

FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN



School Name: LINCOLN PARK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

District Name: Escambia

Principal: Christine Nixon

SAC Chair: Sceletz Carmichael

Superintendent: Malcolm Thomas

Date of School Board Approval: 11-20-2012

Last Modified on: 10/29/2012

Gerard Robinson, Commissioner
Florida Department of Education
325 West Gaines Street
Tallahassee, Florida 32399

Dr. Mike Grego, Chancellor
K-12 Public Schools
Florida Department of Education
325 West Gaines Street
Tallahassee, Florida 32399

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

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

School Grades Trend Data
Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT)/Statewide Assessment Trend Data
High School Feedback Report
K-12 Comprehensive Research Based Reading Plan

ADMINISTRATORS

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

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO Progress along with the associated school year)
		B.S. Industrial Psychology/Human			<p>2012 Lincoln Park Elementary School School Grade F 32% of students scored at Achievement Level 3 or higher in reading; 27% of students scored at Achievement Level 3 or higher in math; 69% of students scored at Achievement Level 3 or higher in writing; 32% of students scored at Achievement Level 3 or higher in science; 64% of students earned learning gains in reading; 51% of students earned learning gains in math; 68% of lowest quartile students earned learning gains in reading; 50% of lowest quartile students earned learning gains in math</p> <p>2011 Lincoln Park Elementary School School Grade D AYP 85% 43% of students met high standards in reading; 62% if students met high standards in math; 68% of students met</p>

Principal	Christine Nixon	Resources; M . Ed. Curriculum and Instruction; Certification, Educational Leadership	3	10	<p>high standards in writing; 24% of students met high standards in science; 41% of students made learning gains in reading; 65% made learning gains in math. 50% of the lowest quartile of students made learning gains in reading; 60% of the lowest quartile of students made learning gains in math;</p> <p>2010 Lincoln Park Elementary School School Grade D AYP 82% 52% of students met high standards in reading, 54% of students met high standards in math, 58% of students met high standards in writing, and 29% of students met high standards in science. 55% of students made learning gains in reading, and 55% of students made learning gains in math. 47% of the lowest quartile of students made learning gains in reading and 67% of the lowest quartile made learning gains in math. The criteria met with AYP increased.</p>
-----------	-----------------	--	---	----	---

INSTRUCTIONAL COACHES

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

Subject Area	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Instructional Coach	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)
Reading	Wesley Gordon				<p>2011-2012 Scenic Heights Elementary School Grade B; 68% of students at achievement levels 3 or higher; 63% of students made learning gains; 61% of students in the lowest quartile made learning gains.</p> <p>2010-2011 Scenic Heights Elementary School Grade A; 82 % of students at achievement levels 3 or higher; 75% of students made learning gains; 75% of students in the lowest quartile made learning gains.</p>

EFFECTIVE AND HIGHLY EFFECTIVE TEACHERS

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

	Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date	Not Applicable (If not, please explain why)
1	Hire In-Field teachers. Assign consulting teacher (CT) for first year teachers. Assign veteran teachers to experienced teachers new to the school worksite. Utilize START teachers.	Principal;	2012	

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

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

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

Number of staff and paraprofessional that are teaching out-of-field/ and who are not highly effective.	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective
100% of all instructors at	

Staff Demographics

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

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

Total Number of Instructional Staff	% of First-Year Teachers	% of Teachers with 1-5 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 6-14 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 15+ Years of Experience	% of Teachers with Advanced Degrees	% Highly Effective Teachers	% Reading Endorsed Teachers	% National Board Certified Teachers	% ESOL Endorsed Teachers
26	23.1%(6)	53.8%(14)	7.7%(2)	15.4%(4)	26.9%(7)	0.0%(0)	23.1%(6)	0.0%(0)	34.6%(9)

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
Cathy Roche	Lori Martin Felipe Lawall Marisa McCants	District level assignment	Weekly meetings; Great Beginnings district level meetings and workshops; Informal and formal observations
Michel Henry-Slater	Leslie Richardson Stephanie Landey		
Michelle Leitner Tammmy Safford	Sonja Oates Sabrina Shareef Donya Daggs Michale Melton	Proximity and similar subject areas being taught	Bi-weekly meetings; Briefings following faculty meetings/trainings; Meetings prior to school events

ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS

Coordination and Integration

Note: For Title I schools only

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

Title I, Part A

\$30,922 of Title 1 funds are being used to fund 50% Of Media Specialist.
 \$39,062 of Title 1 funds are being using to fund classroom supplies
 \$7,776 of Title 1 funds are being used for professional development activities
 \$1,650 of Title 1 funds are being used for parental involvement activities

Title I, Part C- Migrant

Services for migrant children are provided by the district level Title 1 office. After thorough checking of the Migrant Student Information Exchange (MSIX) System and our local Student Data Base, we have determined that there are 0 Migrant Students at Lincoln Park Elementary.

Title I, Part D

Services to neglected and delinquent students are provided by various district-operated programs. These services are overseen by the Title 1 office. Our school does not serve Title 1, Part D students.

Title II

Professional development is offered at both the school and district level.

At the school level, some of the areas of professional development that will be offered include:

- Differentiated Instruction
- Technology Integration
- Classroom and Behavior Management
- Florida's Continuous Model

Title III

Services for English Language Learners are provided as required by law. Several ESOL centers are provided at various key locations in the district. Students who do not attend centrally located school-based sites attend their zones school where ESOL endorsed teachers provide services. All teachers who serve ELL identified students have ESOL endorsement on their teaching certificate. Our school is not an ESOL Center and we do not serve any ESOL students.

Title X- Homeless

The school works with the district's Homeless Coordinator to provide resources (clothing, school supplies, and social services referrals) for students identified as homeless under the McKinney-Vento Act to eliminate barriers for a free and appropriate education. This program is overseen by the District Title I Office. At Lincoln Park Elementary School we have no identified homeless students.

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

SAI monies were reduced and/or eliminated from our school's budget.

Violence Prevention Programs

The school offers a non-violence and anti-drug program to students that incorporate guest speakers, counseling, and classroom discussion. Red Ribbon Week is held in October with school-wide activities and guest speakers. Through our school's School Wide Behavior Plan, we provide training for faculty, staff, and students regarding bullying. The Jeffrey Johnston Stand Up for All Students Act, requires our school district to adopt an official policy prohibiting bullying and harassment of students and staff on school grounds, at school-sponsored events, and through school computer networks. In addition, our district has launched the "Bullying" Reporting website where bullies may be reported anonymously.

Nutrition Programs

Our school is committed to continue offering nutritional choices in its cafeteria. This includes salad bar, ala carte items and self serve options. Our school is a Healthier Generation Alliance School. The school follows the district's nutrition program for summer feeding at select sites. Additional programs and staff will address the obesity issue, especially in elementary aged children.

Housing Programs

This is offered at the district level and overseen by the Title I District Office. This program is not applicable to our school.

Head Start

Lincoln Park houses a Head Start program on site that is under the direction of the Escambia County Readiness Coalition. The program has three teachers housed in one building with three classrooms.

Adult Education

Evening programs are offered at all of our high schools.

Career and Technical Education

N/A

Job Training

N/A

Other

N/A

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

School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

The RtI team is comprised of the principal, school psychologist, grade level representatives including ESE, speech pathologist, and behavior coach who provide a common vision for the use of data-based decision making. This ensures that the school based team is implementing RtI, conducts assessment of RtI skills of the school staff, and communicates with parents regarding school-based RtI plans and activities. The general education teacher and reading coach provide information about the core instruction, participate in student data collection, deliver Tier I instruction/intervention, collaborate with other staff to implement Tier II interventions, and integrate Tier I materials/instruction with Tier II/III activities; The ESE teacher participates in the Tier process to provide support and offer strategies to the general education teacher; the school psychologist participates in the collection, interpretation, and data analysis, facilitates development of intervention plans, and provides support for intervention fidelity and documentation. The speech pathologist educates the team in the role that language plays in curriculum, assessment, and instruction. This is done as a basis for appropriate program design and helps identify systemic patterns of student needs with respect to language.

Describe how the school-based MTSS Leadership Team functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions). How does it work with other school teams to organize/coordinate MTSS efforts?

The team meets on a regular basis to: review screening data and link to instructional decisions, review progress monitoring data at the grade level and classroom level to identify students who are meeting/exceeding benchmarks. Students are identified as moderate risk or at high risk for not meeting benchmarks. Based on the above information, the team will identify professional development resources. The team will also collaborate regularly, problem solve, share effective practices, evaluate implementation, make decisions, and practice new processes and skills. The team will also facilitate the process of building consensus, increasing infrastructure, and making decisions about implementation.

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

After test scores have been released, the team will meet to discuss the data. Other data to discuss is from the Tier 1, 2 and 3 meetings. Academic and Social/Emotional areas will be addressed and clear expectations for instruction will be made. The team will provide input to help develop the School Improvement Plan.

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.

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.
Lincoln Park's RtI Leadership Team will meet to review test data from the 2012 FCAT test administration and from the Tier 1, 2, and 3 meetings. The team will also assist with the disaggregating of school data. The information is then shared with the entire Lincoln Park faculty.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

Professional Development sessions will be conducted with the faculty utilizing weekly meeting times and school-based teacher planning days provided on the district calendar. The school psychologist will provide training to the staff as well. One of the district's behavior analysts is working extensively with faculty and staff providing support on RtI.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

Weekly meetings have been scheduled for the RtI team meetings. An RtI chart has been developed to chart students through the process as well as to maintain the timetable for interventions and review of data at tier meetings

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

The Literacy Leadership Team is comprised of the principal, reading coach, media specialist, and grade level chairs.

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

The Literacy Team meets monthly to plan literacy activities within the school day as well as Family Literacy events during the school day as well as after-school hours.

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

The Literacy Team will focus on the expansion of Accelerated Reading Program, teaching reading strategies at family reading night events, and having students reading more complex text will be the major emphasis for 2012-2013 to support increasing student achievement and raising proficiency levels.

Public School Choice

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification
[View uploaded file](#) (Uploaded on 10/29/2012)

*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.

Orientations are held for students entering kindergarten to assist families from early childhood programs to kindergarten at Lincoln Park. Kindergarten conferences are also held to gather information and data to assist in the educational and instructional aspects of the transition.

*Grades 6-12 Only

Sec. 1003.413(b) F.S.

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

N/A

*High Schools Only

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

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

N/A

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

N/A

Postsecondary Transition

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

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

N/A

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading. Reading Goal #1a:	In 2013, LPE will increase the percent of students scoring Achievement Level 3 by 1%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In 2012, 25% (23) of students scored level 3 or higher on FCAT 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test.	In 2013, 26% (24) of Lincoln Park students in grades 3-5 will achieve a Level 3 or higher on the FCAT 2012 FCAT reading test.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1A.1. Effective Use of Small Group Centers	1A.1. Differentiated Instruction	1A.1. Principal Reading Coach Grade Level Teacher	1A.1 Evaluation of Effectiveness of lessons based on weekly benchmark assessment data and lesson studies.	1A.1. Baseline data, benchmark assessment data, mid year assessment data, 2013 FCAT data, Study Island data reports
2	1A.2. Active Student Engagement	1A.2. Differentiated Instruction	1A.2. Principal Reading Coach Grade Level Teacher	1A.2. Principal Reading Coach Grade Level Teacher	1A.2. Baseline data, benchmark assessment data, mid year assessment data, 2013 FCAT data, Study Island data reports
3				1A.2. Evaluation of Effectiveness of lessons based on weekly benchmark assessment data and lesson studies.	

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading. Reading Goal #1b:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading. Reading Goal #2a:	In 2012, Lincoln Park will increase by 1% the number of students in grades 3-5 scoring a Level 4 or 5 on the FCAT 2.0 2013 Reading Test.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In 2012, 9% (8) of Lincoln Park students achieved a level 4 or 5 proficiency on the FCAT 2.0 reading test.	In 2013, 10% (9) of Lincoln Park students will achieve a level 4 or 5 proficiency on the FCAT 2.0 2013 reading test.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	2A.1. Increasing rigor in reading instruction	2A.1. Differentiated Instruction	2A.1. Principal Reading Coach Grade Level Teacher	2A.1. Evaluation of effectiveness of lessons based on weekly benchmark assessment data and lesson studies.	2A.1. Baseline data, benchmark assessment data, mid year assessment data, 2013 FCAT data, StudyIsland data reports.
2	2A.2. Additional opportunities for enrichment activities	2A.2. Participate in district Battle of Books Competition and Debate Competition	2A.2. Principal Reading Coach Grade Level Teacher	2A.2. Evaluation of effectiveness of strategy based on increases in student achievement on weekly benchmark assessment data and student participation in weekly book study and practice sessions	2A.2. Baseline data, benchmark assessment data, mid year assessment data, 2013 FCAT data, Study Island data reports

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

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in reading. Reading Goal #2b:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #3a:	The number of students making learning gains in reading will increase by 1% on the 2013 FCAT 2.0 reading assessment.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In 2012, 64% (58) of Lincoln Park students in grades 3-5 made learning gains in the area of reading on FCAT 2.0 2012 reading test.	In 2013, 65% (59) of Lincoln Park students in grades 3-5 will make learning gains in the area of reading on FCAT 2.0 2013 reading test.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	3A.1. Effective Use of Small Group Instruction	3A.1. Differentiated Instruction	3A.1. Principal Reading Coach Grade Level Teacher	3A.1. Evaluation of Effectiveness of lessons based on weekly benchmark assessment data and lesson studies.	3A.1. Baseline data, benchmark assessment data, mid year assessment data, 2013 FCAT data, Study Island data reports

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #4:	In 2013 Lincoln Park students in the lowest 25th quartile will increase by 1% on the FCAT 2013 reading test.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In 2012, 68% (62) of Lincoln Park students in the lowest 25th quartile made learning gains in reading.	In 2013, 69% (63) of Lincoln Park students in the lowest 25th quartile will make learning gains on the FCAT 2.0 2013 reading test.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	4A.1. Length of School Day	4A.1. Extended School Day	4A.1. Principal	4A.1. Monthly meetings to evaluate implementation of additional activities during the extra instructional hour provided for reading.	4A.1. Baseline data, benchmark assessment data, mid year assessment data, 2013 FCAT data, Study Island data reports

Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), AMO-2, Reading and Math Performance Target

5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Reading Goal # 5A : <input type="text"/>					
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

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

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5B:	In 2013, Lincoln Park students will increase by 1% the number of black students making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT 2.0 reading test.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In 2012, Lincoln Park students 68% of Black students made learning gains on FCAT 2.0 reading test.	In 2013, Lincoln Park students will decrease to 67% the number of black students at Lincoln Park who make learning gains on the 2013 FCAT 2.0 reading test.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	5B.1. White: Lack of active Black: Lack of active	5B.1. Differentiated Instruction	5B.1. Principal Reading Coach	5B.1. Evaluation of Effectiveness of lessons	5B.1. Baseline data, benchmark

1	student engagement Hispanic: Asian: American Indian	Grade Level Teacher	based on weekly benchmark assessment data and lesson studies.	assessment data, mid year assessment data, 2013 FCAT data, Study Island data reports
---	--	------------------------	---	---

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

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5C:	N/A
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5D:	N/A
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

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

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5E:	In 2013, LPE will decrease the percentage of ED students not making satisfactory progress in reading by 1%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
66% (60) of students did not make AYP in the area of	65% (59) of students will make AYP in the area of reading

reading.	FCAT 2.0.				
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	5E.1. Length of School Day	5E.1. Extended School Day	5E.1. Principal Reading Coach Grade Level Teacher	5E.1. Monthly meeting to evaluate implementation of extra instructional hour provided for reading	5E.1. Baseline data, benchmark assessment data, mid year assessment data, 2013 FCAT data, Study Island data reports

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Differentiated Instruction in Reading	K-5	Reading Coach and LPES DA Team	School Wide	Monthly meetings will be held during faculty training sessions and during monthly teacher planning days	Strategies will be included in lesson plans and teachers will implement the strategies and activities. Student data will be collected and analyzed to determine level of student achievement and engagement. Lessons will be adjusted per the data.	Principal and other leadership team members.
Common Core Standards in Reading	K-5	Reading Coach and LPES DA Team	School Wide	Monthly meetings will be held during faculty training sessions and during monthly teacher planning days	Strategies will be included in lesson plans and teachers will implement the strategies and activities. Student data will be collected and analyzed to determine level of student achievement and engagement. Lessons will be adjusted per the data.	Principal and other leadership team members.

Reading Budget:

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

No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$0.00

End of Reading Goals

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.				
1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking.				
CELLA Goal #1:				
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:				
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

Students read in English at grade level text in a manner similar to non-ELL students.				
2. Students scoring proficient in reading.				
CELLA Goal #2:				
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:				
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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

3. Students scoring proficient in writing.

CELLA Goal #3:

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

CELLA Budget:

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

End of CELLA Goals

Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal # 1a:	In 2013, Lincoln Park will increase by 1% the students scoring level 3 on the 2013 FCAT Mathematics Test.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In 2012, 19% of Lincoln Park students will achieve proficiency (FCAT level 3) on FCAT 2012 Mathematics Test.	In 2013, 20% of Lincoln Park students will achieve proficiency (FCAT level 3) on FCAT 2013 Mathematics Test. In 2013, LPE will increase the number of students at Achievement Level 3 in Math by 1%.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of parental involvement	Utilize FCIM to provide additional instruction in targeted areas in math.	Principal and teachers of 3rd, 4th, and 5th grade students.	Instructional Focus Calendars, Assessments will be reviewed by the teachers and principal on a weekly basis.	Mini Assessments, baseline assessments, mid-year assessments, and 2012 Math FCAT Data
2	Differentiated Instruction, Technology	Utilize Successmaker to provide additional interventions for struggling students. Utilize Study Island.	Principal and teachers of 3rd, 4th, and 5th grade students.	Study Island Reports will be reviewed on a daily basis by teachers and weekly basis by principal, data notebooks.	Study Island Reports, and 2012 FCAT Math Data
3	New Teachers	Utilize district training and district Math Coach	Principal, District and Specialists in Math	Classroom Walk Throughs	2012 FCAT Math Data
4	1A.1. Effective Use of Small Group Centers	1A.1. Differentiated Instruction	1A.1. Principal Math Coach Grade Level Teacher	1A.1. Evaluation of effectiveness of lessons based on weekly benchmark assessment data and lesson studies.	1A.1. Baseline data, benchmark assessment data, mid year assessment data, 2013 FCAT data, Study Island data reports
5	1A.2. Effective Instructional Strategies	1A.2. Ongoing modeling of instructional strategies/practices	1A.2. Math Coach	1A.2. Evaluation of Effectiveness of lessons based on weekly benchmark assessment data and lesson studies.	1A.2. Baseline data, benchmark assessment data, mid year assessment data, 2013 FCAT data, Study Island data reports

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal # 1b:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2a:	In 2013, LPE will increase the number of students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in mathematics.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In 2012, 7% of Lincoln Park students achieved proficiency (FCAT levels 4 and 5) on FCAT 2012 mathematics.	In 2013, 8% of Lincoln Park students will achieve above proficiency (FCAT levels 4 and 5) on FCAT 2013 mathematics.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of parental support	Utilize FCIM to provide additional instruction in targeted areas in math.	Principal and teachers of 3rd, 4th, and 5th grade students.	Instructional Focus Calendars, Assessments will be reviewed by the teachers and principal on a weekly basis, data notebooks	Mini Assessments, baseline assessments, mid-year assessments, and 2013 Math FCAT Data
2	Differentiated Instruction, Technology	Utilize Study Island to provide additional interventions for struggling students.	Principal and teachers of 3rd, 4th, and 5th grade students.	Study Island Reports will be reviewed on a daily basis by teachers and weekly basis by principal, data notebooks	Study Island Reports and 2013 FCAT Math Data
3	2A.1. Effective Use of Small Group Centers	2A.1. Differentiated Instruction	2A.1. Principal Math Coach Grade Level Teacher	2A.1. Evaluation of Effectiveness of lessons based on weekly benchmark assessment data and lesson studies.	2A.1. Baseline data, benchmark assessment data, mid year assessment data, 2013 FCAT data, Study Island data reports
4	2A.2. Effective Instructional Strategies	2A.2. Ongoing modeling of instructional strategies/practices	2A.2. Principal Math Coach Grade Level Teacher	2A.2. Evaluation of Effectiveness of lessons based on weekly benchmark assessment data and lesson studies.	2A.2. Baseline data, benchmark assessment data, mid year assessment data, 2013 FCAT data, Study Island data reports
5	2A.3. Participate in district Sunshine Battle of Books Competition and Debate Competition	2A.3. Participate in district Sunshine Math Competition and implementation of sunshine math club at LPE.	2A.3. Principal Math Coach Grade Level Teacher	2A.3. Evaluation of effectiveness of strategy based on increases in student achievement on weekly benchmark assessment data and	2A.3. Baseline data, benchmark assessment data, mid year assessment data, 2013 FCAT data,

			student participation in weekly book study and practice sessions	Study Island data reports
--	--	--	--	---------------------------

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

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2b:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3a:	In 2013, LPE will increase the percentage of students making learning gains in math by 1%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In 2012, 51% (50) of Lincoln Park students made learning gains on the 2011 Mathematics test.	In 2013, 52% (51) of Lincoln Park students will make learning gains on the 2013 Mathematics test.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of parental support	Utilize FCIM to provide additional instruction.	Principal and 3rd, 4th, 5th grade teachers.	Instructional Focus Calendars, Assessments will be reviewed by the teachers and principal on a weekly basis, data notebooks	Mini Assessments, baseline and mid-year assessments, 2013 Reading FCAT Data
2	Differentiated instruction, technology	Utilize Study Island to provide additional interventions for struggling students.	Principal and 3rd, 4th, 5th grade teachers.	Study Island Reports will be reviewed on a daily basis by teachers and weekly basis by principal.	Study Island Reports and 2013 FCAT Reading Data
3	3A.1. Effective Use of Small Group Centers	3A.1 Differentiated Instruction	3A.1. Principal Math Coach Grade Level Teacher	3A.1. Evaluation of Effectiveness of lessons based on weekly benchmark assessment data and lesson studies.	3A.1. Baseline data, benchmark assessment data, mid year assessment data, 2013 FCAT data, Study Island data

					reports
4	3A.2. Effective Instructional Strategies	3A.2. Ongoing modeling of instructional strategies/practices	3A.2. Principal Math Coach Grade Level Teacher	3A.2. Evaluation of Effectiveness of lessons based on weekly benchmark assessment data and lesson studies.	3A.2. Baseline data, benchmark assessment data, mid year assessment data, 2013 FCAT data, Study Island data reports

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #4:	In 2013, LPE will increase the percentage of students in the lowest 25% making learning gains in math by 1%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In 2012, 50% (49) of Lincoln Park's lowest 25 percentile made learning gains on the 2012 FCAT Mathematics test	In 2013, 51% (50) of Lincoln Park's lowest 25 percentile will make learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Mathematics test.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Differentiated instruction	Utilize FCIM to provide additional instruction in targeted areas in math.	Principal and 3rd, 4th, 5th grade teachers.	Instructional Focus Calendars, Assessments will be reviewed by the teachers and principal on a weekly basis, data notebooks	Mini Assessments, baseline and mid-year assessments, 2013 Math FCAT Data
2	Lack of parental support, technology	Utilize Successmaker to provide additional interventions for struggling students.	Principal and 3rd, 4th, 5th grade teachers.	Study Island reports will be reviewed on a daily basis by teachers and weekly basis by principal.	Study Island Reports, 2013 FCAT Math Data

		Use resources provided by Go Math series. Utilize study Island.			
3	4A.1. Effective Use of Small Group Centers	4A.1. Differentiated Instruction	4A.1. Principal Math Coach Grade Level Teacher	4A.1. Evaluation of Effectiveness of lessons based on weekly benchmark assessment data and lesson studies.	4A.1. Baseline data, benchmark assessment data, mid year assessment data, 2013 FCAT data, Study Island data reports
4	4A.2. Effective Instructional Strategies	4A.2. Ongoing modeling of instructional strategies/practices	4A.2. Principal Math Coach Grade Level Teacher	4A.2. Evaluation of Effectiveness of lessons based on weekly benchmark assessment data and lesson studies.	4A.2. Baseline data, benchmark assessment data, mid year assessment data, 2013 FCAT data, Study Island data reports

Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), AMO-2, Reading and Math Performance Target

5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.		Elementary School Mathematics Goal # 5A :				
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017

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

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5B:	In 2013, LPE will decrease the percentage of Black students not making satisfactory progress in math.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In 2012, 76% (69) of black students made Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) on FCAT 2012 Mathematics Test.	In 2013, black students at Lincoln Park making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) will increase to 75% (68) on the FCAT 2013 Mathematics Test.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of parental support	Utilize FCIM to provide additional instruction in targeted areas in math. Use resources provided by Go Math series.	Principal and 3rd, 4th, 5th grade teachers	Instructional Focus Calendars, Assessments will be reviewed by the teachers and principal on a weekly basis, data notebooks	Mini Assessments, baseline and mid-year assessments, 2013 Math FCAT Data
2	Differentiated Instruction, Technology	Utilize Study Island to provide additional interventions for struggling students.	Principal and 3rd, 4th, 5th grade teachers	Study Island Reports will be reviewed on a daily basis by teachers and weekly basis by principal.	Study Island Reports, 2013 FCAT Math Data
	5B.1. White: Black: Lack of active	5B.1. Differentiated Instruction	5B.1. Principal Math Coach Grade Level	5B.1. Evaluation of Effectiveness of lessons based on weekly	5B.1. Baseline data, benchmark assessment data,

3	student engagement Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	Teacher	benchmark assessment data and lesson studies.	mid year assessment data, 2013 FCAT data, Study Island data reports
---	---	---------	---	---

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5D:	N/A
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

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

E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal E:	In 2013, LPE will decrease the percentage of ED students not making satisfactory progress in math by 1%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In 2012, 73% (72) of Economically Disadvantaged students did made Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) on 2012 FCAT Mathematics Test.	In 2013, 72% (71) of Economically Disadvantaged students will make Adequate Yearly Progress(AYP) on FCAT 2013 Mathematics Test.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of parental support, students with unidentified disabilities	Utilize FCIM to provide additional instruction in targeted areas in math.	Principal and 3rd, 4th and 5th teachers.	Instructional Focus Calendars, Assessments will be reviewed by the teachers and principal on a weekly basis, data notebooks	Mini Assessments, baseline and mid-year assessments, 2013 Math FCAT Data
2	Differentiated instruction, technology	Utilize Study Island to provide additional interventions for struggling students.	Principal and 3rd, 4th and 5th teachers.	Study Island Reports will be reviewed on a daily basis by teachers and weekly basis by principal.	Study Island Reports, 2013 FCAT Math Data
3	5E.1. Lack of student engagement	5E.1. Differentiated Instruction	5E.1. Principal Math Coach Grade Level Teacher	5E.1. Evaluation of Effectiveness of lessons based on weekly benchmark assessment data and lesson studies.	5E.1. Baseline data, benchmark assessment data, mid year assessment data, 2013 FCAT data, Study Island data reports

End of Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Rigor, Go Math Instructional Resources Workshops, Differentiated instruction	K-5 Mathematics	Principal-Christine Nixon Ramona Wright-District Math Specialist Tammy Barton-DOE Math Specialist LPES DA Math Team Leader Michelle Leitner	K-5 Faculty	Once a month	Classroom Walk throughs, implementation/ monitoring of coaching plans,	Principal-Christine Nixon Ramona Wright-District Math Specialist Tammy Barton-DOE Math Specialist LPES DA Math Team Leader Michelle Leitner

Mathematics Budget:

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

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

End of Mathematics Goals

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:					
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science. Science Goal #1a:		In 2013, LPE will increase the percentage of students scoring Achievement Level 3 in Science on the FCAT Science test by 1%.			
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
In 2012, 21% of the students met proficiency (Level 3) in Science on the 2011 FCAT Science test.		In 2013, 25% of Lincoln Park students will achieve proficiency (Level 3) in Science on the 2012 FCAT Science test.			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Struggling students	CIM Lessons, Classroom science teachers will utilize science lab materials for hands on activities on a weekly basis at minimum. Additional instruction using small groups, differentiated instruction	Principal, Teachers	CIM assessment data, daily lesson assessments, and lesson plans will be reviewed on a weekly basis by the principal and teachers.	Mini Assessments, Baseline and Mid-year assessments, CWT, Write Score Assessment for Science, 2012 FCAT Science data
2	Lack of parental support	Invite parents to participate in classroom activities and labs, Encourage parents to utilize Family Resource Center (FRC)	Principal, Teachers	CIM assessment data, daily lesson assessments, and lesson plans will be reviewed on a weekly basis by the principal and teacher.	Mini Assessments, Baseline and Mid-year assessments, CWT, Writing Score assessment for Science, 2012 FCAT Science data
3	Lack of Background knowledge	CIM Lessons, Classroom science teachers will utilize science lab materials for hands on activities on a weekly basis at minimum, Additional instruction using small group, differentiated	Principal, Teachers	CIM assessment data, daily lesson assessments, and Lesson plans will be reviewed on a weekly basis by the principal and teacher.	Mini Assessments, Baseline and Mid-year assessment, CWT, Writing Score assessment for Science, 2012 FCAT Science data

		Instruction			
4	1A.1. Effective Use of Small Group Instruction and Active Student Engagement	1A.1. Differentiated Instruction	1A.1. Principal, Grade Level Teacher	1A.1. Evaluation of effectiveness of strategy based on increases in student achievement on weekly benchmark assessment data and student participation in small groups	1A.1. Baseline data, benchmark assessment data, mid year assessment data, 2013 FCAT data, Study Island data reports

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment:
Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science.

Science Goal #1b:

2012 Current Level of Performance:

2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in science.

Science Goal #2a:

In 2013, LPE will increase the percentage of students scoring at Achievement Levels 4 and 5 or higher on FCAT Science.

2012 Current Level of Performance:

2013 Expected Level of Performance:

On the 2012 FCAT, 7% of the students scored above proficiency (at Level 4 and 5) on FCAT Science.

On the 2013 FCAT, 11% of the students will score above proficiency (at Level 4 and 5 or higher) on FCAT Science.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Struggling students	Classroom Teachers will utilize science lab materials for hands on activities on a weekly basis at minimum.	Principal, Teacher	Lesson plans and assessment data will be reviewed by the principal and teacher.	Mini Assessments, Baseline and Mid-year Assessments, CWT, 2012 FCAT data
2	Lack of background knowledge	Classroom Teachers will utilize science lab materials for hands on activities on a weekly basis at minimum.	Principal, Teacher	Lesson plans and assessment data will be reviewed by the principal and teacher.	Mini Assessments, Baseline and Mid-year Assessments,

					CWT, 2012 FCAT Science data.
3	2A.1. Effective Use of Small Group Instruction and Active Student Engagement	2A.1. Differentiated Instruction	2A.1. Principal, Grade Level Teacher	2A.1. Evaluation of effectiveness of strategy based on increases in student achievement on weekly benchmark assessment data and student participation in small groups	2A.1. Baseline data, benchmark assessment data, mid year assessment data, 2013 FCAT data, Study Island data reports
4	2A.2. Opportunities for enrichment activities	2A.2. Participation in school and district science fairs	2A.2. Principal, Grade Level Teacher	2A.2. Evaluation of effectiveness of strategy based on increases in student achievement on weekly benchmark assessment data and student participation in project based learning in science	2A.2. Baseline data, benchmark assessment data, mid year assessment data, 2013 FCAT data, Study Island data reports

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

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment:
Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in science.

Science Goal #2b:

2012 Current Level of Performance:

2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

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

Differentiated Instruction in Science	K-5	LPES DA Team	School Wide	Monthly meetings will be held during faculty training sessions and during monthly teacher planning days	Strategies will be included in lesson plans and teachers will implement the strategies and activities. Student data will be collected and analyzed to determine level of student achievement and engagement. Lessons will be adjusted per the data.	Principal and other leadership team members.
---------------------------------------	-----	--------------	-------------	---	---	--

Science Budget:

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

End of Science Goals

Writing Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:					
1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing. Writing Goal #1a:		In 2013, LPE will increase the percentage of students scoring achievement level 3.0 or higher in writing.			
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
In 2012, 69% (20) of the students at Lincoln Park in grade 4 scored a level 3 or higher on 2011 FCAT Writing Test.		72% (21) of Lincoln Park students in grade 4 will maintain state standards in writing on the 2013 FCAT Writing Test.			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	Students that are struggling in Reading	Students will utilize the writing process on a daily basis. Students will be given grade-level	Principal and teachers of 4th grade students.	Students writing samples will be kept in a portfolio for administrative review.	Monthly writing prompt scores and 2012 FCAT Writing data

1		writing prompts on a monthly basis.		Teachers will record and share data during grade level meetings with principal. Teachers will utilize the district's Writes Right writing manual.	
2	1A.1. Lack of writing opportunities across the curriculum	1A.1. Writing Journals in all content area subjects	1A.1. Principal Grade level teacher	1A.1. Students will be given multiple opportunities each day to respond in writing during lessons.	1A.1. Writing section of student success data binder and journals
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:

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Step Up To Writing	K-5 Writing	District LA Dept.	School wide	Monthly during teacher planning days and faculty training sessions	Reviewing student writing data and journals with other teachers, students, and parents	Brian Spivey
Lucy Calkins	K-2	District LA Dept.	School wide			Christine Nixon
Grammar Graphics	K-5	District LA Dept.	School wide			Beverly Patteson

Writing Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)

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

End of Writing Goals

Attendance Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of attendance data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Attendance Attendance Goal #1:	Lincoln Park's average daily attendance rate will increase to 94%.
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
In 2012, the number of Lincoln Park's students daily attendance rate was 93%.	Lincoln Park's average daily attendance (ADA) rate will increase to 94%.
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)
In 2012, the number of Lincoln Park's students with excessive absences was 146.	Lincoln Park Elementary will decrease the number of students with excessive absences by 5% (139).
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)
In 2012, the number of Lincoln Park's students with excessive absences was 82.	Lincoln Park will decrease the number of students with excessive tardies by 5% (78).

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1. Lack of awareness of the link between punctuality and success in school 2. Rate of Out of	1. Communication of educational goals and instructional schedule with parents 2. Utilizing the In	Principal and Guidance Counselor	Attendance Reports	Attendance Reports

	School Suspension compared to total school enrollment.	School Suspension.			
2	1.1. Lack of parental responsiveness to excessive absences	1.1. Home visits by school leadership or visiting teacher and inclusion of attendance data at all parent meetings.	1.1. Principal, data clerk, grade level teacher, school social worker	1.1. Biweekly review of attendance data by school leadership; daily monitoring of attendance data by classroom teacher.	1.1. Review of attendance roster and biweekly school wide attendance report

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Quarterly Staff Meetings	K-5	Principal RTI Team Behavior Coach	School wide	Quarterly	Review of Attendance data in TERMS, phone calls/meetings with parents	Principal RTI Team Behavior Coach

Attendance Budget:

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

End of Attendance Goal(s)

Suspension Goal(s)

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

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

1. Suspension Suspension Goal #1:	In 2013, LPE will reduce the number of out of school suspensions by 1%.
2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
22 students	17 Students
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School
20 students	16 Students
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions
31 out-of-school suspensions	25 Students
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School
20 students	17 Students

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of Behavior Intervention Programs	Implementation of the School Wide Behavior Plan	Principal	Suspension data	Suspension data
2	Lack of a variety of behavior intervention programs	Use of after school detention, Positive Behavior Support	Principal	Behavior and suspension data	Behavior and suspension data
3	1.1. The same group of students consistently receive the out of school suspensions.	1.1. Small group Second Step sessions with behavior coach	1.1.Principal Behavior Coach Grade Level Teacher	1.1.Rate of out of school suspensions will decrease as students have n=more engagement in the second step sessions	1.1. School Discipline Report

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
					Teachers will talk with	

Second Step	K-5	Behavior Coach	School wide	Monthly sessions during faculty training sessions	students about the second step vignettes and the strategies being taught Teachers will give feedback during monthly sessions	Principal, Behavior Coach, and LPES DA Team
-------------	-----	----------------	-------------	---	--	---

Suspension Budget:

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

End of Suspension Goal(s)

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:					
1. Parent Involvement					
Parent Involvement Goal #1:		In 2013, LPE parents will increase their participation in parental involvement activities by 1%.			
*Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.					
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:		2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:			
In 2012, parents were provided the opportunity to participate in 13 or more parental activities at Lincoln Park Elementary.		In 2013, parents will be provided the opportunity to participate in 15 or more parental activities at Lincoln Park Elementary.			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	Parents who work during school hours	Lincoln Park Elementary will offer afternoon and evening activities at	Principal Grade Level Chairs	Determine number of parents participating in programs.	Sign In Sheets

1		LPES, including the use of the Title 1 Family Resource Center.			
2	Parents that are not aware of school activities.	Send School Messenger messages to families as an announcement and reminder to them about school wide events.	Principal Grade Level Chairs	Review School Messenger data on successful message deliveries and poll parents on the school climate survey about the effectiveness of method of communication.	School Messenger data and climate survey
3	Lack of understanding of the impact on student achievement	Arrange parent conferences, school wide and grade level programs, and family outreach activities, including the use of the Title 1 Family Resource Center.	Principal Grade Level Chairs	Poll parents on school climate survey about the effectiveness of method of communication.	School Climate Survey
4	1.1. Lack of understanding of the impact of parental involvement on academic student achievement	1.1. Arrange parent conferences and parental involvement activities school wide, as well as family outreach and evening programs to center around instructional strategies parents can use at home.	1.1. Principal, Grade Level Teachers	1.1. Use results of Parent Satisfaction Survey to drive the parental involvement activities	1.1. Sign in sheets for parental involvement activities, End of year Parent Satisfaction survey

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

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

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

Parent Involvement Budget:

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

No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$0.00

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:					
1. STEM STEM Goal #1:			LPES will expand its existing mentor program with two major companies to develop an informal educator opportunities at the school		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1. Scheduling lessons during the school day	1.1. Have the existing partners work with the teachers to present action labs that correspond with one topic being taught each week for a determined grade level/levels.	1.1. Principal Lead Partner Contacts with the two companies Grade Level Teachers	1.1. The number of lessons presented each month and the number of students engaged will be monitored	1.1. Monthly meeting and report of progress.

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
-Initial Level I Training -Virtual Afternoon PLC Group -Afternoon Curriculum Development -Level II Training	Grade 2 Math and Science	Principal, and DOE STEM Coordinator	Grade 2	November 15, 2012 November 28, 2012 January 9, 2013 January 15, 2013	PD Trainings and classroom walk through.	Principal and DOE STEM Coordinator

STEM Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)

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

End of STEM Goal(s)

Additional Goal(s)

N/A Goal:

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

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

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

Budget:

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

End of N/A Goal(s)

FINAL BUDGET

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

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Priority	<input type="checkbox"/> Focus	<input type="checkbox"/> Prevent	<input type="checkbox"/> NA
--	--------------------------------	----------------------------------	-----------------------------

Are you a reward school: Yes No

A reward school is any school that improves their letter grade or any school graded A.

[View uploaded file](#) (Uploaded on 10/29/2012)

School Advisory Council

School Advisory Council (SAC) Membership Compliance

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

Yes. Agree with the above statement.

Describe projected use of SAC funds	Amount
No data submitted	

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

Ongoing data review to monitor academic progress, ongoing budgetary review of school funds and usage, input in school improvement and parental involvement plans and ongoing review of the plans, monthly meetings.

AYP DATA

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

SCHOOL GRADE DATA

No Data Found

Escambia School District LINCOLN PARK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 2010-2011						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	43%	62%	68%	24%	197	Writing and Science: Takes into account the % scoring 4.0 and above on Writing and the % scoring 3 and above on Science. Sometimes the District writing and/or science average is substituted for the writing and/or science component.
% of Students Making Learning Gains	41%	65%			106	3 ways to make gains: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	50% (YES)	60% (YES)			110	Adequate Progress based on gains of lowest 25% of students in reading and math. Yes, if 50% or more make gains in both reading and math.
FCAT Points Earned					413	
Percent Tested = 99%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					D	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Escambia School District LINCOLN PARK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 2009-2010						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	52%	54%	58%	29%	193	Writing and Science: Takes into account the % scoring 4.0 and above on Writing and the % scoring 3 and above on Science. Sometimes the District writing and/or science average is substituted for the writing and/or science component.
% of Students Making Learning Gains	55%	55%			110	3 ways to make gains: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	47% (NO)	67% (YES)			114	Adequate Progress based on gains of lowest 25% of students in reading and math. Yes, if 50% or more make gains in both reading and math.
FCAT Points Earned					417	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					D	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested