# FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

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

2012-2013

# 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

## PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

### School Information

| | |
|---|---|
| School Name: Windermere Elementary | District Name: Orange |
| Principal: Diana Greer | Superintendent: Dr. Barbara Jenkins |
| SAC Chair: Andrea Stoumbos/ Susan Ott | Date of School Board Approval: January 29, 2013 |

### Student Achievement Data and Reference Materials:

The following links will open in a separate browser window.
School Grades Trend Data (Use this data to complete Sections 1-4 of the reading and mathematics goals and Sections 1 and 2 of the writing and science goals.)
Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT)/Statewide Assessment Trend Data (Use this data to inform the problem-solving process when writing goals.)
High School Feedback Report
K-12 Comprehensive Research Based Reading Plan

### Administrators

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

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

| Position | Name | Degree(s)/ Certification(s) | Number of Years at Current School | Number of Years as an Administrator | Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/statewide assessment Achievement Levels, learning gains, lowest 25%), and AMO progress, along with the associated school year) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Principal | Diana Greer | Bachelor of Science Elementary Education<br>Master of Science Elementary Education<br>Educational Specialist Educational Leadership | 6 months | 3 | **2011-12 Windermere Elementary School-** earned "A" grade; 82% meeting high standards in Reading, 82 % meeting high standards in Math, 87% meeting high standards in Writing, 67% meeting high standards in Science, 72% made learning gains in Reading, 74% made learning gains in Math, 69% of students in lowest 25% made learning gains in Reading, 51% of students in lowest 25% made learning gains in Math.<br><br>**2010-11 Dillard Street Elementary School**- earned "B" grade; **82% of AYP standards met;** 81% meeting high standards in Reading, 82% meeting high standards in Math, 93% meeting high standards in writing, 59% meeting high standards in science, 69% made learning gains in reading, 61% made learning gains in math, 65% of students in the lowest 25% made leaning gains in reading, 49% of students in the lowest 25% made leaning gains in math.<br><br>**2009-10 Dillard Street Elementary School** -earned an "A" grade; **92% of AYP standards met**84% meeting high standards in Reading, 84% meeting high standards in Math, 86% meeting high standards in writing, 57% meeting high standards in science, 74% made learning gains in reading, 70% made learning gains in math, 58% of students in the lowest 25% made leaning gains in reading, 81% of students in the lowest 25% made leaning gains in math. |
| Assistant Principal | Thomas Tanko | Specialist Educational Leadership<br>Masters of Elementary Education<br>Bachelors of Business Administration | 7 years | 9 years | **2011-12 Windermere Elementary- earned "A" grade; 82% meeting high standards in Reading, 82 % meeting high standards in Math, 87% meeting high standards in Writing, 67% meeting high standards in Science, 72% made learning gains in Reading, 74% made learning gains in Math, 69% of students in lowest 25% made learning gains in Reading, 51% of students in lowest 25% made learning gains in Math.**<br><br>**2010-2011 Windermere Elementary School earned "A" grade; 100% of AYP criteria met; 93% of students in reading meeting high standards and 92% of students in math meeting high standards; 68% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in reading and 63% in math.**<br><br>**2009-2010 Windermere Elementary School earned "A" grade; 97% of AYP criteria met; 90% of students in reading meeting high standards and 92% of students in math meeting high standards; 55% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in reading and 78% in math.**<br><br>**2008-2009 Windermere Elementary School earned "A" grade; 100% of AYP criteria met; 93% of students in reading meeting high standards and 90% of students in math meeting high standards; 71% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in reading and 75% in math.**<br><br>**2007-2008 Windermere Elementary School earned "A" grade; 100% of AYP criteria met; 93% of students in reading meeting high standards and 90% of students in** |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | **math meeting high standards; 72% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in reading and 65% 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) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Elem. Ed. | Susan (Betsy) Shaw | Elementary Education<br>Early Childhood<br>ESOL endorsement | 5 years | Second year | **2011-12 Windermere Elementary-** earned "A" grade; 82% meeting high standards in Reading, 82 % meeting high standards in Math, 87% meeting high standards in Writing, 67% meeting high standards in Science, 72% made learning gains in Reading, 74% made learning gains in Math, 69% of students in lowest 25% made learning gains in Reading, 51% of students in lowest 25% made learning gains in Math.<br><br>**2010-2011 Windermere Elementary School** earned "A" grade; 100% of AYP criteria met; 93% of students in reading meeting high standards and 92% of students in math meeting high standards; 68% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in reading and 63% in math.<br><br>**2009-2010 Windermere Elementary School** earned "A" grade; 97% of AYP criteria met; 90% of students in reading meeting high standards and 92% of students in math meeting high standards; 55% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in reading and 78% in math.<br><br>**2008-2009 Windermere Elementary School** earned "A" grade; 100% of AYP criteria met; 93% of students in reading meeting high standards and 90% of students in math meeting high standards; 71% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in reading and 75% in math.<br><br>**2007-2008 Windermere Elementary School** earned "A" grade; 100% of AYP criteria met; 93% of students in reading meeting high standards and 90% of students in math meeting high standards; 72% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in reading and 65% 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.

| Description of Strategy | Person Responsible | Projected Completion Date |
|---|---|---|
| 1. Recruitment of HQ Teachers: Pre-qualification of instructional applicants: All instructional applicants are pre-qualified as Highly Qualified before they are called for an interview. | Diana Greer/ Tom Tanko | 8/22/12 |
| 2. Retention of HQ Teachers: All teachers participate and contribute to Professional Learning Communities (PLCs), focusing on student achievement and professional development. | Diana Greer/ Tom Tanko | 6/7/13 |
| 3. Identification of Teacher Leaders: Building capacity by supporting teaching and learning, providing leadership opportunities for classroom teachers via content area teams and vertical teaming. Teacher Leaders build capacity within the framework for the OCPS Instructional non-negotiable. | Diana Greer/ Tom Tanko | 6/7/13 |
| 4. Recruitment of HQ Teachers: Pre-qualification of instructional applicants: All instructional applicants are pre-qualified as Highly Qualified before they are called for an interview. | Diana Greer/ Tom Tanko | 8/22/12 |

### *Non-Highly Effective Instructors*

Provide the number of instructional staff and paraprofessionals that are teaching out-of-field and who received less than an effective rating (instructional staff only). *When using percentages, include the number of teachers the percentage represents (e.g., 70% [35]).

| Number of instructional staff and paraprofessionals that are teaching out-of-field and/or who received less than an effective rating (instructional staff only). | Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective |
|---|---|
| 17% (10) teaching out-of field due to ESOL<br><br>98% (57) teachers received an effective rating of 3.0 or higher. | • ESOL courses<br>• Continued training on Marzano's Evaluation model on iObservation<br>• Vertical PLC staff development using the Art and Science of Teaching |

## *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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 58 | 0 | 35% (20) | 36% (21) | 29% (17) | 31% (18) | 98% (57) | 5% (3) | 0 | 57% (33) |

## *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 |
|---|---|---|---|
| Amy Rohrbach | Zachary Frank | Both teach fifth grade | Smart Board training<br>Differentiated Instruction<br>Writing Training |
| Carla Setaram | Christa Bromhead<br>Jamie Johnson | Both teach third grade | Smart Board Training<br>Differentiated Instruction<br>Writing Training |
| Dawn LeFils | Shannon Reid | Both teach fourth grade | Smart Board Training<br>Differentiated Instruction<br>Writing Training |
| Madelyn Fitzpatrick | Alyssa Dillon | Both teach first grade | Smart Board Training<br>Differentiated Instruction<br>Writing Training |

## *Coordination and Integration*-Title I Schools Only

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

| |
|---|
| Title I, Part A |

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

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

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

| School-Based MTSS/RtI Team |
|---|
| Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.<br><br>Diana Greer, Principal; Tom Tanko, Assistant Principal; Barbara Gold, Instructional Support; Betsy Shaw, Curriculum Resource Teacher; Kitty Gonzalez, VE Teacher; Lila Siefker, Speech and Language Teacher; Trish Rivard, Gifted Teacher; Kayla Graham, Behavior Specialist; and Tavelyn Beckett, School Psychologist |
| 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?<br>The MTSS/RtI process at Windermere Elementary is a comprehensive program. All teachers are trained on the process at the beginning of the school year. All Tier 1 and Tier 2 documentation is required to be kept by the classroom teacher and revisited every month during data meetings with pre and post intervention data. Level 1documentation requires six weeks of consistent core implementation.<br><br>At the conclusion of the six week window, the MTSS/RtI team will convene to discuss the successes and continued challenges of the student as it pertains to the core. Six weeks later, any student who continues in the MTSS/RtI process will be subject to a Level 2 meeting in which the MTSS/RtI team will discuss the success and challenges of the student as it pertains to the interventions used in Tier 2. The team will determine, based on the student data, whether or not to proceed to Tier 3 or continue with interventions that were successful in Tier 2. After six weeks of Tier 3 interventions, the MTSS/RtI team will reconvene to determine whether or not the combination of MTSS/RtI interventions at Tier 1, Tier 2, and/or Tier 3 has garnered the adequate catch-up growth or if EPT is viable. |

| |
|---|
| Describe the role of the school-based MTSS leadership team in the development and implementation of the school improvement plan (SIP). Describe how the RtI problem-solving process is used in developing and implementing the SIP?<br>The MTSS/RtI team will monitor the effectiveness of the interventions outlined in the activities throughout the school improvement plan using teacher-created data, grade level assessments, benchmark assessments, SRI, DRA, and FAIR data. |
| MTSS Implementation |
| Describe the data source(s) and the data management system(s) used to summarize data at each tier for reading, mathematics, science, writing, and behavior.<br>All teachers are required to submit their Level 1 and/or Level 2 data prior to each MTSS/RtI meeting. All teachers will be trained on the usage of data tracking for Level 1 and Level 2 interventions. Between FAIR (3 times a year), OPM (every 20 days between FAIR), Edusoft Benchmark Assessments (2 times a year), SRI (3 times a year) and classroom assessment data (monthly), we should have enough standardized assessment tools to track the overall effectiveness of MTSS/RtI. |
| Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.<br>The MTSS/RtI Support team, consisting of Kitty Gonzalez, Lila Siefker, and Barbara Gold, will provide our teachers with training as to the appropriate steps for identification of students/strategies and documentation of appropriate interventions/data tracking. |
| Describe the plan to support MTSS.<br>Monthly MTSS/RtI meetings during planning time will be provided to support teachers in problem solving appropriate intervention and tracking students.<br>Paraprofessional support during intervention block will be provided to all grade level to support intervention pull out of students and progress monitoring. |

***Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)***

| School-Based Literacy Leadership Team |
|---|
| Identify the school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT).<br>Principal, Diana Greer; Assistant Principal, Tom Tanko; Curriculum Resource Teacher, Betsy Shaw; Instructional Support, Barbara Gold; Kindergarten Teacher, Amanda May; First Grade Teacher, Madelyn Fitzpatrick and Alyssa Dillon; Third Grade Teacher, Marysa Sobral and Carla Setaram; Fourth Grade teacher, Dawn LeFils; Fifth Grade Teacher, Amy Rohrbach; VE Teacher, Kitty Gonzalez; Literacy Lab Facilitator, James Nall and Gifted Teacher, Trish Rivard. |
| Describe how the school-based LLT functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions).<br>The school based LLT is a collaborative team which meets monthly to ensure that all teachers are involved in acquiring Students' proficiency of literacy skills. The school based LLT will also collaborate with the district Reading Leadership Team to support the reading related goals and objectives stated in this School Improvement Plan, the school professional development plan (including professional learning communities and lesson study), and reading initiatives throughout the school with the goal to increase student achievement in reading. |
| What will be the major initiatives of the LLT this year?<br><br>Implementation of Common Core Standards in K and 1st grades. The integration of writing response throughout all subject areas. Using the Florida Continuous Improvement Model, the LLT will work with teachers to analyze student data, plan focused instruction, monitor progress through state and school assessments, adjust instruction in response to data, and address reading benchmarks in all content areas. |

## *Public School Choice*

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

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

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

| |
|---|
| |

****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?

| |
|---|
| |

***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?

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

***Postsecondary Transition***

Note: Required for High School- Sec. 1008.37(4), F.S.
Describe strategies for improving student readiness for the public postsecondary level based on annual analysis of the High School Feedback Report.

## PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

## Reading Goals

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

| Reading Goals | | | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| **1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading.** | | | 1.1The need to increase the use of differentiated instruction to meet the needs of our diverse population. | 1.1Provide staff development and materials to increase and improve differentiated instructional strategies.<br><br>Provide and train personnel and parent volunteers to assist during intervention/enrichment | 1.1Curriculum Resource Teacher, Classroom teachers, Administrators | 1.1 Progress Monitoring, Collaboration during PLC meetings, Classroom Observations | 1.1 Benchmark Tests, FAIR, DRA, Houghton-Mifflin Assessments, AR, SRI, FCAT |
| Reading Goal #1A: By June 2013, 25% (113/453) of all students taking the | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| | 2012 FCAT results | By June, 2013, 25% | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| reading FCAT at Windermere School will score Level 3. | showed that 22% (99/443) 3rd, 4th & 5th grade students taking FCAT scored a Level 3. | (113/453) of students taking the reading FCAT will score a 3. | | block. | | | |
| | | | 1.2 Students lack a rich vocabulary foundation to meet rigorous reading standards. | 1.2.School wide implementation of intensive vocabulary instruction. | 1.2.Curriculum Resource Teacher, Classroom teacher, Administrators | 1.2.Progress Monitoring, Collaboration during PLC meetings, Classroom Observations | 1.2. Benchmark Tests, FAIR, DRA, Houghton-Mifflin Assessments, AR, SRI, FCAT |
| | | | 1.3. The need for a remedial program for students below grade level in reading. | 1.3. Use of Lexia and Reading Plus in the Literacy Lab. | 1.3.Curriculum Resource Teacher, Classroom Teachers, Literacy Lab Facilitator | 1.3. Progress Monitoring, Collaboration during PLC meetings, Classroom Observations | 1.3. Benchmark Tests, FAIR, DRA, Houghton-Mifflin Assessments, AR, SRI, FCAT, Reading Plus/Lexia reports. |
| **1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading.** | | | NA | 1B.1. | 1B.1. | 1B.1. | 1B.1. |
| Reading Goal #1B: *NA.* | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| | *NA* | *NA.* | | | | | |
| | | | 1B.2. | 1B.2. | 1B.2. | 1B.2. | 1B.2. |
| | | | 1B.3. | 1B.3. | 1B.3. | 1B.3. | 1B.3. |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |

<table>
<tr><td colspan="3">2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 in reading.</td><td>2.1 Students lack the mastery of upper level comprehension strategies required in various genre.</td><td>2.1. School wide effort to increase accessibility to a variety of genre for master of upper level comprehension strategies.<br><br>2.1 Students will participate regularly in the AR program.</td><td>2.1. Curriculum Resource Teacher, Classroom teachers, Administrators</td><td>2.1. Progress Monitoring, Collaboration during PLC meetings, Classroom Observations, Data meetings</td><td>2.1 Benchmark Tests, FAIR, DRA, Houghton-Mifflin Assessments, AR, SRI, FCAT, AR scores</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="3">Reading Goal #2A:<br><br>By June, 2013, 61% (276/453) of the students taking FCAT will score a level 4 & 5.</td><td>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</td><td>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</td><td rowspan="3"></td><td rowspan="3"></td><td rowspan="3"></td><td rowspan="3"></td></tr>
<tr><td>2012 FCAT results show that 58% (257/443) of the students taking FCAT scored Levels 4 & 5.</td><td>By June, 2013, 61% (276/453) of the students taking FCAT will score a level 4 & 5.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2"></td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2" rowspan="2">2.2.The need to increase the use of differentiated instruction to meet the needs of our higher achieving students.</td><td>2.2.Provide staff development and materials to increase and improve differentiated instructional strategies.<br><br>2.2 Provide will be provided supplemental materials to support the enrichment.</td><td>2.2.Curriculum Resource Teacher, Classroom teachers, Administrators</td><td>2.2. Progress Monitoring, Collaboration during PLC meetings, Classroom Observations</td><td>2.2 Benchmark Tests, FAIR, DRA, Houghton-Mifflin Assessments, AR, SRI, FCAT</td><td>2A.2.</td></tr>
<tr><td>2A.3.</td><td>2A.3.</td><td>2A.3.</td><td>2A.3.</td><td>2A.3.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in reading.</td><td>NA</td><td>2B.1.</td><td>2B.1.</td><td>2B.1.</td><td>2B.1.</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="3">Reading Goal #2B:<br><br>NA</td><td>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</td><td>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</td><td rowspan="3"></td><td rowspan="3"></td><td rowspan="3"></td><td rowspan="3"></td></tr>
<tr><td>NA</td><td>NA</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2"></td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2"></td><td>2B.2.</td><td>2B.2.</td><td>2B.2.</td><td>2B.2.</td><td>2B.2.</td></tr>
</table>

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | 2B.3. | 2B.3. | 2B.3. | 2B.3. | 2B.3. |

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **3A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.** | | | 3.1. The need to increase the use of differentiated instruction to meet the needs of our diverse population. | 3.1. Identify and purchase supplemental Reading and Language Arts materials and resources.<br><br>3.2 Provide opportunities for teachers to observe other classroom teachers implementing DI effectively.<br><br>3.2 Provide staff development on Marzano on student engagement to give teachers effective strategies on how to reach diverse learners. | 3.1. Curriculum Resource Teacher, Classroom teachers, Administrators | 3.1. Progress Monitoring, Collaboration during PLC meetings, Classroom Observations, Data Meetings | 3.1. Benchmark Tests, FAIR, DRA, Houghton-Mifflin Assessments, AR, SRI, FCAT |
| Reading Goal #3A:<br><br>By June, 2013, 76% (222/297) of the students taking the 2012-2013 FCAT will make learning gains. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br><br>2012 FCAT results show that 73% (199/273) of the 4th & 5th Grade students taking FCAT made learning gains. | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br><br>By June, 2013, 76% (226/297) of the students taking the 2012-2013 FCAT will make learning gains. | | | | | |
| | 3.2. The need for a remedial program for students below grade level in reading. | | 3.2. Use of Lexia and Reading Plus in the Literacy Lab and Florida Ready and supplemental materials in the classroom. | 3.2. Curriculum Resource Teacher, Classroom Teachers, Literacy Lab Facilitator | 3.2. Progress Monitoring, Collaboration during PLC meetings, Classroom Observations | 3A.2. Benchmark Tests, FAIR, DRA, Houghton-Mifflin Assessments, AR, SRI, FCAT, Reading Plus/Lexia reports | 3A.2. |
| | | | 3A.3. | 3A.3. | 3A.3. | 3A.3. | 3A.3. |
| **3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.** | | | 3B.1. | 3B.1. | 3B.1. | 3B.1. | 3B.1. |
| Reading Goal #3B: | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *Enter narrative for the goal in this box.* | *Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.* | *Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.* | | | | | |
| | | | 3B.2. | 3B.2. | 3B.2. | 3B.2. | 3B.2. |
| | | | 3B.3. | 3B.3. | 3B.3. | 3B.3. | 3B.3. |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| **4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.** | | | 4.1 The need for a remedial program for students below grade level in reading. | a. Use of Lexia and Reading Plus in the Literacy Lab and Florida Ready and supplemental materials in the classroom.<br><br>4.2 Use of trained personnel to assist during intervention/Enrichment block | 4.1. Curriculum Resource Teacher, Classroom Teachers, Literacy Lab Facilitator | 4.1. Progress Monitoring, Collaboration during PLC meetings, Classroom Observations | 4.1. Benchmark Tests, FAIR, DRA, Houghton-Mifflin Assessments, AR, SRI, FCAT, Reading Plus/Lexia reports |
| Reading Goal #4A:<br><br>By June, 2013, 76% (26/35) of the lowest 25% of students taking the 2012-2013 FCAT will make learning gains in reading. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br><br>2012 FCAT results show that 73% (25/35) of the lowest 25% of students taking FCAT made learning gains in reading. | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br><br>By June, 2013, 76% (26/35) of the lowest 25% of students taking the 2012-2013 FCAT will make learning gains in reading. | | | | | |
| | | | 4A.2. | 4A.2. | 4A.2. | 4A.2. | 4A.2. |
| | | | 4A.3. | 4A.3. | 4A.3. | 4A.3. | 4A.3. |

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

| Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years | | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 | 2013-2014 | 2014-2015 | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **5A. In six years school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.** | **Baseline data 2010-2011** 80% | 82% | 83% | 85% | 87% | 88% | 90% |
| Reading Goal #5A: By 2016-17 the reading gap between white students achieving reading proficiency | | | | | | | |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups: | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | |
| **5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity** (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in reading.** | | Teachers have difficulty effectively differentiating instruction to meet the needs of all students | Provide staff development on differentiating instruction and 21st century literacy skills.<br><br>Provide staff development on Marzano on student engagement to give teachers effective strategies on how to reach diverse learners.<br><br>Teachers will have the opportunity to observe classroom teachers effectively implementing DI strategies. | Principal<br><br>Assistant Principal<br><br>CRT | Classroom Observations<br><br>PLC meeting notes<br><br>Data Meetings | FCAT<br><br>Benchmark<br><br>Classroom assessments | |
| Reading Goal #5B:<br>By June 2013 ethnicities in the 3-5 grades at Windermere Elementary will score at the following proficient levels<br>White 88%<br>Black 53%<br>Hispanic 76%<br>Asian 83% | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br>White 87%<br>Black 40%<br>Hispanic 78%<br>Asian 93% | | | | | | |
| | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br>White 88%<br>Black 53%<br>Hispanic 76%<br>Asian 83% | | | | | | |
| The subgroup American Indian has fewer than 10 students.<br>on the 2013 FCAT Reading subtest.<br>Reading Goal #5B: | | The numbers of program opportunities are inadequate to meet the student's diverse needs. | Using intervention core program in place of the designated core program. | Principal<br><br>Assistant Principal | Ongoing Progress Monitor | FCAT<br>Benchmark | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| By June 2013 ethnicities in the 3-5 grades at Windermere Elementary will score at the following proficient levels<br>White 88%<br>Black 53%<br>Hispanic 76%<br>Asian 83%<br><br>The subgroup American Indian has fewer than 10 students.<br>on the 2013 FCAT Reading subtest. | | | | | | |
| | | 5B.3. | 5B.3. | 5B.3. | 5B.3. | 5B.3. |

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading.** | | | Teachers have difficulty effectively differentiating instruction to meet the needs of all students | Provide staff development on differentiating instruction and 21st century literacy skills.<br><br>Provide staff development on Marzano on student engagement to give teachers effective strategies on how to reach diverse learners.<br><br>Teachers will have the opportunity to observe classroom teachers who effectively implement DI | Principal<br><br>Assistant Principal<br><br>CRT | Classroom Observations<br><br>PLC meeting notes<br><br>Data Meetings | FCAT<br><br>Pre/Post staff development assessment on knowledge of strategies |
| Reading Goal #5C:<br><br>By June 2013, 60% of ELL students taking the reading FCAT at Windermere Elementary will score proficient/at grade level. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| | In June 2012, 77% of ELL students taking the reading FCAT scored proficient/at grade level. | By June 2013, 60% of ELL students taking the reading FCAT will score proficient/at grade level. | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | . | | | strategies. | | | |
| | | | Teachers have difficulty effectively using ELL strategies to support second language learners | Provide resources and support to use during instruction.<br><br>Staff development on thinking maps and visual organizer. | CRT<br><br>CT<br><br>Assistant Principal | Classroom Observations<br><br>Monitor meetings with CT every marking period<br><br>PLC notes | FCAT |
| | | | Limited instructional staff available for after-school tutoring through title III funds | Provide incentives for teachers who teach after-school tutoring.<br><br>Provide curriculum and materials for easy implementation of tutoring. | Assistant Principal | Increase in the amount of teachers who sign up to teach after-school tutoring. | Increase the number of students who can participate in tutoring from 3-5 to include 2nd grade. |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| **5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading.** | | | The numbers of program opportunities are inadequate to meet the student's diverse needs. | Using intervention block with additional resources to meet the SWD students.<br><br>Additional strategies and modifications by VE teacher will be provided. | Principal<br><br>Assistant Principal<br><br>VE Teacher, Classroom Teacher | Classroom assessment, Edusoft, FAIR, SRI, on-going progress monitor. | FCAT |
| Reading Goal #5D:<br>By June 2013, 51% (15/30) of SWD taking the reading FCAT at Windermere Elementary will meet standards.<br><br>On the 2012 reading FCAT, the SWD subgroup made satisfactory progress. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| | In June 2012, 50% (14/30) of SWD taking the reading FCAT scored below grade level. | By June 2013, 51% (15/30) of SWD taking the reading FCAT will score grade level. | | | | | |
| | | | Teachers using the appropriate MTSS/RtI tier interventions to meet the needs of all students | Staff development by MTSS/ RtI team on effective interventions and | Principal<br><br>Assistant Principal | Monthly MTSS/RtI grade level meetings with MTSS/RtI team members | Progress monitoring through classroom assessments, FAIR, Edusoft, |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | accommodations<br><br>Decrease the disproportionate number of male students in ESE (ESE 86% male vs. 52% male total school population) by targeting academically at risk males and provide early intervention through differentiated instruction. | School Psychologist<br><br>MTSS/RtI Team | Monthly PLC meeting to discuss students and intervention strategies | SRI |
| | | 5D.3. | 5D.3. | 5D.3. | 5D.3. | 5D.3. |

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading.** | | | Students in the ED subgroup have environmental factors that cause them to have irregular attendance which impedes their academics | Monitor attendance on a bi-weekly basis.<br><br>Conduct child study meetings for students with more than 10 unexcused absences.<br><br>Provide media passes for computer time as incentives for students who arrive to school early.<br><br>Provide perfect attendance ribbons for students with no absences or tardies. | Registrar, Assistant Principal | Bi-weekly child study meetings. | Monthly attendance reports generated from SMS. |
| Reading Goal #5E:<br><br>By June 2013, 63% of Economically Disadvantaged students taking the reading FCAT at Windermere Elementary will meet standards. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br><br>In June 2012, 54% of Economically Disadvantaged students taking the reading FCAT met standards. | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br><br>By June 2013, 63% of Economically Disadvantaged students taking the reading FCAT at Windermere Elementary will meet standards. | | | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Teachers effectively differentiating instruction to meet the needs of all students | Provide staff development on differentiating instruction and 21st century literacy skills<br><br>Provide staff development on Marzano on student engagement to reach diverse learners.<br><br>Teachers will have the opportunity to observe classroom teachers effectively implementing DI strategies. | Principal<br><br>Assistant Principal<br><br>CRT | Classroom Observations<br><br>PLC meeting notes<br><br>Data Meetings | FCAT<br><br>Pre/Post staff development assessment on knowledge of strategies |
| | | 5E.3. | 5E.3. | 5E.3. | 5E.3. | 5E.3. |

## Reading 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Differentiated Instruction | K-5 | Administration/Resource Teachers | School-wide | Wednesday staff development throughout the year. | PLC notes | Administration and Resource Teachers |
| MTSS/RtI Process | K-5 | MTSS/RtI Leadership Team | School-wide | Wednesday staff development throughout the year. | MTSS/RtI Leadership Team | MTSS/RtI Leadership Team |
| Marzano Effective Teaching Strategies | K-5 | Administration/Resource Teachers | School-wide | Wednesday staff development throughout the year. | Administration and School Teams | Administration |
| Common Core | K-2 | Administration/Resource Teachers/ Lead Teachers | School-wide | Wednesday Staff development and Planning meetings | Instructional Calendars, Lesson Plan Documentation, PLC notes | Administration and Resource Teacher |

## **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 |
| Florida Ready | Test preparation | General Fund | 8,000 |
| Sadler | Supplemental Consumable Materials | General Fund | 2,000 |
| Houghton Mifflin | Supplemental Consumable Materials | General Fund | 2,000 |
| | | | |
| | | | **Subtotal:10,000** |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| Reading Plus | Computer adapted reading program | General Fund | $1,000 |
| Lexia | Computer adapted reading program | General Fund | $1,000 |
| Accelerated Reading | Computer incentive program | PTA | $3,000 |
| | | | **Subtotal: 5,000** |
| Professional Development | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| Common Core | Written materials, resource books, copies | General Fund | $4,000 |
| RtI Training | Professional development will focus on progress monitoring and graphing. | NA | NA |
| | | | **Subtotal:4,000** |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| | | | **Subtotal:** |
| | | | **Total:$ 19,000** |

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

## Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

| CELLA Goals | | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Language Acquisition | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students. | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| **1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking.** | | Teachers have difficulty effectively using ELL strategies to support second language learners | Provide ELL resources and support to use during instruction.<br><br>Provide access to computer adaptive programs.<br><br>Staff development on thinking maps and visual organizers. | CRT<br><br>CT<br><br>Administration | Classroom Observations<br><br>Monitor meetings with CT every marking period<br><br>PLC notes<br><br>Lesson plan documentation | FCAT<br>Houghton Mifflin reading assessments, DRA, SRI and Benchmark |
| CELLA Goal #1:<br>By June 2013 43% (5) of students in grades 3-5 will score proficient on Listening/Speaking portion of CELLA. | 2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking:<br>In 2012 40% (4) of students in grades 3-5 scored proficient on the Listening/Speaking portion of CELLA. | | | | | |
| | | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. |
| | | 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 |
| **2. Students scoring proficient in reading.** | | Teachers have difficulty effectively differentiating instruction to meet the needs of all students | Provide staff development on differentiating instruction and 21st century literacy skills<br><br>Provide trained personnel to assist during intervention block to meet the needs of all learners. | Principal<br><br>Assistant Principal<br><br>CRT | Classroom Observations<br><br>PLC meeting notes<br><br>Data Meetings<br><br>Lesson Plan documentation of ELL strategies | FCAT<br><br>Pre/Post staff development assessment on knowledge of strategies |
| CELLA Goal #2:<br>In 2013 33% (4) of students in grades 3-5 scored proficient on the reading portion of CELLA. | 2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading:<br>In 2012 30% (3) of students in grades 3-5 scored proficient on the reading portion of CELLA. | | | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Teachers have the opportunity to o observe classroom teachers who effectively implement DI strategies. | | | |
| | | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. |
| | | 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 |
| **3. Students scoring proficient in writing.** | | 2.1 Students' lack prior knowledge (non-mastery) of the writing process. | School-wide writing training in Write From the Beginning and Beyond.<br><br>The writing training addresses specific writing strategies and skills teachers need to teach and students need to learn in writing. | CRT<br><br>Fourth Grade Writing Teachers | Teachers will provide monthly writing prompts.<br><br>Teachers will assess writing skills and strategies on a weekly basis. | Write from the Beginning Writing Rubric<br><br>Write Score |
| CELLA Goal #3:<br><br>In 2012 23% (3) of students in grades 3-5 scored proficient on the writing portion of CELLA. | 2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing :<br>In 2012 20% (2) of students in grades 3-5 scored proficient on the writing portion of CELLA.. | | | | | |
| | 2.2 Students' ability to organize information on another language | 2.2. Provide thinking map training to all teachers.<br><br>Classroom teachers incorporate visual organizers to help students organize their thinking. | 2.2. Lead teacher thinking map trainer<br><br>CRT | 2.2. Teachers will provide monthly writing prompts that incorporate visual organizers. | 2.2. Write From the Beginning Writing Rubric | 2.2. |
| | | 2.3. | 2.3. | 2.3. | 2.3. | 2.3. |

## 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 |
| NA | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | **Subtotal:** |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | **Subtotal:** |
| Professional Development | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | **Subtotal:** |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| | | | **Subtotal:** |
| | | | **Total:$0.00** |

*End of CELLA Goals*

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

## Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

| Elementary Mathematics Goals | | | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| **1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics.** | | | 1.1 The need to increase the use of differentiated instruction in math to meet the needs of our diverse population. | 1.1 Provide staff development and materials to increase and improve differentiated instructional strategies in math.<br>1.1 Teachers will have the opportunity to observe classroom teachers effectively implement DI strategies. | 1.1. Curriculum Resource Teacher, Classroom teachers, Administrators | 1.1. Progress Monitoring, Collaboration during PLC meetings, Classroom Observations | 1.1. Benchmark Tests, Teacher Assessments, SAT, FCAT , Moby Math reports, envision math assessments |
| Mathematics Goal #1A:<br>By June, 2013, 31% of (140/453) students taking the FCAT will score a level 3 in math. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br>2012 FCAT results showed that 28% (123/443) of all students taking the FCAT scored a level 3 in math. | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br>By June, 2013, 31% of (140/453) students taking the FCAT will score a level 3 in math. | | | | | |
| | 1.2. The need for remediation for students below grade level. | | 1.2. Provide staff development and materials to increase and improve remedial instructional strategies in math, use of math lab | 1.2. Curriculum Resource Teacher, Classroom teachers, Administrators, lab facilitator | 1.2. Progress Monitoring, Collaboration during PLC meetings, Classroom Observations | 1.2. Benchmark Tests, Teacher Assessments, SAT, FCAT, Moby math reports, envision math assessments | 1A.2. |
| | | | 1A.3. | 1A.3. | 1A.3. | 1A.3. | 1A.3. |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.** | | | 1B.1. | 1B.1. | 1B.1. | 1B.1. | 1B.1. |
| Mathematics Goal #1B:<br><br>*NA* | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br>*NA* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br>*NA* | | | | | |
| | | | 1B.2. | 1B.2. | 1B.2. | 1B.2. | 1B.2. |
| | | | 1B.3. | 1B.3. | 1B.3. | 1B.3. | 1B.3. |

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in mathematics.** | | | 2.1. The need to increase the use of differentiated instruction to meet the needs of the advanced learners.<br><br>Provide a mentoring program through feeder high schools developed to improve critical thinking and problem solving skills. | 2.1. Provide staff development and materials to increase and improve instruction to meet the needs of the advanced learners. | 2.1. Curriculum Resource Teacher, Classroom teachers, Administrators | 2.1. Progress Monitoring, Collaboration during PLC meetings, Classroom Observations, Data meetings | 2.1. Benchmark Tests, Teacher Assessments, SAT, FCAT, Moby math reports, envision math assessments |
| Mathematics Goal #2A:<br><br>By June, 2013, 56% (253/453) Of the students taking math FCAT will score a level 4 & 5. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br>2012 FCAT results showed that 53% (233/443) of all students taking the FCAT scored a level 3 in math. | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br>By June, 2013, 56% (253/453) Of the students taking math FCAT will score a level 4 & 5. | | | | | |
| | 2.2. Teachers have difficulty utilizing enrichment materials available from the core | | 2.2. Provide staff development to improve enrichment instruction utilizing the Envision math | 2.2. Curriculum Resource Teacher, Administrators | 2.2. Progress Monitoring, Collaboration during PLC meetings, Classroom Observations | 2.2. Benchmark Tests, Teacher Assessments, SAT, FCAT, envision math assessments | 2A.2. |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | curriculum and supplemental items | textbook and other supplemental materials. | | | | |
| | | 2A.3. | 2A.3. | 2A.3. | 2A.3. | 2A.3. |
| **2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.** | | 2B.1. | 2B.1. | 2B.1. | 2B.1. | 2B.1. |
| Mathematics Goal #2B:<br>*NA* | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br>*NA* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br>*NA* | | | | |
| | | 2B.2. | 2B.2. | 2B.2. | 2B.2. | 2B.2. |
| | | 2B.3. | 2B.3. | 2B.3. | 2B.3. | 2B.3. |

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **3A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.** | | | 3.1. The need to increase the use of differentiated instruction to meet the needs of diverse learners. | 3.1. Provide staff development and materials to increase and improve instruction to meet the needs of diverse learners.<br><br>Teachers will have the opportunity to observe classroom teachers effectively implementing DI strategies. | 3.1. Curriculum Resource Teacher, Classroom teachers, Administrators | 3.1. Progress Monitoring, Collaboration during PLC meetings, Classroom Observations | 3.1. Benchmark Tests, Teacher Assessments, SAT, FCAT, Moby Math reports, envision math assessments. |
| Mathematics Goal #3A:<br><br>By June, 2013, 78% (232/297) of students taking the Math FCAT will make learning gains. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br>2012 FCAT results showed that 75% (205/273) of students taking the FCAT made learning | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br>By June, 2013, 78% (232/297) of students taking the Math FCAT will make learning gains | | | | | |

<table>
<tr><td colspan="2" rowspan="2"></td><td>3.2. Students lack basic fluency in math to be successful on grade level.</td><td>3.2. Utilization of computer-based basic facts proficiency (Moby Math, Math Lab.<br><br>Teaches will be trained and utilized manipulatives and mental models.</td><td>3.2. Curriculum Resource Teacher, Classroom teachers, Administrators, Lab facilitator</td><td>3.2. Progress Monitoring, Collaboration during PLC meetings, Classroom Observations, lesson plans</td><td>3.2. Benchmark Tests, Teacher Assessments, SAT, FCAT, Moby Math reports, envision math assessments</td></tr>
<tr><td>3A.3.</td><td>3A.3.</td><td>3A.3.</td><td>3A.3.</td><td>3A.3.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3" rowspan="4">3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.<br><br>Mathematics Goal #3B:<br><br>NA</td><td>NA</td><td>3B.1.</td><td>3B.1.</td><td>3B.1.</td><td>3B.1.</td></tr>
<tr><td>2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br>NA</td><td>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br>NA</td><td colspan="3" rowspan="2"></td></tr>
<tr><td>3B.2.</td><td>3B.2.</td><td>3B.2.</td><td>3B.2.</td></tr>
<tr><td>3B.3.</td><td>3B.3.</td><td>3B.3.</td><td>3B.3.</td></tr>
</table>

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

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.** | | | There are limited opportunities for remedial program for students below grade level in math. | 4.1. Provide staff development and materials to increase and improve instruction to meet the needs of struggling learners.<br><br>Math lab and supplemental materials will be available for the students to utilize.<br><br>Trained personnel to assist during intervention block. | 4.1. Curriculum Resource Teacher, Classroom teachers, Administrators | 4.1. Curriculum Resource Teacher, Classroom teachers, Administrators | 4.1. Benchmark Tests, Teacher Assessments, SAT, FCAT, Moby Math reports, envision math assessments. |
| Mathematics Goal #4A:<br><br>By June, 2013, 57% (13/23) of the lowest 25% of students taking the FCAT will make learning gains in math. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br><br>In 2012, 54% (12/23) of the lowest 25% of students taking FCAT made learning gains in Math. | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br><br>By June, 2013, 57% (13/23) of the lowest 25% of students taking the FCAT will make learning gains in math. | | | | | |
| | | | Some students are not proficient in basic facts and lack the foundational skills needed to achieve higher level thinking. | 4.2. Utilize computer-based basic facts proficiency (Moby Math).<br><br>Teachers will be trained and utilized manipulatives and mental models. | 4.2. Curriculum Resource Teacher, Classroom teachers, Administrators | 4.2. Curriculum Resource Teacher, Classroom teachers, Administrators | 4.2. Benchmark Tests, Teacher Assessments, SAT, FCAT, Moby Math reports, envision math assessments |
| | | | 4A.3. | 4A.3. | 4A.3. | 4A.3. | 4A.3. |

<table>
<tr><td colspan="2">Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years</td><td>2011-2012</td><td>2012-2013</td><td>2013-2014</td><td>2014-2015</td><td>2015-2016</td><td>2016-2017</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">5A. In six years school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.</td><td>Baseline data 2010-2011<br><br><u>80%</u></td><td>82%</td><td>83%</td><td>85%</td><td>87%</td><td>88%</td><td>90%</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="8"><u>Mathematics Goal #5A:</u> By 2016-17 the mathematics gap between white students achieving proficiency and other ethnicities will decrease as follows: gap for black students will decrease from <u>42%</u>% to <u>22%</u>%; gap for Hispanic students will decrease from <u>11%</u>% to <u>6</u>%.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="8"></td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.</td><td>Teachers have difficulty effectively differentiating instruction to meet the needs of all students</td><td>Provide staff development on differentiating instruction and 21st century literacy skills<br><br>Teachers will have the opportunity to observe classroom teachers effectively implementing DI strategies.<br>.</td><td>Principal<br><br>Assistant Principal<br><br>CRT</td><td>Classroom Observations<br><br>PLC meeting notes<br><br>Data Meetings</td><td colspan="2">FCAT<br><br>Benchmark<br><br>Classroom assessments</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3"><u>Mathematics Goal #5B:</u><br>By June 2013 ethnicities in the 3-5 grades at Windermere Elementary will score at the following proficient levels<br>White 88%<br>Black 52%<br>Hispanic 78%<br>Asian 92%<br><br>American Indian subgroup has fewer</td><td><u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u><br>White 86%<br>Black 34%<br>Hispanic 78%<br>Asian 90%</td><td><u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u><br>White 88%<br>Black 52%<br>Hispanic 78%<br>Asian 92%</td><td colspan="5"></td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3"></td><td>5B.2.</td><td>5B.2.</td><td>5B.2.</td><td>5B.2.</td><td colspan="2">5B.2.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3"></td><td>5B.3.</td><td>5B.3.</td><td>5B.3.</td><td>5B.3.</td><td colspan="2">5B.3.</td></tr>
</table>

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| than 10 students on the 2013 FCAT math subtest. | | | | | | |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| **5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.**<br><br>Mathematics Goal #5C:<br><br>On the 2012 math FCAT, the ELL subgroup made satisfactory progress.<br><br>By June 2013, 70% (6/9) of ELL students taking the math FCAT at Windermere Elementary will meet standards. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br>In June 2013, 73% of ELL students taking the math FCAT met standards. | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br>By June 2013, 70% of ELL students taking the math FCAT will meet standards. | Teachers have difficulty effectively differentiating instruction to meet the needs of all students | Provide staff development on differentiating instruction and 21st century literacy skills | Principal<br><br>Assistant Principal<br><br>CRT | Classroom Observations<br><br>PLC meeting notes<br><br>Data Meetings | FCAT<br><br>Benchmark<br><br>Classroom assessments |
| | | | Teachers have difficulty effectively using ELL strategies to support second language students. | Provide staff development on differentiating instruction and 21st century math skills.<br><br>Provide staff development on Marzano on student engagement to give teachers effective strategies on how to reach diverse learners.<br><br>Teachers will have the opportunity to observe classroom teachers who effectively implement DI strategies. | Assistant Principal | Increase in the amount of teachers who sign up to teach after-school tutoring. | Increase the number of students who can participate in tutoring from 3-5 to include 2nd grade. |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Provide incentives for teachers who teach after-school tutoring<br><br>Provide curriculum and materials for easy implementation of tutoring | | | |
| | | 5C.3. | 5C.3. | 5C.3. | 5C.3. | 5C.3. |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| **5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.** | | Teachers limited opportunities utilizing the appropriate MTSS/RtI tier interventions to meet the needs of all students | Staff development by MTSS/RtI team on effective interventions and accommodations<br><br>MTSS/RtI meetings during teacher planning time<br><br>Decrease the disproportionate number of male students in ESE (ESE 86% male vs. 52% male total school population) by targeting academically at risk males and provide early intervention through differentiated instruction. | Principal<br><br>Assistant Principal<br><br>School Psychologist<br><br>MTSS/RtI Team | Monthly MTSS/RtI grade level meetings with MTSS/ RtI team members<br><br>Monthly PLC meeting to discuss students and intervention strategies | Progress monitoring through weekly mini-assessments, documentation of interventions through MTSS/RtI team. |
| Mathematics Goal #5D:<br>On the 2012 math FCAT, the SWD subgroup made satisfactory progress.<br><br>By June 2013, 51% of Students with Disabilities taking the math FCAT at Windermere Elementary will meet standards. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br>In June 2012, 47% of SWD taking the math FCAT at met standards. | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br>By June 2013, 51% of SWD taking the math FCAT will meet standards. | | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Teachers have difficulty effectively differentiating instruction to meet the needs of all students | Provide staff development on differentiating instruction and 21st century literacy skills for SWD. | Principal<br><br>Assistant Principal<br><br>CRT | Classroom Observations<br><br>PLC meeting notes<br><br>Data Meetings | FCAT<br>Benchmark Assessments<br>Classroom Assessments | 5D.2. |
| | | 5D.3. | 5D.3. | 5D.3. | 5D.3. | 5D.3. |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| **5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.** | | Students in the ED subgroup have environmental factors that cause them to have irregular attendance which impedes their academics | Monitor attendance on a bi-weekly basis.<br><br>Conduct child study meetings for students with more than 10 unexcused absences.<br><br>Provide media passes for computer time as incentives for students who arrive to school early.<br><br>Provide perfect attendance ribbons for students with no absences or tardies. | Registrar, Assistant Principal | Bi-weekly child study meetings. | Monthly attendance reports generated from SMS. |
| Mathematics Goal #5E:<br><br>By June 2013, 59% of Economically Disadvantaged students taking the math FCAT at Windermere Elementary will meet standards. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br><br>In June 2012, 50% of Economically Disadvantaged students taking the math FCAT met standards. | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br><br>By June 2013, 59% of Economically Disadvantaged students taking the math FCAT will meet standards. | | | | |
| | | 5E.2. | 5E.2. | 5E.2. | 5E.2. | 5E.2. |
| | | 5E.3. | 5E.3. | 5E.3. | 5E.3. | 5E.3. |

*End of Elementary School Mathematics Goals*

## Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

| Middle School Mathematics Goals | | | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| **1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics.** | | | 1A.1. | 1A.1. | 1A.1. | 1A.1. | 1A.1. |
| Mathematics Goal #1A: | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| *NA* | *NA* | *NA* | | | | | |
| | | | 1A.2. | 1A.2. | 1A.2. | 1A.2. | 1A.2. |
| | | | 1A.3. | 1A.3. | 1A.3. | 1A.3. | 1A.3. |
| **1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.** | | | 1B.1. | 1B.1. | 1B.1. | 1B.1. | 1B.1. |
| Mathematics Goal #1B: | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| *NA* | *NA* | *NA* | | | | | |
| | | | 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

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in mathematics.** | | | 2A.1. | 2A.1. | 2A.1. | 2A.1. | 2A.1. |
| Mathematics Goal #2A: | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| *NA* | *NA* | *NA* | | | | | |
| | | | 2A.2. | 2A.2. | 2A.2. | 2A.2. | 2A.2. |
| | | | 2A.3. | 2A.3. | 2A.3. | 2A.3. | 2A.3. |
| **2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.** | | | 2B.1. | 2B.1. | 2B.1. | 2B.1. | 2B.1. |
| Mathematics Goal #2B: | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| *NA* | *NA* | *NA* | | | | | |
| | | | 2B.2. | 2B.2. | 2B.2. | 2B.2. | 2B.2. |
| | | | 2B.3. | 2B.3. | 2B.3. | 2B.3. | 2B.3. |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| **3A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.** | | | 3A.1. | 3A.1. | 3A.1. | 3A.1. | 3A.1. |
| Mathematics Goal #3A: | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| *NA* | *NA* | *NA* | | | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | 3A.2. | 3A.2. | 3A.2. | 3A.2. | 3A.2. |
| | | 3A.3. | 3A.3. | 3A.3. | 3A.3. | 3A.3. |
| **3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.** | | 3B.1. | 3B.1. | 3B.1. | 3B.1. | 3B.1. |
| Mathematics Goal #3B: *NA.* | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | |
| | *NA* | *NA* | | | | |
| | | 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 |
| **4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.** | | 4A.1. | 4A.1. | 4A.1. | 4A.1. | 4A.1. |
| Mathematics Goal #4: *NA* | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | |
| | *NA* | *NA* | | | | |
| | | 4A.2. | 4A.2. | 4A.2. | 4A.2. | 4A.2. |
| | | 4A.3. | 4A.3. | 4A.3. | 4A.3. | 4A.3. |

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

| Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years | | | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 | 2013-2014 | 2014-2015 | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **5A. In six years, school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.** | **Baseline data 2010-2011** | | | | | | | |
| Mathematics Goal #5A:<br>*NA* | | | | | | | | |
| **Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:** | | | **Anticipated Barrier** | **Strategy** | **Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring** | **Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy** | **Evaluation Tool** | |
| **5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity** (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.** | | | 5B.1.<br>White:<br>Black:<br>Hispanic:<br>Asian:<br>American Indian: | 5B.1. | 5B.1. | 5B.1. | 5B.1. | |
| Mathematics Goal #5B:<br>*NA* | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br>*NA* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br>*NA* | | | | | | |
| | | | 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.** | | | 5C.1. | 5C.1. | 5C.1. | 5C.1. | 5C.1. |
| Mathematics Goal #5C:<br>*NA* | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br>*NA* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br>*NA* | | | | | |
| | | | 5C.2. | 5C.2. | 5C.2. | 5C.2. | 5C.2. |
| | | | 5C.3. | 5C.3. | 5C.3. | 5C.3. | 5C.3. |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| **5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.** | | | 5D.1. | 5D.1. | 5D.1. | 5D.1. | 5D.1. |
| Mathematics Goal #5D:<br>NA | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br>*NA* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br>*NA* | | | | | |
| | | | 5D.2. | 5D.2. | 5D.2. | 5D.2. | 5D.2. |
| | | | 5D.3. | 5D.3. | 5D.3. | 5D.3. | 5D.3. |

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

*End of Middle School Mathematics Goals*

## Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals

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

| **High School Mathematics Goals** | | | **Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement** | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| **1. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.** | | | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. |
| Mathematics Goal #1:<br>*NA* | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br>*NA* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br>*NA* | | | | | |
| | | | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. |
| | | | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **2. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.** | | | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. |
| Mathematics Goal #2:<br>*NA* | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br>*NA* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br>*NA* | | | | | |
| | | | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. |
| | | | 2.3. | 2.3. | 2.3. | 2.3. | 2.3. |

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **3. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.** | | | 3.1. | 3.1. | 3.1. | 3.1. | 3.1. |
| Mathematics Goal #3:<br>*NA* | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br>*NA* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br>*NA* | | | | | |
| | | | 3.2. | 3.2. | 3.2. | 3.2. | 3.2. |
| | | | 3.3. | 3.3. | 3.3. | 3.3. | 3.3. |

*End of Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals*

## Algebra 1 End-of-Course (EOC) Goals *(this section needs to be completed by all schools that have students taking the Algebra I EOC)*

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

| Algebra 1 EOC Goals | | | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| **1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Algebra 1.** | | | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. |
| Algebra 1 Goal #1:<br>*NA* | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br>*NA* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br>*NA* | | | | | |
| | | | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. |
| | | | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| **2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra 1.** | | | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. |
| Algebra Goal #2:<br>*NA* | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br>*NA* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br>*NA.* | | | | | |
| | | | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. |
| | | | 2.3. | 2.3. | 2.3. | 2.3. | 2.3. |

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

<table>
<tr><td colspan="3">Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years</td><td>2011-2012</td><td>2012-2013</td><td>2013-2014</td><td>2014-2015</td><td>2015-2016</td><td>2016-2017</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">3A. In six years, school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.</td><td>Baseline data 2010-2011</td><td rowspan="2"></td><td rowspan="2"></td><td rowspan="2"></td><td rowspan="2"></td><td rowspan="2"></td><td rowspan="2"></td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">Algebra 1 Goal #3A:<br><br>NA</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="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 subgroups:</td><td>Anticipated Barrier</td><td>Strategy</td><td>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</td><td>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</td><td colspan="2">Evaluation Tool</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3" rowspan="4">3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.<br><br>Algebra 1 Goal #3B:<br><br>NA</td><td>3B.1.<br>White:<br>Black:<br>Hispanic:<br>Asian:<br>American Indian:</td><td>3B.1.</td><td>3B.1.</td><td>3B.1.</td><td colspan="2">3B.1.</td></tr>
<tr><td>3B.2.</td><td>3B.2.</td><td>3B.2.</td><td>3B.2.</td><td colspan="2">3B.2.</td></tr>
<tr><td>3B.3.</td><td>3B.3.</td><td>3B.3.</td><td>3B.3.</td><td colspan="2">3B.3.</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</td><td>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</td><td colspan="6"></td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>NA</td><td>NA</td><td colspan="6"></td></tr>
</table>

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

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.** | | | 3C.1. | 3C.1. | 3C.1. | 3C.1. | 3C.1. |
| Algebra 1 Goal #3C:<br>*NA* | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br>*NA* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br>*NA* | | | | | |
| | | | 3C.2. | 3C.2. | 3C.2. | 3C.2. | 3C.2. |
| | | | 3C.3. | 3C.3. | 3C.3. | 3C.3. | 3C.3. |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| **3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.** | | | 3D.1. | 3D.1. | 3D.1. | 3D.1. | 3D.1. |
| Algebra 1 Goal #3D:<br>NA | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br>*NA.* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br>*NA* | | | | | |
| | | | 3D.2. | 3D.2. | 3D.2. | 3D.2. | 3D.2. |
| | | | 3D.3. | 3D.3. | 3D.3. | 3D.3. | 3D.3. |

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

*End of Algebra 1 EOC Goals*

## Geometry End-of-Course Goals *(this section needs to be completed by all schools that have students taking the Geometry EOC)*

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

| Geometry EOC Goals | | | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| **1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Geometry.** | | | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. |
| Geometry Goal #1:<br>*NA* | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br>*NA.* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br>*NA* | | | | | |
| | | | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. |
| | | | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Geometry.** | | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. |
| Geometry Goal #2:<br><br>*NA* | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br>*NA* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br>*NA* | | | | |
| | | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. |
| | | 2.3. | 2.3. | 2.3. | 2.3. | 2.3. |

| Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years | | 2012-2013 | 2013-2014 | 2014-2015 | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **3A. In six years, school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.** | **Baseline data 2011-2012** | | | | | |
| Geometry Goal #3A:<br><br>*NA* | | | | | | |
| 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 |
| **3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity** (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) **not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.** | | 3B.1.<br>White:<br>Black:<br>Hispanic:<br>Asian:<br>American Indian: | 3B.1. | 3B.1. | 3B.1. | 3B.1. |
| Geometry Goal #3B: | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *NA* | *NA* | *NA* | | | | | |
| | | | 3B.2. | 3B.2. | 3B.2. | 3B.2. | 3B.2. |
| | | | 3B.3. | 3B.3. | 3B.3. | 3B.3. | 3B.3. |

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.** | | | 3C.1. | 3C.1. | 3C.1. | 3C.1. | 3C.1. |
| Geometry Goal #3C: | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| *NA* | *NA* | *NA* | | | | | |
| | | | 3C.2. | 3C.2. | 3C.2. | 3C.2. | 3C.2. |
| | | | 3C.3. | 3C.3. | 3C.3. | 3C.3. | 3C.3. |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| **3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.** | | | 3D.1. | 3D.1. | 3D.1. | 3D.1. | 3D.1. |
| Geometry Goal #3D: | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| *NA* | *NA* | *NA* | | | | | |
| | | | 3D.2. | 3D.2. | 3D.2. | 3D.2. | 3D.2. |
| | | | 3D.3. | 3D.3. | 3D.3. | 3D.3. | 3D.3. |

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

*End of Geometry EOC Goals*

## Mathematics Professional Development

| **Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activities**<br>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 |
| Envision Math Reteach/Extension training | K-5 | Resource Teachers | School-wide | Wednesdays and Planning Time | PLCs notes, instructional calendars, lesson plans | Resource Teachers, Administration |
| Moby Math lab training | K-5 | Moby Math Lead Teachers, Bridgette Matthews | School-wide | Wednesdays and Planning Time | Grade Level Teams | Lead Teachers, Administration |
| Common Core Standards | K-2 | Resource Teacher, Lead Teachers | School-wide | Wednesday staff development and Planning Time | PLC notes, instructional calendars, classroom observations | Administration |

## **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 |
| Envision Math | Adopted math series | District | NA |
| Marzano's Art and Science of Teaching | Book, copies, resource materials | General Fund | $200 |
| | | | **Subtotal: $200** |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| Moby Math | Computer-based math instruction | General Fund | 1,000 |
| | | | |
| | | | **Subtotal:$1,000** |
| Professional Development | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| Moby Math | Lead Teachers and Tech support teacher will provide training on effective use of computer adaptive program. | NA | NA |
| FCIM | Train teachers on the usage of mini-assessment data | NA | None |
| | | | **Subtotal:$0.00** |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| | | | **Subtotal:** |
| | | | **Total:$1,200** |

*End of Mathematics Goals*

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

## Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

| Elementary and Middle Science Goals | | | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| **1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science.** | | | 1.1. Students lack the foundation of science concepts taught in K-4th grade. | 1.1 Grade levels will partner with science special area teacher to incorporate foundational gaps during science lab instruction.<br><br>Teachers will be attending training for new instructional materials over the summer and during preplanning. | 1.1. Science lab teacher, administration | 1.1. Progress Monitoring, collaboration during PLC meetings, Classroom Observations, lesson plan documentation | 1.1. FCAT, Classroom Assessments, science benchmark |
| Science Goal #1A:<br><br>By June, 2013, 37% (55/148) of students taking FCAT will score a level 3 in science. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br><br>2012 FCAT results showed that 34% (50/148) of the 5th grade students taking FCAT scored level 3. | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br><br>By June, 2013, 37% (55/148) of students taking FCAT will score a level 3 in science. | | | | | |
| | 1.2. Materials needed for hands on science labs to engage students | | 1.3. Science teacher will deliver hands on science labs. Teachers will utilize STEM labs to support hands-on labs. | 1.2. Science Teacher, Administration, Classroom Teachers | 1.2. Progress Monitoring, collaboration during PLC meetings, Classroom Observations | 1.2. FCAT, Classroom Assessments, science benchmark | 1A.2. |
| | | | 1A.3. | 1A.3. | 1A.3. | 1A.3. | 1A.3. |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science.** | | | 1B.1. | 1B.1. | 1B.1. | 1B.1. | 1B.1. |
| Science Goal #1B:<br>*NA* | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br>*NA* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br>*NA* | | | | | |
| | | | 1B.2. | 1B.2. | 1B.2. | 1B.2. | 1B.2. |
| | | | 1B.3. | 1B.3. | 1B.3. | 1B.3. | 1B.3. |

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in science.** | | | 2A.1. Students lack the exposure to science vocabulary and concepts. | 2A.1. Grade level teams will work together to incorporate science level vocabulary and concepts school-wide<br><br>Integration of science computer based program during computer lab | 2A.1. Classroom teacher, Science lab teacher, Administration | 2A.1. Progress Monitoring collaboration during PLC meetings, classroom observations, lesson plan documentation | 2A.1. FCAT, classroom assessments, science benchmark |
| Science Goal #2A:<br><br>By June, 2013, 35% (52/148) of the 5th graders will score a level 4 or 5. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| | 2012 FCAT results showed that 32% (47/148) of the 5th grade students scored level 4 or 5. | By June, 2013, 35% (52/148) of the 5th graders will score a level 4 or 5. | | | | | |
| | 1.4. Materials needed for hands on science labs to engage students | | 1.5. Science teacher will deliver hands on science labs. Teachers will utilize STEM labs to | 1.2. Science Teacher, Administration, Classroom Teachers | 1.2. Progress Monitoring, collaboration during PLC meetings, Classroom Observations | 1.2. FCAT, Classroom Assessments, science benchmark | 2A.2. |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | support hands-on labs. | | | | |
| | | 2A.3. | 2A.3. | 2A.3. | 2A.3. | 2A.3. |
| **2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science.** | | 2B.1. | 2B.1. | 2B.1. | 2B.1. | 2B.1. |
| Science Goal #2B: NA | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | |
| | *NA* | *NA* | | | | |
| | | 2B.2. | 2B.2. | 2B.2. | 2B.2. | 2B.2. |
| | | 2B.3. | 2B.3. | 2B.3. | 2B.3. | 2B.3. |

*End of Elementary and Middle School Science Goals*

## Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals

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

| High School Science Goals | | | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| **1. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science.** | | | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. |
| Science Goal #1: *NA* | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| | *NA* | *NA* | | | | | |
| | | | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| **2. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science.** | | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. |
| Science Goal #2:<br>*NA* | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br>*NA* | 2013Expected Level of Performance:*<br>*NA.* | | | | |
| | | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. |
| | | 2.3. | 2.3. | 2.3. | 2.3. | 2.3. |

*End of Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals*

## Biology 1 End-of-Course (EOC) Goals *(this section needs to be completed by all schools that have students taking the Biology I EOC)*

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

| Biology 1 EOC Goals | | | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| **1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Biology 1.** | | | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. |
| Biology 1 Goal #1:<br>*NA* | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br>*NA* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br>*NA* | | | | | |
| | | | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. |
| | | | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. |

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

<table>
<tr><td colspan="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:</td><td>Anticipated Barrier</td><td>Strategy</td><td>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</td><td>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</td><td>Evaluation Tool</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Biology 1.</td><td>2.1.</td><td>2.1.</td><td>2.1.</td><td>2.1.</td><td>2.1.</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="3">Biology 1 Goal #2:<br><br>NA</td><td>2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br>NA</td><td>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br>NA</td><td rowspan="3"></td><td rowspan="3"></td><td rowspan="3"></td><td rowspan="3"></td><td rowspan="3"></td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2" rowspan="2"></td></tr>
<tr><td>2.2.</td><td>2.2.</td><td>2.2.</td><td>2.2.</td><td>2.2.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2"></td><td>2.3.</td><td>2.3.</td><td>2.3.</td><td>2.3.</td><td>2.3.</td></tr>
</table>

*End of Biology 1 EOC Goals*

## Science Professional Development

| Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity<br>Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity. | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus | Grade Level/Subject | PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader | PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide) | Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
| Science Textbook | K-5 | District resource facilitation | Classroom Teachers, science lab teachers | Summer and preplanning | Collaborative Teams, PLCs notes, lesson plan documentation | Administration, Science Teacher |
| | 5th | Science Lab Teacher | Classroom Teachers, Science lab teacher | 5th grade monthly PLC meetings | Science benchmark, PLC notes | Science lab teacher, CRT |
| | | | | | | |

## Science Budget (Insert rows as needed)

| Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities/materials. | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s) | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| Integrate Science Vocabulary | Science | General Fund | $500 |
| | | | **Subtotal:$500.00** |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| Interactive Whiteboards | Expand use of Whiteboards | PTA | $24,000 |
| BrainPop | Computer adapted software with science activities | General Fund | $1,600 |
| | | | **Subtotal:$25,600** |
| Professional Development | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| Vertical Team Planning | Discuss STEM labs during staff development in vertical teams | General Fund | $500 |
| | | | **Subtotal:$500.00** |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| | | | **Subtotal:** |
| | | | **Total:$26,600.00** |

*End of Science Goals*

## Writing Goals

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

<table>
<tr><th colspan="3">Writing Goals</th><th colspan="5">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</th></tr>
<tr><td colspan="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:</td><td>Anticipated Barrier</td><td>Strategy</td><td>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</td><td>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</td><td>Evaluation Tool</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">1A. FCAT: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing.</td><td rowspan="2">1.1. Students lack a consistent writing foundation across the grade levels.</td><td rowspan="2">1.1. Implement a school-wide K-5 basic writing program with standardized rubrics and writing strategies.</td><td rowspan="2">1.1. Classroom Teachers, Curriculum Resource teacher, Administration</td><td rowspan="2">1.1. Progress Monitoring, Collaboration at PLCs, Classroom Observations, Lesson Plan Documentation</td><td rowspan="2">1.1Write From the Beginning and Beyond rubrics, Write Score</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="2">Writing Goal #1A:<br><br>By June, 2013, 90% (135/151) of the 4th grade students taking FCAT writing will score level 3 or above.</td><td>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</td><td>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</td></tr>
<tr><td>2012 FCAT results showed that 87% (131/151) of all students taking FCAT Writing scored level 3 or above.</td><td>By June, 2013, 90% (135/151) of the 4th grade students taking FCAT writing will score level 3 or above.</td><td>1A.2. The need for students to use appropriate grammar and spelling incorporated in their essays.</td><td>1A.2. Language Skills incorporated in reading block and the use of supplemental materials.</td><td>1A.2. Classroom teachers, CRT, Administration</td><td>1A.2. Classroom Observations, Lesson Plan Documentation</td><td>1A.2. Write From the Beginning and Beyond rubrics, Write Score</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2"></td><td>1A.3.</td><td>1A.3.</td><td>1A.3.</td><td>1A.3.</td><td>1A.3.</td></tr>
</table>

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing.** | | | 1B.1. | 1B.1. | 1B.1. | 1B.1. | 1B.1. |
| Writing Goal #1B:<br>NA | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br>*NA* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br>*NA* | | | | | |
| | | | 1B.2. | 1B.2. | 1B.2. | 1B.2. | 1B.2. |
| | | | 1B.3. | 1B.3. | 1B.3. | 1B.3. | 1B.3. |

## Writing Professional Development

| **Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity**<br>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 and Beyond Training | K-5, ESE | Write From the Beginning Trained facilitators | | Summer<br>Wednesday Staff Development<br>Teacher Work Days | Vertical Team writing scoring<br>Monthly Writing Prompt Rubrics | CRT, Administration |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

## 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 |
| Write From the Beginning and Beyond | Narrative and Expository Manuals | General Fund | $5,000 |
| | | | |
| | | | **Subtotal:$5,000** |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| Multimedia publishing | Use of IPAD, netbooks to publish and share writing | The Mustang Education Fund | $20,000 |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | |
| | | | **Subtotal:$20,000** |
| Professional Development | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| Thinking Maps Training | Visual Organizers | NA | NA |
| | | | |
| | | | **Subtotal:0.00** |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| | | | **Subtotal:** |
| | | | **Total:$25,000** |

*End of Writing Goals*

## Civics End-of-Course (EOC) Goals *(required in year 2014-2015)*

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

| Civics EOC Goals | | | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| **1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Civics.** | | | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. |
| Civics Goal #1:<br>NA | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br>*NA* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br>*NA* | | | | | |
| | | | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. |
| | | | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. |

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

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Civics.** | | | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. |
| Civics Goal #2:<br>NA | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br>*NA* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br>*NA* | | | | | |
| | | | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. |
| | | | 2.3. | 2.3. | 2.3. | 2.3. | 2.3. |

## Civics Professional Development

| **Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity**<br>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 |
| NA | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

## Civics Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | **Subtotal:** |
| Professional Development | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| NA | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | **Subtotal:** |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| NA | | | |
| | | | **Subtotal:** |
| | | | **Total:** |

*End of Civics Goals*

## U.S. History End-of-Course (EOC) Goals *(required in year 2013-2014)*

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

| U.S. History EOC Goals | | | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| **1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in U.S. History.** | | | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. |
| U.S. History Goal #1:<br>*NA* | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br>*NA* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br>*NA* | | | | | |
| | | | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. |
| | | | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| **2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in U.S. History.** | | | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. |
| U.S. History Goal #2:<br>NA | 2012 Current Level of Performance:*<br>*NA.* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:*<br>*NA* | | | | | |
| | | | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. |
| | | | 2.3. | 2.3. | 2.3. | 2.3. | 2.3. |

## U.S. History Professional Development

| **Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity**<br>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 |
| NA | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

## U.S. History Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

*End of U.S. History Goals*

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

## Attendance Goal(s)

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

| Attendance Goal(s) | | | Problem-solving Process to Increase Attendance | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Based on the analysis of attendance data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| **1. Attendance** | | | Lack of Parental compliance | Increase perfect attendance incentives frequencies from quarterly awards to monthly recognition.<br><br>Careful monitoring by office staff and classroom teachers to contact parents when students are absent.<br><br>Utilization of school social workers for students with excessive absences and tardies. | Principal<br><br>Assistant Principal<br><br>Registrar<br><br>Teachers | Monthly monitoring of Data Warehouse Attendance Summary<br><br>Student Management System weekly attendance data report<br><br>Child Study Meetings<br><br>Incentive program | Monthly attendance reports from SMS |
| Attendance Goal #1:<br><br>By June, 2013, we will increase the attendance rate to 100% (892/892). | 2012 Current Attendance Rate:* | 2013 Expected Attendance Rate:* | | | | | |
| | In the 2011-12 school year, the attendance rate at Windermere Elementary was 98% (874/892). | By June, 2013, we will increase the attendance rate to 100% (892/892). | | | | | |
| | 2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more) | 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more) | | | | | |
| | 8% (7/892) students with excessive absences. | By June, 2013, we will reduce the number of excessive | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | absences by .3% (3 students, (4/892) | | | | | |
| | 2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more) | 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more) | | | | | |
| | 8% (65/892) students with excessive tardies. | By June, 2013, we will reduce the number of excessive tardies by 1% (9 students). | | | | | |
| | | | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. |
| | | | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. |

## Attendance Professional Development

| Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity<br>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 |
| Review of Student Code of Conduct | K-5 | Assistant Principal<br><br>Classroom Teachers | School-wide | Quarterly | District forms submitted to discipline area administrator | Assistant Principal |
| Student Recognition on | K-5 | | School-wide | On-going | Submissions to Administration by | All staff members |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Morning Announcements | | Principal | | | teachers/staff members | |
| | | | | | | |

**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 |
| Perfect Attendance Ribbons | Incentives every 9 weeks | General Fund | $500 |
| | | | **Subtotal: $500** |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| | | | **Subtotal:** |
| Professional Development | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | **Subtotal** |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | **Subtotal:** |
| | | | **Total:$500.00** |

*End of Attendance Goals*

## Suspension Goal(s)

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

<table>
<tr><th colspan="3">Suspension Goal(s)</th><th colspan="4">Problem-solving Process to Decrease Suspension</th></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement:</td><td>Anticipated Barrier</td><td>Strategy</td><td>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</td><td>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</td><td>Evaluation Tool</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">1. Suspension</td><td rowspan="11">Lack of inherence to follow school rules for a limited amount of students</td><td rowspan="11">Parent meetings on discipline and safety.<br><br>Behavior Leadership Team Committee<br><br>Implement school-wide behavioral system with fidelity.<br><br>RtI-B Team</td><td rowspan="11">Principal<br><br>Assistant Principal<br><br>Teachers, Staff<br><br>District Social Worker<br>RtI Team<br><br>Counselor<br>Dean</td><td rowspan="11">Weekly and monthly monitoring of discipline incidents<br><br>School climate surveys<br><br>RtI-B (child study) team meeting intervention discussions</td><td rowspan="11">OCPS referral process<br><br>Parent-communication logs<br><br>RtI (Intervention) data</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="2">Suspension Goal #1:<br><br>By June, 2013, we will decrease the in school suspensions by .5% (4/762) in school suspensions</td><td>2012 Total Number of In – School Suspensions</td><td>2013 Expected Number of In- School Suspensions</td></tr>
<tr><td>During the 2011-2012 school year, less the 1% students received in school suspensions. (5/842).</td><td>By June, 2013, we will decrease the in school suspensions by .5% (4/762) in school suspensions</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out- of- School</td><td>2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out- of-School</td></tr>
<tr><td>During the 2011-2012 school year, 15 student 1.8% (15/842) out of school suspensions</td><td>By June, 2013, we will decrease the number of out of school suspensions by 5% ( 13/762)</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>1.2.</td></tr>
<tr><td>2012 Total</td><td>2013 Expected</td></tr>
</table>

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Number of In – School Suspensions | Number of In- School Suspensions | | | | | |
| | | | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. |
| | | | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. |

## Suspension Professional Development

| Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity<br>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 |
| Code of Conduct Review | All instructional staff | Assistant Principal | All instructional staff | Preplanning<br>Quarterly with students | Classroom observation<br>Monitoring of office referrals | Assistant Principal |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

## 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 |
| NA | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | **Subtotal:** |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| NA | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | **Subtotal:** |
| Professional Development | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| NA | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | **Subtotal:$0.00** |

| Other | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| | | | **Subtotal:** |
| | | | **Total:** |

*End of Suspension Goals*

## Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

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

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

| **Dropout Prevention Goal(s)** | | | **Problem-solving Process to Dropout Prevention** | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| **1. Dropout Prevention** | | | 1.1. Teachers and parents lack of understanding of the consequences of retention as it impacts graduation rates. | Implementation of school wide intervention with staff support. | Classroom teacher<br><br>MTSS/RtI Team | PLC notes on intervention students<br><br>Ongoing progress Monitoring | Classroom assessments<br>FAIR<br>SRI<br>Benchmark testing |
| Dropout Prevention Goal #1:<br><br>By June, 2013 we will decrease the retention rate by 25% (3/453) in grades 3, 4, & 5. | 2012 Current Dropout Rate:*<br>In 2012, 1% (4/443) of students in grades 3, 4 & 5 were retained. | 2013 Expected Dropout Rate:*<br>By June, 2013 we will decrease the retention rate by 25% (3/453). | | | | | |
| | 2012 Current Graduation Rate:*<br>*NA* | 2013 Expected Graduation Rate:*<br>*NA* | | | | | |
| | | | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. |
| | | | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. |

## Dropout Prevention Professional Development

| **Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity**<br>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 |
| RtI Meetings | K-5 | RtI Team | K-5 teachers | Monthly meetings during teacher planning | PLC notes<br>Data Meetings | RtI Team<br>Administration |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

## Dropout Prevention Budget (Insert rows as needed)

| Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials. | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s) | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | **Subtotal:** |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | **Subtotal:** |
| Professional Development | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | **Subtotal:** |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| | | | **Subtotal:** |
| | | | **Total:0.00** |

*End of Dropout Prevention Goal(s)*

## Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

| Parent Involvement Goal(s) | | | Problem-solving Process to Parent Involvement | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| **1. Parent Involvement** | | | 1.1. Time constraints and distance from home to school for transfer students. | 1.1 Get teachers and students involved in encouraging parent attendance.<br><br>1.1 Offer meetings at various times to accommodate parents. | 1.1. PTA; Administration; Classroom Teachers | 1.1. Participation Data | 1.1. Participation Data |
| Parent Involvement Goal #1:<br><br>By June, 2013, we will increase the parental involvement at school activities by 3% to 85%(648). | 2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement: * | 2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement: * | | | | | |
| | In 2012, we had approximately 82% (690) parental involvement in school activities. | By June, 2013, we will increase the parental involvement at school activities by 3% to 85%(648) | | | | | |
| | | | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. |
| | | | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. |

## Parent Involvement Professional Development

| Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity<br>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 |
| Meet Your Teacher/Open House | PK-5 | PTA | School-wide | After school | Sign in sheets | Administration |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Science Fair/Night | 3-5 | PTA | School-wide | After school | Sign in sheets | Administration |
| Meet Your Teacher/Open House | PK-5 | PTA | School-wide | After school | Sign in sheets | Administration |
| Reading Night | PK-2 | PTA | School-wide | After school | Sign in sheets | Administration |
| Book Fair Night | K-5 | PTA | School-wide | After school | Sign in sheets | Administration |
| Conferences | PK-5 | Classroom Teachers, Parents | School-wide | After school | Conference notes | Administration |

## 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 |
| K-2 Reading Night | Reading content activities for students and families in grades K-2. | PTA | NA |
| Science Fair night 3-5 | Highlight student science fair projects | General Fund | $200 |
| | | | **Subtotal: $200** |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | **Subtotal:** |
| Professional Development | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | **Subtotal:** |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| | | | **Subtotal:** |
| | | | **Total:$200.00** |

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

## 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 |
| STEM Goal #1:<br><br>By May 2013 all K-5 classrooms will conduct a minimum of four STEM design challenges as outlined by Orange County Public with an emphasis in grades 3-5 being able to define, explain and implement the Engineering Design Process with in a variety of contexts. | Teachers have limited training in problem based learning for all students. | Provide training for K-5 teachers in problem based learning by district STEM support staff. | Principal<br>Assistant Principal<br>CRT | Classroom Observations<br>Instructional Calendars<br>Lesson Plans | Fusion Unit Assessments<br>Science Benchmark<br>Science Journals |
| | Limited time in the daily schedule to allow for design challenge labs | Create master schedule with flexibility to have math and science blocks combined. | Assistant Principal | Classroom Observations<br>Instructional Calendars<br>Lesson Plans<br>Master Schedule | Fusion Unit Assessments<br>Science Benchmark<br>Science Journals |
| | 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<br>Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity. |
|---|

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

| 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| STEM | K-5/All content | OCPS Professional Development Facilitator | K-5 teachers, science lab teacher | Wednesday Staff Development | Classroom observation<br>Lesson Plans<br>PLC notes | Principal<br>Assistant Principal<br>CRT<br>Science Lab Teacher |
| Fusion Science Training | K-5/Science | OCPS training Textbook/ Facilitator | K-5 teachers, science lab teacher | Wednesday Staff Development | Classroom observations<br>Lesson Plans<br>PLC notes | Principal<br>Assistant Principal<br>CRT<br>Science Lab Teacher |
| | | | | | | |

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

| Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials. | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s) | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| Science Fusion | Science textbook | District Textbook Funds | NA |
| | | | |
| | | | **Subtotal:** |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| BrainPop | Computer adapted software | General Fund | $1,600 |
| | | | |
| | | | **Subtotal:$1,600** |
| Professional Development | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| STEM Training | Problem based learning | NA | NA |
| | | | |
| | | | **Subtotal:** |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| | | | |

| | |
|---|---|
| | **Subtotal:** |
| | **Total:$1,600** |

*End of STEM Goal(s)*

## Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)

| CTE 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 |
| CTE Goal #1:<br>NA | NA | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. |
| | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. |
| | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. |

## CTE Professional Development

| Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity<br>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 |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

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

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

*End of CTE Goal(s)*

## Additional Goal(s)

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

| Additional Goal(s) | | | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| **1. Additional Goal** | | | 1.1 Inadequate recruitment of 3rd graders prior to entering 4th grade to participate in Strings | 1.1 Provide concerts string concert for 3rd graders in the spring to generate excitement for program.<br><br>Show case strings during winter and spring concerts with parents, students, and community. | 1.1 Strings Instructor<br><br>Music Instructor | 1.1 Enrollment in program | 1.1 End of the year enrollment data |
| Additional Goal #1:<br><br>By June 2013, 13% (39) 4th and 5th grade students were enrolled in strings at Windermere Elementary | 2012 Current Level :*<br><br>In June 2012, 10% (29) 4th and 5th grade students were enrolled in strings at Windermere Elementary. | 2013 Expected Level :*<br><br>By June 2013, 13% (39) 4th and 5th grade students were enrolled in strings at Windermere Elementary | | | | | |
| | | | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. |
| **2. Additional Goal** | 2012 Current Level :* | 2013 Expected Level :* | 2.1The need to increase the use of differentiated instruction to meet the needs of our diverse population. | 2.1Provide staff development and materials to increase and improve differentiated instructional strategies.<br><br>Provide train personnel and parent volunteers to assist during intervention/enrichment | 2.1Curriculum Resource Teacher, Classroom teachers, Administrators | 2.1 Progress Monitoring, Collaboration during PLC meetings, Classroom Observations | 2.1 FAIR, DRA, Houghton-Mifflin Assessments, SRI, |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | block.<br><br>3rd grade teachers will have the opportunity to observe other classroom teachers effectively implementing DI strategies. | | | |

| **ADDITIONAL GOAL(S)** | | | **Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement** | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| **3. Additional Goal** | | | 3.1 Students have limited organizational skills. | 3.1. Teachers will demonstrate and model organizational techniques through Designation College. | 3.1. Classroom teachers in grades 3-5, Destination College Coordinator, Curriculum Resource Teacher | 3.1. Teacher observation and discussion at PLC's | 3.1. Notes from PLC |
| Additional Goal #3:<br>1. During the 2012-2013 school year, 100% of the teachers in grades 3-5 will fully implement Destination College. | 2012 Current Level :*<br>1. During the 2011-2012 school year, 100% of the teachers in grades 3-5 fully implemented Destination College. | 2013 Expected Level :*<br>1. During the 2012-2013 school year, 100% of teachers in grades 3-5 will fully implement Destination | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | College. | | | | | |

| **Additional Goal(s)** | | | **Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement** | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement: | | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| **4. Additional Goal** | | | 4.1 The need to increase the use of differentiated instruction to help ensure student fluency in use of mathematical operations. | 4.1 Provide staff development and materials to increase and improve instruction pertaining to mathematical operations. | 4.1 Curriculum Resource Teacher, Classroom teachers, Administrators | 4.1 Progress Monitoring, Collaborating during PLC meetings, Classroom Observations, Data Meetings | 4.1 Benchmark tests, Teacher Assessments, SAT, FCAT, Moby math reports, Envision math assessments |
| Additional Goal #4:<br><br>By June 2013, 86% (393/453) of 3rd, 4th and 5th grade students taking the Math FCAT at Windermere Elementary will score a Level 3 or higher to denote they are fluent in math operations. | 2012 Current Level :*<br><br>In June 2012, 80% (356/443) 3rd, 4th and 5th grade students taking the FCAT math scored a Level 3 or higher. | 2013 Expected Level :*<br><br>By June 2013, 86% (393/453) of 3rd, 4th and 5th grade students taking the FCAT math will score Level 3 or higher. | | | | | |
| | | | 4.2 There are limited opportunities in the core math program to embed critical thinking and problem solving. | 4.2 Provide staff development with special emphasis on mathematical operations to help improve instruction. | 4.2 Curriculum Resource Teacher, Administrators | 4.2 Progress Monitoring, Collaboration during PLC meetings, Classroom Observations | 4.2 Benchmark tests, Teacher Assessments, SAT, FCAT, Envision math assessments |
| | | | | | | | |

| **5. Additional Goal** | | | 5.1 The need to increase the use of differentiated instruction to meet the needs of our diverse population. | 5.1 Provide staff development and materials to increase and improve differentiated instructional strategies. | 5.1Curriculum Resource Teacher, Classroom teachers, Administrators | 5.1 Progress Monitoring, Collaboration during PLC meetings, Classroom Observations | 5.1 FLKRS |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Additional Goal #5:<br><br>By June 2013, 90% (35/39) of K students taking FLKRS who attended VPK at WES and enrolled in K at WES were elementary school ready (scored at least 70% on probability of reading success). | 2012 Current Level :*<br><br>In June 2012, FLKRS data results showed that 87% (34/39) of K students who attended VPK at WES and enrolled in K at WES were elementary school ready. | 2013 Expected Level :*<br><br>By June 2013, 90% (35/39) of K students taking FLKRS who attended VPK at WES and enrolled in K at WES were elementary school ready. | | | | | |

## Additional Goals Professional Development

| **Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity**<br>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 |
| Destination College | 3-5 | Destination College Coordinator | Teachers grades 3-5 | Ongoing | Review of student notebooks | Destination College Coordinator |
| Differentiated Instruction | K-5 | Administration/Resource Teachers | School-wide | Wednesday staff development throughout the year. | PLC notes | Administration and Resource Teachers |
| Common Core | K-2 | Administration/Resource Teachers/ Lead Teachers | School-wide | Wednesday Staff development and Planning meetings | Instructional Calendars, Lesson Plan Documentation, PLC notes | Administration and Resource Teacher |

## 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 |
| Houghton Mifflin | Supplemental Consumable Materials | General Fund | 2,000 |
| | | | |
| | | | **Subtotal: $2,000** |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| Lexia | Computer adapted reading program | General Fund | $1,000 |
| | | | |
| | | | **Subtotal: $1,000** |
| Professional Development | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| Common Core | Written materials, resource books, copies | General Fund | $400 |
| | | | |
| | | | **Subtotal: $400** |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| Strings showcase concert | Parent and community concert of strings program in winter and spring | NA | NA |
| | | | |
| | | | **Subtotal:** |
| | | | **Total: $6,000** |

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

| Please provide the total budget from each section. |
|---|
| **Reading Budget** |
| **Total: $19,000** |
| **CELLA Budget** |
| **Total: $0.00** |
| **Mathematics Budget** |
| **Total: $1,200** |
| **Science Budget** |
| **Total: $25,600** |
| **Writing Budget** |
| **Total: $25,000** |
| **Civics Budget** |
| **Total: NA** |
| **U.S. History Budget** |
| **Total: $500** |
| **Attendance Budget** |
| **Total: $0.00** |
| **Suspension Budget** |
| **Total: $0.00** |
| **Dropout Prevention Budget** |
| **Total: $0.00** |
| **Parent Involvement Budget** |
| **Total: $2,000** |
| **STEM Budget** |
| **Total: $1,600** |
| **CTE Budget** |
| **Total:** |
| **Additional Goals** |
| **Total: $6,000** |
| |
| **Grand Total:$80,900** |

## 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 | | |
|---|---|---|
| ☐Priority | ☐Focus | ☐Prevent |
| NA | NA | NA |

Are you reward school? ☒Yes ☐No
(A reward school is any school that has improved their letter grade from the previous year or any A graded school.)

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

## School Advisory Council (SAC)

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

☒ Yes ☐ No

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

| Describe the activities of the SAC for the upcoming school year. |
|---|
| |

| Describe the projected use of SAC funds. | Amount |
|---|---|
| | |
| | |
| | |