

FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN



School Name: PARK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

District Name: Highlands

Principal: Brenda Longshore

SAC Chair: Debra Thompson

Superintendent: Wally Cox

Date of School Board Approval: November 8, 2011

Last Modified on: 11/5/2012

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) |
|-----------|------------------|---|------------------------------|--------------------------------|---|
| Principal | Brenda Longshore | BA-Elementary Education, Warner Southern College; MA-Educational Leadership, University of South Florida; PhD-Leadership & Higher Education, Barry University; Principal Certification-State of Florida | 5 | 9 | Principal of Park Elementary in 2010-2011; Grade A, Reading Mastery: 70%, Math mastery: 74%, Science mastery: 37%. Overall AYP 90%, AYP reading: White 82%, Black Hispanic, and Econ Dis did not make AYP in reading. AYP Math: White 84%, Hispanic 83%, Black and Ec. Dis did not make AYP in math. Principal of Park Elementary in 2009-2010: Grade B, Reading mastery: 70%, Math mastery: 73%, Science mastery: 42%. AYP 77%, White, Black, Hispanic, and SWD subgroups did not make AYP in reading, Black, Hispanic, and SWD subgroups did not make AYP in math. Principal of Park Elementary in 2008-2009: Grade A, Reading mastery: 76%, Math mastery: 81%, Science mastery: 43%. AYP: 100%. 2007-2008: Grade: A, Reading mastery: 66%, Math mastery: 73%, Science mastery: 43%. AYP 97%, Hispanic subgroup did not make AYP in reading. Assistant Principal at Park Elementary: 2006-2007: Grade: C, Reading mastery |

| | | | | | |
|-----------------|----------------|--|---|---|---|
| | | | | | 65%, Math mastery 60%, Science mastery 36%. AYP: 92%, Black subgroup did not make AYP in reading, Black and SWD population did not make AYP in math. 2005-2006: Assistant Principal at Lake Placid Elementary |
| Assis Principal | Debra Thompson | BA-Elementary Education, University of South Florida; MA-Educational Leadership, University of South Florida; Principal Certification-State of Florida | 5 | 5 | Assistant Principa of Park Elementary in 2010-2011: Grade A, Reading Mastery: 70%, Math mastery: 74%, Science mastery: 37%. Overall AYP 90%, AYP reading: White 82%, Black Hispanic, and Econ Dis did not make AYP in reading. AYP Math: White 84%, Hispanic 83%, Black and Ec. Dis did not make AYP in math. Assistant Principal of Park Elementary in 2009-2010: Grade B, Reading mastery: 70%, Math mastery: 73%, Science mastery: 42%. AYP 77%, White, Black, Hispanic, and SWD subgroups did not make AYP in reading, Black, Hispanic, and SWD subgroups did not make AYP in math. Assistant Principal of Park Elementary in 2008-2009: Grade A, Reading Mastery: 76%, Math mastery: 81%, Science Mastery: 43%. AYP: 100%. 2007-2008: Grade: A, Reading Mastery: 66%, Math Mastery: 73%, Science Mastery: 43%. AYP 97%, Hispanic subgroup did not make AYP in reading. |

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 | Deborah Andrews | B.A. Early Childhood and Elementary Education, Florida Southern College | 19 | 7 | 2010-2011: A, AYP 90% 2009-2010: B, AYP 77% 2008-2009: A, AYP 100% 2007-2008 A, AYP 97% 2006-2007: C, AYP 92% |
| | | | | | |

EFFECTIVE AND HIGHLY EFFECTIVE TEACHERS

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

| | Description of Strategy | Person Responsible | Projected Completion Date | Not Applicable (If not, please explain why) |
|---|--|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|---|
| 1 | New teachers will meet with grade level team to continue to understand and apply the Sunshine State Standards, Core Curriculum and Data Analysis of their classroom, grade level, and school | Team Leader | End of School | |
| 2 | New teachers will be assigned a peer teacher to assist with district guideline implementation. Meetings will be held bi-weekly to share observations of instruction. | Mentor Teacher | End of School | |
| 3 | | | | |
| 4 | Provide targeted staff development | Administration, Resource Teachers | End of School Year | |

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 |
| No data submitted | |

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 |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--|---|--|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 40 | 7.5%(3) | 20.0%(8) | 32.5%(13) | 40.0%(16) | 17.5%(7) | 97.5%(39) | 12.5%(5) | 10.0%(4) | 57.5%(23) |

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 |
|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------------|------------------------------|
| Brenda Anderson | Diana McPhail | PEC (CLT) | Weekly Meetings |
| Cathy Johnson | Vidannys Rivera | PEC (CLT) | Weekly Meetings |
| | | | |

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

Will provide funds to all elementary schools and one middle school with 75% free/reduced poverty level, in a school wide project format, to target academic assistance to all students, professional development for teachers and parent involvement activities. This grant is also the funding source for implementing the requirements of NCLB.

Title I, Part C- Migrant

Provides services to migrant students (PreK-12th grade) and their families. The primary goal of the Migrant program is to improve academic performance of migrant students, and provide health and guidance services to them. The Migrant Early Childhood Program serves 4 year old children in a full time preschool program, focusing on readiness activities. Parent involvement and education is an integral part of the Migrant Program.

Title I, Part D

Provides services to children who are delinquent or neglected.

Title II

Title II, Part A: Provides for teacher professional development and supports all teachers and paraprofessionals to be highly qualified.

Title II, Part D: Enhancing Education Through Technology (EETT) supports technology professional development.

Title III

Supports activities to assist students become proficient in English, supports teacher professional development in E.L.L. strategies and parent involvement and education.

Title IV

Provides prevention services to students at the district alternative school. Also provides learning opportunities for school guidance counselors to acquire training to assist students with drug free and violence free lifestyles.

Title X- Homeless

Student Services coordinates with Title I, Part A to provide resources (clothing, school supplies, social services referrals) for students identified as homeless under the McKinney-Vento Act to eliminate barriers for a free and appropriate education.

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

SAI funds will be coordinated with Title I funds to provide summer school for Level 1 readers.

Violence Prevention Programs

The district offers a non-violence and anti-drug program to students that incorporates field trips, community service, drug tests, and counseling.

Nutrition Programs

District food service department provide services in summer for breakfast and lunches at Park Elementary. In addition, the food service department provide services in summer for breakfast and lunches at Park Elementary.

Housing Programs

N/A

Head Start

N/A

Adult Education

N/A

Career and Technical Education

Proposals are submitted annually to enhance selected Vocational Programs for regular, disadvantaged, and handicapped students in grades 7-12.

Title VI Provides funding for the district Career Academy, professional development for teachers and activities to increase student achievement.

Job Training

A partnership with the city will provide students with a job skills program that will allow students the opportunity to learn how to create a resume, dress for success, and perform well during a job interview.

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.

The members of the school-based RTI Leadership Team include the Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading Coach, Guidance Counselor, ESE Teacher, School Psychologist, School Social Worker, and Curriculum Leadership Team.

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?

During the 2011-2012 school year, members of the RTI team train all faculty and staff within the first month of school on the RTI process. Members of the RTI meet quarterly in progress monitoring meetings to review student performance and make instructional decisions. Members meet monthly to discuss changes in targeted students. Members meet weekly with grade level teams to support teachers in assisting students by using a variety of tiered-interventions

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?

Members of the RTI committee met through the summer to begin developing the school improvement plan. School wide and grade-level data was analyzed to identify student achievement and behavior trends. The members analyzed disaggregated data in order to identify trends and groups in need of intervention. Data review plans, supports, and calendars were generated. Data-based decision making rules and procedures were developed. Processes to ensure intervention fidelity continue to be developed. The school improvement plan will be shared with all major stakeholders including the School Advisory Council (SAC), parents, teachers, and students.

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.

A tiered system of interventions will be used that becomes more intensive as one moves through the tiers.

Tier 1: Implement universal strategies

Tier 2: Implement targeted, evidenced-based interventions

Tier 3: Implement intensive, evidenced-based interventions

At each meeting, assessment data is thoroughly reviewed using data generated from FAIR, Pinnacle grade book, Performance Matters, PMRN, SWIS, grade level indicators, classroom assessments, and Genesis student management system.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

Members of the RTI team completed six days of Professional Development with the State representative over the past four years. The district RTI committee has created an RTI Manual for Highlands County. The RTI school committee will review this manual with the staff in order to continue to update knowledge during monthly faculty meetings.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

Administration: Brenda Longshore, Principal; Debra Thompson, Assistant Principal
Teachers: Mary Linda Jackson, K; Cathy Johnson, 1st; Courtney Murfield, 2nd; Nikki McGee, 3rd; Susan Jahna, 4th; Tracy Lee, 5th; Brenda Anderson, ESE; Debbie Walley, Special Areas; Deborah Andrews, Literacy Resource Teacher.

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

The Literacy Leadership Team meets weekly by grade level to discuss student data. Through these discussions, instructional strategies will be modified to best meet the needs of all students. Feedback will be shared with administration through a grade level communication guide. In addition, the reading resource teacher will provide on-going support to teachers and ESE teachers will collaborate with regular ed teachers weekly. Administration attends grade level meetings once a month to review grade level data. Administration also meets with students to conduct student data chats.

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

The major initiatives of the Literacy Leadership Team this year will be to ensure the understanding of best practices by all teachers and continue to support each grade level with resources to target every sub-population that has not met proficiency in reading, math, and science.

Public School Choice

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification
[View uploaded file](#) (Uploaded on 10/26/2012)

*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.

Pre-K migrant program provides services to 3-4 year old children at Park Elementary. The Migrant liaison assist families in registering and obtaining information concerning entrance into kindergarten. The Handicap-Pre-K classrooms also provides services to 3-4 year old children at Park Elementary. The Staffing Specialist assists these families in obtaining information concerning entrance into kindergarten.

*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.

*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?

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)).

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: | Park Elementary continues to focus on effective reading strategies to improve student performance. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 51%(114) students achieved a proficiency level 3 on FCAT Reading 2010-2011 | 52% of students will score proficiency level 3 on FCAT Reading 2011-2012 |

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 | Students will not utilize strategies effectively when comprehending passages. | Teachers will model and instruct students in the use of effective reading strategies including FRI and other best practices for the purpose of comprehension. | Administration, reading coach, teacher | Students will be assessed three times a year by FAIR and progress monitored monthly when exhibiting reading deficits. Students will also be assessed with Harcourt Theme and Weekly Tests. Teachers, administration, and Reading Coach meet quarterly to progress monitor all students | Harcourt Weekly and Theme Tests, FAIR, and Grade Level Indicators |

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: | Park Elementary continues to focus on effective reading strategies to improve student performance. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 33%(74) students scored above proficiency in FCAT Levels in Reading 2010-2011 | 34% of the students will perform above proficiency FCAT Levels 4 and 5 in Reading 2011-2012. |

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 | Students experience difficulty maintaining or improving higher levels of achievement. | 1. Teachers will model and instruct students in the use of effective reading strategies including FRI and other best practices for the purpose of comprehension. Teachers will increase use of higher order thinking skills to create a rigorous learning environment. | Administration, reading coach, teacher | Students will be assessed three times a year by FAIR and progress monitored quarterly. Students will also be assessed with Harcourt Theme and Weekly Tests. | Harcourt Weekly and Theme Tests, FAIR, and Grade Level Indicators |

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: | Park Elementary continues to focus on effective reading strategies to improve student performance. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|--|
| 67%(149) students achieved learning gains in FCAT Reading 2010-2011 | | 68 % of students will achieve learning gains in FCAT Reading 2011-2012 | | | |
| 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 | Data analysis and progress monitoring ineffective in driving instruction. | Administration, Reading Coach, and Teachers meet to review data by grade level and school-wide to increase effectiveness of instruction. Staff will discuss current rate of progression and determine necessary interventions to increase level of rigor. | Administration, reading coach, teacher | Quarterly progress monitor meetings, biweekly data analysis will be tracked using Excel and Performance Matters Data Warehouse. | Harcourt Weekly and Theme Tests, FAIR, FAIR OPM and Grade Level Indicators |

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: | Park Elementary continues to focus on effective reading strategies to improve student performance. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 67%(21) students in the lowest 25% made learning gains in FCAT Reading 2010-2011. | 68 % of the students in the lowest 25% will make learning gains on FCAT Reading 2011-2012 |

| | | | | |
|---|--|-----------|-----------------|--|
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
| | | Person or | Process Used to | |

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Position Responsible for Monitoring | Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|--|--|---|--------------------------------|
| 1 | Students will not respond to supplemental strategic intervention. | Students will be monitored monthly to determine the rate of progression and compared to others receiving same intervention instruction. Reading Coach and Administration will work with classroom teachers to determine most appropriate methods and strategies. | Administration, Reading Coach, Classroom Teacher, Guidance Counselor, and RTI Team | More frequent assessments will be given and analyzed. These assessments will specifically measure student growth and deficient areas. | FAIR, FAIR OPM, CBM, and MAZE. |

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: | Required target of 79% achieving AYP goal not met by Black and Hispanic students |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| The following subgroups achievement towards AYP is as follows: White - 82%; Black - 39%; Hispanic - 71% | The following subgroups will achieve AYP percentage as follows: White - 83%; Black 40%; Hispanic 72 %. |

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 | Gaps in vocabulary development for students to be successful in reading are deficient. | Teachers will utilize strategies from the core curriculum and strategic intervention to explicitly develop vocabulary, and background knowledge as taught through FRI and other reading best practices. | Administration, Reading Coach, Classroom Teacher | Classroom observations and lesson plans. | Data gained from Harcourt Tests, FAIR, FAIR OPM, Strategic Intervention. |

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: | There were not enough students to qualify for this AYP subgroup. |
|---|--|

| | | | | | |
|---|---------------------|----------|---|---|-----------------|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | | | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | |
| There were not enough students to qualify for this AYP subgroup | | | There were not enough students to qualify for this AYP subgroup | | |
| 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: | | | There were not enough students to qualify for this AYP subgroup | | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | | | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | |
| There were not enough students to qualify for this AYP subgroup | | | There were not enough students to qualify for this AYP subgroup | | |
| 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: | | | Required Target of 79% achieving AYP goal not met by Economically Disadvantaged students. | | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | | | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | |
| 59% of Economically Disadvantaged students scored at or above grade level in reading. Required Target of 79% not met. | | | 60% of Economically Disadvantaged students will score at or above grade level in reading on FCAT 2011-2012. | | |
| 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 | Student do not have adequate background knowledge to be successful in comprehending what is read. | Teachers will focus on building background knowledge and other comprehension strategies to provide students with tools to better understand passages | Administration, Reading Coach, Teachers | FAIR, FAIR OPM, Teacher lesson plans and observations | FAIR, FAIR OPM, Harcourt theme and weekly tests |

read.

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 | | | | | | |

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: | Park Elementary will focus on building a concrete understanding of the NGSSS in all grade levels. In addition to the basal curriculum, teachers will implement a hands-on, spiraling approach to instruction through math centers to engage students and develop real-world problem solvers. Students will also have opportunities to participate in on-line math instruction and practice. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| Based on the 2011 FCAT math data, 74%(168) of students in grades 3-5 achieved proficiency in math. | In grades 3-5, 76% of the students will achieve proficiency on the 2012 FCAT Math 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 | Students will need a concrete understanding of the NGSSS. | Teachers will incorporate the use of manipulatives and hands on activities to build concrete understanding of math concepts. | Administration, Resource Teacher | Grade level teams will review the results of common assessment data and plan together weekly. | Park will use the Performance Matters Assessment, as well as baseline, mid-year assessment, and end of the year assessments tied to the NGSSS. |

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:

| | |
|--|---|
| | Park Elementary will focus on building a concrete |
|--|---|

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics.
 Mathematics Goal #2a: understanding of the NGSSS in all grade levels. In addition to the basal curriculum, teachers will implement a hands-on, spiraling approach to instruction through math centers to engage students and develop real-world problem solvers. Students will also have opportunities to participate in on-line math instruction and practice.

2012 Current Level of Performance: 2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Based on the 2011 FCAT math data, 74%(71) of students did achieve Levels 4 and 5 proficiency on the 2011 FCAT math test. In grades 3-5, 75% of the students will achieve Levels 4 and 5 proficiency on the 2012 FCAT math 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 | Students will need a concrete understanding of the NGSSS. | Teachers will incorporate the use of manipulatives and hands on activities to build concrete understanding of math concepts. | Administration, Resource Teacher | Grade level teams will review the results of common assessment data and plan together weekly. | Park will use the Performance Matters Assessment, as well as baseline, mid-year assessment, and end of the year assessments tied to the NGSSS. |

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: Park Elementary will focus on building a concrete understanding of the NGSSS in all grade levels. In addition to the basal curriculum, teachers will implement a hands-on, spiraling approach to instruction through math centers to engage students and develop real-world problem solvers. Students will also have opportunities to participate in on-line math instruction and practice.

2012 Current Level of Performance: 2013 Expected Level of Performance:

| | |
|---|---|
| Based on the 2011 FCAT math data, 63% () of students made learning gains in math. | 65% of the students will achieve high standards on the 2012 FCAT Math 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 | Students will need a concrete understanding of the NGSSS. | Teachers will incorporate the use of manipulatives and hands on activities to build concrete understanding of math concepts. | Administration, Resource Teacher | Grade level teams will review the results of common assessment data and plan together weekly. | Park will use the Performance Matters Assessment, as well as baseline, mid-year assessment, and end of the year assessments tied to the NGSSS. |

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: | Park Elementary will focus on building a concrete understanding of the NGSSS in all grade levels. In addition to the basal curriculum, teachers will implement a hands-on, spiraling approach to instruction through math centers to engage students and develop real-world problem solvers. Students will also have opportunities to participate in on-line math instruction and practice. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| Based on 2011 FCAT math test, 61% (18) of students in the lowest 25%, made learning gains in math. | 62% of students in the lowest 25% will make learning gains on the 2012 FCAT Math Test. |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of | Evaluation Tool |
|--|---------------------|----------|------------------------------------|--|-----------------|
|--|---------------------|----------|------------------------------------|--|-----------------|

| | | | Monitoring | Strategy | |
|---|---|--|----------------------------------|---|--|
| 1 | Students will need a concrete understanding of the NGSSS. Students lack knowledge of mathematical vocabulary. | Teachers will incorporate the use of manipulatives and hands on activities to build concrete understanding of math concepts. Teachers will incorporate direct instruction lessons related to vocabulary terms. | Administration, Resource Teacher | Grade level teams will review the results of common assessment data and plan together weekly. | Park will use the Performance Matters Assessment, as well as baseline, mid-year assessment, and end of the year assessments tied to the NGSSS. |

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: | Park Elementary will focus on building a concrete understanding of the NGSSS in all grade levels. In addition to the basal curriculum, teachers will implement a hands-on, spiraling approach to instruction through math centers to engage students and develop real-world problem solvers. Students will also have opportunities to participate in on-line math instruction and practice. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| On the 2011 FCAT math test the following subgroups achievement toward AYP is as follows: White - 84%, Black - 48%, Hispanic - 83%. The 80% required AYP score was not met by the Black subgroup. | On the 2012 FCAT math test the following subgroups achievement toward AYP will be as follows: White - 85%, Black - 50%, Hispanic - 85%. |

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 | Students will need a concrete understanding of the NGSSS. Students lack knowledge of mathematical vocabulary. | Teachers will incorporate the use of manipulatives and hands on activities to build concrete understanding of math concepts. Teachers will incorporate direct instruction lessons related to vocabulary terms. | Administration, Resource Teacher | Grade level teams will review the results of common assessment data and plan together weekly. | Park will use the Performance Matters Assessment, as well as baseline, mid-year assessment, and end of the year assessments tied to the NGSSS. |

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: | NA |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| | |

| NA | | | NA | | |
|---|---------------------|----------|---|---|-----------------|
| 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 | NA | NA | NA | NA | 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 subgroup:

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

| 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 | NA | NA | NA | NA | 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 subgroup:

| | | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|--|--|
| E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal E: | | Park Elementary will focus on building a concrete understanding of the NGSSS in all grade levels. In addition to the basal curriculum, teachers will implement a hands-on, spiraling approach to instruction through math centers to engage students and develop real-world problem solvers. Students will also have opportunities to participate in on-line math instruction and practice. | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | | |
| Based on the 2011 FCAT math test, 69% of students in the Economically Disadvantaged subgroup made Adequate Yearly Progress. | | On the 2012 FCAT math test, 70% of students in the Economically Disadvantaged subgroup will make Adequate Yearly Progress. | | | |

| 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 | Students will need a concrete understanding of the NGSSS. Students lack knowledge of mathematical vocabulary. | Teachers will incorporate the use of manipulatives and hands on activities to build concrete understanding of math concepts. Teachers will incorporate direct instruction lessons related to vocabulary | Administration, Resource Teacher | Grade level teams will review the results of common assessment data and plan together weekly. | Park will use the Performance Matters Assessment, as well as baseline, mid-year assessment, and end of the year assessments tied |

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 | | | | | | |

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 |

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: | Park Elementary continues to focus on student achievement of NGSSS Science standards through the effective integration of reading using FRI strategies, engaging hands on lessons by working in a science lab once a week in addition to the classroom, and real world experiences. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |

Based on 2011 FCAT Science test, 37%(19) of students achieved Level 3 on FCAT Science.

Based on 2012 FCAT Science test, 38% of students will score Level 3 on 2012 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 | Barriers include lack of real world science experience, prior knowledge in this content area, and comprehension of non-fiction text. | Continued implementation of FRI strategies, providing more hands on in a science lab environment once a week, real world experiences, and increase the availability of non-fiction text. | Teacher, Science resource teacher, and Administration | Grade level team will meet weekly to discuss instructional strategies. Progress monitoring team with meet monthly to assess student needs. | Performance Matters assessment administered 3 times annually. Scott Foresman chapter and unit assessments aligned with NGSSS. |
| 2 | | | | | |

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

Park Elementary continues to focus on student achievement of NGSSS Science standards through the effective integration of reading using FRI strategies, engaging hands on lessons, science lab once a week, and real world experiences.

2012 Current Level of Performance:

2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Based on 2011 Science FCAT, 6% (5) of students scored Levels 4 and 5.

Increase the percent of 5th grade students achieving Level 4 and 5 from 6% to 7% on the 2012 FCAT Science assessment.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | | | Person or | Process Used to | |
|--|--|--|-----------|-----------------|--|
|--|--|--|-----------|-----------------|--|

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Position Responsible for Monitoring | Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|--|---|--|---|
| 1 | Lack of prior knowledge in this content area, lack of real world science experiences, and comprehension of non-fiction texts. | Continued implementation of FRI strategies, increase availability of non-fiction text, and exposure to real world, hands on science through a science lab once a week. | Teacher, Science Resource Teacher, and Administration | Grade levels will meet weekly to discuss instructional strategies and monthly to assess student achievement. Progress monitoring teams will meet monthly to assess student data. | Performance Matters assessment will be given 3 times annually in addition to Scott Foresman chapter and unit assessments. |

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 | | | | | | |

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: | Park Elementary utilizes a highly motivating and effective writing program, Kathy Robinson, Just Write!, to engage students in the writing process. Our goals are to prepare students to write structured essays and to foster creativity in writing. The writing process should be enjoyable as well as rewarding to students. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| On the 2011 Writing FCAT, 99% (82)students achieved adequate yearly progress. | 90% or higher of the students will maintain adequate yearly progress on the 2012 Writing FCAT. |

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 | According to last year's data, the students have a solid foundation of the basic format of writing an essay, but the students need to be equipped with strategies to build more elaboration in their writing. | Teachers will meet bi-weekly with the grade level team to plan effective instruction and to discuss data. Teachers will conference with individual students daily to assist students in adding elaboration to their writing. Facilitation and collaboration with other schools within the district. | Administration, Resource Teacher | Student writing samples will be viewed daily by the teacher and shared with the grade level team bi-weekly to discuss areas of progress and areas in need of improvement. | Teachers will determine progress by data from the Beginning of the Year, Mid-Year, and End of the Year Prompt Assessments. Teachers will use scored writing samples for progress monitoring. |

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 |
|------------------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------------|---|--|-----------------------------------|---|
| No Data Submitted | | | | | | |

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 |

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: | | Park Elementary strives to promote the importance of daily attendance for all students. | | | |
| 2012 Current Attendance Rate: | | 2013 Expected Attendance Rate: | | | |
| Based on the 2011 data, attendance was 95% (473 students). | | Increase the student attendance from 95% to 96%. | | | |
| 2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more) | | 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more) | | | |
| Based on 2010 attendance data, 22% (132 students) had excessive absences. | | Decrease the number of excessive absences from 22% to 20%. | | | |
| 2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more) | | 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more) | | | |
| Based on 2010 attendance data, 18% (112 students) had excessive tardies. | | Decrease the number of excessive tardies from 18% to 16%. | | | |
| 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 | Illness, arriving late to breakfast. | Provide student instruction of hand washing and proper hygiene skills, provide health and hygiene information to parents through school newsletters, and provide flu shot information. Stress the importance of on time arrival for Free Breakfast. | Teachers and Administration | SARC will meet bi-weekly to analyze student attendance data and identify excessive absences and tardies. Progress Monitoring team will also meet monthly to address student absences. Teachers will provide health and hygiene information in school newsletters. | Daily Attendance Record, SARC 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 |
|------------------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------------|---|---|-----------------------------------|---|
| No Data Submitted | | | | | | |

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: | Park Elementary aims to build effective environments in which positive behavior is more effective than problem behavior. |
| 2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions | 2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions |
| Based on 2011 data, there were 189 In-School Suspensions. | Decrease the number of In-School Suspensions by 5%. |
| 2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School | 2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School |
| Based on 2011 data, 15% (90) students received In-School Suspension. | Decrease the number of students receiving In-School Suspension by 5% |
| 2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions | 2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions |

| | |
|---|---|
| Based on 2011 data, there were 29 Out-of-School Suspensions. | Decrease the number of Out-of-School Suspensions by 5% |
| 2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School | 2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School |
| Based on 2011 data, 3% (20) students received Out-of-School Suspension. | Decrease the number of students receiving Out-of-School Suspension 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 personal positive behavior skills. | Continue Positive Behavior Support (PBS Program). Ensuring all students are receiving appropriate positive reinforcement through social skill instruction in the individual classrooms daily. Implement daily classroom point sheets with at risk students. "Check-In and Check-Out" mentoring program. Implement Response To Intervention (RTI). The implementation of "Leader in Me" leadership training. | Administration, Teachers, and Guidance (RTI team) | Collect and analyze data monthly by reviewing discipline referrals and classroom point sheets. PBS team will meet monthly to plan and assess school-wide behavior goals and strategies. | Frequency count of students receiving referrals and count of classroom daily point sheets. |
| 2 | Lack of student leadership | Continue to implement "The Leader in Me" by developing individual leadership roles and implementing data notebooks. | Administration, Teachers | Students acquire leadership roles. Students create and maintain data notebooks. | Frequency count of students receiving referrals decline. |

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 | | | | | | |

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: <i>*Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.</i> | Park Elementary strives to provide opportunities for parents to attend multiple parent nights dealing with building leaders, curriculum, science strategies, in addition to reading and math strategies. |
| 2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement: | 2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement: |
| Based on 2011 data, 60% of parents attended a parent involvement night. | Increase percentage of parents attending at least one parent involvement night to 70%. |

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 child care. | Offer child care to parents attending a parent involvement night on school site. | Teachers and Administration | Parent Involvement Committee will meet quarterly or as needed to plan and assess achievement of goal. | Parent Attendance count. |
| 2 | Language | Providing translators for parent involvement night. | Teachers and Administration | Parent Involvement Committee will meet quarterly or as needed to plan and assess achievement of goal. | Parent Sign in sheet. |
| 3 | Transportation | Provide transportation upon request. | Administration | Parent Involvement Committee will meet quarterly or as needed to plan and assess achievement of goal. | The number of parents attending that requested transportation. |
| | Time | Providing a variety of | Administration | Parent survey to | Parent |

| | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|-----------------------------|------------------|
| 4 | | times for meetings to accommodate parents schedules. | | determine time of meetings. | attendance count |
|---|--|--|--|-----------------------------|------------------|

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: | |
| 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 | | | | | | |

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 |

Additional Goal(s)

Technology Goal:

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:

| | |
|---|--|
| 1. Technology Goal Technology Goal #1: | Park Elementary continues to strive toward increased mastery of technology skills through the use of classroom and lab computers, SmartBoards, and software. |
| 2012 Current level: | 2013 Expected level: |
| Based on computer lab assessments, 93% of 3rd, 4th, and 5th grade students demonstrates mastery of basic technology skills needed to improve academic achievement | Increase 3rd, 4th, and 5th grade students who can demonstrate mastery of basic technology skills needed to improve academic achievement from 93% to 95%. |

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 previous access to technology. | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Continue the effective use of technology to implement the Sunshine State Standards to improve the performance of all students. 2. Provide training for staff and students on the use of technological systems and software. 3. Investigate and evaluate new technology based instructional models, methods, and strategies for possible use in classrooms and labs. 4. Provide equitable, up-to-date software/hardware and technology access in sufficient quantities and on a timely basis to staff and students. 5. Continue to promote the availability of assistive technology to meet the educational requirements of No Child Left Behind (herein NCLB) in assisting all students, including those with special needs. 6. Maintain an Instructional Technology Resource Teacher for Park Elementary School. | Administration, Instructional Technology Specialist, and Teachers. | Review technology lesson plans, Maintain inventory of technology tools, Observe technology use | Monitor successful student presentations of multi-media projects using technology tools such as: Microsoft Office, desktop computers, laptops, projectors, SmartBoards, scanners, digital cameras, Internet resources, and technology assessments. |

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 Technology 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 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.

No Attachment

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.



If NO, describe the measures being taken to Comply with SAC Requirement

| Describe projected use of SAC funds | Amount |
|-------------------------------------|--------|
| No data submitted | |

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

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

| Highlands School District PARK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 2010-2011 | | | | | | |
|--|-----------|-----------|---------|---------|---------------------|---|
| | Reading | Math | Writing | Science | Grade Points Earned | |
| % Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above) | 70% | 74% | 99% | 37% | 280 | 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 | 67% | 63% | | | 130 | 3 ways to make gains: ● 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? | 67% (YES) | 61% (YES) | | | 128 | 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 | | | | | 538 | |
| Percent Tested = 100% | | | | | | Percent of eligible students tested |
| School Grade* | | | | | A | Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested |

| Highlands School District PARK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 2009-2010 | | | | | | |
|--|-----------|-----------|---------|---------|---------------------|---|
| | Reading | Math | Writing | Science | Grade Points Earned | |
| % Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above) | 70% | 73% | 84% | 42% | 269 | 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 | 69% | 56% | | | 125 | 3 ways to make gains: ● 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? | 69% (YES) | 56% (YES) | | | 125 | 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 | | | | | 519 | |
| Percent Tested = 100% | | | | | | Percent of eligible students tested |
| School Grade* | | | | | B | Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested |