

Liza Jackson Preparatory School Student Performance Data Document

Liza Jackson Preparatory School (LJPS) has earned an A+ designation from the state of Florida *every year* since able to qualify in 2002. We have also been designated by the state of Florida as a “High Performing” school for the past three years, 2011, 2012, and 2013. These accomplishments are possible because LJPS is a data-driven School.

LJPS embeds Common Core standards (grades K – 2) and a blend of Next Generation, 2.0, and Common Core Standards (grades 3 – 8) into our established, advanced curriculum. We do not believe in teaching to “the” test. We teach well every day using best practices and informed, effective, targeted instruction. School-wide curriculum maps and grade level scope and sequences are in place for every subject. The curriculum maps and scope and sequences are reviewed and revised at the end of each school year. The LJPS Scope and Sequences for each grade level are located on our website, www.lizajackson.org. Each scope and sequence includes: entry skills needed to be successful in the grade level, curriculum with the standards embedded by subject for each nine-weeks, and exit skills needed for promotion to the next grade level.

Data Used to Determine Student Progress:

The following data is used to determine student progress at LJPS:

- Discovery Education Assessment (DEA): grades K – 8 (Commercial Standard-based Assessment)
 - Benchmark Assessment Tests – beginning/mid/end of year assessments
 - Reading: grades K – 8
 - Mathematics: grades K – 8
 - Science: grades 3 - 8
 - Teacher-created Probes
 - Reading: grades K – 8
 - Mathematics: grades K – 8
 - Science: grades 3 - 8
- Florida Comprehensive Achievement Test (FCAT): grades 3 – 8 (State Standard-based Assessment)
 - Reading: grades 3 – 8
 - Mathematics: grades 3 – 8
 - Science: grades 5 & 8
 - FL Writes (FCAT Writes): grades 4 & 8
- End of Course (EOC) Exams: (State & County created Standard-based Assessments)
 - State EOC Exams:
 - Algebra 1: grades 7 & 8
 - Geometry: grade 8
 - County- created Test:
 - Civics: grade 7
- Florida Kindergarten Readiness Screener (FLKRS): grade K (State Assessment)
- 4Sight, Standard-based Reading assessment test developed by Success For All Foundation (SFAF): grades 3 – 5 (Commercial Standard-based Test)

- Roots Reading Inventory, Reading Assessment test developed by Success For All Foundation (SFAF): grades K & 1 (Commercial Curriculum & Standard-based Assessment)
- Publisher-created chapter pre/mid/post assessments: grades K – 8 (Curriculum-based Assessment)
- Liza Writes: grades K – 8 (County Curriculum & Standard-based Assessment)

To maintain validity, reliability, absence of bias and instructional sensitivity, LIPS uses state, commercial, publisher, or county developed assessments. All assessments LIPS selects are research-based and normed over time. They are administered to a wide body of students throughout the state and/or nationally. Documentation is available on all tests we administer to prove they are valid, reliable, and bias-free.

Process Used to Administered Tests:

Students are assigned into testing groups, depending on assessment, in the following way:

- DEA: homeroom or subject
- FCAT: homeroom
- EOC: subject
- FL Writes: homeroom
- Liza Writes: homeroom
- Pre/post chapter tests: homeroom or subject

*Students with accommodations may be pulled out to test in smaller, more flexible groups or individually, or given accommodations within the classroom to meet the requirements designated on their IEP, 504, or medical plan as required by law.

When administering formal paper assessments to students, the desks are moved into rows, separated by at least 2 feet of space, and adjusted so all are facing the same direction. If space is not sufficient for proper separation, privacy screens are placed on each desktop. When administering computer-based assessments, privacy screens are placed around each computer to ensure privacy and to cut down on distractions. Teachers verify student name matches the student taking the assessment before testing begins. Accommodations are given to students who have an active Individual Education Plan (IEP), 504 Plan, or medical plan as required by law.

All assessments are administered with a teacher or staff member who is familiar to the students. This provides a more relaxed, comfortable, and safe environment. School administrators, teachers and proctors are trained each year in test administration and security. New teachers and staff members are provided with extra support until they are comfortable testing on their own. All assessments listed above, with the exception of Liza Writes and Pre/post chapter tests, are administered with state security measures in place. Proctors are also in every testing group during testing to have two pair of eyes monitoring the test and to ensure testing protocol is adhered to throughout the entire testing period. Teachers follow scripted manual dialog, without deviation, when administering the directions throughout the exam. Teachers also strictly follow the timing allotments specified for each test. Students are allowed the full amount of testing time, even if they finish early. Students are encouraged to go back and check their work or if done to sit quietly so as to not disturb their fellow classmates. Make-up testing is administered in the same format as regular testing. We strive to test 100% of our students as this guarantees results that are representative of all of LIPS students.

Process Used to Review Data:

The following is the process used to review student progress at LJPS.

- Data is collected from each teacher and the state at the end of each school year for review during the summer for the upcoming year.
 - DEA end of year Benchmark Assessments: K – 3 Reading & Mathematics and 3 – 8 Science is used for formal evaluation of school’s progress. K – 8 data is used to establish goals and objectives for each grade level and school-wide.
 - FCAT – grades 3 – 8 in Reading, Mathematics; 5 & 8 Science; and 4 & 8 Writing
 - EOCs – Middle School
 - Pre/Post Math Assessments – with teacher recommendations students who are in need of advanced class placement in math
 - Spring Liza Writes Scores, grades K - 8
 - Reading Levels: Roots Reading Inventory; 4Sights; SFAF Checklists
- During pre-planning of each school year, administration holds data review meetings with each grade level team.
- Data is reviewed and a spreadsheet is generated with each grade level’s strengths and weakness based on DEA, grades K – 3, and FCAT, grades 3 – 8, results.
 - Click on link below to view School-wide Strengths and Weaknesses document:
<\\Liza\users\SACS\Sacs Reports\Schoolwide strengths and weaknesses 9 14.xlsx>
 - Click on link below for a summary of the School-wide Strengths and Weaknesses document:
<\\Liza\users\SACS\Sacs Reports\DEA FCAT analysis 2013 str wkns.xlsx>
- Based on DEA and FCAT the lowest quartile from each subject, Reading, Mathematics, Science, and Writing, is identified by skill and a strategy sheet is completed and used throughout the year by each teacher to track the progress of their students in the lowest quartile.
 - Click on link below to view Strategy Sheet document:
<C:\Users\jjenzen\Documents\13 14\Data\Lowest Quartile students\Lowest quartile and catagory sheet form.xlsx>
- The strengths and weaknesses information is taken to the first Leadership Team meeting. It is analyzed and school-wide academic goals are determined.
- The LJPS School Goals plan (School Improvement Plan) is developed collaboratively with all teachers involved in the process.
- The LJPS School Goals are shared with all stakeholders.

Student Performance Data:

- **DEA – Standard-based test – Core Standards, grades K – 2; Next Generation Standards, grades 3 - 8**

**LJPS 2013 DEA Longitudinal
Reading Data**

Kindergarten Reading	
	2013
Percent ≥ 3	85%
Percent of Students Moving Up One or More Levels	34%
Percent of Students Moving Down One or More Levels	19%
1st Grade Reading	
	2013
Percent of Students in Levels 3, 4, 5	86%
Percent of Students Moving Up One or More Levels	77%
Percent of Students Moving Down One or More Levels	5%
2nd Grade Reading	
	2013
Percent of Students in Levels 3, 4, 5	92%
Percent of Students Moving Up One or More Levels	49%
Percent of Students Moving Down One or More Levels	11%
3rd Grade Reading	
	2013
Percent of Students in Levels 3, 4, 5	69%
Percent of Students Moving Up One or More Levels	44%
Percent of Students Moving Down One or More Levels	16%

LJPS 2013 DEA MATH LONGITUDINAL DATA

Kindergarten Math	
	2013
Percent ≥ 3	84%
Percent of Students Moving Up One or More Levels	33%
Percent of Students Moving Down One or More Levels	17%
1st Grade Math	
	2013
Percent of Students in Levels 3, 4, 5	83%
Percent of Students Moving Up One or More Levels	56%
Percent of Students Moving Down One or More Levels	1%
2nd Grade Math	
	2013
Percent of Students in Levels 3, 4, 5	95%
Percent of Students Moving Up One or More Levels	70%
Percent of Students Moving Down One or More Levels	1%
3rd Grade Math	
	2013
Percent of Students in Levels 3, 4, 5	80%
Percent of Students Moving Up One or More Levels	38%
Percent of Students Moving Down One or More Levels	18%

LJPS 2013 DEA SCIENCE LONGITUDINAL DATA

3rd Grade Science	
	2013
Percent ≥ 3	83%
Percent of Students Moving Up One or More Levels	60%
Percent of Students Moving Down One or More Levels	5%

4th Grade Science	
Percent of Students in Levels 3, 4, 5	88%
Percent of Students Moving Up One or More Levels	71%
Percent of Students Moving Down One or More Levels	4%
6th Grade Science	
	2013
Percent of Students in Levels 3, 4, 5	92%
Percent of Students Moving Up One or More Levels	33%
Percent of Students Moving Down One or More Levels	16%
7th Grade Science	
	2013
Percent of Students in Levels 3, 4, 5	85%
Percent of Students Moving Up One or More Levels	38%
Percent of Students Moving Down One or More Levels	6%

- **FCAT – Standard-based test – Next Generation Standards, grades 3 - 8**

LJPS 2013 FCAT READING LONGITUDINAL DATA

3rd Grade Reading				
	2010	2011	2012	2013
Percent <u>> 3</u>	90%	92%	80%	83%
4th Grade Reading				
	2010	2011	2012	2013
Percent of Students in Levels 3, 4, 5	84%	88%	84%	80%
Percent of Students Moving Up One or More Levels	18%	19%	29%	18%
Percent of Students Moving Down One or More Levels	29%	26%	23%	39%
5th Grade Reading				
	2010	2011	2012	2013

District *	State *
2013	2013
66%	57%
District *	State *
2013	2013
65%	60%

District *	State *
2013	2013

Percent of Students in Levels 3, 4, 5	85%	90%	85%	85%
Percent of Students Moving Up One or More Levels	27%	27%	42%	28%
Percent of Students Moving Down One or More Levels	23%	9%	17%	26%

70%	60%
-----	-----

6th Grade Reading				
	2010	2011	2012	2013
Percent of Students in Levels 3, 4, 5	92%	88%	77%	85%
Percent of Students Moving Up One or More Levels	24%	16%	24%	21%
Percent of Students Moving Down One or More Levels	23%	20%	20%	26%

District *	State *
2013	2013
71%	59%

7th Grade Reading				
	2010	2011	2012	2013
Percent of Students in Levels 3, 4, 5	91%	92%	87%	74%
Percent of Students Moving Up One or More Levels	24%	25%	21%	21%
Percent of Students Moving Down One or More Levels	23%	21%	26%	15%

District *	State *
2013	2013
66%	57%

8th Grade Reading				
	2010	2011	2012	2013
Percent of Students in Levels 3, 4, 5	85%	81%	91%	84%
Percent of Students Moving Up One or More Levels	27%	7%	36%	18%
Percent of Students Moving Down One or More Levels	12%	41%	13%	21%

District *	State *
2013	2013
66	56

***Due to changes in the 2013 scoring, all scores throughout the state dropped.**

LJPS 2013 FCAT MATH LONGITUDINAL DATA

3rd Grade Math				
	2010	2011	2012	2013
Percent ≥ 3	99%	93%	78%	89%

District *	State *
2013	2013
61%	58%

4th Grade Math				
	2010	2011	2012	2013
Percent of Students in Levels 3, 4, 5	83%	93%	84%	84%
Percent of Students Moving Up One or More Levels	5%	5%	23%	34%
Percent of Students Moving Down One or More Levels	58%	38%	22%	15%

District *	State *
2013	2013
64%	61%

5th Grade Math				
	2010	2011	2012	2013
Percent of Students in Levels 3, 4, 5	73%	77%	95%	85%
Percent of Students Moving Up One or More Levels	20%	27%	48%	42%
Percent of Students Moving Down One or More Levels	29%	9%	5%	9%
6th Grade Math				
	2010	2011	2012	2013
Percent of Students in Levels 3, 4, 5	93%	70%	79%	84%
Percent of Students Moving Up One or More Levels	55%	16%	32%	26%
Percent of Students Moving Down One or More Levels	6%	26%	23%	27%
7th Grade Math				
	2010	2011	2012	2013
Percent of Students in Levels 3, 4, 5	98%	92%	79%	77%
Percent of Students Moving Up One or More Levels	13%	11%	37%	27%
Percent of Students Moving Down One or More Levels	25%	44%	15%	21%
8th Grade Math				
	2010	2011	2012	2013
Percent of Students in Levels 3, 4, 5	95%	93%	91%	76%
Percent of Students Moving Up One or More Levels	27%	8%	32%	14%
Percent of Students Moving Down One or More Levels	12%	15%	23%	27%

District *	State *
2013	2013
55%	61%

District *	State *
2013	2013
64%	52%

District *	State *
2013	2013
65%	55%

District *	State *
2013	2013
45	51

***Due to changes in the 2013 scoring, all scores throughout the state dropped.**

LJPS 2013 FCAT SCIENCE LONGITUDINAL DATA

5th Grade Science					District *	State *
	2010	2011	2012	2013	2013	2013
Percent of Students in Levels 3, 4, 5	69%	87%	85%	87%	63%	53%

8th Grade Science					District *	State *
	2010	2011	2012	2013	2013	2013
Percent of Students in Levels 3, 4, 5	70%	77%	91%	77%	65%	47%

***Due to changes in the 2013 scoring, all scores throughout the state dropped.**

FCAT Writes Longitudinal Data

Year	Grade	Mean Score	= or > 3.0	= or > 3.5	= or > 4.0
2013	4	3.3	87%	51%	33%
2012	4	3.3	79%	46%	29%
2011	4	3.9	98%		69%
2010	4	3.7	92%		52%
2013	8	3.8	89%	71%	55%
2012	8	4	95%	84%	64%
2011	8	4.3	99%		90%
2010	8	4.5	100%		86%

District * * = or > 4.0	State * * = or > 4.0
2013	2013
35%	37%

31%	35%
-----	-----

Note: 2013 Proficiency Level: 3.5

- Liza Writes – Scored with Teacher-created Developmentally Appropriate Writing Rubric, grades K – 2; FCAT Writing Rubric, grades 3 - 8

Liza Writes Grade Level Averages - 2013

Grade	Average	# Proficient
K	11/24	45%
1	18/24	75%
2	16/24	67%
3	3.2	47%
5	3.5	59%
6	4.5	64%
7	4	55%

- Learning Gains:

DEA Learning Gain Percentages- 2013

Grade	2013 Reading	2013 Math	2013 Science	2013 Total	2012 Reading	2012 Math	2012 Total	2 yr Total
K	71	76		74	76	47	62	68
K	69	82		76	94	81	88	82
K	89	67		78	71	76	74	76
K	72	78		75				
K	75	71		73	78	59	69	71
1	94	94		94	82	61	72	83
1	78	94		86	100	100	100	93
1	77	94		86	100	94	97	92
1	100	73		87	83		83	85
2	100	100		100	100	72	83	92
2	86	94		90	76	94	85	88
2	78	94		86				
2	80	94		87	55	94	75	81
2	94	94		94	100	72	86	90
3	56	71	76	68	77	94	86	77
3		94	100	97	100	56	78	88
3	89	83	78	83	100	100	100	92
3		88	94	97				
3		65	78	72				
4	38			38				
4		85		85				

4	78			78				
4			90	90				
5		100		100				
5			91	91				
5	88			88				
5	95			95	93	94	94	95
6	88			88				
6		82		82				
6			79	79				
7	85			85				
7		83		83				
7			84	84				
8	82			82				
8		73		73				
8			88	88				
REM 2 – 8 RDG	56			56	46		46	51
REM 2 – 8 MATH		72		72		50	50	61

2013 Percentage FCAT Learning Gains

Grade	Reading	Math
4	56%	74%
5	69%	90%
6	70%	72%
7	72%	77%
8	82%	70%

- Disaggregated Data:**

Learning Gain Percentages for Lowest Quartile - 2013

	2011	2012	2013
Reading - FCAT	52%	68%	62%
Math - FCAT	49%	62%	80%
Reading - DEA/FCAT	57%	57%	55%
Math - DEA/FCAT	48%	57%	78%

FCAT: grades 4 - 8

DEA/FCAT: grades 2 – 8

ESE FCAT Percent Proficient Data - 2013

Subgroup	Grade	Reading % Proficient			Math % Proficient			Science % Proficient			Writing % Proficient			Algebra % Proficient		Geometry % Proficient	
		2011	2012	2013	2011	2012	2013	2011	2012	2013	2011	2012	2013	2012	2013	2012	2013
Gifted	3	100	100	100	100	100	100										
	4	100	100	100	100	100	100				100	100	100				
	5	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100							
	6	100	100	100	100	100	100										
	7	100	100	100	100	100	100							100	100		
	8	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100			100
Total		100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Speech Impaired	3	89	100	100	100	50	100										
	4	100	100	83	100	100	83				75	63	33				
	5	80	100	100	100	100	100	50	100	83							
	6	100	100	67	100	100	100										
	7		67	100		100	100							100			
	8	0		100	0		100	0		100	100		0			100	
Total		74	93	92	80	90	97	25	100	86	88	63	29	100	100		
Language Impaired	3		0	0		0	0										
	4	100		0	100		100				0		100				
	6	100		0	100		0										
	7	0	100	0	0	100	0										
	8	0	0	100	100	0	100	100	0	0	0	0	0	0			
Total		50	33	20	75	33	40	100	0	0	0	0	50				
Specific Learning Disabled	3		100			100											
	4	100		100	0		100				0		0				
	5	100	0	100	100	0	100			100							
	6		0	100		0	100										
	7	100		0	100		0										
	8	50	100	0	100	100	100			100	34	0	0				
Total		88	50	60	75	50	80			100	17	0	0				
Hospital Home bound	8		100	100		100	100		100	100		0	100				
Total			100	100		100	100		100	100		0	100				
Autism	6		50	100		100	100										
	7			100			100										
Total			50	100		100	100										
Other Health	3		100			0											
	4		100	100		100	100					100	0				

	07	90	67	44	100	67	56							100	100		0
	08	25	80	86	100	100	57	50	80	43	83	89	14	100	100		100
Total		79	87	81	81	85	78	50	90	56	92	78	17	100	100		100
Indian	3	0			100												
	4	0	100		0	100					0	100					
	5			100			100			100	0						
Total		0	100	100	50	100	100			100	0	100					
Mixed	03	100	50	100	100	83	100										
	04	83	67	50	100	80	67				83	80	33				
	05	100	86	75	67	97	88	0	87	75							
	06	96	58	73	57	84	82										
	07	100	33	38	80	81	38										
	08	67	100	20	67	91	40	56	95	40	89	97	40	100	100		
Total		91	66	70	79	86	74	28	91	62	86	85	18	100	100		
White	03	93	85	81	94	83	88										
	04	90	87	85	93	80	87				72	80	36				
	05	91	84	87	86	97	85	84	87	90							
	06	92	82	89	76	84	84										
	07	92	91	84	92	82	86							100	100		
	08	87	92	89	95	91	83	80	94	85	89	97	60	100	100		100
Total		91	87	86	89	86	85	82	91	87	81	89	46	100	100		100

ELL FCAT Percent Proficient Data - 2013

Subgroup	Grade	Reading % Proficient	Math % Proficient
ELL	07	0	0
Total		0	0

No ELL students in 2011 or 2012 in tested grades

End of Course Exam Longitudinal Data

EOC	Grade	Number Tested	Number Scored 60% or >	2012	2013 Percent Proficient	District 2013	State 2013
Civics	7	108	106	n/a	Norming Yr	n/a	n/a
Algebra	7			100%	100%	99%	98%
Algebra	8			100%	100%	98%	90%
Geometry	8			n/a	100%	Not avail.	97%

- School Comparison Data:

LJPS Comparison to County & State Schools - 2013

School	Reading % Proficient or higher	Math % Proficient or higher	Writing % Proficient or higher	Science % Proficient or higher	% made Reading Gains: Lowest Quartile	% made Math Gains: Lowest Quartile	AYP in Lowest Quartile - Reading	AYP in Lowest Quartile - Math
LJPS	82	83	61	82	72	82	Y	Y
County Combined Schools: non-charter	66	65	55	62	64	66		
County Elem	68	62	54	64	66	68		
County MS	73	72	54	68	70	71		
St Combined Schools: charter	61	56	53	51	67	64		
State Elem: charter	61	58	54	54	66	62		
State MS: charter	62	59	55	48	69	69		
St Combined Schools: non-charter	59	57	55	54	66	65		
State Elem	58	55	57	53	65	64		
State MS	56	55	54	48	65	66		

Blank Spaces: Data not available

2013 FCAT READING Results			
FCAT Reading		Mean Scale Scores	% > 3
4th Grade	State	201	57
	District	206	66
	LJPS	212	83
3rd Grade Reading Rank in District: 3rd			
FCAT Reading		Mean Scale Scores	% > 3
4th Grade	State	213	60
	District	218	65
	LJPS	223	80
4th Grade Reading Rank in District: 2nd			

FCAT Reading		Mean Scale Scores	% > 3
5th Grade	State	221	60
	District	226	70
	LJPS	234	85
5th Grade Reading Rank in District: 2nd			

FCAT Reading		Mean Scale Scores	% > 3
6th Grade	State	225	59
	District	229	71
	LJPS	236	85
6th Grade Reading Rank in District: 4th			

FCAT Reading		Mean Scale Scores	% > 3
7th Grade	State	238	57
	District	238	66
	LJPS	246	74
7th Grade Reading Rank in District: 3rd			

FCAT Reading		Mean Scale Scores	% > 3
8th Grade	State	237	56
	District	244	66
	LJPS	256	84
8th Grade Reading Rank in District: 1st			

2013 FCAT MATH Results

FCAT MATH		Mean Scale Scores	% \geq 3
3rd Grade	State	201	58
	District	204	61
	LJPS	213	89
3rd Grade Math Rank in District: 1st			

FCAT MATH		Mean Scale Scores	% \geq 3
4th Grade	State	215	61
	District	216	64
	LJPS	224	84
4th Grade Math Rank in District: 2nd			

FCAT MATH		Mean Scale Scores	% \geq 3
5th Grade	State	222	55
	District	226	61
	LJPS	237	86
5th Grade Math Rank in District: 1st			

FCAT MATH		Mean Scale Scores	% \geq 3
6th Grade	State	227	52
	District	232	64
	LJPS	237	84
6th Grade Math Rank in District: 2nd			

FCAT MATH		Mean Scale Scores	% \geq 3
7th Grade	State	236	55
	District	241	65
	LJPS	247	77
7th Grade Math Rank in District: 4th			

FCAT MATH		Mean Scale Scores	% \geq 3
8th Grade	State	243	51
	District	250	45
	LJPS	259	76
8th Grade Math Rank in District: 4th			

2013 FCAT SCIENCE Results			
FCAT Science		Mean Scale Scores	% \geq 3
5th Grade	State	322	53
	District	343	63
	LJPS	376	87
5th Grade Science Rank in District: 1st			

FCAT Science		Mean Scale Scores	% \geq 3
8th Grade	State	316	47
	District	345	65
	LJPS	376	77
8th Grade Science Rank in District: 2nd			

End of Course Exam Longitudinal Data

EOC	Grade	Number Tested	Number Scored 60% or >	2012	2013 Percent Proficient	District 2013	State 2013
Civics	7	108	106	n/a	Norming Year	n/a	n/a
Algebra	7			100%	100%	99%	98%
Algebra	8			100%	100%	98%	90%
Geometry	8			n/a	100%		97%

- **School Report Card Data:**

Liza Jackson Preparatory School Report Card

Total Points 2013	Scale	School Rank in State 2012	School Rank in State 2013	Grade 2013	Grade 2012	Grade 2011	Charter	Free or Reduced-Price Lunch Rate	Minority Rate	Title I
702*	900**	19 th	43 rd	A	A	A	Yes	19	25	No

*Highest points earned by state school: 819

**Due to inclusion of Middle School at LJPS, we are on the 900 point scale not the 800 point elementary scale

Reading % Proficient or higher	Math % Proficient or higher	Writing % Proficient or higher	Science % Proficient of higher	% made Reading Gains: Lowest Quartile	% made Math Gains: Lowest Quartile	AYP in Lowest Quartile - Reading	AYP in Lowest Quartile - Math
82	83	61	82	72	82	Y	Y

- **School Report Card Comparison Data:**

LJPS School Report Card - 2013

School	Total Points 2013	Scale	School Rank in State 2012	School Rank in State 2013	Grade 2013	Grade 2012	Grade 2011	Charter	Free or Reduced-Price Lunch Rate	Minority Rate	Title I
LJPS	702*	900**	19th	43rd	A	A	A	Yes	19	25	No
County Combined Schools	657	900		150 th	A	A	A	Yes	40	28	No
Elem 1 North	645	800		187 th	A	A	A	No	17	16	No
Elem 2 South	535	800		940 th	A	A	A	No	65	37	Yes
MS 1 North	697	900		49 th	A	A	A	No	19	17	No
MS 2 South	633	900		633 rd	A	A	A	No	23	15	No

*Highest points earned by state school: 819

**Due to inclusion of Middle School at LJPS, we are on the 900 point scale not the 800 point elementary scale

Blank Spaces: Data not available

Student Performance Diagnostic Questions

After extensive data analysis, Liza Jackson personnel have determined the following:

Areas of Notable Achievement

- Above Expected Level of Performance:
 - Ranked in the top four in the district in all FCAT tested subjects with the exception of 4th grade Writing
 - Reading: scored 8 – 18 points above the district and 12 – 28 points above the state in average number of proficient students as measured by FCAT
 - Math: scored 12 – 31 points above the district and 14 – 32 points above the state in average number of proficient students as measured by FCAT
 - 100% of 7th & 8th grade students are proficient and scored a level 4 or 5 on Algebra or Geometry EOCs (End of Course Exams)
 - Science: scored 12 – 24 points above the district and 30 – 34 points above the state in average number of proficient students as measured by FCAT
 - Writing in 8th grade: scored 24 points above the district and 20 points above the state in average number of proficient students as measured by FCAT
 - SES in Reading, Math, and Science as measured by FCAT
 - 2nd in Reading and Math as measured by DEA
 - Overall Math and Science as measured by FCAT
- Positive Trend in Performance:
 - Overall Science proficiency levels as measured by FCAT/DEA
 - Overall Math proficiency levels as measured by FCAT/DEA
 - 3rd and 6th grade Reading proficiency levels as measured by FCAT
 - Consistently scoring above the district and state proficiency levels as measured by FCAT
- Overall Highest Level of Performance:
 - 2nd, 8th grade Reading as measured by FCAT/DEA
 - 2nd, 3rd, 5th grade Math as measured by FCAT/DEA
 - 7th, 8th grade on Algebra and Geometry EOCs
 - 4th, 5th, 6th grade Science as measured by FCAT/DEA
 - 1st, 8th grade Writing as measured by FCAT Writes/Liza Writes
- Subgroups Trend in Performance:
 - ESE: Speech, Specific Learning Disabled, Homebound, Indian, Autism; Reading and Math as measured by FCAT
 - Lower quartile, Math as measured by FCAT
 - Speech Impaired, Reading and Math as measured by FCAT
 - SES, Math and Science as measured by FCAT
- Achievement Gap Closing Between:
 - Between ESE group and White Race as measured by FCAT
 - Between Hispanic Race and Black Race as measured by FCAT
- Other Data Sources Consistent with Findings:
 - DEA (Discovery Education Assessment): Benchmark assessment & probes

- 4Sight and other SFA (Success For All) assessments
- Compass Learning
- EOCs
- Liza Writes
- Summative Assessments
- Classroom Assessments

Areas of Need of Improvement

- Below Expected Level of Performance:
 - K, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7: Writing as measured by FCAT Writes/Liza Writes
 - OHI (Other Health Impaired) as measured by FCAT
 - 7th & 8th Black Race: Math as measured by FCAT
 - LI (Language Impaired) as measured by FCAT
 - 4th, 7th, 8th Mixed Race: Reading, Math, Science, Writing as measured by FCAT
- Negative Trend in Performance:
 - Writing as measured by FCAT Writes/Liza Writes
 - Mixed Race: Reading , Math, Science as measured by FCAT
- Overall Lowest Level of Performance:
 - 4th Writing as measured by FCAT Writes
 - Mixed Race: Reading , Math, Science as measured by FCAT
 - OHI: Reading, Math, Science as measured by FCAT
- Subgroups Trend in Performance:
 - Mixed Race: Reading , Math, Science as measured by FCAT
 - OHI: Reading, Math, Science as measured by FCAT
 - LI: Reading, Math, Science, Writing as measured by FCAT/FCAT Writes
- Achievement Gap Widening Between:
 - Between Black Race and Mixed Races as measured by FCAT
 - Between Language Impaired and all other ESE disabilities as measured by FCAT
- Other Data Sources Consistent with Findings:
 - DEA (Discovery Education Assessment): Benchmark assessment & probes
 - 4Sight and other SFA (Success For All) assessments
 - Compass Learning
 - EOCs
 - Liza Writes
 - Summative Assessments
 - Classroom Assessments