

PART I - ELIGIBILITY CERTIFICATION

11WY3

The signatures on the first page of this application 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 has some configuration that includes one or more of grades K-12. (Schools on the same campus with one principal, even K-12 schools, must apply as an entire school.)
2. The school has made adequate yearly progress 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, the school must meet the state's Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) requirement in the 2010-2011 school year. AYP must be certified by the state and all appeals 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 and a significant number of students in grades 7 and higher must take the course.
5. The school has been in existence for five full years, that is, from at least September 2005.
6. The nominated school has not received the Blue Ribbon Schools award in the past five years: 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009 or 2010.
7. The nominated school or district is not refusing OCR access to information necessary to investigate a civil rights complaint or to conduct a district-wide compliance review.
8. 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.
9. 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.
10. 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

11WY3

All data are the most recent year available.

DISTRICT

1. Number of schools in the district: 29 Elementary schools
 (per district designation) 5 Middle/Junior high schools
3 High schools
1 K-12 schools
38 Total schools in district
2. District per-pupil expenditure: 12186

SCHOOL (To be completed by all schools)

3. Category that best describes the area where the school is located: Small city or town in a rural area
4. Number of years the principal has been in her/his position at this school: 1
5. Number of students as of October 1, 2010 enrolled at each grade level or its equivalent in applying school:

Grade	# of Males	# of Females	Grade Total			# of Males	# of Females	Grade Total
PreK	10	18	28		6	0	0	0
K	18	16	34		7	0	0	0
1	21	13	34		8	0	0	0
2	18	16	34		9	0	0	0
3	18	12	30		10	0	0	0
4	13	20	33		11	0	0	0
5	15	15	30		12	0	0	0
Total in Applying School:								223

6. Racial/ethnic composition of the school: 4 % American Indian or Alaska Native
2 % Asian
2 % Black or African American
16 % Hispanic or Latino
0 % Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
76 % White
0 % Two or more races
100 % Total

Only the seven standard categories should be used in reporting 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.

7. Student turnover, or mobility rate, during the 2009-2010 school year: 1%

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

(1)	Number of students who transferred <i>to</i> the school after October 1, 2009 until the end of the school year.	2
(2)	Number of students who transferred <i>from</i> the school after October 1, 2009 until the end of the school year.	1
(3)	Total of all transferred students [sum of rows (1) and (2)].	3
(4)	Total number of students in the school as of October 1, 2009	201
(5)	Total transferred students in row (3) divided by total students in row (4).	0.01
(6)	Amount in row (5) multiplied by 100.	1

8. Percent limited English proficient students in the school: 6%

Total number of limited English proficient students in the school: 13

Number of languages represented, not including English: 2

Specify languages:

Spanish and Vietnamese

9. Percent of students eligible for free/reduced-priced meals: 60%
 Total number of students who qualify: 134

If this method does not produce 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.

10. Percent of students receiving special education services: 13%
 Total number of students served: 28

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

<u>0</u> Autism	<u>0</u> Orthopedic Impairment
<u>0</u> Deafness	<u>3</u> Other Health Impaired
<u>0</u> Deaf-Blindness	<u>12</u> Specific Learning Disability
<u>0</u> Emotional Disturbance	<u>12</u> Speech or Language Impairment
<u>0</u> Hearing Impairment	<u>0</u> Traumatic Brain Injury
<u>0</u> Mental Retardation	<u>0</u> Visual Impairment Including Blindness
<u>0</u> Multiple Disabilities	<u>1</u> Developmentally Delayed

11. Indicate number of full-time and part-time staff members in each of the categories below:

	Number of Staff	
	<u>Full-Time</u>	<u>Part-Time</u>
Administrator(s)	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>
Classroom teachers	<u>13</u>	<u>0</u>
Special resource teachers/specialists	<u>7</u>	<u>1</u>
Paraprofessionals	<u>8</u>	<u>1</u>
Support staff	<u>6</u>	<u>0</u>
Total number	<u>35</u>	<u>2</u>

12. Average school student-classroom teacher ratio, that is, the number of students in the school divided by the Full Time Equivalent of classroom teachers, e.g., 22:1: 17:1

13. Show the attendance patterns of teachers and students as a percentage. Only high schools need to supply graduation rates. Briefly explain in the Notes section any student or teacher attendance rates under 95% and teacher turnover rates over 12% and fluctuations in graduation rates.

	2009-2010	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006
Daily student attendance	95%	95%	94%	94%	96%
Daily teacher attendance	92%	92%	92%	92%	92%
Teacher turnover rate	15%	23%	25%	25%	25%
High school graduation rate	%	%	%	%	%

If these data are not available, explain and provide reasonable estimates.

Staff Attendance--Our district mandates staff development. Some of this staff development requires that our teachers be out of the classroom for that training. University Park operates on an extended day schedule. To compensate teachers for this additional time, each teacher is granted three (3) compensatory days. Each teacher is allocated 10 sick days a year. Some committee work requires that teachers miss school to serve on district committees.

The data on teacher daily attendance is estimated.

Because our district changed tracking systems in 2007, they were not able to report the teacher turnover rate in the years 2005, 2006, and 2007. So the information provided for those years are estimates.

14. For schools ending in grade 12 (high schools): Show what the students who graduated in Spring 2010 are doing as of Fall 2010.

Graduating class size:	_____
Enrolled in a 4-year college or university	_____ %
Enrolled in a community college	_____ %
Enrolled in vocational training	_____ %
Found employment	_____ %
Military service	_____ %
Other	_____ %
Total	_____ 0%

The mission of University Park School, in partnership with parents, students, and the greater community, is to assure each pre-K through fifth grade student receives an engaging, rigorous, and comprehensive education in a caring environment.

University Park is located on the eastside of Casper, Wyoming. It is one of 29 elementary schools in our town of approximately 53,569 people. Natrona County School District encompasses 5,376 square miles and six towns with a total of 11,750 students. We are considered a school district of choice, which means transportation is provided to any student in our community to attend any school they choose. University Park Elementary is a school of 223 students in grades preschool through fifth grade. It has held relatively constant percentages for poverty in the last decade (52%-58%). This year, a new eastside elementary school opened, changing our demographics slightly. One hundred thirty four (60%) of our students qualify for free or reduced lunch assistance. Currently, fifty students are labeled at-risk and thirteen students qualify as English Language Learners. We have two sections of each grade level, pre-school through fifth grade. We currently have two teachers who are Nationally Board Certified and two more who are working toward that goal.

University Park did not make AYP in the school year 2005-2006. In the subsequent school years, we implemented Reading First in all grade levels. We also chose a strong math program for our population and aligned our writing strategies to the state assessments.

University Park has gone from an unsuccessful school to one that has been district rated as excelling in two curricular areas (reading and written expression) for four consecutive years. We have held the excelling status in math for three of the four years. University Park was designated a 2008 National Title 1 Distinguished School. We have made AYP in all years since 2005. In the 2010-11 kindergarten registration, we have a waiting list of 34 students, which tells us that in a district of choice, our parents and community recognize our accomplishments and dedication to children.

Following the year that University Park did not meet AYP, the entire staff dedicated themselves to improvement. Each teacher reflected deeply on their practice and how they worked as an integral part of the team for the betterment of the student. We immersed ourselves in professional development that would perfect our instructional practice. We worked to instill intrinsic motivation and personal pride in our students using the motto, "Hard work, done well, feels great!" We implemented techniques to maintain high student engagement, determined high yield strategies that are used school-wide, set high expectations for learning and behavior, and began student goal-setting with cycles of continuous improvement. Our philosophy is to get our work done first, then reap the rewards. We have uninterrupted blocks of instructional time that we hold dear. Celebrations are scheduled after the instructional tasks have been met. Each teacher, and each grade level is one cog in the gear that maintains our learning cycle. We perform as a team for the greater good. Our goal is to prepare students for the next year of their learning.

University Park follows its own mandate to maintain a safe and healthy climate for each student. A new developmentally appropriate playground was installed offering areas of play that promote kinesthetic stimulation, imagination, and social development. Our families and staff worked diligently for three years to earn the needed money. Because of those efforts, we convinced our school board trustees to assist in the purchase and installation of the new equipment.

We provide students with the tools they will need in their future that will enable them to reach their potential. We instill the values of perseverance, effort, work ethic, and personal responsibility. Everyone is treated with respect. Discipline is handled in a low-key fashion. Consequences are established school-wide. Every adult and every child knows the rules and the expectations.

University Park uses the Response to Intervention (RtI) method to assist our at-risk students. We have a team of tutors and classified staff that provide the tiered interventions that address student needs. We provide every support necessary to close the achievement gap and keep the student successful in the same curriculum that most peers follow.

Since implementing the Reading First framework, along with the other initiatives, student achievement has been extraordinary. The dedication to our goals and our refusal to lower our standards makes University Park worthy of Blue Ribbon status.

1. Assessment Results:

The Website URL where information on our state assessment can be found here:
http://edu.wyoming.gov/Programs/statewide_assessment_system/paws.aspx

The state performance level which would demonstrate "meeting the standard" began at the set point of 40% of all students in the school meeting proficiency on our state assessment called the Proficiency Assessments for Wyoming Students (PAWS). Two years ago, the benchmark moved to 50%. Our school has scored significantly above that level in the past five years. The state of Wyoming and Natrona County School District uses the PAWS reading, language arts and math assessments. The school district also uses the Northwest Evaluation Association (NWEA) standardized growth tests in those same curricular areas, in conjunction with PAWS to determine the progress of a school. The district uses seven growth-rating levels that range from "substantially below" to "substantially above." University Park has been rated either "quite a bit above" or "substantially above" in growth from one year to the next in most grade levels. We have sustained this progress over time.

Our district also provided an analysis of the percentage of third grade students reading at grade level, broken out by elementary schools. Of the twenty-two schools that could be reported, University Park ranked second overall. The school ranked first is a non-Title school. The analysis provides four years of data from 2007 through 2010. University Park had 87% in 2007, 97% in 2008, 82% in 2009, and 90% in 2010. We pride ourselves on our early intervention model and the data shows us that it is successful.

Our trend line increased dramatically five years ago and we have continued to be one of the top elementary schools in town. Our trend line has since leveled out, and we continue to maintain high levels of proficiency. We have also closed the achievement gap between our free/reduced population and non-free/reduced lunch population. It is also note-worthy to point out that, as our school has decreased in population, due to a district shift to move the upper elementary students to middle school, it takes only a few students to impact the overall scores. We have also noticed that students that enter in kindergarten and remain with us for their entire elementary career are more advanced in the academic skills than most students who move in the later grades. As our school has gained recognition for the achievement gains, we have many students that have entered our school in third and fourth grade. While some have the prerequisite skills, many of them have been less than successful in their other schools. A greater percentage of the students have moved to our school with existing Individual Educational Plans (IEP's). It may take us more than one year, but we can and will move those students to proficient levels as well.

There is no significant difference between our overall population and the free/reduced subgroup. In fact, the students who receive free/reduced lunch often have slightly higher scores than the non-free/reduced lunch. Our ethnic student groups, African American and Hispanic, are too small for statistical analysis. We measure those students individually, and track their personal growth and progress. We did notice the trend that very few ethnic minority students could score advanced proficient. Our questions would include, is this inability to score higher due to a lack of cultural background and possible test bias? Are we doing all we can to boost their vocabulary and provide the necessary background knowledge? Are we talking about too few students to come to a statistical conclusion?

We have reduced the number of students with individual educational plans in the last five years from about 18% to around 13%. Many of the students who are on the individual plans have been able to grow from below basic levels to proficient, as well. Through the RtI (Response to Intervention) process, we stop many students from special education. The students who do require that service have more severe disabilities than in the past. We have changed staff in the special education area, and that has made a significant positive impact in the past five years.

The staff in our school is never satisfied with our test results. We realize that the percentages represent real students and we need to move all to the proficient level. Our goal is to have 100% of the students scoring proficient or higher. When we hold our school data summits, we concentrate on the individual student needs, and put our resources where they are most beneficial.

2. Using Assessment Results:

University Park relies on assessment data to determine priorities for our resources. We meet three times each year (fall, winter, and spring) for a Data Summit. At these meetings, we examine the data to determine the number of students in each category and assign resources to those groups of children. We balance both at-risk and enrichment for students. We are flexible with our resources and adjust to the needs at the time. For example, in the beginning of the year we know that many kindergartners just need the exposure to the instruction to make growth, but by the middle of the year, we might see four students that have not responded to the full-group instruction, so we devise a tutoring slot for that small group aimed at specific skill gaps.

We also have Learning Center meetings every quarter. The purpose of these meetings is to discuss the individual needs of each student and prepare an action plan for the school to address those needs. For example, a student may be exhibiting eyestrain, so the teacher may report on the eye evaluation that was sent from the doctor. This helps all staff in the building working with this child to better serve his needs. We can track the student progress through our tiered interventions and report out in the Learning Center meetings whether the student is ready to have less support, still needs the same level of support, or requires more support.

There are grade level team meetings held twice each month. We examine the progress monitoring data that we have collected. We talk about trend lines and discuss instructional strategies that need to be in place to make gains in student achievement. We seek the most definitive instructional tools available to implement across the grade levels. For example, we have dedicated ourselves to increasing active student engagement school-wide. So, from the collaboration that happens in the grade level meetings, we learn teaching tips from each other and set up observation sessions to boost our teaching knowledge. If a student is responding to the intervention, we maintain the level of intensity in the intervention. If the student is not responding with enough of a learning line, we adjust our intervention.

3. Communicating Assessment Results:

Three times per year, University Park holds school-wide goal setting conferences with parents and students. At the conference, students and teachers discuss all the assessment results with parents. We explain in detail the meaning of the scores in relation to peers, and to the students' past performance. Students explain their progress and the goals they wish to set. Students and teachers maintain individual data folders, so students can track their own growth in subject areas. Teachers keep classroom score information in a district data bank. The district reports out the data to the community at large at least once per year. The district relays the information regarding schools' scores through the local newspaper and their own monthly communication report. The state department also reports the scores on the state assessment to the newspapers across the state. Individual reports are sent to each home to report the student progress on the state assessment.

University Park uses classroom newsletters, sent every other week, to relay information on student achievement to parents and the community. We report areas of achievement outside of the academic as well. We are proud of all the ways our students can show their talents. University Park tracks the students who have graduated from our elementary setting as they move through their education. We celebrate our former students who achieve in middle school or high school because we provided the foundation for their future success.

The data for University Park is posted at the front entrance for all to see as they enter the school. Family members can focus on the data reports as they wait for their children. We have a bulletin board in that same entryway to post newspaper articles or other items highlighting our school or our students.

The district hosts a yearly data review for all the schools in Natrona County. This data is posted to each school and to the community news. Through this, University Park has been designated as “Excelling” in the three curricular areas that are reviewed.

4. Sharing Lessons Learned:

When University Park embraced the Reading First framework, we joined five other schools in the Natrona County School District and many more across the state. Each site utilized a reading coach that also served as a liaison between the schools. They met several times each year to share ideas and answer questions.

The RF schools in our district met four times each year for the purpose of sharing ideas and techniques across the grade level teams. Teachers participated in grade level team discussions. We continue the collaboration through email and share everything from observation forms to graphic organizers. Our district has an Essential Curriculum web page encouraging teachers to submit their ideas, lesson plans, test prompt practice items, and scoring tools.

University Park has opened our doors to many visitors from other schools. Twice each year, the Wyoming State Department of Education makes observations focusing on classroom management, academic standards, and curriculum details. We are given feedback on program fidelity across the grade levels. We welcome the debriefings and the chance to talk with other teachers. Our school district has encouraged visitors from other sites to view our classrooms, as well. We share our data and our personal reflections pertaining to how we believe we attained those results.

Our district utilizes Instructional Facilitators, whose job description mirrors that of a coach. The IF’s meet monthly for a full day of training. During this training, the IF’s share what is working and collaborate with each other to improve instruction and learning at all schools. Instructional Facilitators share video clips of classroom instruction happening at their schools. They also ask for suggestions and support to continuously make improvements. They share tools developed by our staff such as rubrics, graphic organizers, and writing formats. The Instructional Facilitator then returns to University Park with fresh ideas of which teachers can utilize.

Natrona County School District has named University Park as a demonstration site for Continuous Improvement. Our school has a vision of continuous improvement evident in each classroom. We share individual student data folders, our classroom curriculum continuous improvement data, known as PDSA (plan, do, study, act), and our methodology for achieving great results. The staff at University Park is dedicated to the education of every child. Our focus is, truly, to prepare the student for the next grade level and for life. We set high goals and we push everyone to do their best. When visitors come to our school, they see students and teachers following this mantra.

1. Curriculum:

University Park delivers most core academic curriculum in whole group instruction. Our premise is that all students should have access to the grade level material. We trust the research-proven materials that we utilize. We also imbed the research on best practice for students from poverty and their instructional needs. Our curriculum is spiraling, with multiple exposures and rehearsals built into each academic area. We stress the use of complete sentences for answers and rich academic language. Through active academic engagement strategies, we hold all students accountable for their personal learning.

- a. Reading is taught via the Reading First framework. We have been a Reading First school since 2005, using Houghton-Mifflin as the basal. The five big ideas of reading are covered every day in all K-5 classrooms.
- b. Mathematics is taught in a sixty-minute block. The spiraling curriculum covers the strands of mathematical concepts. (geometry, number sense, operations and concepts, algebra, measurement, and data analysis) Again, our faculty uses a school-wide program to build consistency.
- c. Written Language is taught through a combination of Six Traits, Step Up to Writing, the Ace Strategy, and practice on released test items. We employ the formulas provided in Step Up to Writing and the Ace Strategy (Answer, Cite Evidence, and Expand) because our students need sequential steps to process their writing. We teach the Six Traits to foster a love of writing and literature. We teach from the released test items because our students need to actually see and interact with that type of material in order to display their best attempt.
- d. Spelling and Language Arts is taught as imbedded into the reading and writing programs. We use the writing process to edit and revise, working on the grade level appropriate conventions. We encourage the students to use rich vocabulary even if the spelling is not correct. We stress correct spelling of words that have been taught. These standards are also held for punctuation, sentence variety and length, as well as proper grammar.
- e. Science is taught through two main methods. Our district invested in Science Kits, which are shared throughout our elementary buildings. Each kit centers around a particular scientific concept and offers hands-on learning for students using experiments and the scientific process. To learn the science vocabulary and concepts, we use non-fiction reading material and discussions. We have employed Reading for Information as both a tutoring tool and as supplemental material for reading.
- f. Social Studies instruction is similar to science. The Reading for Information books are leveled in order to teach the subject matter without the interference of a child's reading ability. We also employ real-world experiences into the instruction.
- g. Art is taught once each week. The teachers adhere to our district has art standards in the lessons of color, line, perspective, drawing, and sculpture. The focus is to develop budding talent and use artistic endeavors to be creative and for enjoyment.
- h. Music: Our students receive vocal music twice per week for thirty minutes each session through our school district. They also complete units with rhythm and beat. In fifth grade, students can choose between orchestra, band or vocal music. For the past five years, University Park has brought in Missoula Children's Theater for a week's residency. The fee is paid through fundraising efforts at the school level. The auditions are open to the entire student body and the performance is held at the end of one week. MCT strives to use participation in the performing arts as a vehicle to develop the life skills (social skills, communication skills, self-discipline, a strong work ethic, an understanding of the team concept and self-esteem) necessary to answer the challenges of our time. MCT's programs can and do provide the kindling to ignite the flame of interest in the performing arts. Within each MCT cast, girls and boys are equal; the disabled become able; the shy experiment with bravery; the slow are rehearsed to perfection; and the

gifted become part of the whole. The lesson they learn is that all of them are necessary for the show to go on. Few arenas exist where responsibility is taught and learned so clearly. MCT provides a unique opportunity to learn the lessons of group dynamics while excelling as an individual—a lesson from art that carries into life.

- i. Physical Education, Health, and Nutrition are curricular areas fulfilled by formal P.E. instruction two times each week, class discussions on safe and healthy choices, and by the inclusion of nutritional snacks served daily through the federal food program along with breakfast and lunch. Through fundraising efforts, University Park installed new playground equipment two years ago. This raised our student capacity from twenty-three percent to eighty percent. Our children are far more active at their recess breaks than ever before.

2. Reading/English:

In 2005, we chose to join Reading First because we had not made AYP the previous year. We wanted to guarantee that we would never fail our students again. We believe in the philosophy of early intervention to which Reading First ascribes. We wanted to take advantage of the professional development offered by Reading First and the follow up services of a Reading Coach. Reading is taught in a ninety-minute sacred block of time at each grade level. Sacred time is defined as a time we refrain from interruptions, we don't schedule anything else over the top such as guest speakers or field trips, and we ensure that our transitions are quick so that no time is wasted within the ninety-minute block. We teach from a basal that includes the five big ideas of reading. (phonemic awareness, phonics, vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension) Our instruction uses modeling, guided practice, and independent practice. We scaffold and support in our instruction. Because we have two classes for each grade level, we divide our students into those with higher skill acquisition and lower skill acquisition. They move to the appropriate classroom for their whole-class instruction. Thirty to forty minutes is devoted to the word work. Students then work in the anthology to practice comprehension strategies and vocabulary development. During partner reading time, the focus is on fluency. When extra interventions are needed, the school uses diagnostic tools to pinpoint student needs. Students can receive word work support in the Phonics for Reading or Rewards series. They can build their fluency through Read Naturally. If they have trouble with comprehension, we use Corrective Reading, Comprehension. We also have implemented PALS (peer-assisted learning system). This cooperative format provides practice opportunities in all the big ideas. All of these programs supplement the core reading program and are accomplished in extra thirty to forty-five minute blocks that we call Walk to Read. All of our students are ability grouped for Walk to Read. During this time, we meet individual needs including enrichment through novel sets and non-fiction material. If students require more intensive interventions, tutoring is offered for an additional time period. We follow the Response to Intervention model to close the learning gaps before the option of special education is warranted.

3. Mathematics:

Mathematics is taught through the Saxon curriculum. Saxon provides a spiraling learning system with multiple exposures and practice opportunities. It covers all the math strands in most daily lessons. For students, this keeps the information fresh. The research pertaining to children of poverty, says that direct instruction and lots of repetition are best practice. In a Saxon lesson, students begin with a mental math time. They solve several types of math problems, including money concepts, measurement, and multiple step equations. After mental math warm-ups, a new concept is taught through direct instruction and guided practice. The lesson concludes with student practice of the new concept and all previously taught concepts. Homework is given four nights per week. The homework is identical to the lesson covered that day, furthering the practice. There are monthly enrichment lessons with hands-on activities, too.

Using the same program school-wide affords students the chance to cement the mathematical concepts into their personal strategy bank. We supplement the Saxon curriculum with fact practice and written math prompts each week. Students work all year to better speak and write about their math thinking. When students are not achieving at grade level, our computer-based programs are used to close the gap. We use a plethora of fact games and math races. These are motivational and engaging for the struggling

student. Connecting Math Concepts curriculum is used with our lowest achieving students. Again, we are working with the research that outlines the best practice for our population. This program does an excellent job in helping students connect the math concepts in a way that makes sense for them. For example, there are multiplication maps for each integer, which are laid out in a set pattern, so students can learn to count-by that number. Our math block is either one-hour for the primary grades or seventy-five minutes for the intermediate grades. We also have math tutoring time for any students with those needs. Again, we follow Response to Intervention to move students through the tiers, as needed.

4. Additional Curriculum Area:

Technology enhances our curriculum and also stands alone as a curriculum area. University Park has a computer lab with thirty Mac computers. We also have two portable carts, which house twenty computers. All of our classrooms are equipped with Promethian boards. We also use video, clickers, and calculators. Our special education classroom is also using Ipads and Ipods. The school also employs three Wii's that are used for indoor recess and reinforcement.

Students interact with the technology to enhance their learning. The state and district assessments are all computerized, so students must be proficient with the technology. They also use it to enhance their assignments. They can create visual images and written work, vote, graph, practice, learn new concepts, take tests, and receive reinforcement. The school subscribes to Orchard as a computer program vehicle to practice math, reading and language. We also use Read Naturally on the computers for fluency practice. For the youngest students and those with the largest gaps, we use the MAP practice skills, which match our district tests. Students can practice a specific skill set and get immediate feedback, and teachers can get instant information on student progress.

Promethian boards are utilized in the classroom to provide large visuals for the whole-group instruction. Teachers use video streaming and imagery on these boards to enhance vocabulary concepts. The teachers can also further a comprehension concept. Students use Clickers to instantly display answers so teachers can determine how students are progressing. The Ipad or Ipod can create large print for students, or read aloud to the students, as examples of use. There are phonemic awareness activities and phonics games for students who need that instruction. Students can video their performances in all curricular areas. Teachers can also use video to critique and reflect on their instructional practice. The technology enhances student motivation and engagement.

Our school's mission includes preparing students for the future. The technology that we employ directly relates to the students' acquisition of essential skills and knowledge.

5. Instructional Methods:

University Park uses a variety of instructional methods as it differentiates instruction for our diverse needs of student subgroups. For our special education subgroup, we use mainstream inclusion and small group pullout with direct instruction, individual instruction using Ipods and Ipads, Read Naturally on the computer, and targeted instruction on essential skills. An adult, whether certified or classified, always monitors this instruction. Their Individual Education Plan guides the instruction and sets the goals. The special education teacher sets the task analysis in order to break down the instruction in small steps and quick success. The curriculum is not modified, as that would change the expectations for the student and risk their ability to score proficient. We do carefully select and use accommodations. Students use their accommodations on a daily basis, so the accommodations are incorporated into their learning when they are needed for assessments.

For the English Language Learners subgroup, we stress vocabulary development. We use academic language throughout the school day and we stress the use of complete sentences in all interactions. We use the Promethian board in conjunction with the Internet to display images and video of unfamiliar vocabulary. We also intentionally teach idioms and figurative language. Our reading curriculum has an instructional focus on vocabulary and uses a variety of methods to grow word knowledge and use.

Pictures, meaningful sentences, examples and non-examples, and acting are all methods employed for language acquisition. For ELL students who do not pass the language test, the tutors teach in small groups and directly target the skill gaps.

University Park has closed the achievement gap for ethnic minorities. We use materials that promote multicultural instruction. Many of the stories in our reading series concern cultural history, customs, and celebrations of diverse nationalities. We treat everyone with respect and value every individual in our school. We hold the same high expectations for all students. We make no excuses. We balance assimilation and acculturation in our school by accepting home values and explaining school values. For example, we can adapt our celebrations to fit most religious beliefs.

6. Professional Development:

Professional Development is serious at University Park. In the past five years, the staff has been united on professional development opportunities. We have participated in Reading First program specific training, Academic Engagement Strategies with Kevin Feldman, BEST for positive behavioral supports, Peer Assisted Learning Systems (PALS) from Vanderbilt University, Continuous Improvement through Jim Shipley Associates, Todd Whitaker's work on great teachers, and numerous book studies on the research and strategies behind the Reading First initiative. All implementation is followed through with support and guidance by the Reading Coach or Instructional Facilitator. Another piece that has made us successful is the follow through by outside consultants, who push us to perfection.

The Reading First training helped us improve reading instruction and the scores demonstrate that effectiveness. We generalized that training to other subjects. BEST training helped us focus on the positive behavior displayed by students and made for a respectful and safe environment in which we all take responsibility. The Feldman training, focusing on engagement strategies provided tools such as partner sharing, and writing on sticky notes. We have implemented those strategies in all academic areas and they have been successful in focusing student attention and engagement and increasing motivation.

University Park undertakes all professional development as an opportunity to improve instruction and implement with fidelity. We are aligned with the district's goals of having all students at grade level by third grade and being a high performing school. The impact on student achievement has been spectacular. University Park has been a leader in the district on test scores. Our students are well prepared for the next academic level. One example is Spring 2010. There were nine students in our district at the middle school and high school levels that had the honor of going to Washington D.C. as National History Day contenders. Of those nine, five spent their elementary career at University Park. Another former student received the Eagle Scout honor. We take pride in all the students' accomplishments as they progress through their school career. We know the foundation has been laid at University Park.

As a school of choice district, individual schools have some flexibility and freedom in professional development. We submit a plan that aligns with our school improvement plan and the district's improvement plan. The PD takes place either the week before school begins, or at semester break.

7. School Leadership:

School Leadership structure in University Park is collaborative. The principal is seen as an instructional leader and as a champion of the school. We have a Goal Team Leadership team that consists of the chairs of the specific goal teams. The members meet to discuss the progress of the goal teams. The goal teams are Accreditation, Safe and Healthy, Math, and Reading. Every teacher on the staff is a member of one committee, so there is involvement by all. The goal teams meet to work on specific tasks according to their topic.

Every spring, we have a series of school improvement meetings. We review our budget for next year, determine where our resources should be prioritized, and finalize plans for the upcoming school year. Parents are invited to these meetings as a voice and to hear an explanation on school finances. We also

have a parent committee (UPBEAT), which makes decisions on extra-curricular activities and expenditures.

We hold data review summits three times each year. During this time, we make school-wide decisions on tutoring groups and program delivery based on student achievement. We have Teacher/Parent/Student handbooks explaining our policies. We verify knowledge of the policies through signatures. The principal does the classroom walk-throughs and formal observations/evaluations to ensure program fidelity and implementation consistency. We know that these factors impact student achievement. When students are moving through the RtI tiers, the principal also completes the fidelity checks.

The Instructional Facilitator is in charge of coordinating and leading bi-weekly grade level meetings. These meetings are used for data review, student placement in specific interventions, instructional tips, setting dates for modeling or observations, and addressing concerns.

University Park holds monthly staff meetings. We share information and make decisions. When there are major stressors affecting staff relationships, the principal acts as a mediator and focuses the attention on all the positives in the school. This is not always an easy task as we are a strong-willed and determined group of educators.

At the classroom level, every teacher leads the students in weekly goal setting. They both keep track of the progress, determine positive actions, and learning improvements. Students also have individual goal folders where they track test scores on a variety of measures and track their progress. Every staff member and each student owns the ultimate responsibility for learning.

PART VII - ASSESSMENT RESULTS

STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Mathematics

Grade: 3 Test: PAWS

Edition/Publication Year: state test Publisher: Pearson

	2009-2010	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006
Testing Month	Mar	Mar	Mar	Mar	Mar
SCHOOL SCORES					
proficient/advanced	90	94	94	97	83
proficient/advanced	36	42	34	56	30
Number of students tested	31	36	35	39	46
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-economic Disadvantaged Students					
proficient/advanced	88	95	100	100	24
proficient/advanced	25	40	69	57	76
Number of students tested	16	20	16	23	25
2. African American Students					
proficient/advanced					
proficient/advanced					
Number of students tested					
3. Hispanic or Latino Students					
proficient/advanced					
proficient/advanced					
Number of students tested					
4. Special Education Students					
proficient/advanced					
proficient/advanced					
Number of students tested					
5. English Language Learner Students					
proficient/advanced					
proficient/advanced					
Number of students tested					
6.					
proficient/advanced					
proficient/advanced					
Number of students tested					
NOTES:					

11WY3

STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Reading

Grade: 3 Test: PAWS

Edition/Publication Year: state test Publisher: Pearson

	2009-2010	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006
Testing Month	Mar	Mar	Mar	Mar	Mar
SCHOOL SCORES					
proficient/advanced	71	81	83	87	72
proficient/advanced	19	8	29	23	11
Number of students tested	31	36	35	39	46
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-economic Disadvantaged Students					
proficient/advanced	57	75	88	91	68
proficient/advanced	19	5	19	22	4
Number of students tested	16	20	16	23	25
2. African American Students					
proficient/advanced					
proficient/advanced					
Number of students tested					
3. Hispanic or Latino Students					
proficient/advanced					
proficient/advanced					
Number of students tested					
4. Special Education Students					
proficient/advanced					
proficient/advanced					
Number of students tested					
5. English Language Learner Students					
proficient/advanced					
proficient/advanced					
Number of students tested					
6.					
proficient/advanced					
proficient/advanced					
Number of students tested					
NOTES:					

11WY3

STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Mathematics

Grade: 4 Test: PAWS

Edition/Publication Year: state test Publisher: Pearson

	2009-2010	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006
Testing Month	Mar	Mar	Mar	Mar	Mar
SCHOOL SCORES					
proficient/advanced	88	81	80	91	80
proficient/advanced	44	29	38	32	25
Number of students tested	34	31	35	47	40
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-economic Disadvantaged Students					
proficient/advanced	84	93	76	96	81
proficient/advanced	21	20	29	26	18
Number of students tested	19	15	21	23	22
2. African American Students					
proficient/advanced					
proficient/advanced					
Number of students tested					
3. Hispanic or Latino Students					
proficient/advanced					
proficient/advanced					
Number of students tested					
4. Special Education Students					
proficient/advanced					
proficient/advanced					
Number of students tested					
5. English Language Learner Students					
proficient/advanced					
proficient/advanced					
Number of students tested					
6.					
proficient/advanced					
proficient/advanced					
Number of students tested					
NOTES:					

11WY3

STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Reading

Grade: 4 Test: Paws

Edition/Publication Year: state test Publisher: Pearson

	2009-2010	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006
Testing Month	Mar	Mar	Mar	Mar	Mar
SCHOOL SCORES					
proficient/advanced	89	87	94	87	67
proficient/advanced	35	39	40	28	12
Number of students tested	34	31	35	47	40
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-economic Disadvantaged Students					
proficient/advanced	60	93	95	91	72
proficient/advanced	0	27	33	26	22
Number of students tested	19	15	21	23	22
2. African American Students					
proficient/advanced					
proficient/advanced					
Number of students tested					
3. Hispanic or Latino Students					
proficient/advanced					
proficient/advanced					
Number of students tested					
4. Special Education Students					
proficient/advanced					
proficient/advanced					
Number of students tested					
5. English Language Learner Students					
proficient/advanced					
proficient/advanced					
Number of students tested					
6.					
proficient/advanced					
proficient/advanced					
Number of students tested					
NOTES:					

11WY3

STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Mathematics

Grade: 5 Test: PAWS

Edition/Publication Year: state test Publisher: Pearson

	2009-2010	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006
Testing Month	Mar	Mar	Mar	Mar	Mar
SCHOOL SCORES					
proficient/advanced	81	91	78	92	69
proficient/advanced	23	21	17	25	19
Number of students tested	26	33	42	36	36
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-economic Disadvantaged Students					
proficient/advanced	83	84	83	88	56
proficient/advanced	17	11	4	18	11
Number of students tested	12	19	23	17	18
2. African American Students					
proficient/advanced					
proficient/advanced					
Number of students tested					
3. Hispanic or Latino Students					
proficient/advanced					
proficient/advanced					
Number of students tested					
4. Special Education Students					
proficient/advanced					
proficient/advanced					
Number of students tested					
5. English Language Learner Students					
proficient/advanced					
proficient/advanced					
Number of students tested					
6.					
proficient/advanced					
proficient/advanced					
Number of students tested					
NOTES:					

11WY3

STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Reading

Grade: 5 Test: PAWS

Edition/Publication Year: state test Publisher: Pearson

	2009-2010	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006
Testing Month	Mar	Mar	Mar	Mar	Mar
SCHOOL SCORES					
proficient/advanced	66	76	71	77	69
proficient/advanced	19	15	10	8	25
Number of students tested	26	33	42	36	36
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-economic Disadvantaged Students					
proficient/advanced	58	74	61	71	61
proficient/advanced	25	11	0	6	17
Number of students tested	12	19	23	17	18
2. African American Students					
proficient/advanced					
proficient/advanced					
Number of students tested					
3. Hispanic or Latino Students					
proficient/advanced					
proficient/advanced					
Number of students tested					
4. Special Education Students					
proficient/advanced					
proficient/advanced					
Number of students tested					
5. English Language Learner Students					
proficient/advanced					
proficient/advanced					
Number of students tested					
6.					
proficient/advanced					
proficient/advanced					
Number of students tested					
NOTES:					

11WY3

STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Mathematics Grade: School Average

	2009-2010	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006
Testing Month	Mar	Mar	Mar	Mar	Mar
SCHOOL SCORES					
proficient/advanced	87	92	84	93	77
proficient/advanced	35	31	29	38	24
Number of students tested	91	100	112	122	143
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-economic Disadvantaged Students					
proficient/advanced	85	92	85	94	73
proficient/advanced	21	26	20	34	18
Number of students tested	47	54	60	63	65
2. African American Students					
proficient/advanced					
proficient/advanced					
Number of students tested					
3. Hispanic or Latino Students					
proficient/advanced	86	100	77	100	67
proficient/advanced	21	27	31	15	0
Number of students tested	14	14	13	13	18
4. Special Education Students					
proficient/advanced	58	50	30	54	47
proficient/advanced	0	0	0	0	0
Number of students tested	12	16	10	13	17
5. English Language Learner Students					
proficient/advanced					
proficient/advanced					
Number of students tested					
6.					
proficient/advanced					
proficient/advanced					
Number of students tested					
NOTES:					

11WY3

STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Reading Grade: School Average

	2009-2010	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006
Testing Month	Mar	Mar	Mar	Mar	Mar
SCHOOL SCORES					
proficient/advanced	76	81	82	84	69
proficient/advanced	24	20	25	21	14
Number of students tested	90	101	111	119	144
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-economic Disadvantaged Students					
proficient/advanced	70	80	80	85	65
proficient/advanced	19	14	17	19	7
Number of students tested	47	53	60	65	80
2. African American Students					
proficient/advanced					
proficient/advanced					
Number of students tested					
3. Hispanic or Latino Students					
proficient/advanced	75	93	59	92	50
proficient/advanced	29	29	23	15	6
Number of students tested	14	14	13	13	18
4. Special Education Students					
proficient/advanced	33	38	30	54	24
proficient/advanced	0	0	0	0	0
Number of students tested	12	16	10	13	17
5. English Language Learner Students					
proficient/advanced					
proficient/advanced					
Number of students tested					
6.					
proficient/advanced					
proficient/advanced					
Number of students tested					
NOTES: PAWS scores for the school year 2009-10 were determined to be invalid and inaccurate due to technological problems experienced throughout the state. All districts were "held harmless".					

11WY3