2013

**2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN**

**PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS**

**School Information**

School Name: Waterbridge Elementary School	District Name: Orange
Principal: Dr. Diane Gullett	Superintendent: Barbara M. Jenkins
SAC Chair: Shani Lucas/ Wendy Sanchez	Date of School Board Approval: January 29, 2013

**Student Achievement Data and Reference Materials:**

The following links will open in a separate browser window.

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

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

[High School Feedback Report](#)

[K-12 Comprehensive Research Based Reading Plan](#)

**Administrators**

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

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	Dr. Diane Gullett	Ed.D. Educational Leadership M. Ed. Educational Leadership B.A. 1-6 Elementary Education	4	13	Prior School Grades Previous School All ‘A’ since 1998 & Top 100 High Performing School in the State of Florida Prior School AYP 04-07 Yes; AYP 08-09 No; AYP 09-10 No 79% met goal Grade B; AYP 10-11 No 87% met goal Grade A; 11-12 Grade A <b>2011-2012</b> -25% of AMO Targets Met in Reading and 63% of AMO Targets Met in Math
Assistant Principal	Mr. Gregg Baron	Bachelor of Arts in Education, Master of Education/Elementary	0	1.5	Prior School Grades <b>2011-2012</b> A school grade; 10-11 AYP-No-92% met goal <b>2011-2012</b> 50% of AMO Targets Met in Reading and 88% of AMO

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

		Education K-6, Educational Leadership All Levels			Targets Met in Math
--	--	--	--	--	---------------------

### Instructional Coaches

List your school's instructional coaches and briefly describe their certification(s), number of years at the current school, number of years as an instructional coach, and their prior performance record with increasing student achievement at each school. Include history of School Grades, FCAT/statewide assessment performance (percentage data for achievement levels, learning gains, Lowest 25%), and ambitious but achievable annual measurable objective (AMO) progress. Instructional coaches described in this section are only those who are fully released or part-time teachers in reading, mathematics, or science and work only at the school site.

Subject Area	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	Number of Years at Current School	Number of Years as an Instructional Coach	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)
CRT	Cyndy Hetrick	B.A. Elementary Education M.A. Early Childhood Education Gifted Endorsement Reading Endorsement	4	17	Prior School Grades Previous School All 'A' since 1998 Prior School AYP 04-07 Yes; AYP 08-09 No; AYP 09-10 No 79% met goal Grade B; AYP 10-11 No 87% met goal Grade A; 11-12 Grade A <b>2011-2012</b> -25% of AMO Targets Met in Reading and 63% of AMO Targets Met in Math
Math Coach/ Resource Teacher	Jessica Steelman	B.A. Elementary Education M.A. K-8 Math and Science ESOL	4	7	Waterbridge Elementary School Grade 10-11 A 87% of criteria met; 11-12 Grade A <b>2011-2012</b> -25% of AMO Targets Met in Reading and 63% of AMO Targets Met in Math
CT	Enid Rodriguez	B.A. Elementary Education Elem/Secondary ESOL Elem/Secondary Spanish Elem Ed Grades K-6	6	3	Waterbridge Elementary School Grade 10-11 A 87% of criteria met; 11-12 Grade A <b>2011-2012</b> -25% of AMO Targets Met in Reading and 63% of AMO Targets Met in Math
Reading/ Instructional Coach	Victoria Tierney	B.A. Teacher Arts Teaching K-6 ESOL K-12	2	2	Waterbridge Elementary School Grade 11-12 Grade A <b>2011-2012</b> -25% of AMO Targets Met in Reading and 63% of AMO Targets Met in Math

### Effective and Highly Effective Teachers

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

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

Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date
1. Administration will follow the district's protocol for recruiting highly qualified teachers. This process would include checking certification and calling references of applicants.	Principal Assistant Principal Secretary/Bookkeeper	Ongoing
2. A mentoring program will be in place for teachers in their first three years of teaching.	Principal Assistant Principal Reading/ Instructional Coach	Ongoing
3. We will utilize our mentoring program, PLC's, lesson studies, and recognition to retain those high-quality, effective teachers.	Principal Assistant Principal Reading/ Instructional Coach Instructional Coach Resource Teacher CRT CT	Ongoing
4. Highly effective teachers will be offered educational leadership opportunities.	Principal Assistant Principal	Ongoing

***Non-Highly Effective Instructors***

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

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

Number of instructional staff and paraprofessionals that are teaching out-of-field and who received less than an effective rating (instructional staff only).	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective
Currently, there are (0) instructional staff members or paraprofessionals that are teaching out of field <b>and</b> who received less than an effective rating.	Teachers who are out-of-field, but effective will attend ESOL classes.  Teachers who are less than effective will receive virtual and/or face-to face professional development in Domain 1 in the areas of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Providing clear learning goals and scales</li> <li>• Establishing classroom routines and procedures</li> <li>• Organizing layout of the classroom</li> </ul>

**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	% of teachers with an Effective rating or higher	% of Reading Endorsed Teachers	% of National Board Certified Teachers	% of ESOL Endorsed Teachers
74	1% (1)	43% (32)	24% (18)	32% (24)	35% (26)	96% (71)	8% (6)	1% (1)	86% (64)

***Teacher Mentoring Program/Plan***

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

Mentor Name	Mentee Assigned	Rationale for Pairing	Planned Mentoring Activities
Angela Hernandez-5 <sup>th</sup> Grade (Instructional Delivery/12 years’ experience) Marlene Logrono-4 <sup>th</sup> Grade (Differentiation of Instruction/17 years’ experience) Debra Smith-2 <sup>nd</sup> Grade (Classroom Management/8 years’ experience)	Tasheika Wellington-1 <sup>st</sup> Grade (1 year exp.)	As there were no “new teachers” to Waterbridge Elementary, the school’s induction program will be supporting those teachers who have 1-2 years of teaching experience. The program is being facilitated by the assistant principal, instructional coach, and a panel of experienced educators. These mentor teachers were chosen based on their areas of expertise: instructional delivery, classroom management, engagement with students, and ability to differentiate instruction.	Informal observations between instructional coach/mentors and mentees Modeled lessons by mentor teachers. Monthly Instructional Coach/Mentee meeting Ongoing trainings with curriculum and behavior management Book Study based on the book <i>Teach Like a Champion</i>
Angela Hernandez-5 <sup>th</sup> Grade (Instructional Delivery/12 years’ experience) Marlene Logrono-4 <sup>th</sup> Grade (Differentiation of Instruction/17 years’ experience) Debra Smith-2 <sup>nd</sup> Grade (Classroom Management/8 years’ experience)	Lacey Dowling-4 <sup>th</sup> Grade (1 year exp.)		
Angela Hernandez-5 <sup>th</sup> Grade (Instructional	Jennifer Eldred-3 <sup>rd</sup> Grade (1 year exp.)		

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

<p>Delivery/12 years' experience)</p> <p>Marlene Logrono-4<sup>th</sup> Grade (Differentiation of Instruction/17 years' experience)</p> <p>Debra Smith-2<sup>nd</sup> Grade (Classroom Management/8 years' experience)</p>			
<p>Angela Hernandez-5<sup>th</sup> Grade (Instructional Delivery/12 years' experience)</p> <p>Marlene Logrono-4<sup>th</sup> Grade (Differentiation of Instruction/17 years' experience)</p> <p>Debra Smith-2<sup>nd</sup> Grade (Classroom Management/8 years' experience)</p>	<p>Erin Wolfe-K (1 year exp.)</p>		
<p>Angela Hernandez-5<sup>th</sup> Grade (Instructional Delivery/12 years' experience)</p> <p>Marlene Logrono-4<sup>th</sup> Grade (Differentiation of Instruction/17 years' experience)</p> <p>Debra Smith-2<sup>nd</sup> Grade (Classroom Management/8 years' experience)</p>	<p>Lauren Willis-K (1 year exp.)</p>		
<p>Angela Hernandez-5<sup>th</sup> Grade (Instructional Delivery/12 years' experience)</p> <p>Marlene Logrono-4<sup>th</sup> Grade (Differentiation of Instruction/17 years' experience)</p> <p>Debra Smith-2<sup>nd</sup> Grade (Classroom Management/8 years' experience)</p>	<p>Melissa Moeller-K (1 year exp.)</p>		
<p>Angela Hernandez-5<sup>th</sup> Grade (Instructional Delivery/12 years' experience)</p> <p>Marlene Logrono-4<sup>th</sup> Grade (Differentiation of Instruction/17 years' experience)</p>	<p>Joanna Perez-Burgos-K (1 year exp.)</p>		

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

Debra Smith-2 <sup>nd</sup> Grade (Classroom Management/8 years' experience)			
<p>Angela Hernandez-5<sup>th</sup> Grade (Instructional Delivery/12 years' experience)</p> <p>Marlene Logrono-4<sup>th</sup> Grade (Differentiation of Instruction/17 years' experience)</p> <p>Debra Smith-2<sup>nd</sup> Grade (Classroom Management/8 years' experience)</p>	Pamela Costello-1 <sup>st</sup> Grade (1 year exp.)	As there were no "new teachers" to Waterbridge Elementary, the school's induction program will be supporting those teachers who have 1-2 years of teaching experience. The program is being facilitated by the assistant principal, instructional coach, and a panel of experienced educators. These mentor teachers were chosen based on their areas of expertise: instructional delivery, classroom management, engagement with students, and ability to differentiate instruction.	
Carmen Ramirez-K Bilingual (6 years' experience)	Maribel Rivera-1 <sup>st</sup> Grade Bilingual (0 years exp.)	Ms. Ramirez and Ms. Perez-Burgos were paired because of their subject area-primary bilingual. Ms. Ramirez has proven instructional competence in the area of bilingual education.	

**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.

<p>Title I, Part A funds are used to provide additional instructional staff including reading and instructional coaches to support teacher development and student achievement. Funds are used to provide high quality professional development for not only instructional staff members, but funds are also used to provide parent education classes such as Thinking Map for Parents and Read and Rise, two programs that educate parents on how to best support their child's academic development. In addition to the personnel, Title 1 funds are also used to purchase materials to reach proficiency on challenging state and academic standards and assessments. 3<sup>rd</sup>-5<sup>th</sup> grade classes receive the StoryWorks magazine monthly to support reading. With the move to Common Core standards, K-2<sup>nd</sup> grade teachers will be incorporating The Daily 5. To support this venture, books were purchased for teachers using Title 1 funds.</p>
<p>Title I, Part C Migrant funds are used to implement Kids Connect, Peer Mediation, mentors, Anti-Bullying Programs, C.H.A.M.P.S. and Conscious Discipline to provide a safe learning environment for all students</p>
<p>Title I, Part D</p>

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

Title II funds are used for professional development activities to improve instruction, to impact student performance, and academic achievement. Title II funds will be allocated to pay for Lesson Study materials and substitutes to give teachers adequate time to implement Lesson Study in their PLC.
Title III funds are used for professional development activities to improve instruction, to impact student performance, and academic achievement. Title III funds will be allocated to pay for Lesson Study materials and substitutes to give teachers adequate time to implement Lesson Study in their PLC.
Title X- Homeless: The Homeless Education Program, provided through the McKinney Vento Act, allows our students services if they are classified as homeless. When parents register, they complete the OCPS Housing Questionnaire. The school guidance counselor is the contact for this program and ensures parents are aware of services available to families. District Homeless Social Worker provides resources (clothing, school supplies, and social services referrals) for students identified as homeless under the McKinney Vento Act to eliminate barriers for a free and appropriate education.
Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI): The school provides free tutoring services for identified students in grades three through five in reading and math.
Violence Prevention Programs: The guidance counselor takes the lead in our Character Education Program. Waterbridge uses Learning for Life as its main Character Education Program. Bully Prevention is also in place. This is our third year of implementing Peer Mediation, Conscious Discipline, and CHAMPS. We have a core team for each program that is instructing and modeling the program for the school. We are building a positive culture of student engagement and building relationships in order to infuse rigor and relevance using 21 <sup>st</sup> century skills into the curriculum.
Nutrition Programs: Waterbridge Elementary offers breakfast and lunch programs that are in compliance with the USDA Breakfast and Lunch Program. Nutrition and Health Lessons are taught through our PE and Health Programs.
Housing Programs: NONE
Head Start: NONE
Adult Education: NONE
Career and Technical Education: NONE
Job Training: NONE
Other: NONE

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

School-Based MTSS/RtI Team
Identify the school-based MTSS Leadership Team: Dr. Diane Gullett, Principal; Mr. Gregg Baron, Assistant Principal; Mrs. Cyndy Hetrick, Curriculum Resource Teacher; Mrs. Jessica Steelman, RT/Math Coach; Ms. Victoria Tierney, Reading/ Instructional Coach; Mrs. Enid Rodriguez, CT; Mrs. Susan Patterson, Guidance and Placement Specialist; Mrs. Suzanne Pickell, Speech Pathologist; Mrs. Dena Rasul, School Psychologist; and the School Social Worker, Luis Rodriguez.



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

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 school based MTSS/RtI Leadership Team meets with the classroom teacher, focusing on data, pacing of instruction, prior interventions and current interventions that address the needs of their students. The MTSS/RtI Team helps to determine students who are in need of assistance academically, socially and behaviorally. Decisions are data based and the team will determine that which is alterable and that which is unalterable, and that which is educationally relevant. In addition to these meetings, members of the MTSS/RtI Team will meet with grade level groups and/or individual teachers to address the specific academic or behavioral concerns of their students. With the use of student data, struggling students will be identified and an intervention plan will be put into place. Further meetings will be held to evaluate the effectiveness of the intervention using Ongoing progress monitoring data and modifications can be made if necessary.

Describe the role of the school-based MTSS/RtI leadership team in the development and implementation of the school improvement plan (SIP). Describe how the MTSS/RtI problem-solving process is used in developing and implementing the SIP? The Principal, as a member of the MTSS/RtI Leadership Team, will meet with the team along with some members of the School Advisory Council (SAC) to discuss and address the focus of the School Improvement Plan. During the meeting, they will discuss the issues facing students who are not making satisfactory progress. Based on this discussion, team members will review and address the professional staff development needs to assist teachers with providing rigorous and relative instruction to students.

### MTSS/RtI Implementation

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

Baseline data: Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network (PMRN)-Tier 1, Florida Assessment for Instruction in Reading (FAIR)-Tier 1, Benchmark Assessments-Tier1, FLKRS-Tier 1, Envision initial assessment-Tier 1, Houghton Mifflin (initial reading assessment)-Tier 1, Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT)-Tier-1, IDEL-Tier 1

Progress Monitoring: School wide Writing Prompts-Tier 1, FAIR OPM-Tier 2, Mini Benchmark Assessments-Tier 2, and other formative classroom assessments-Tier 2

Diagnostic: FAIR Targeted Diagnostic Tests-Tier 2/3, Tejas Lee-Tier 1/2/3, Core Phonics Survey-Tier 2/3, PAST-Tier 2/3

Midyear: FAIR-Tier 1, HM Midyear Assessments for Fall and Spring-Tier 1, Benchmark Assessments-Tier 1, School wide Writing Prompt-Tier 1, APRENDA-Tier 1

End of Year: School wide Writing Prompt-Tier 1, Benchmark Assessment-Tier 1, CELLA-Tier 1, HM Final Assessment-Tier 1, FCAT-Tier 1

Tier 1: FAIR, Benchmark Assessments, Mini-Benchmark Assessments, Houghton Mifflin Reading Assessments, EnVision Math Assessments, Discipline Referral Data, Monthly Writing Prompts

Tier 2: FAIR Targeted Diagnostic Assessments, Tejas Lee, Core Phonics Survey, PAST, Mini-Benchmark Assessments, Corrective Reading Assessments, EIR Assessments, iReady Reports, Behavior Contract/Plan Data, Easy CBM

Tier 3: Corrective Reading Assessments, EIR Assessments, iReady Reports, Easy CBM

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS/RtI.

As the district is moving from an RtI-based approach to a MTSS-based approach, further direction and training will be forthcoming. In the meantime, the MTSS/RtI Leadership team will be training staff on MTSS/RtI procedures, available resources and necessary documentation to track response.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

Once all staff members have been trained in MTSS, the MTSS/RtI Leadership Team will provide ongoing support via grade level PLC meetings and school-wide professional development. The implementation of a MTSS/RtI approach will be monitored through regular student data and progress monitoring of interventions.

## 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): Dr. Diane Gullett, Principal; Victoria Tierney, Reading/ Instructional Coach; Carmen Ramierz- Kindergarten; Tiffany Ong- First Grade; Dee Dee Smith- Second Grade; Jennifer Eldred- Third Grade; Tricia Amirzadeh- Fourth Grade; Laura Hunt- Fifth Grade; Shelley Ward – Instructional Support
Describe how the school-based LLT functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions): Each member of the LLT is a member of a grade level PLC. The LLT meets regularly to support the School Improvement process in the area of literacy. They will communicate the district literacy plan to their teams and report back to the LLT the specific concerns and needs of their team. To build capacity, the LLT takes a leadership role in becoming the literacy “experts” on their team mentoring and modeling literacy strategies with colleagues.
What will be the major initiatives of the LLT TEAM this year? <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Review the district literacy plan with all teachers</li><li>• Create and monitor a school wide reading award system that encompasses the Accelerated Reader Program</li><li>• Promote reading through the Sunshine State Readers</li><li>• Promote and model strategies for reading success, including strategies to meet the needs of the highest 25%</li><li>• Encourage parent participation through joint/student events and parent education classes to support better readers</li></ul>

### *Public School Choice*

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

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

***\*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.

NONE

***\*Grades 6-12 Only*** Sec. 1003.413 (2)(b) F.S

For schools with grades 6-12, how does the school ensure that every teacher contributes to the reading improvement of every student?

NONE

***\*High Schools Only***

Note: Required for High School-Sec. 1003.413(2)(g), (2)(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?

NONE

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?

NONE

***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](#).

NONE

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
<b>1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading.</b>			1A.1. 34% of the population is made up of ELL students.	1A.1. Providing professional development for supporting ELL students in the mainstream classroom.	1A.1. Principal Assistant Principal Reading/ Instructional Coach CRT CT Classroom Teachers LITERACY LEADERSHIP TEAM	1A.1. Monitoring reading instruction and lesson plans Observations Teachers can follow student progress via the Imagine Learning Program	1A.1. FAIR Houghton-Mifflin Benchmark Test Classroom Assessments My On Capstone Digital Reach for Reading FCAT
<b>Reading Goal #1A:</b>  <i>By June 2013, 29% of students (156) at Waterbridge Elementary will score at Level 3 or above on FCAT 2.0 Reading.</i>	<b>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</b>  <i>In June 2012, 26% of students (135) at Waterbridge Elementary scored at Level 3 or above on FCAT 2.0 Reading.</i>	<b>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</b>  <i>By June 2013, 29% of students (156) at Waterbridge Elementary will score at Level 3 or above on FCAT 2.0 Reading.</i>	These students struggle with fluency and vocabulary which interferes with comprehension	Focus on using the OCPS curriculum to ensure that all standards are taught.  Develop school wide events that promote vocabulary skills.  Reinforce technology-based programs to support previously taught skills.			
			1A.2. A number of students not reading on grade level.	1A.2. Increase the number of students interested in reading through Sunshine State Readers, Read Alouds and Book Talks.  Utilize FCRR activities that will differentiate instruction during small groups and/or centers.  Build a master schedule to incorporate common intervention times among grade level PLC's  Instructional staff will be utilizing iReady Reading to diagnose instructional gaps, guide instructional focus, and provide progress monitoring.	1A.2. Principal Assistant Principal CRT Media Specialist Classroom Teachers	1A.2. Monitoring reading instruction and lesson plans Observations Teacher Feedback/Reflections Review PLC meeting notes Review intervention data	1A.2. FAIR Houghton-Mifflin Benchmark Test Mini Benchmark Test Classroom Assessments iReady FCAT
			1A.3. Teachers need support in creating highly engaging lessons that introduce new content	1A.3. Provide professional development focusing on Marzano's Design Questions 2 and 5	1A.3. Principal Assistant Principal Reading/ Instructional Coach	1A.3. Monitoring reading instruction and lesson plans Observations	1A.3. FAIR Houghton-Mifflin Benchmark Test

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

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

				CRT	Teacher Reflections	Mini Benchmark Test Classroom Assessments Teacher Evaluations FCAT
<b>1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading.</b>		1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.
Reading Goal #1B:  NONE	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
			1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.
		1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.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
<b>2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 in reading.</b>			2A.1. Students need to be challenged in discussions with their reading.	2A.1. Introduce Literature Circles for students to read and have discussions to build their critical thinking skills.	2A.1. Principal Reading/ Instructional Coach Media Specialist CRT	2A.1. Observations Lesson plans PLC Weekly Notes	2A.1. FAIR Houghton-Mifflin Benchmark Test Classroom Assessments Mini Benchmarks FCAT
<u>Reading Goal #2A:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
By June 2013, 35% of students (188) at Waterbridge Elementary will score at or above Level 4 or 5 on FCAT 2.0 Reading.	In June 2012, 32% of students (166) at Waterbridge Elementary scored at or above Level 4 or 5 on FCAT 2.0 Reading.	By June 2013, 35% of students (188) at Waterbridge Elementary will score at or above Level 4 or 5 on FCAT 2.0 Reading.					
			2A.2. Teachers need support in enriching the needs of proficient learners.	2A.2. Gifted resource teacher will provide professional development in enrichment activities, as well as provide "Prime Time" enrichment activities for high performing students.	2A.2. Principal Reading/ Instructional Coach CRT Gifted teacher	2A.2. Monitoring reading instruction and lesson plans Observations Tracking student learning gains	2A.2. FAIR Houghton-Mifflin Benchmark Test Mini Benchmark Test Classroom Assessments FCAT
			2A.3 Teachers need support in developing questioning techniques that encourage students to explore text on a deeper level.	2A.3 Teachers will be introduced to DBQs, the document based question approach, through ongoing professional development.	2A.3 Principal Assistant Principal Reading/ Instructional Coach CRT	2A.3 Observations Lesson Plans PLC Weekly Notes	2A.3 FAIR Houghton-Mifflin Benchmark Test Classroom Assessments Mini Benchmarks FCAT
<b>2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in reading.</b>			2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.
<u>Reading Goal #2B:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
NONE							
			2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.
			2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.

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

**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
<b>3A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.</b>			3A.1. Increase the number of students meeting reading proficiency.	3A.1. Reinforce systematic and explicit research-based tutoring K-5 for students needing additional support to reach their reading goals. PALS in Kindergarten, EIR in 1 <sup>st</sup> and 2 <sup>nd</sup> grade, and Corrective Reading in 3 <sup>rd</sup> -5 <sup>th</sup> grade.  Provide professional development to teachers that utilize Fountas and Pinnell/Daily 5.	3A.1. Principal Assistant Principal CRT LITERACY LEADERSHIP TEAM	3A.1. Review data with the Leadership Team and grade level PLC's.	3A.1. FAIR Ongoing Progress Monitoring Benchmark Test Houghton-Mifflin Assessment Classroom Assessment FCAT
<b>Reading Goal #3A:</b>	<b>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</b>	<b>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</b>					
<i>By June 2013, 76% of students (261) at Waterbridge Elementary will make learning gains on FCAT 2.0 Reading.</i>	<i>In June 2012, 73% of students (248) at Waterbridge Elementary made learning gains on FCAT 2.0 Reading.</i>	<i>By June 2013, 76% of students (261) at Waterbridge Elementary will make learning gains on FCAT 2.0 Reading.</i>					
			3A.2. Students lack the desire to read for pleasure.	3A.2. Refine joint parent/student learning opportunities at an off-campus location to encourage reading for pleasure.  Establish "Science Storybook Night" for students to engage in science stories and experiments.	3A.2. Principal Assistant Principal CRT Literacy Committee Family Learning Committee Math and Science Committee	3A.2. Parent Survey	3A.2. Results of parent surveys to determine impact of events.
			3A.3. Lack of parent involvement	3A.3. Provide parents with an opportunity to experience a sample FCAT 2.0 Reading Test.  Provide extended media center hours for parents and students to have the opportunity to access the library and check-out books.	3A.3. Principal Assistant Principal CRT CT Media Specialist Classroom Teachers	3A.3. Parent Survey	3A.3. Results of parent surveys to determine impact of events.
			<b>3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.</b>			3B.1.	3B.1.
<b>Reading Goal #3B:</b>	<b>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</b>	<b>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</b>					
NONE							

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

		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
<p><b>4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.</b></p> <p><u>Reading Goal #4:</u></p> <p><i>By June 2013 79% of the lowest 25% of students (68) at Waterbridge Elementary will make learning gains on FCAT 2.0 Reading.</i></p>	<p><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u></p> <p><i>In June 2012 76% of the lowest 25% of students (65) at Waterbridge Elementary made learning gains on FCAT 2.0 Reading.</i></p>	<p><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u></p> <p><i>By June 2013 79% of the lowest 25% of students (68) at Waterbridge Elementary will make learning gains on FCAT 2.0 Reading.</i></p>	<p>4A.1. Accurately determine target students needing interventions</p>	<p>4A.1. Focus on refining the MTSS/RtI process across all grade levels to enhance the success in meeting the needs of the targeted students.</p> <p>Develop an Action Plan for the MTSS/RtI process and integrate this into scheduled weekly data meetings in order to closely identify and monitor struggling students.</p> <p>MTSS/RtI team will assess teachers in selecting reading interventions for students in targeted groups and assist in monitoring progress by providing appropriate monitoring tools.</p>	<p>4A.1. MTSS/RtI Team</p>	<p>4A.1. Review data with the MTSS/RtI Team and meet with teachers to monitor the success of interventions.</p> <p>Review the data and have discussions of intervention strategies during MTSS/RtI, PLC, and Data Meetings.</p>	<p>4A.1. FAIR</p> <p>Ongoing Progress Monitoring</p> <p>Benchmark Tests</p> <p>Houghton-Mifflin</p> <p>Classroom Assessments</p> <p>FCAT</p>
			<p>4A.2. Engage targeted students in intervention groups.</p>	<p>4A.2. Increase the number of students that will receive Corrective Reading and/or EIR for interventions.</p>	<p>4A.2. MTSS/RtI Team</p>	<p>4A.2. Review Corrective Reading data and/or EIR data to monitor the success of interventions.</p>	<p>4A.2. Corrective Reading</p> <p>EIR</p>
			<p>4A.3. Parents are unaware of how to help their child in reading.</p>	<p>4A.3. Create a "Thinking Maps" workshop for parents to attend that will be cross-curricular.</p> <p>Provide parents with a literacy workshop.</p>	<p>4A.3. Reading/ Instructional Coach</p> <p>CRT</p> <p>Literacy Committee</p> <p>Teachers</p>	<p>4A.3. Parent Survey</p>	<p>4A.3. Results of parent surveys to determine impact of events.</p>



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

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years			2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	
<b>5A. In six years school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.</b> <b>Reading Goal #5A:</b>  <i>Waterbridge Elementary will reduce the achievement gap between White and Hispanic subgroups.</i>	<b>Baseline data 2010-2011</b>			<i>By June 2013 the percentage of students not making satisfactory progress on FCAT Reading 2.0 will be:</i> 35%	<i>By June 2014 the percentage of students not making satisfactory progress on FCAT Reading 2.0 will be:</i> 31%	<i>By June 2015 the percentage of students not making satisfactory progress on FCAT Reading 2.0 will be:</i> 28%	<i>By June 2016 the percentage of students not making satisfactory progress on FCAT Reading 2.0 will be:</i> 24%	<i>By June 2017 the percentage of students not making satisfactory progress on FCAT Reading 2.0 will be:</i> 21%	
	Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
<b>5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading.</b> <b>Reading Goal #5B:</b>  <i>By June 2013 the student subgroups not making satisfactory progress on FCAT 2.0 Reading will be:</i> White: 26% (100) Black: 39% (29) Hispanic: 39% (113) Asian: 24% (11) American Indian: n/a	<b>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</b>  <i>In June 2012 the student subgroups not making satisfactory progress on FCAT 2.0 Reading are:</i> White: 28% Black: 39% Hispanic: 46% Asian: 30% American Indian: n/a	<b>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</b>  <i>By June 2013 the student subgroups not making satisfactory progress on FCAT 2.0 Reading will be:</i> White: 26% Black: 39% Hispanic: 39% Asian: 27% American Indian: n/a	5B.1.  There is a significant achievement gap between the number of Hispanic students not making satisfactory progress in reading (46%) and the number of white students not making satisfactory progress in reading (28%).	5B.1.  Instructional staff will be utilizing iReady Reading to diagnose instructional gaps, guide instructional focus, and provide progress monitoring.  Reinforce the use of SIOP (Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol) to address the language needs of ELLs and students from bilingual homes.	5B.1.  Principal Assistant Principal Resource Teacher CRT CT Reading/ Instructional Coach SIOP Leaders	5B.1.  Discussions during weekly PLC meetings Generate and review student data and track progress Review lesson plans Classroom observations	5B.1.  iReady Reading FAIR Ongoing Progress Monitoring Benchmark Tests Houghton-Mifflin Classroom Assessments CELLA FCAT		
			5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	
				5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.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
<b>5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading.</b>			5C.1. Lack of acquired academic language	5C.1. Reinforce the use of SIOP (Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol) to address the language needs of ELLs and students from bilingual homes.  Utilize technology programs such as Reach for Reading and Imagine Learning to monitor the language acquisition necessary to make satisfactory progress in reading.	5C.1. Principal Assistant Principal CT Reading/ Instructional Coach Tech Support Rep	5C.1. Review lesson plans Classroom observations	5C.1. FAIR Ongoing Progress Monitoring Benchmark Tests Houghton-Mifflin Classroom Assessments CELLA Technology usage reports FCAT
<u>Reading Goal #5C:</u>  <i>By June 2013 37% or less of ELL students will not make satisfactory progress on FCAT 2.0 Reading.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>  <i>In June 2012 45% of ELL students are not making satisfactory progress on FCAT 2.0 Reading.</i>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>  <i>By June 2013 37% or less of ELL students will not make satisfactory progress on FCAT 2.0 Reading.</i>	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
<b>5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading.</b>			5D.1. Instructional staff lacks the necessary resources to support students with disabilities.	5D.1. Instructional staff will be supporting student learning using Tucker Signing to address the development of fundamental literacy skills.	5D.1. Principal Assistant Principal CRT Reading/ Instructional Coach	5D.1. Weekly PLC discussions Teacher Reflections	5D.1. Teacher Reflections PLC Notes
<u>Reading Goal #5D:</u>  <i>By June 2013 66% (23) or less of students with disabilities will not make satisfactory progress on FCAT 2.0 Reading.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>  <i>In June 2012 88% of students with disabilities are not making satisfactory progress on FCAT 2.0 Reading.</i>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>  <i>By June 2013 66% or less of students with disabilities will not make satisfactory progress on FCAT 2.0 Reading.</i>	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

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
<b>5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading.</b>			5E.1. Students and parents lack access to resources.	5E.1. Waterbridge Elementary will offer extended Media Center hours for students to access books and utilize the computer lab.	5E.1. Principal Assistant Principal Media Specialist	5E.1. Review sign-in sheet to document the media usage	5E.1. Media Center sign-in sheet
<b>Reading Goal #5E:</b>  <i>By June 2013 38% (155) or less of economically disadvantaged students will not make satisfactory progress on FCAT 2.0 Reading.</i>	<b>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</b>  <i>In June 2012 44% of economically disadvantaged students are not making satisfactory progress on FCAT 2.0 Reading.</i>	<b>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</b>  <i>By June 2013 38% or less of economically disadvantaged students will not make satisfactory progress on FCAT 2.0 Reading.</i>					
			5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.
			5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.

## Reading Professional Development

<b>Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activities</b> <small>Please note that each strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.</small>						
PD Content/Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Technology	K-5	Carmen Perez Jessica Steelman Technology PLC	School-wide	August - May	Teacher Reflections Technology Training Records	Principal Assistant Principal Reading/ Instructional Coach CRT Resource Teacher CT
Fountas and Pinnell/Daily 5	K-5	Victoria Tierney	School-wide	August - May	Observations PLC Weekly Notes	Principal Assistant Principal Reading/ Instructional Coach CRT CT
DBQ's (Document Based Questions)	K-5	Victoria Tierney	School-wide	August - May	Observations PLC Weekly Notes	Principal Assistant Principal Reading/ Instructional Coach CRT

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

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

						CT
Marzano: The Art and Science of Teaching	K-5	Victoria Tierney	School-wide	August - May	Observations PLC Weekly Notes	Principal Assistant Principal Reading/ Instructional Coach CRT CT
iReady	K-5	Victoria Tierney	School-wide	October - May	Observations Review Student Data PLC Weekly Notes	Principal Assistant Principal Reading/ Instructional Coach CRT CT

**Reading Budget (Insert rows as needed)**

Include only school funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities/materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Increase Reading Proficiency	My On Capstone Library	NONE	NONE
Increase Reading Proficiency/ Guides Instruction/Interventions	iReady	NONE	NONE
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Increase Reading Proficiency	Daily 5	NONE	
Increase Reading Proficiency	Fountas and Pinnell	NONE	NONE
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount

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

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

<b>Subtotal:</b>
<b>Total: NONE</b>

*End of Reading Goals*

**Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals**

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

CELLA Goals		Problem-Solving Process to Increase Language Acquisition				
Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking.</b>		1.1. Students lack the confidence to practice their second language skills	1.1. Introduce students to the Imagine Learning software to allow students practice English language learning.	1.1. Principal Assistant Principal CT Classroom Teachers Tech. Support Rep	1.1. Usage Reports Classroom Observations	1.1. Imagine Learning CELLA FAIR
<b>CELLA Goal #1:</b> <i>By June 2013 33% of ELL students (83) at Waterbridge Elementary will score Proficient in listening/speaking on CELLA.</i>	<b>2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking:</b> <i>In June 2012 30% of ELL students (76) at Waterbridge Elementary scored Proficient in listening/speaking on CELLA.</i>					
		1.2. Lack of parental involvement due to language barrier	1.2. Continue ESOL PLC (Parent Leadership Council) to provide parents with strategies that will support student learning.	1.2. Principal Assistant Principal CT Bilingual Teachers	1.2. Review sign-in sheets Agendas	1.2. Parent Survey
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Students read grade-level text in English in a manner similar to non-ELL students.		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>2. Students scoring proficient in reading.</b>		2.1. Students struggle with English language acquisition skills	2.1. Introduce students to the Imagine Learning software to allow students practice English language learning.  Introduce Reach for Reading curriculum in all bilingual classrooms.  Schedule "Read and Rise" engagement program designed to	2.1. Principal Assistant Principal CT Reading/ Instructional Coach Bilingual Teachers	2.1. Usage reports Lesson plans Classroom observations Review sign-in sheets	2.1. Imagine Learning CELLA FAIR FCAT Benchmark Test Mini Benchmark Test Classroom Assessments Tejas Lee Parent Survey
<b>CELLA Goal #2:</b> <i>By June 2013 32% of ELL students (81) at Waterbridge Elementary will score Proficient in reading on CELLA.</i>	<b>2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading:</b> <i>In June 2012 29% of ELL students (73) at Waterbridge Elementary scored Proficient in reading on CELLA.</i>					

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

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

			bring families, schools, and communities together to support children's literacy development.			
		2.2. Lack of parental involvement due to language barrier	2.2. Continue ESOL PLC (Parent Leadership Council) to provide parents with strategies that will support student learning.	2.2. Principal Assistant Principal CT Bilingual Teachers	2.2. Review sign-in sheets Agendas	2.2. Parent Survey
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

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
<b>3. Students scoring proficient in writing.</b>		2.1. Students struggle with English language acquisition skills	2.1. Introduce students to the Imagine Learning software to allow students practice English language learning.	2.1. Principal Assistant Principal CT	2.1. Usage reports Classroom observations	2.1. Imagine Learning CELLA FCAT Benchmark Test Mini Benchmark Test Classroom Assessments Monthly Writing Prompts
<u>CELLA Goal #3:</u>	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing :					
<i>By June 2013 28% of ELL students (71) at Waterbridge Elementary will score Proficient in writing on CELLA.</i>	<i>In June 2012 25% of ELL students (63) at Waterbridge Elementary scored Proficient in writing on CELLA.</i>					
		2.2. Lack of parental involvement due to language barrier	2.2. Continue ESOL PLC (Parent Leadership Council) to provide parents with strategies that will support student learning.	2.2. Principal Assistant Principal CT Bilingual Teachers	2.2. Review sign-in sheets Agendas	2.2. Parent Survey
		2.3. Teachers lack resources to support ELL's with their basic writing skills.	2.3. Continue the use of Thinking Maps for ELL to support the writing process	2.3. Principal Assistant Principal CT CRT	2.3. Classroom observations Lesson plans	2.3. FCAT Benchmark Test Mini Benchmark Test Classroom Assessments Monthly Writing Prompts

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

**CELLA Budget** (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities/materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Enhance student writing	Thinking Maps for ELL's	NONE	NONE
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
NONE			
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
NONE			
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
NONE			
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
			<b>Total: NONE</b>

*End of CELLA Goals*

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

**Elementary School Mathematics Goals**

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

<b>Elementary Mathematics Goals</b>			<b>Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</b>				
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
<b>1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics.</b>			1A.1. Increase the number of students mastering the standards and achieving proficiency in mathematics.	1A.1. Provide professional development for teachers with support in NGSSS in 3-5 and Common Core in K-2 through Lesson Study.  Increase math fluency through technology resources.	1A.1. Principal Assistant Principal Resource Teacher	1A.1. Observations Monitoring lesson plans PLC discussions Lesson Study Reflections	1A.1. Benchmark Test Mini Benchmark Test Classroom Assessments iReady Moby Math FCAT
<u>Mathematics Goal</u> #1A:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
<i>By June 2013, 32% of students (172) at Waterbridge Elementary scored at Level 3 or above on FCAT 2.0 Math.</i>	<i>In June 2012, 29% of students (150) at Waterbridge Elementary scored at Level 3 or above on FCAT 2.0 Math.</i>	<i>By June 2013, 32% of students (172) at Waterbridge Elementary scored at Level 3 or above on FCAT 2.0 Math.</i>					
			1A.2. Parents are unaware of how to help their child in math.	1A.2. Establish a parent learning opportunity for parents to come and participate in a “Make-and-Take Games” that they can do with their child at home.  Create a “Thinking Maps” workshop for parents to attend that will be cross-curricular.	1A.2. Principal Assistant Principal Resource Teacher CRT Teachers	1A.2. Results of parent surveys to determine impact of events.	1A.2. Parent Survey
			1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.
<b>1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.</b>			1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.
<u>Mathematics Goal</u> #1B:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
NONE							
			1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.

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



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

		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
<b>2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in mathematics.</b>			2A.1. Capturing and engaging proficient students so they can continue to progress with the current demonstrated on the FCAT 2.0 Math.	2A.1. Engage students in brain-based strategies for math learning.  Provide students with assignments that focus on using higher level thinking skills (i.e. Superstars).  Utilize technology to develop skills of students who need to go beyond the basic curriculum.	2A.1. Principal Resource Teacher Classroom Teachers	2A.1. Monitor data Observations Teacher Reflections	2A.1. Benchmark Test Mini Benchmark Test Envision Assessments Classroom Assessments iReady Moby Math FCAT
<u>Mathematics Goal #2A:</u>  <i>By June 2013, 39% of students (209) at Waterbridge Elementary will score at or above Level 4 or 5 on FCAT 2.0 Math.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>  <i>In June 2012, 36% of students (186) at Waterbridge Elementary scored at or above Level 4 or 5 on FCAT 2.0 Math.</i>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>  <i>By June 2013, 39% of students (209) at Waterbridge Elementary will score at or above Level 4 or 5 on FCAT 2.0 Math.</i>	2A.2. Teachers need support in meeting the needs of the proficient learners.	2A.2. Through Lesson Study identify and provide additional professional development in meeting the needs of the proficient learner.	2A.2. Principal Assistant Principal Gifted Teacher Resource Teacher	2A.2. Monitoring math instruction and lesson plans Observations Lesson Study Reflections	2A.2. Benchmark Test Mini Benchmark Test Envision Assessments Classroom Assessments FCAT
			2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.
<b>2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.</b>			2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.
<u>Mathematics Goal #2B:</u>  NONE	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.
			2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.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	
<b>3A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.</b>			3A.1. Providing adequate support to students not making learning gains	3A.1. Expand the R.E.A.L. (Remediation and Enrichment Academic Lab/Math Learning Lab) to provide additional hands-on mathematics learning experiences.  Instructional staff will be utilizing iReady Math to diagnose instructional gaps, guide instructional focus, and provide progress monitoring.	3A.1. Principal Assistant Principal Resource Teacher Classroom Teachers	3A.1. Monitor student progress PLC discussions about growth and trends in math data Observations	3A.1. Benchmark Test Mini Benchmark Test Envision Assessments Classroom Assessments iReady FCAT	
<b>Mathematics Goal #3A:</b>  <i>By June 2013 86% of students (295) at Waterbridge Elementary will make learning gains on FCAT 2.0 Math.</i>	<b>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</b>  <i>In June 2012, 84% of students (286) at Waterbridge Elementary made learning gains on FCAT 2.0 Math.</i>	<b>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</b>  <i>By June 2013 86% of students (295) at Waterbridge Elementary will make learning gains on FCAT 2.0 Math.</i>						
				3A.2. Lack of parent involvement in math learning	3A.2. Offer a technology night for parents to introduce resources with regards to technology that will support student learning.	3A.2. Principal Assistant Principal Resource Teacher Classroom Teachers	3A.2. Parent Survey	3A.2. Review the results of parent surveys to determine impact of event.
				3A.3. Lack of student interest in math learning	3A.3. Utilize online games and websites and promote grade level competitions	3A.3. Principal Assistant Principal Resource Teacher Classroom Teachers	3A.3. PLC discussions about growth and trends in math data Observations	3A.3. Benchmark Test Mini Benchmark Test Envision Assessments Classroom Assessments FCAT
<b>3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.</b>			3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	
<b>Mathematics Goal #3B:</b>  <p style="text-align: center;">NONE</p>	<b>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</b>	<b>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</b>						
				3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	
				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 group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.</b>			4A.1. Accurately determine target students needing interventions	4A.1. Focus on refining the MTSS/RtI process across all grade levels to enhance the success in meeting the needs of the targeted students.  Develop an Action Plan for the MTSS/RtI process and integrate this into scheduled weekly data meetings in order to closely identify and monitor struggling students.	4A.1. MTSS/RtI Team	4A.1. Review data with the MTSS/RtI Team and meet with teachers to monitor the success of interventions.	4A.1. Ongoing Progress Monitoring Benchmark Tests Mini Benchmark Test Classroom Assessments FCAT
<b>Mathematics Goal #4:</b>  <i>By June 2013 71% of students (61) at Waterbridge Elementary will make learning gains on FCAT 2.0 Math.</i>	<b>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</b>  <i>In June 2012 68% of students (58) at Waterbridge Elementary made learning gains on FCAT 2.0 Math.</i>	<b>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</b>  <i>By June 2013 71% of students (61) at Waterbridge Elementary will make learning gains on FCAT 2.0 Math.</i>					
			4A.2. Engage targeted students in intervention groups.	4A.2. MTSS/RtI team will assist teachers in selecting reading interventions for students in targeted groups and assist in monitoring progress by providing appropriate monitoring tools.	4A.2. MTSS/RtI Team	4A.2. Review the data and have discussions of intervention strategies during MTSS/RtI, PLC, and Data Meetings.	4A.2. Ongoing Progress Monitoring Benchmark Tests Mini Benchmark Test Classroom Assessments FCAT
			4A.3. Parents are unaware of how to help their child in math.	4A.3. Establish a parent learning opportunity for parents to come and participate in a "Make-and-Take Games" that they can do with their child at home.  Create a "Thinking Maps" workshop for parents to attend that will be cross-curricular.	4A.3. Resource Teacher CRT Classroom Teachers	4A.3. Parent Survey	4A.3. Results of parent surveys to determine impact of events.

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

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years			2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	
<b>5A. In six years school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.</b> <b>Mathematics Goal #5A:</b> <i>Waterbridge Elementary will reduce the achievement gap between White and Hispanic subgroups.</i>	<b>Baseline data 2010-2011</b>			<i>By June 2013 the percentage of students not making satisfactory progress on FCAT Math 2.0 will be:</i> 34%	<i>By June 2014 the percentage of students not making satisfactory progress on FCAT Math 2.0 will be:</i> 31%	<i>By June 2015 the percentage of students not making satisfactory progress on FCAT Math 2.0 will be:</i> 27%	<i>By June 2016 the percentage of students not making satisfactory progress on FCAT Math 2.0 will be:</i> 24%	<i>By June 2017 the percentage of students not making satisfactory progress on FCAT Math 2.0 will be:</i> 20%	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
<b>5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.</b> <b>Mathematics Goal #5B:</b> <i>By June 2013 the student subgroups that will not be making satisfactory progress on FCAT 2.0 Math will be:</i> White: 31% (119) Black: 41% (30) Hispanic: 33% (96) Asian: 13% (6) American Indian: n/a	<b>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</b> <i>In June 2012 the student subgroups not making satisfactory progress on FCAT 2.0 Math are:</i> White: 30% Black: 35% Hispanic: 39% Asian: 22% American Indian: n/a	<b>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</b> <i>By June 2013 the student subgroups that will not be making satisfactory progress on FCAT 2.0 Math will be:</i> White: 31% Black: 41% Hispanic: 37% Asian: 15% American Indian: n/a	5B.1. There is an achievement gap between White and Hispanic students due to lack of English language acquisition skills.	5B.1. Instructional staff will be utilizing iReady Math to diagnose instructional gaps, guide instructional focus, and provide progress monitoring.	5B.1. Principal Assistant Principal Resource Teacher CRT Reading/ Instructional Coach	5B.1. Discussions during weekly PLC meetings Generate and review student data and track progress	5B.1. iReady Math Benchmark Tests Mini Benchmark Test Classroom Assessments FCAT		
				5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	
				5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.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	
<b>5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.</b>			5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	
<b>Mathematics Goal #5C:</b>  <i>By June 2013 38% or less of ELL students will not making satisfactory progress on FCAT 2.0 Math.</i>	<b>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</b>  <i>In June 2012 42% of ELL students are not making satisfactory progress on FCAT 2.0 Math.</i>	<b>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</b>  <i>By June 2013 38% or less of ELL students will not making satisfactory progress on FCAT 2.0 Math.</i>	There is a significant achievement gap between the number of Hispanic students not making satisfactory progress in reading (42%) and the number of white students not making satisfactory progress in math (34%).	Instructional staff will be utilizing iReady Math to diagnose instructional gaps, guide instructional focus, and provide progress monitoring.  Reinforce the use of SIOP (Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol) to address the language needs of ELLs and students from bilingual homes.	Principal Assistant Principal Resource Teacher CRT CT SIOP Leaders	Discussions during weekly PLC meetings Generate and review student data and track progress Review lesson plans Classroom observations	iReady Math Ongoing Progress Monitoring Benchmark Tests Mini Benchmark Test Classroom Assessments FCAT	
				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	
<b>5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.</b>			5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.	
<b>Mathematics Goal #5D:</b>  <i>By June 2013 66% (23) or less of students with disabilities will not make satisfactory progress on FCAT 2.0 Math.</i>	<b>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</b>  <i>In June 2012 88% of students with disabilities are not making satisfactory progress on FCAT 2.0 Math.</i>	<b>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</b>  <i>By June 2013 66% or less of students with disabilities will not make satisfactory progress on FCAT 2.0 Math.</i>	Instructional staff lacks the necessary resources to support students with disabilities.	Introduce the Touch Math program as a multisensory approach to basic number sense.	Principal Assistant Principal CRT Resource Teacher Reading/ Instructional Coach	Review lesson plans Review assessments Classroom observations	Benchmark Test Mini Benchmark Test Classroom Assessments iReady EnVision Assessments	
				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

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
<b>5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.</b>			5E.1. Students and parents lack access to resources.	5E.1. Waterbridge Elementary will offer extended Media Center hours for students to access books and utilize the computer lab.	5E.1. Principal Assistant Principal Media Specialist	5E.1. Review sign-in sheet to document the media usage	5E.1. Media Center sign-in sheet
<b>Mathematics Goal #5E:</b>  <i>By June 2013 35% (143) or less of economically disadvantaged students will not make satisfactory progress on FCAT 2.0 Math.</i>	<b>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</b>  <i>In June 2012 38% of economically disadvantaged students are not making satisfactory progress on FCAT 2.0 Math.</i>	<b>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</b>  <i>By June 2013 35% or less of economically disadvantaged students will not make satisfactory progress on FCAT 2.0 Math.</i>	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*

### Mathematics Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activities						
Please note that each strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content/Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Lesson Study	K-5	Jessica Steelman	School-wide	August – Ongoing throughout the year	Teacher Reflections Observations	Principal Assistant Principal CRT Resource Teacher CT
Touch Math	K-5	Cyndy Hetrick	School-wide	August – Ongoing throughout the year	Teacher Reflections Observations	Principal Assistant Principal Reading/ Instructional Coach CRT Resource Teacher CT
iReady	K-5	Jessica Steelman	School-wide	October-May	Observations Review of Lesson Plans	Principal Assistant Principal

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

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

					Review of Student Work	Resource Teacher
--	--	--	--	--	------------------------	------------------

**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
Higher Level Thinking & Problem Solving	Math Superstars K-5	School Budget	\$500
			<b>Subtotal: \$500</b>
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Supplemental support for state standards	iReady Math	SAC	\$3901.00
			<b>Subtotal: \$3901</b>
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Lesson Study	Substitutes for release time	Title II	\$2800.00
Strategies of Effective Instruction	Thinking Maps for Math	NONE	NONE
			<b>Subtotal: \$2800</b>
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Parent Learning Opportunity	Make and Take Learning Games	Title 1	\$500
			<b>Subtotal: \$500</b>
			<b>Total: \$7701.00</b>

*End of Mathematics Goals*

**Elementary and Middle School Science Goals**

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

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

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

Elementary and Middle Science Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science.</b>			1A.1. Access to hands on activities, scientific concepts and strategies.	1A.1. Increase the use of science lab resources in the classrooms to enhance science instruction.	1A.1. Principal Assistant Principal Resource Teacher Classroom Teachers	1A.1. Science Room Log Monitor lesson science instruction and lesson plans Observations Teacher Reflections	1A.1. Benchmark Test Mini Benchmark Test Classroom Assessments FCAT
<b>Science Goal #1A:</b>  <i>By June 2013 40% of students (72) at Waterbridge Elementary will score at a Level 3 and above on FCAT Science.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> <i>In June 2012 37% of (60) students at Waterbridge Elementary scored at a Level 3 and above on FCAT Science.</i>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> <i>By June 2013 40% of students (72) at Waterbridge Elementary will score at a Level 3 and above on FCAT Science.</i>					
			1A.2. Lack of parent involvement in science learning.	1A.2. Establish "Science Storybook Night" for students to engage in science stories and experiments.  Create a "Thinking Maps" workshop for parents to attend that will be cross-curricular.	1A.2. Principal Assistant Principal CRT Literacy Committee Family Learning Committee Math and Science Committee	1A.2. Parent Survey	1A.2. Results of Parent Survey to determine impact of event.
			1A.3 Lack of technology at home to conduct research	1A.3. Extend Media Center hours for parents and students to allow access to our Media Computer Lab.	1A.3. Principal Assistant Principal Media Specialist	1A.3. Parent Survey	1A.3. Results of Parent Survey to determine impact of event.
<b>1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science.</b>			1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.
<b>Science Goal #1B:</b>  NONE	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
			1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.



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

		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
<b>2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in science.</b>			2A.1. Students connecting science with real-world experiences	2A.1. Utilize an Interactive Garden for students to develop science skills with real-world applications.	2A.1. Principal Assistant Principal Resource Teacher AIMS Teacher Classroom Teachers	2A.1. Monitoring science instruction and lesson plans Observations Teacher Reflections	2A.1. Benchmark Test Mini Benchmark Test Classroom Assessments FCAT
<b>Science Goal #2A:</b>  <i>By June 2013, 20% of students (36) at Waterbridge Elementary will score at or above Level 4 or 5 on FCAT 2.0 Science.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> <i>In June 2012, 17% of students (28) at Waterbridge Elementary scored at or above Level 4 or 5 on FCAT 2.0 Science.</i>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> <i>By June 2013, 20% of students (36) at Waterbridge Elementary will score at or above Level 4 or 5 on FCAT 2.0 Science.</i>					
	2A.2. Capturing and engaging proficient students so they can continue to progress with the current success demonstrated on FCAT 2.0 Science.			2A.2. Refine the use of Science Journals with students to document the process of science learning.	2A.2. Principal Assistant Principal Resource Teacher AIMS Teacher Classroom Teachers	2A.2. Monitoring science instruction and lesson plans Observations Teacher Reflections	2A.2. Benchmark Test Mini Benchmark Test Classroom Assessments FCAT
			2A.3	2A.3	2A.3	2A.3	2A.3
<b>2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science.</b>			2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.
<b>Science Goal #2B:</b>  NONE	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	2B.2.			2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.
			2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.

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

*End of Elementary and Middle School Science Goals*

**Science Professional Development**

<b>Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity</b>						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Promoting Science in ELL (P-SELL)	Grade 5	Mariel Milano	5 <sup>th</sup> Grade Teachers	Ongoing August-May	Classroom Walkthroughs by P-SELL Coordinator and Administrators	Principal Assistant Principal Resource Teacher

**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
Hands-on Instruction	Science Resource Materials	Internal/PTA	\$100
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
NONE			
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
NONE			
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Make Real-world science applications	Interactive Garden	NONE	NONE

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

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

Parent Involvement	Science Storybook Materials	Title 1	\$100
			<b>Subtotal: \$100</b>
			<b>Total: \$200</b>

*End of Science Goals*

**Writing Goals**

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

Writing Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>1A. FCAT: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing.</b>			1A.1. Increase the number of students meeting writing proficiency.	1A.1. Provide teachers with professional development of Write from the Beginning and Thinking Maps.	1A.1. Principal Assistant Principal CRT	1A.1. Guided discussions in PLC's PLC Weekly Notes Observations	1A.1. Teacher Reflections Grade-level Monthly Writing Prompts FCAT
<b>Writing Goal #1A:</b>  <i>By June 2013 86% of students (141) at Waterbridge Elementary will score at a Level 4 and above on FCAT 2.0 Writing.</i>	<b>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</b>  <i>In June 2012 86% of students (152) at Waterbridge Elementary scored at a Level 3 and above on FCAT 2.0 Writing.</i>	<b>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</b>  <i>By June 2013 86% of students (141) at Waterbridge Elementary will score at a Level 4 and above on FCAT 2.0 Writing.</i>					
			1A.2. Students writing for authentic purposes.	1A.2. Develop activities across grade levels for student (i.e. Learning Buddies Pen Pals)  Provide students with a purpose to write (i.e. Poetry Tree) and display student writing.  Families will participate in a themed author's night.	1A.2. Principal Assistant Principal CRT CT Classroom Teachers	1A.2. Teachers provide feedback about learning buddies	1A.2. Teacher Reflections
			1A.3. 34% of the population is made up of ELL students.  These students struggle with syntax	1A.3. Utilize the PLC on Thinking Maps for ELL students.  Focus on using the OCPS	1A.3. Principal Assistant Principal Reading/ Instructional Coach CRT	1A.3. Guided discussions in PLC's Observations of Thinking Maps Software	1A.3. Teacher Reflections Grade-level Monthly Writing Prompts FCAT

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

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

			and need language support	curriculum to ensure that all standards are taught.  Reinforce technology-based programs to support previously taught skills.	CT Classroom Teachers LITERACY LEADERSHIP TEAM		
<b>1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing.</b>			1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.
Writing Goal #1B:  NONE	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
			1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.
			1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.

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

**Writing Professional Development**

<b>Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity</b>						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Write from the Beginning	K-5	Cyndy Hetrick	Grade Level PLC's	August – May	Observations Teacher Reflections Writing Samples	Principal Assistant Principal CRT Resource Teacher CT
Thinking Maps	K-5	Cyndy Hetrick	Grade Level PLC's	August – May	Observations Teacher Reflections Samples of student work	Principal Assistant Principal CRT Resource Teacher CT

**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
Instruction/Intervention	Thinking Maps for ELL	NONE	NONE
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
<b>NONE</b>			
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Writing Instruction	Write from the Beginning	NONE	NONE
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Other			

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

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

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
NONE			
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
			<b>Total: NONE</b>

*End of Writing Goals*

**Attendance Goal(s)**

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

Attendance Goal(s)			Problem-solving Process to Increase Attendance				
Based on the analysis of attendance data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
<b>I. Attendance</b>			1.1. Students with excessive absences and tardies.	1.1. Refine parent communication log in the student's WAVES Binder.  Social worker will be available to assist parents in getting their child to school on time.  Perfect Attendance Awards given quarterly.  Monthly, principal will recognize students who have perfect attendance and no tardies through a prize drawing.	1.1. Assistant Principal Guidance Counselor	1.1. Monitor attendance records	1.1. Attendance records
<b>Attendance Goal #1:</b>  <i>By June 2012, Waterbridge Elementary is expected to have a 95% average attendance rate.</i>	<u>2012 Current Attendance Rate:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Attendance Rate:*</u>					
	<i>In June 2012, Waterbridge Elementary had a 92% average attendance rate.</i>	<i>By June 2012, Waterbridge Elementary is expected to have a 95% average attendance rate.</i>					
	<u>2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)</u>	<u>2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)</u>					
	<i>In June 2012, Waterbridge Elementary had 363 students with excessive absences.</i>	<i>By June 2012, Waterbridge Elementary is expected that 327 or less will have excessive absences.</i>					
	<u>2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive</u>	<u>2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive</u>					

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

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

	Tardies (10 or more)	Tardies (10 or more)					
	<i>In June 2012, Waterbridge Elementary had 244 students with excessive tardies.</i>	<i>By June 2012, Waterbridge Elementary is expected that 211 or less will have excessive tardies.</i>					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

**Attendance Professional Development**

<b>Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity</b>						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
School-wide Procedures Training	K-5	Assistant Principal	All instructional staff	Pre-planning	Daily Attendance Reporting	Registrar Social Worker Guidance Counselor

**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
NONE			
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
NONE			
			<b>Subtotal:</b>

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

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

Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
School-wide Procedures Training	School-wide Procedures Training	NONE	NONE
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
NONE			
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
			<b>Total: NONE</b>

*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
<b>1. Suspension</b>			1.1. Lack of school-wide expectations and procedures for consistent behavior modification.	1.1. Reinforce school expectations and norms to create a safe and engaging learning environment.  Reinforce C.H.A.M.P.S., Conscious Discipline, and Peer Mediation.  Reinforce Learning for Life Character Education Program.  Introduce school-wide positive behavior recognition system.  Introduce staff to Response to Intervention-Behavior resources and practices.	1.1. Principal Assistant Principal Guidance Counselor Guidance Committee Classroom Teachers	1.1. Observations Guidance Committee Notes	1.1. Observation Notes  Review of Discipline Records
<b>Suspension Goal #1:</b> <i>By June 2012, Waterbridge Elementary will reduce the number of students receiving Out-of-School suspensions and the number of offenses resulting in Out-of-School Suspensions.</i>	2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions					
	<i>In June 2012, there were 6 offenses that resulted in In-School Suspension.</i>	<i>By June 2013, it is expected that there will be 6 or less offenses that result in In-School Suspension.</i>					
	2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School					
	<i>In June 2012, there were 4 students that received In-School Suspension.</i>	<i>By June 2013 it is expected that 4 students or less will receive In-School Suspension.</i>					
	2012 Total Number of Out-of-	2013 Expected Number of					

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



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

	<b>School Suspensions</b>	<b>Out-of-School Suspensions</b>					
	<i>In June 2012, there were 27 offenses that resulted in Out-of-School Suspension.</i>	<i>By June 2013 it is expected that there will be 20 or less offenses that result in Out-of-School Suspension.</i>					
	<b>2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School</b>	<b>2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School</b>					
	<i>In June 2012, there were 15 students that received Out-of-School Suspension.</i>	<i>By June 2013, it is expected that 10 students or less will receive Out-of-School Suspension.</i>					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

**Suspension Professional Development**

<b>Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity</b>						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring

**Suspension Budget (Insert rows as needed)**

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
NONE			
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount

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

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

NONE			
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
NONE			
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
NONE			
<b>Subtotal:</b>			
<b>Total: NONE</b>			

*End of Suspension Goals*

**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
<b>1. Parent Involvement</b>			1.1. Lack of parental involvement	1.1. Parent Communications- School Messenger Quarterly Newsletters School Website Classroom Websites/Blogs Marquee Event Flyers WAVES Binder	1.1. Principal Assistant Principal CRT CT TSR Classroom Teachers	1.1. Review parent surveys	1.1. Parent survey
<b>Parent Involvement Goal #1:</b>	<b>2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:*</b>	<b>2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:*</b>					
<i>By June 2013, 75% of parents at Waterbridge Elementary will have participated in at least two activities during the school year.</i>	<i>In June 2012, 72% of parents at Waterbridge Elementary were involved in at least two activities offered during the school year.</i>	<i>By June 2013, 75% of parents at Waterbridge Elementary will have participated in at least two activities during the school year.</i>					

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

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

		1.2. Language/cultural barriers	1.2. Communications and workshops provided with Spanish translation as needed.	1.2. CT Bilingual Teachers	1.2. Review event sign-in sheets and evaluation sheets	1.2. Event sign-in sheets Event evaluation sheets
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

**Parent Involvement Professional Development**

<b>Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity</b>						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
NONE						

**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
NONE			
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
NONE			
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
NONE			

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

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

				<b>Subtotal:</b>
Other				
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount	
NONE				
				<b>Subtotal:</b>
				<b>Total: NONE</b>

*End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)*

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

STEM 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
<b>STEM Goal #1:</b>  At Waterbridge Elementary, 25% of classroom teachers will be participating in problem-based learning that is used up to four times per year in 1-4 subjects(s) to provide learning experiences that have high potential for student engagement ( e.g. using technology tools to solve problems, participating in issues- or community-based activities, or completing performance based assessments that address real-world problems).	1.1. Lack of knowledge with regards to district-developed design lessons for core content areas	1.1. Teachers attend training to have class participation in Interdisciplinary Quarterly Science/Mathematics Based Design Challenges	1.1. Principal Assistant Principal Resource Teacher Classroom Teachers	1.1. Lesson Plans Observations PLC Weekly Notes	1.1. Benchmark Test Mini Benchmark Test Classroom Assessments FCAT
	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	Grade	PD Facilitator	PD Participants	Target Dates (e.g. , Early	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for

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

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

and/or PLC Focus	Level/Subject	and/or PLC Leader	(e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)		Monitoring
STEM: Problem-Based Learning	K-5	Jessica Steelman Mariel Milano	Grade Level PLC's	August – May	Observations Samples of student work	Principal Assistant Principal Resource Teacher CT

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

**STEM Budget** (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Training on STEM Activities	STEM Training	NONE	NONE
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
NONE			
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
NONE			
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
			<b>Total: NONE</b>

*End of STEM Goal(s)*

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

**Additional Goal(s)**

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

<b>Additional Goal(s)</b>			<b>Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</b>				
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
<b>1. Additional Goal</b>			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
<b>Additional Goal #1:</b>	<u>2012 Current Level :*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level :*</u>	Students are unable to attend extracurricular activities due to transportation or cost.	Afterschool club facilitators will provide interested families with private transportation information.  Strings instructor will provide families with cost effective options for instrument rental/purchase.	Assistant Principal Afterschool Club Facilitators Strings Instructor	Enrollment numbers and percentages for clubs	Club/class attendance Private transportation records
<i>Waterbridge Elementary will provide opportunities in the fine arts in order to support the district's goal of enrollment in Fine Arts programs.</i>	<i>At the end of the 2011-2012 school year, 30 students were involved with Waterbridge Elementary's chorus.</i>	<i>By the end of the 2012-2013 school year, there will be a 50% increase in the number of students involved (45 students) with Waterbridge Elementary's chorus.</i>					
	<u>2012 Current Level :*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level :*</u>					
	<i>At the end of the 2011-2012 school year, 27 students were involved with Waterbridge Elementary's strings class.</i>	<i>By the end of the 2012-2013 school year, there will be a 50% increase in the number of students involved with Waterbridge Elementary's strings class (41 students).</i>					
<b>2. Additional Goal</b>			2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
<b>Additional Goal #2:</b>	<u>2012 Current Level :*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level :*</u>	Students are unaware of post-secondary options.	Staff promotes a college going culture as designated by Destination College.	Principal Assistant Principal CRT CT Resource Teacher Classroom Teachers	Teacher Reflections Review survey results for feedback	Staff Survey
<i>Waterbridge Elementary will provide opportunities and activities to increase college and career awareness with students.</i>		Maintain high number of student awareness.					
			2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
			Students lacking access to	JA in a Day- Volunteers from	Principal	Teacher Reflections	Staff Survey

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

		real-world experiences regarding economic life skills.	EPCOT will spend a day teaching 6 JA lessons to all K-5 students.	Assistant Principal CRT CT Resource Teacher Classroom Teachers	Review survey results for feedback		
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	
<b>3. Additional Goal</b>		3.1.	3.1.	3.1.	3.1.	3.1.	
<b>Additional Goal #3:</b>  <i>Waterbridge Elementary will maintain proportionate classification in ESE programs.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level :*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level :*</u>	Teacher beliefs about student learning and instructional strategies to meet high expectations.	Introduce the Multi-Tier Support System to instructional staff through district staff development.	Principal Assistant Principal CRT CT Resource Teacher Staffing Specialist Classroom Teachers	Teacher Reflections Review survey results for feedback	Staff Survey SAPSI
		<i>Waterbridge Elementary will maintain proportionate classification in ESE programs.</i>					
			3.2.	3.2.	3.2.	3.2.	3.2.
			3.3.	3.3.	3.3.	3.3.	

**Additional Goals Professional Development**

<b>Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity</b>						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
College and Career Awareness	K-5	Gregg Baron	School-wide	Ongoing Sept. - May	Observations Teacher Reflections	Principal Assistant Principal CRT CT Resource Teacher Reading/ Instructional Coach
MTSS/RtI	K-5	Gregg Baron Susan Patterson	All grade level PLC's	Ongoing Sept. - May	Observations Teacher Reflections Review PLC Meeting Notes	Principal Assistant Principal CRT CT

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



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

						Resource Teacher Reading/ Instructional Coach
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

**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
NONE			
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
NONE			
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
NONE			
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
NONE			
			<b>Subtotal:</b>
			<b>Total: NONE</b>

*End of Additional Goal(s)*

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

**Final Budget** (Insert rows as needed)

Please provide the total budget from each section.	
<b>Reading Budget</b>	<b>Total: NONE</b>
<b>CELLA Budget</b>	<b>Total: NONE</b>
<b>Mathematics Budget</b>	<b>Total: \$7701.00</b>
<b>Science Budget</b>	<b>Total: \$200</b>
<b>Writing Budget</b>	<b>Total: NONE</b>
<b>Attendance Budget</b>	<b>Total: NONE</b>
<b>Suspension Budget</b>	<b>Total: NONE</b>
<b>Parent Involvement Budget</b>	<b>Total: NONE</b>
<b>STEM Budget</b>	<b>Total: NONE</b>
<b>Additional Goals</b>	<b>Total: NONE</b>
	<b>Grand Total: \$7,901.00</b>

**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

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

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

--	--	--

Are you reward school?  Yes  No

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

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

**School Advisory Council (SAC)**

*SAC Membership Compliance*

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

Yes  No

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

Describe the activities of the SAC for the upcoming school year.
Meet a minimum of 8 times a year to review school needs, school data, oversee the goals of the School Improvement Plan. Make recommendations for activities and programs to meet student needs and goals.

Describe the projected use of SAC funds.	Amount
Purchase and introduce iReady Math to diagnose instructional gaps, guide instructional focus, and provide progress monitoring.	\$3901.00