

**U.S. Department of Education**  
**2014 National Blue Ribbon Schools Program**

---

[X] Public or [ ] Non-public

For Public Schools only: (Check all that apply) [ ] Title I [ ] Charter [X] Magnet [X] Choice

Name of Principal Mrs. Stacey A Quiñones

(Specify: Ms., Miss, Mrs., Dr., Mr., etc.) (As it should appear in the official records)

Official School Name Morikami Park Elementary School

(As it should appear in the official records)

School Mailing Address 6201 Morikami Park Rd

(If address is P.O. Box, also include street address.)

City Delray Beach State FL Zip Code+4 (9 digits total) 33484-6999

County Palm Beach County State School Code Number\* 501951

Telephone 561-894-7300 Fax 561-894-7350

Web site/URL https://www.edline.net/pages/Morikami\_Park\_Elementary E-mail Stacey.Quinones@palmbeachschools.org

Twitter Handle \_\_\_\_\_ Facebook Page \_\_\_\_\_ Google+ \_\_\_\_\_

YouTube/URL \_\_\_\_\_ Blog \_\_\_\_\_ Other Social Media Link \_\_\_\_\_

I have reviewed the information in this application, including the eligibility requirements on page 2 (Part I-Eligibility Certification), and certify that it is accurate.

Date \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
(Principal's Signature)

Name of Superintendent\*Mr. E. Wayne Gent E-mail: Superintendent@palmbeachschools.org  
(Specify: Ms., Miss, Mrs., Dr., Mr., Other)

District Name School District of Palm Beach County Tel. 561-434-8000

I have reviewed the information in this application, including the eligibility requirements on page 2 (Part I-Eligibility Certification), and certify that it is accurate.

Date \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
(Superintendent's Signature)

Name of School Board President/Chairperson Mr. Chuck Shaw  
(Specify: Ms., Miss, Mrs., Dr., Mr., Other)

I have reviewed the information in this application, including the eligibility requirements on page 2 (Part I-Eligibility Certification), and certify that it is accurate.

Date \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
(School Board President's/Chairperson's Signature)

*\*Non-public Schools: If the information requested is not applicable, write N/A in the space.*

## **PART I – ELIGIBILITY CERTIFICATION**

---

**Include this page in the school’s application as page 2.**

The signatures on the first page of this application (cover page) certify that each of the statements below concerning the school’s eligibility and compliance with U.S. Department of Education, Office for Civil Rights (OCR) requirements is true and correct.

1. The school configuration includes one or more of grades K-12. (Schools on the same campus with one principal, even a K-12 school, must apply as an entire school.)
2. The school has made its Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs) or Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) each year for the past two years and has not been identified by the state as “persistently dangerous” within the last two years.
3. To meet final eligibility, a public school must meet the state’s AMOs or AYP requirements in the 2013-2014 school year and be certified by the state representative. Any status appeals must be resolved at least two weeks before the awards ceremony for the school to receive the award.
4. If the school includes grades 7 or higher, the school must have foreign language as a part of its curriculum.
5. The school has been in existence for five full years, that is, from at least September 2008 and each tested grade must have been part of the school for the past three years.
6. The nominated school has not received the National Blue Ribbon Schools award in the past five years: 2009, 2010, 2011, 2012, or 2013.
7. The nominated school has no history of testing irregularities, nor have charges of irregularities been brought against the school at the time of nomination. The U.S. Department of Education reserves the right to disqualify a school’s application and/or rescind a school’s award if irregularities are later discovered and proven by the state.
8. The nominated school or district is not refusing Office of Civil Rights (OCR) access to information necessary to investigate a civil rights complaint or to conduct a district-wide compliance review.
9. The OCR has not issued a violation letter of findings to the school district concluding that the nominated school or the district as a whole has violated one or more of the civil rights statutes. A violation letter of findings will not be considered outstanding if OCR has accepted a corrective action plan from the district to remedy the violation.
10. The U.S. Department of Justice does not have a pending suit alleging that the nominated school or the school district as a whole has violated one or more of the civil rights statutes or the Constitution’s equal protection clause.
11. There are no findings of violations of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act in a U.S. Department of Education monitoring report that apply to the school or school district in question; or if there are such findings, the state or district has corrected, or agreed to correct, the findings.

## PART II - DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

---

All data are the most recent year available.

**DISTRICT** (Question 1 is not applicable to non-public schools)

1. Number of schools in the district (per district designation):
- 108 Elementary schools (includes K-8)
  - 37 Middle/Junior high schools
  - 26 High schools
  - 4 K-12 schools
- 175 TOTAL

**SCHOOL** (To be completed by all schools)

2. Category that best describes the area where the school is located:
- Urban or large central city
  - Suburban with characteristics typical of an urban area
  - Suburban
  - Small city or town in a rural area
  - Rural
3. 3 Number of years the principal has been in her/his position at this school.
4. Number of students as of October 1 enrolled at each grade level or its equivalent in applying school:

Grade	# of Males	# of Females	Grade Total
PreK	0	0	0
K	72	65	137
1	66	73	139
2	72	65	137
3	64	68	132
4	61	59	120
5	71	67	138
6	0	0	0
7	0	0	0
8	0	0	0
9	0	0	0
10	0	0	0
11	0	0	0
12	0	0	0
<b>Total Students</b>	406	397	803

5. Racial/ethnic composition of the school:
- 0 % American Indian or Alaska Native
  - 5 % Asian
  - 12 % Black or African American
  - 18 % Hispanic or Latino
  - 0 % Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
  - 61 % White
  - 4 % Two or more races
  - 100 % Total**

(Only these seven standard categories should be used to report the racial/ethnic composition of your school. The Final Guidance on Maintaining, Collecting, and Reporting Racial and Ethnic Data to the U.S. Department of Education published in the October 19, 2007 *Federal Register* provides definitions for each of the seven categories.)

6. Student turnover, or mobility rate, during the 2012 - 2013 year: 1%

This rate should be calculated using the grid below. The answer to (6) is the mobility rate.

<b>Steps For Determining Mobility Rate</b>	<b>Answer</b>
(1) Number of students who transferred <i>to</i> the school after October 1, 2012 until the end of the school year	2
(2) Number of students who transferred <i>from</i> the school after October 1, 2012 until the end of the 2012-2013 school year	3
(3) Total of all transferred students [sum of rows (1) and (2)]	5
(4) Total number of students in the school as of October 1	795
(5) Total transferred students in row (3) divided by total students in row (4)	0.006
(6) Amount in row (5) multiplied by 100	1

7. English Language Learners (ELL) in the school: 1 %  
9 Total number ELL  
 Number of non-English languages represented: 8  
 Specify non-English languages: Chinese, Malayalam, Spanish, Creole, Bengali, Urdu, Mandarin, Portuguese
8. Students eligible for free/reduced-priced meals: 22 %  
 Total number students who qualify: 180

If this method is not an accurate estimate of the percentage of students from low-income families, or the school does not participate in the free and reduced-priced school meals program, supply an accurate estimate and explain how the school calculated this estimate.

9. Students receiving special education services:  $\frac{9}{86}$  %  
86 Total number of students served

Indicate below the number of students with disabilities according to conditions designated in the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. Do not add additional categories.

- |                          |   |
|--------------------------|---|
| 8 Autism                 | 0 Orthopedic Impairment                 |
| 0 Deafness               | 4 Other Health Impaired                 |
| 0 Deaf-Blindness         | 12 Specific Learning Disability         |
| 0 Emotional Disturbance  | 50 Speech or Language Impairment        |
| 0 Hearing Impairment     | 0 Traumatic Brain Injury                |
| 0 Mental Retardation     | 1 Visual Impairment Including Blindness |
| 12 Multiple Disabilities | 0 Developmentally Delayed               |

10. Use Full-Time Equivalents (FTEs), rounded to nearest whole numeral, to indicate the number of personnel in each of the categories below:

	<b>Number of Staff</b>
Administrators	2
Classroom teachers	49
Resource teachers/specialists e.g., reading, math, science, special education, enrichment, technology, art, music, physical education, etc.	9
Paraprofessionals	1
Student support personnel e.g., guidance counselors, behavior interventionists, mental/physical health service providers, psychologists, family engagement liaisons, career/college attainment coaches, etc.	3

11. Average student-classroom teacher ratio, that is, the number of students in the school divided by the FTE of classroom teachers, e.g., 22:1 18:1

12. Show daily student attendance rates. Only high schools need to supply yearly graduation rates.

<b>Required Information</b>	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Daily student attendance	96%	96%	96%	96%	96%
High school graduation rate	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

13. **For schools ending in grade 12 (high schools)**

Show percentages to indicate the post-secondary status of students who graduated in Spring 2013

<b>Post-Secondary Status</b>	
Graduating class size	0
Enrolled in a 4-year college or university	0%
Enrolled in a community college	0%
Enrolled in career/technical training program	0%
Found employment	0%
Joined the military or other public service	0%
Other	0%

14. Indicate whether your school has previously received a National Blue Ribbon Schools award.

Yes                      No X

If yes, select the year in which your school received the award.

## **PART III – SUMMARY**

---

At Morikami Park Elementary School, we understand the principle of educating to embody both academics as well as social development. Our school vision statement reads: Educating Today's Children for Tomorrow's World and our mission statement reads: Working together with open and inquiring minds to develop responsible, respectful, and caring citizens who are lifelong learners dedicated to success within a global society. We analyze each statement to ensure its alignment with the International Baccalaureate and the Palm Beach County School District mission and vision statements. Morikami Park is an International Baccalaureate (IB) school located in Delray Beach, Florida. We were one of the first 10 schools in North America to implement the IB Primary Years Programme (PYP). In Palm Beach County we are one of four schools to hold this accreditation. Morikami Park Elementary is a dedicated magnet school. We offer the International Baccalaureate Primary Years Programme. All of our students must submit an application with the school district prior to Kindergarten in order to attend. Students are then selected through a random lottery process. Due to Morikami's reputation we receive close to 1,000 applications each year for the 144 openings we have in Kindergarten. Once our students are selected they choose to stay until the end of fifth grade.

In addition to the broad demographic area our school covers, our student population represents many diverse ethnicities including African American, Hispanic, and Asian. Our students come to us with a variety of educational needs; among the students supported are those with learning disabilities and those in need of behavior modifications. We have many students who are eligible for full time gifted programs, but opt out of attending gifted centers. Their families know we will challenge their children with a rigorous, comprehensive program.

Many traditions have become a part of Morikami. Our students celebrate diversity and cultures with our annual Multicultural Day. Pink Night is an event that takes place every October to raise awareness and funds for breast cancer research. Karaoke Friday is an incentive that our students earn for good cafeteria behavior. Golden Globes are awards that can be given daily for outstanding behavior. Our FCAT Pep Rally is held every year with the whole school involved to help motivate our students to do their best for the test. Our Earth Day celebration includes students and their families to raise awareness about the importance of keeping our environment clean.

For more than 10 years, Morikami Park has received the Five Star School Award which is presented each year to those schools that have shown evidence of exemplary community involvement. We have an average of 10,000 volunteer hours logged each year. Our volunteers include parents, guardians, grandparents, and community members. In addition, our School Advisory Council is comprised of 15 voting members, eight of whom are parents and business partners. Our business partners play an important role in the success of many of our activities by sponsoring fundraisers and providing rewards and recognition of our students' accomplishments.

Another notable achievement is our recognition as a Green School for the fifth year in a row. We are committed to environmental protection, both locally and globally, and we make every effort to promote sustainable practices at school. Conservation is emphasized in an interdisciplinary fashion throughout the curriculum. The "Green Team", which consists of faculty and parents, was established to educate the school community and to organize projects and activities that involve the participation of everyone.

Battle of the Books is a voluntary reading incentive program for students in grades 3-12. The purpose is simply to encourage students to read good books and have fun while competing with peers. After participating in school-level battles, the teams then compete with others across the district. For the last three years, several Morikami Park teams ranked in the top 10 of all Palm Beach serving schools grades 3-6. In 2011, we brought home the trophy as our team won the grade 3-6 county battle.

Our parent-teacher association (PTA) is an integral part of our school community. We have maintained 100% membership for the past 9 years. Our PTA sponsors many of our fundraisers and community building

activities. The funds raised support many of our school programs as well as general classroom and school needs.

The dedication of the staff at Morikami Park Elementary School sets us apart from other schools. Our teachers give tirelessly of their time and talent to ensure the success of their students. The sense of pride at Morikami Park with students and parents is palpable. Students are proud of their school and they reach above and beyond to meet the high expectations set forth.

## **PART IV – INDICATORS OF ACADEMIC SUCCESS**

---

### **1. Assessment Results:**

#### **A.**

The Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test 2.0 (FCAT 2.0) measures student performance on selected benchmarks of the Next Generation Sunshine State Standards (NGSSS) in reading, math and science. The NGSSS articulates challenging content Florida students are expected to know and be able to do. FCAT 2.0 Reading and Mathematics are reported on a developmental score scale, which is used to determine a student's annual progress from grade to grade. Achievement levels define the success a student has with the NGSSS on the FCAT 2.0. The passing score on FCAT 2.0 Reading and Mathematics is the minimum score in Achievement Level 3. Achievement levels, which range from 1 (lowest) and 5 (highest) are defined as follows: Level 1-students demonstrate an inadequate level of success with the challenging content of the NGSSS; Level 2-students demonstrate a below satisfactory level of success with the challenging content of the NGSSS; Level 3-students demonstrate a satisfactory level of success with the challenging content of the NGSSS; Level 4-students demonstrate an above satisfactory level of success with the challenging content of the NGSSS; Level 5-Students demonstrate mastery of the most challenging content of the NGSSS.

#### **B.**

**Trends:** In a review of our data, we found that in 2009 through 2011 our reading data remained consistent with 91-92 % of students demonstrating proficiency with a score of Level 3 or higher on the FCAT. From FY12 to FY 13 we saw a decrease in the percent of our students meeting proficiency standards with 87% in FY12 and 84% in FY 13. In a review of our math data, we found that we remained consistent from 2009 to 2011 with a score of 92% in FY09, 94% in FY10 and 95% in FY11. In a similar fashion to reading, we saw a decrease in students proficiency in math with FY12 at 89% and FY13 at 90%.

**Contributing Factors:** There are many contributing factors to the decrease in scores in FY12 and FY13. One major factor was the revision of the state standards to include more rigorous content; the new standards (NGSSS) require more depth of knowledge of fewer important concepts as opposed to fragmented knowledge of a multitude of concepts. The NGSSS require students to think critically, to work cooperatively, and to problem solve creatively. Students are now required to go beyond a simple retrieval of information and to move into the analysis, utilization and knowledge of pertinent concepts.

Additionally, the FCAT was revised to FCAT 2.0 to reflect the NGSSS. For example, the reading test now includes more complex text passages as well as a greater number of test items requiring reasonable inferences and prior knowledge. The math test in grade 5 is now a computer-based assessment which includes more open-ended gridded response items.

In 2011, the State Board of Education established new Achievement Levels for FCAT 2.0 Reading and Mathematics. Spring 2012 is the first time the results were reported according to these new standards. Because the FCAT 2.0 is based on more demanding content standards and the achievement standards are more rigorous, scores appear lower on the new scale than on the previous scale. We feel that these changes rather than a change in instructional practices were a major contributing factor to the dip in our scores.

#### **Achievement Gaps:**

We have found an achievement gap in two of our sub groups: African-American students in reading and Students with Disabilities in reading and math. We have put in place a variety of measures to close this achievement gap. We implemented a tutorial program for these students before, during and after school to provide additional remediation. In order to close the reading gap, we purchased the research-based Leveled Literacy Intervention system and trained our support staff in its use. These students receive daily instruction with this curriculum. Additionally, we purchased an online program called Raz-Kids that students can access in school and at home. We are implementing early intervention strategies with these subgroups to identify strengths and weaknesses to support and remediate them before they get to the critical testing years. For math, we have determined that students in these subgroups have a lack of fluency with basic math facts and, in response we have purchased an online program called Reflex Math that students can access from

school and home. We have opened our computer labs before school and have computer lab time scheduled into each teacher's instructional day to make sure that every student has access to this technology. We provide these students with emotional support through mentoring programs with our guidance counselor and support staff.

## **2. Using Assessment Results:**

Our assessment results are used to drive instruction. We are fortunate that our school district has developed an extensive Educational Data Warehouse (EDW) which houses all of our school and district data. On a regular basis, we analyze diagnostic reports for reading and math, literacy assessment reports, and Palm Beach Writes reports. We are able to drill down our reports to show individual classroom teacher data and make comparisons between teachers, individual student data, and school performance in comparison to the district.

As professional educators who are striving to continuously improve we analyze our data in a variety of ways. Administration and teachers collect multiple measures of student learning data, such as our standardized tests, district diagnostic data, teacher observations of student abilities, and authentic assessments. When analyzing data we look at the number of students demonstrating proficiency and, the number of students not demonstrating learning gains, and we can dig deeper to determine the strands in which the students are deficient. Teachers work collaboratively with their grade level; pooling their knowledge, talent, and ideas to structure lessons around the areas of deficiency. Students are placed in groups according to the areas in need of remediation; the groups are fluid and change as data is collected and analyzed. Our use of data allows us to identify students in need of enrichment or special assistance at any point during the school year. Classroom resources are aligned so that teachers have the necessary materials to remediate areas of weakness. We have developed strategies such as after and during school tutorials and intensive reading intervention in order to achieve high standards. In math we focus on problem-solving strategies and rigor across all academic areas in order to reach our goals. We meet through our School Based Team meetings to evaluate how the interventions affect student learning, what interventions are working and for whom they are working. Using this information, we adjust our instructional practices, and try again.

Sharing information with our parents, students, and community is an important component of our data analysis. Three times per school year, our teachers are informed about our data through a formal school presentation during a faculty meeting to ensure their awareness of the school's challenges and celebrations. Teachers are updated as to the patterns that exist in the data and the list of problem areas. At the meetings, administration encourages teachers to brainstorm strategies to help increase student achievement. Administration also holds data chats with teachers twice during the school year to discuss current student data and instructional practices. Teachers hold data chats with students, notifying each student of their progress. At that time, each teacher discusses areas of strength and weakness and assist students in setting learning goals for themselves. Students track their progress on each learning goal in the classroom using a scale. Parents and the community are notified of our school data through our School Advisory Committee meetings and our monthly newsletter.

## **3. Sharing Lessons Learned:**

Morikami Park has had many opportunities to share best practices with other schools in our district and beyond. Due to our high scores in writing over the past few years, we were contacted by our area office to provide training to their schools for writing instructional practices. One of our fourth grade teachers and the assistant principal provided comprehensive area training for a number of schools and area staff in the writing process and, strategy instruction, as well as the writing workshop format. On a daily basis, we receive phone calls from principals in our district who would like to know what practices and programs we use to achieve our high results in reading and writing. We are always willing to share and have welcomed teachers from these schools into our classrooms to observe and meet with our teachers.

We are a seasoned (IB) school and, as a result, we are called upon to provide mentorship to other IB schools across the state and country. We frequently open our doors to schools from around the country to tour and meet with our IB coordinator. They visit classrooms and talk to our teachers about best practices in the implementation of the IB program and inquiry across the curriculum. In October, we hosted a two day district IB training for schools both in our district and neighboring districts. Teachers who attended were able to visit classrooms to observe teachers and take pictures of innovative ideas. Our IB coordinator and many teachers are certified IB trainers and they are frequently called upon to train teachers in other districts around the country and even locations as far away as Dubai. Our teachers join IB accreditation teams throughout the country to mentor schools so that we can continue to evolve as an IB school.

Another program that has been shared is our dog therapy program established to help our struggling readers. We have found this program to be successful in helping reluctant and dysfluent readers make progress and develop a love for reading. The principal has shared this idea with principals around our district.

#### **4. Engaging Families and Community:**

Partnerships are key to the success of Florida's school system. While our schools work diligently to provide all students with exceptional quality instruction in a safe and stimulating environment, they cannot do it alone. Harvard Graduate School of Education lecturer, Karen Mapp, reported that just as certain instructional strategies can help a school to reach its learning goals, family and community engagement can be a strategy for getting students reading at grade level, closing achievement gaps, and motivating students for long-term educational success.

At Morikami Park Elementary, we could not agree more. We regard family and community involvement as a vital strategy for achieving productive learning outcomes. Morikami has done this successfully in a variety of ways. Family and community involvement are key components in school events, such as literacy night, family math night, science night, and an expanded Business Partnership program. These programs are designed to bring classroom concepts to life and develop effective and lasting relationships with families to support their children's learning. Partnerships with community leaders, business owners, and area "celebrities" are employed to execute events that strengthen learning objectives. Examples of these include active and rotating reading rooms featuring "celebrity" readers, a partnership with Publix Super Markets to host an active math scavenger hunt, and guest scientists that deliver exciting demonstrations building on concepts used in our school's science lab. These events are just a few examples of how we engage families and communities to enhance student learning opportunities.

Additionally, Morikami has strengthened its Business Partnership program which now offers even more student learning opportunities by linking community and families together. Recently, a current business partner, the Delray Beach Public Library, sponsored an art showcase that featured Morikami's visual and performing arts. Also at this event, a guest scientist entertained students and their parents by executing stunning science concepts and by debuting the first 3D digital printer Morikami students had ever seen! As a result, students were enticed and motivated to take the concepts learned at this event back into the classroom. Additionally, they were emotionally elated to have their works of art showcased and to have the opportunity to share their musical talents with the community.

At Morikami, we have found that the evidence is consistent - families have a major influence on student achievement. When schools, families, and community groups work together children consistently do better in school. As such, Morikami will continue to strengthen and expand its family and community engagement plan.

## **PART V – CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION**

---

### **1. Curriculum:**

Our core curriculum is aligned to Florida Standards which are the Common Core State Standards (CCSS). Grades K-2 follow CCSS in both reading and math and grades 3-5 follow a blended model of the Next Generation Sunshine State Standards (NGSSS) and CCSS. The CCSS represent a coherent progression of learning expectations in English language arts (ELA) and math designed to prepare K-12 students for college and career success. The standards define the knowledge and skills students should have in their education with an emphasis on learning goals, and clear end-of-the-year expectations with a strong focus on results.

The standards set requirements not only for (ELA), but also for literacy in history/social studies, and science. Just as students must learn to read, write, speak, listen, and use language effectively in a variety of content areas, so too must the standards specify the literacy skills and understandings required for college and career readiness in multiple disciplines. The reading CCSS require deep comprehension and high-level thinking. Close, analytical reading is what is required of students. Rigor is a natural part of the CCSS and students are required to read increasingly complex texts for longer periods of time. The CCSS unify reading so that readers bring the same skills to various texts. At Morikami we strive to meet the demands of the CCSS by requiring teachers to follow the mandated 90 minute literacy block and conducting small group instruction daily.

The standards for mathematical content set grade-specific standards. What students can learn at any particular grade level depends upon what they have learned before. Each skill builds upon another. The mathematics standards follow several mathematical practices with a focus on students making sense of problems and persevering in solving them. At the same time, all students must have the opportunity to learn and meet the same high standards if they are to access the knowledge and skills necessary in their post-school lives. The standards for mathematical content are a balanced combination of procedure and understanding. Structured, purposeful inquiry is the main approach for teaching and learning mathematics. We have implemented a 60-minute math block that encompasses a whole group lesson followed by small group instruction in order to meet the demands of the CCSS.

For science and social studies, we utilize the NGSS and our teachers write Units of Inquiry using these standards. What sets Morikami Park apart from other elementary schools is that we do not use textbooks as our main source of teaching science and social studies; we use inquiry as a vehicle for learning in the Primary Years Programme. A requirement of being an International Baccalaureate (IB) PYP school is that we create a transdisciplinary curriculum that is engaging, relevant, challenging and significant for learners. The curriculum comprises of three interrelated components that follow an open-ended question format-(1) What do we want to learn? (written curriculum); (2) How best will we learn? (taught curriculum); (3) How will we know what we have learned? (assessed curriculum).

At Morikami Park, learning to communicate in a variety of ways, in more than one language is fundamental to the development of intercultural understanding. Intercultural understanding involves recognizing and reflecting on one's own perspective as well as the perspective of people of other beliefs and cultures. Our students in grades K-5 receive instruction in Spanish and Mandarin Chinese. They learn the language as well as the rich cultural heritage of countries speaking these languages and their commonality and connection to our culture.

We have a comprehensive physical education program. Students have classes with an instructor who follows state mandated curriculum to teach students the skills and fundamentals for individual as well as competitive and non-competitive team sports. This program encourages life-long health and wellness. In addition to Physical Education class, students are provided with a structured daily physical education time to encourage health and relieve stress. Health and nutrition is focused on through our IB Units of Inquiry and in our math and science lab.

## **2. Reading/English:**

At Morikami, we take a balanced literacy approach, teaching with the Reader's Workshop framework of instruction which supports an inquiry based approach to learning. The curriculum we teach is based on district-wide Units of Study that focus on reading genres. This curriculum is tightly aligned to the CCSS. The teacher begins with a read aloud or shared reading and then provides a minilesson to the whole group to expose them to the skill through a demonstration from the unit while he/she is there to provide support as the students try out the skill. Students are expected to use turn and talk, stop and jot, and reader's response log/reflections to demonstrate a deeper understanding of the learning goal. During independent time students are taught to choose authentic literature at just the right reading level for their ability. Time is provided daily for students to independently read and build stamina as they delve into increasingly complex texts. During independent reading time, the teacher either teaches a guided reading lesson or confers with individual students based on their need as determined through assessments.

We recognize that foundational skills are the building blocks of reading. We utilize assessments to determine student needs as well as the Continuum of Literacy to ensure that students are acquiring the necessary reading behaviors, concepts of print, the alphabetic principle, phonics and basic conventions of the English writing system through word work.

Instruction is differentiated based on student need with struggling readers given more direct instruction like daily, Immediate Intensive Instruction (iii) and small skill groups in order to develop the skills and strategies that they will rely upon throughout their lives.

Through our many hours of collaborating to determine what will make students improve their reading skills, we have concluded that building stamina and hours of practice will create confident, proficient readers. In addition, as a staff, we recognize that as students develop more proficient reading skills it is imperative that text complexity increases. While it is vital that we provide our struggling readers with support and foundational skills, it is also vital for us to provide enrichment to enhance the skills of our on or above grade level students with novel studies, literature circles, and book clubs. Our ultimate goal through this process is to create a reading community where students are hard at work, reading, thinking, and making decisions to become lifelong readers.

## **3. Mathematics:**

At Morikami Park we understand that mathematics is a way of thinking, communicating, and learning about the world. Our mission is to ensure that each student is challenged to achieve growth and success in their mathematic development. Our mathematics curriculum involves the integrated, connected study of the mathematics content as well as developed proficiency in understanding concepts, computing fluently, applying concepts, reasoning logically, and engaging with mathematics. Our instructional methods begin with teachers understanding what students know and need to learn and then challenging and supporting them to learn it well. As facilitators of learning, we model mathematical thinking and reasoning as well as support and promote creative thinking and risk taking in finding and explaining solutions.

We use a range of assessments and analyze outcomes to map students' progress and plan appropriate future leaning experiences. In an effort to improve the mathematical skills of students who are performing below grade level strategic interventions and appropriate assistance is provided. We chose to utilize small group instruction to provide an environment that maximizes learning opportunities.

We recognize that numbers are the foundation of mathematics and students must learn and acquire instant recall of the single digit number facts for addition and multiplication and the related facts for subtraction and division. Our computer lab is open before school to allow students to use a technology program called Reflex math which builds fluency in basic facts. For our students above grade level math skills are enhanced through available technologies and the opportunity to explore and apply mathematics across key learning areas and beyond the school setting.

Problem solving is not only a goal of our mathematics curriculum but an integral part of our program. Students are given frequent opportunities to formulate, grapple with, and solve complex problems that involve a significant amount of effort. They are encouraged to reflect on their thinking during the problem-solving process so that they can apply and adapt the strategies they develop to other problems.

Students confidently engage in complex mathematical tasks chosen carefully by teachers. They draw on knowledge from a wide variety of mathematical topics, sometimes approaching the same problem from different mathematical perspectives or representing the mathematics in different ways until they find methods that enable them to make progress. There are high expectations for all, with accommodations for those who need them and challenges for those who stand to benefit from them.

#### **4. Additional Curriculum Area:**

A driving force behind the Primary Years Programme (PYP) is a deeply held philosophy about the nature of international education. An international curriculum guides our students in developing the knowledge, values, and skills necessary to be citizens of the world. We help our students develop interpersonal and communication skills as well as thinking and research skills. These skills allow our students to be open-minded and inquiring individuals. Our commitment to international mindedness is the central idea of our program. Internationalism is integrated into all learning rather than viewed as a stand-alone subject.

We recognize that teaching science and social studies as a subject is not sufficient. We believe that it is important to learn science and social studies in context and to explore content that is relevant to students. We teach science and social studies in the form of units of inquiry. These units of inquiry can last anywhere from four to six weeks. Units of inquiry encourage students to ask questions, and provide input on how they will learn the content, and how they will be assessed after the content is learned. Our teachers structure the learning environment to provide opportunities for students to develop planned and spontaneous inquiries.

When teaching science we offer an increase in hands-on learning experiences, a high level of student involvement in a flexible learning environment, and concept driven curriculum. We have shown tremendous improvement over the past three years in our science instruction. We have reflected on our teaching practices and made changes to our instruction ensuring that we are covering the material our students need to know. We have implemented more hands on science learning in the classroom and a science lab that the students visit once every eight days. The percentage of our students showing satisfactory progress on the grade 5 FCAT 2.0 Science has maintained steady improvement and increased 9% from 2011-2013.

Our aim with social studies is to promote an intercultural understanding and respect for individuals and their values and traditions. Our students have a deeper understanding of themselves and others as well as their place in the global society. As a result of their learning our students take action within their school and the community. We believe that education must extend beyond the intellectual to include socially responsible attitudes.

#### **5. Instructional Methods:**

Our school has a variety of strategies in place to support the diverse needs of students. All classroom teachers differentiate daily lessons to meet the needs of every learner through small group instruction and utilization of a variety of instructional methods. As a way of sharing good teaching techniques, our teachers present “best practices” at faculty meetings and during professional development. Master teachers provide demonstration lessons in classrooms to enhance the teachers’ proficiency. Once every eight days, each team of teachers meet to review lesson implementation (rate, level, depth and complexity), teaching strategies and student data. This allows teachers to reflect on student needs and tailor instruction to meet those needs. The teams examine specific student needs and develop small group intervention or enrichment based on their findings. These small groups are then taught by the teachers on the team who demonstrate the skill set needed to support the learning.

Many teachers provide enrichment or remediation lessons before and after school, as well as during their planning time. Our special area teachers, like the Media Specialist, Spanish teachers or Physical Education teacher, provide small group or individual instruction to struggling learners outside the scope of their regular duties. We also have an After School Tutorial program in the areas of reading, writing and math for grades 3-5 for those students needing remediation. Exceptional student education (ESE) teachers provide inclusive services, as well as small group, direct instruction to students with special needs.

Technology plays a significant role in meeting students' learning needs. All students have access to computer programs that provide both enrichment and remediation. In addition to programs like Riverdeep and Soar to Success, that are provided by our district, we have implemented Raz-Kids, Reflex Math and Read Naturally. We have instituted a motivational reinforcement program to encourage students to use these programs in their free time. Additionally, we have our computer lab open before school to allow students who arrive early to access these programs. Our classroom teachers use laptops, classroom computers, interwrite pads, and Nooks/iPads to provide digital lessons for students on a day-to-day basis.

## **6. Professional Development:**

We plan and implement research-based professional development to prepare our teachers to deliver differentiated instruction that meets the needs of our students. Most of our professional development this year is centered on the understanding of Common Core State Standards (CCSS). Teachers have been provided with the unpacking of the standards and discussions on what students will need to know and be able to do and the rigor needed to use close reading to tackle complex texts. Across our district we have adopted the reading and writing workshop instructional framework which is an instructional model that aligns to our International Baccalaureate (IB) school flawlessly. It provides students with rigor and independence, and helps teachers differentiate their instruction to meet the needs of every student. Each grade level has a literacy leader who attends monthly cohort meetings to be trained in the structure of the workshop and, instructional strategies, as well as the curriculum units that will be taught and in turn they train their grade level. We have two district leaders (one in K-2 and one in 3-5). These leaders visit the school once a month to provide a lab-site for our teachers. They demonstrate lessons and provide hands-on training and coaching to our teachers in the curriculum and framework; we facilitate teacher participation by providing substitutes. We are fortunate to have a number of instructional leaders on our staff. They frequently provide professional development in their area of expertise to the staff during professional development half days and faculty meetings. Administrators are also provided with an understanding of curriculum and instructional strategies and how best to support teachers in the classroom.

In addition to literacy professional development, our teachers receive professional development in curriculum and instruction for our IB curriculum. This year, we hosted a large-scale two day assessment training at our school to train our teachers in the latest research-based practices of the IB. Teachers were required to bring artifacts and complete independent assignments for the training. Teachers had the opportunity to collaborate with teachers from schools across South Florida.

Every year our staff participates in a book study. This year our book is "Pathways to the Common Core." We discuss the book at our monthly faculty meetings. Our school-based administrative team meets Monday afternoons and we are currently doing a book study on the book "The 15 Invaluable Laws of Growth" to further develop our leadership skills.

## **7. School Leadership**

Our school leadership team is comprised of the principal, assistant principal, guidance counselor (assists with the emotional needs of our students), ESE contact (provides input on the needs our ESE students), and magnet coordinator (ensures that we are meeting the demands of the PYP).

As a leadership team we strive to lead by inspiration and example, rather than authority. We are visionary, and collaborative, and foster growth in our staff. Our responsibility as leaders is to paint a clear picture of the vision required for the organization and to work collaboratively with the staff towards developing a

shared vision. We perceive change as an opportunity to grow and necessary to improve instructional quality and student achievement.

Our mission as principal and assistant principal is to make sure that every student at Morikami Park has access to and receives a quality education. To keep our school moving forward we must be instructional leaders. Our job is to provide resources and support to teachers and students. We mentor teachers as they embark on new instructional practices and curriculum with the implementation of the Common Core State Standards (CCSS). Staff members find that we are very approachable and informal in many respects, but that we hold high expectations for the work that we do. We feel people perform at their best if they know that we believe in them and care about them. As school leaders, we strive to be objective and reflective observers. Some of our time is spent resolving conflict and enforcing rules. We lead by example to provide structure and still promote creativity and imagination. We encourage our teachers not to simply accept what has always been done, but to question what is best for our students and school. We strive to be a positive influence on the Morikami Park community by demonstrating integrity, fairness, flexibility and professionalism.

Day to day, we affect students in a positive manner. We are a visible presence in the hallways and classrooms, making ourselves available to students. They are very comfortable approaching us to discuss their concerns. We offer the best resources we know, human resources. We support our struggling learners by providing small group instruction. This personal connection between administrators and kids makes a huge difference in student achievement. As a result of our leadership style, we are proud to say that in FY13 we retained 100% of our staff.

# PART VII - ASSESSMENT RESULTS

## STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS

**Subject:** Math

**Test:** Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test

**All Students Tested/Grade:** 3

**Edition/Publication Year:** 2013

**Publisher:** Pearson

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	Apr	Apr	Apr	Mar	Mar
<b>SCHOOL SCORES*</b>					
Levels 3-5	93	89	86	95	92
Levels 4-5	67	62	66	78	75
Number of students tested	116	134	138	152	153
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students tested with alternative assessment	0	0	1	0	0
% of students tested with alternative assessment	0	0	0	0	0
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>					
<b>1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students</b>					
Levels 3-5	89	73	72	92	78
Levels 4-5	50	30	48	60	48
Number of students tested	28	30	25	38	37
<b>2. Students receiving Special Education</b>					
Levels 3-5	64	47	71	62	69
Levels 4-5	54	27	57	46	38
Number of students tested	11	19	14	13	16
<b>3. English Language Learner Students</b>					
Levels 3-5					
Levels 4-5					
Number of students tested					
<b>4. Hispanic or Latino Students</b>					
Levels 3-5	90	91	68	89	89
Levels 4-5	70	66	53	79	67
Number of students tested	20	32	19	37	18
<b>5. African- American Students</b>					
Levels 3-5	86	63	88	95	71
Levels 4-5	38	25	31	66	42
Number of students tested	21	16	16	21	24
<b>6. Asian Students</b>					
Levels 3-5				100	91
Levels 4-5				100	91
Number of students tested	7	6	9	10	11

<b>7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students</b>					
Levels 3-5					
Levels 4-5					
Number of students tested					
<b>8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students</b>					
Levels 3-5					
Levels 4-5					
Number of students tested					
<b>9. White Students</b>					
Levels 3-5	95	94	88	97	99
Levels 4-5	70	68	73	79	84
Number of students tested	61	77	84	76	87
<b>10. Two or More Races identified Students</b>					
Levels 3-5			90		92
Levels 4-5			70		77
Number of students tested	7	3	10	6	13
<b>11. Other 1: Other 1</b>					
Levels 3-5					
Levels 4-5					
Number of students tested					
<b>12. Other 2: Other 2</b>					
Levels 3-5					
Levels 4-5					
Number of students tested					
<b>13. Other 3: Other 3</b>					
Levels 3-5					
Levels 4-5					
Number of students tested					

**NOTES:** Cells without data had fewer than 10 students tested.

In 2011, the State Board of Education established new Achievement Levels for FCAT 2.0 Reading and Mathematics. Spring 2012 is the first time the results were reported according to these new standards. Because the FCAT 2.0 is based on more demanding content standards and the achievement standards are more rigorous, scores appear lower on the new scale than on the previous scale. We feel that these changes rather than a change in instructional practices were a major contributing factor to the dip in our scores.

**STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS**

**Subject:** Math

**Test:** Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test

**All Students Tested/Grade:** 4

**Edition/Publication Year:** 2013

**Publisher:** Pearson

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	Apr	Apr	Apr	Mar	Mar
<b>SCHOOL SCORES*</b>					
Levels 3-5	91	89	92	91	92
Levels 4-5	73	71	81	65	63
Number of students tested	137	146	148	147	146
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students tested with alternative assessment	1	0	1	0	0
% of students tested with alternative assessment	0	0	0	0	0
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>					
<b>1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students</b>					
Levels 3-5	81	65	83	81	78
Levels 4-5	60	54	72	39	37
Number of students tested	32	26	36	36	32
<b>2. Students receiving Special Education</b>					
Levels 3-5	76	56	58	50	65
Levels 4-5	48	44	41	20	36
Number of students tested	21	16	12	10	17
<b>3. English Language Learner Students</b>					
Levels 3-5					
Levels 4-5					
Number of students tested	0	2	3	2	1
<b>4. Hispanic or Latino Students</b>					
Levels 3-5	94	86	92	91	91
Levels 4-5	76	54	78	64	74
Number of students tested	32	22	36	22	23
<b>5. African- American Students</b>					
Levels 3-5	84	72	82	70	79
Levels 4-5	53	61	68	20	34
Number of students tested	19	18	22	20	29
<b>6. Asian Students</b>					
Levels 3-5		100			92
Levels 4-5		90			50
Number of students tested	8	10	9	2	12
<b>7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students</b>					
Levels 3-5					

Levels 4-5					
Number of students tested					
<b>8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students</b>					
Levels 3-5					
Levels 4-5					
Number of students tested		0	2	2	1
<b>9. White Students</b>					
Levels 3-5	92	91	95	95	100
Levels 4-5	76	77	85	71	70
Number of students tested	75	87	73	86	65
<b>10. Two or More Races identified Students</b>					
Levels 3-5					81
Levels 4-5					81
Number of students tested	3	9	5	7	16
<b>11. Other 1: Other 1</b>					
Levels 3-5					
Levels 4-5					
Number of students tested					
<b>12. Other 2: Other 2</b>					
Levels 3-5					
Levels 4-5					
Number of students tested					
<b>13. Other 3: Other 3</b>					
Levels 3-5					
Levels 4-5					
Number of students tested					

**NOTES:** Cells with missing data had fewer than 10 students tested.

In 2011, the State Board of Education established new Achievement Levels for FCAT 2.0 Reading and Mathematics. Spring 2012 is the first time the results were reported according to these new standards. Because the FCAT 2.0 is based on more demanding content standards and the achievement standards are more rigorous, scores appear lower on the new scale than on the previous scale. We feel that these changes rather than a change in instructional practices were a major contributing factor to the dip in our scores.

**STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS**

**Subject:** Math

**Test:** Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test

**All Students Tested/Grade:** 5

**Edition/Publication Year:** 2013

**Publisher:** Pearson

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	Apr	Apr	Apr	Mar	Mar
<b>SCHOOL SCORES*</b>					
Levels 3-5	86	90	83	88	85
Levels 4-5	70	70	53	62	68
Number of students tested	140	142	143	145	142
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	0
Number of students tested with alternative assessment	0	1	0	0	0
% of students tested with alternative assessment	0	0	0	0	
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>					
<b>1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students</b>					
Levels 3-5	81	76	68	80	59
Levels 4-5	57	51	44	52	37
Number of students tested	32	33	38	41	27
<b>2. Students receiving Special Education</b>					
Levels 3-5	50	70	42	80	59
Levels 4-5	44	30	8	52	37
Number of students tested	16	10	12	41	27
<b>3. English Language Learner Students</b>					
Levels 3-5					
Levels 4-5					
Number of students tested	1	1	2	1	1
<b>4. Hispanic or Latino Students</b>					
Levels 3-5	83	89	86	89	100
Levels 4-5	66	64	46	78	92
Number of students tested	18	36	22	36	13
<b>5. African- American Students</b>					
Levels 3-5	78	82	56	75	48
Levels 4-5	50	64	17	40	32
Number of students tested	18	22	18	28	25
<b>6. Asian Students</b>					
Levels 3-5				85	
Levels 4-5				46	
Number of students tested	9	9	9	13	6
<b>7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students</b>					
Levels 3-5					

Levels 4-5					
Number of students tested					
<b>8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students</b>					
Levels 3-5					
Levels 4-5					
Number of students tested		1			
<b>9. White Students</b>					
Levels 3-5	87	91	87	95	90
Levels 4-5	75	75	61	65	72
Number of students tested	86	68	84	62	82
<b>10. Two or More Races identified Students</b>					
Levels 3-5					100
Levels 4-5					75
Number of students tested	9	4	8	6	16
<b>11. Other 1: Other 1</b>					
Levels 3-5					
Levels 4-5					
Number of students tested					
<b>12. Other 2: Other 2</b>					
Levels 3-5					
Levels 4-5					
Number of students tested					
<b>13. Other 3: Other 3</b>					
Levels 3-5					
Levels 4-5					
Number of students tested					

**NOTES:** Cells without data had fewer than 10 students tested.

In 2011, the State Board of Education established new Achievement Levels for FCAT 2.0 Reading and Mathematics. Spring 2012 is the first time the results were reported according to these new standards. Because the FCAT 2.0 is based on more demanding content standards and the achievement standards are more rigorous, scores appear lower on the new scale than on the previous scale. We feel that these changes rather than a change in instructional practices were a major contributing factor to the dip in our scores.

**STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS**

**Subject:** Reading/ELA

**Test:** Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test

**All Students Tested/Grade:** 3

**Edition/Publication Year:** 2013

**Publisher:** Pearson

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	Apr	Apr	Apr	Mar	Mar
<b>SCHOOL SCORES*</b>					
Levels 3-5	84	84	82	89	84
Levels 4-5	58	59	64	60	61
Number of students tested	116	134	138	153	152
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students tested with alternative assessment	0	1	0	0	0
% of students tested with alternative assessment	0	0	0	0	0
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>					
<b>1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students</b>					
Levels 3-5	79	73	68	84	62
Levels 4-5	68	46	60	42	35
Number of students tested	28	30	25	38	37
<b>2. Students receiving Special Education</b>					
Levels 3-5	64	47	71	54	56
Levels 4-5	54	27	57	31	19
Number of students tested	11	19	14	13	16
<b>3. English Language Learner Students</b>					
Levels 3-5					
Levels 4-5					
Number of students tested	1	3	3	3	3
<b>4. Hispanic or Latino Students</b>					
Levels 3-5	85	75	74	89	83
Levels 4-5	70	69	54	54	56
Number of students tested	20	32	19	37	18
<b>5. African- American Students</b>					
Levels 3-5	67	81	81	86	46
Levels 4-5	34	31	50	52	25
Number of students tested	21	16	16	21	24
<b>6. Asian Students</b>					
Levels 3-5				80	100
Levels 4-5				50	91
Number of students tested	7	6	9	10	11
<b>7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students</b>					
Levels 3-5					

Levels 4-5					
Number of students tested					
<b>8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students</b>					
Levels 3-5					
Levels 4-5					
Number of students tested					
<b>9. White Students</b>					
Levels 3-5	87	88	83	93	92
Levels 4-5	63	55	70	47	69
Number of students tested	61	77	84	76	87
<b>10. Two or More Races identified Students</b>					
Levels 3-5			70		85
Levels 4-5			40		61
Number of students tested	7	3	10	6	13
<b>11. Other 1: Other 1</b>					
Levels 3-5					
Levels 4-5					
Number of students tested					
<b>12. Other 2: Other 2</b>					
Levels 3-5					
Levels 4-5					
Number of students tested					
<b>13. Other 3: Other 3</b>					
Levels 3-5					
Levels 4-5					
Number of students tested					

**NOTES:** Cells with missing data had fewer than 10 students tested.

In 2011, the State Board of Education established new Achievement Levels for FCAT 2.0 Reading and Mathematics. Spring 2012 is the first time the results were reported according to these new standards. Because the FCAT 2.0 is based on more demanding content standards and the achievement standards are more rigorous, scores appear lower on the new scale than on the previous scale. We feel that these changes rather than a change in instructional practices were a major contributing factor to the dip in our scores.

**STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS**

**Subject:** Reading/ELA

**Test:** Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test

**All Students Tested/Grade:** 4

**Edition/Publication Year:** 2013

**Publisher:** Pearson

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	Apr	Apr	Apr	Mar	Mar
<b>SCHOOL SCORES*</b>					
Levels 3-5	83	89	80	88	91
Levels 4-5	61	66	60	64	65
Number of students tested	137	146	148	147	146
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students tested with alternative assessment	1	0	1	0	0
% of students tested with alternative assessment	1	0	0	0	0
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>					
<b>1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students</b>					
Levels 3-5	72	73	61	81	81
Levels 4-5	34	50	42	42	31
Number of students tested	32	26	36	36	32
<b>2. Students receiving Special Education</b>					
Levels 3-5	57	56	25	70	59
Levels 4-5	43	38	16	30	35
Number of students tested	21	16	12	10	17
<b>3. English Language Learner Students</b>					
Levels 3-5					
Levels 4-5					
Number of students tested	0	2	3	2	1
<b>4. Hispanic or Latino Students</b>					
Levels 3-5	94	82	75	91	96
Levels 4-5	68	59	47	63	69
Number of students tested	32	22	36	22	23
<b>5. African- American Students</b>					
Levels 3-5	68	83	68	70	83
Levels 4-5	21	56	63	30	27
Number of students tested	19	18	22	20	29
<b>6. Asian Students</b>					
Levels 3-5		100		100	75
Levels 4-5		90		90	42
Number of students tested	8	10	9	10	12
<b>7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students</b>					
Levels 3-5					

Levels 4-5					
Number of students tested				2	1
<b>8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students</b>					
Levels 3-5					
Levels 4-5					
Number of students tested					
<b>9. White Students</b>					
Levels 3-5	81	90	88	90	95
Levels 4-5	64	70	73	68	81
Number of students tested	75	87	73	86	65
<b>10. Two or More Races identified Students</b>					
Levels 3-5					94
Levels 4-5					69
Number of students tested	3	9	5	7	16
<b>11. Other 1: Other 1</b>					
Levels 3-5					
Levels 4-5					
Number of students tested					
<b>12. Other 2: Other 2</b>					
Levels 3-5					
Levels 4-5					
Number of students tested					
<b>13. Other 3: Other 3</b>					
Levels 3-5					
Levels 4-5					
Number of students tested					

**NOTES:** Cells missing data had fewer than 10 students tested.

In 2011, the State Board of Education established new Achievement Levels for FCAT 2.0 Reading and Mathematics. Spring 2012 is the first time the results were reported according to these new standards. Because the FCAT 2.0 is based on more demanding content standards and the achievement standards are more rigorous, scores appear lower on the new scale than on the previous scale. We feel that these changes rather than a change in instructional practices were a major contributing factor to the dip in our scores.

**STATE CRITERION--REFERENCED TESTS**

**Subject:** Reading/ELA

**Test:** Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test

**All Students Tested/Grade:** 5

**Edition/Publication Year:** 2013

**Publisher:** Pearson

School Year	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009
Testing month	Apr	Apr	Apr	Mar	Mar
<b>SCHOOL SCORES*</b>					
Levels 3-5	84	87	80	89	89
Levels 4-5	68	66	54	60	55
Number of students tested	140	142	143	145	142
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students tested with alternative assessment	0	1	0	0	0
% of students tested with alternative assessment	0	0	0	0	0
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>					
<b>1. Free and Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-Economic/Disadvantaged Students</b>					
Levels 3-5	75	67	68	80	70
Levels 4-5	53	36	26	48	22
Number of students tested	32	33	38	41	27
<b>2. Students receiving Special Education</b>					
Levels 3-5	56	50	42	50	55
Levels 4-5	44	10	17	28	9
Number of students tested	16	10	12	14	11
<b>3. English Language Learner Students</b>					
Levels 3-5					
Levels 4-5					
Number of students tested	1	1	2	1	1
<b>4. Hispanic or Latino Students</b>					
Levels 3-5	83	83	77	94	92
Levels 4-5	55	58	41	75	46
Number of students tested	18	36	22	36	13
<b>5. African- American Students</b>					
Levels 3-5	67	68	67	71	68
Levels 4-5	61	59	17	25	24
Number of students tested	18	22	18	28	25
<b>6. Asian Students</b>					
Levels 3-5				77	
Levels 4-5				46	
Number of students tested	9	9	9	13	6
<b>7. American Indian or Alaska Native Students</b>					
Levels 3-5					

Levels 4-5					
Number of students tested					
<b>8. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander Students</b>					
Levels 3-5					
Levels 4-5					
Number of students tested					
<b>9. White Students</b>					
Levels 3-5	87	94	81	95	91
Levels 4-5	71	72	63	66	61
Number of students tested	86	68	84	61	82
<b>10. Two or More Races identified Students</b>					
Levels 3-5					100
Levels 4-5					69
Number of students tested	9	4	8	6	16
<b>11. Other 1: Other 1</b>					
Levels 3-5					
Levels 4-5					
Number of students tested					
<b>12. Other 2: Other 2</b>					
Levels 3-5					
Levels 4-5					
Number of students tested					
<b>13. Other 3: Other 3</b>					
Levels 3-5					
Levels 4-5					
Number of students tested					

**NOTES:** Cells without data had fewer than 10 students tested.

In 2011, the State Board of Education established new Achievement Levels for FCAT 2.0 Reading and Mathematics. Spring 2012 is the first time the results were reported according to these new standards. Because the FCAT 2.0 is based on more demanding content standards and the achievement standards are more rigorous, scores appear lower on the new scale than on the previous scale. We feel that these changes rather than a change in instructional practices were a major contributing factor to the dip in our scores.