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Analysis of Student Data

Celebrations

* Kindergarten Aimsweb: Over the last 2 years in (from 2011-2012 and 2012-2013) the average point growth is very similar, as are the beginning and ending averages.
* Grade 1 Aimsweb: Fall Mathematics (M-COMP) average increased each year from 2010-2013. Spring M-COMP increased each year from 2010-2013
* Grade 2 Aimsweb: From 2010-2012 the M-COMP fall average increased each year.
* In grade K-5 an average of 87% in 2011/12 of students reached benchmark as measured by DRA and FP Benchmark increased to 92% in 2012/13

CMT

* Grade 3 hit target of 85% at goal in reading strands: Forming a General understanding (88%) and Developing Interpretation (95%)
* Grade 4 hit target of 85% at goal in reading strand: Forming a General Understanding (90%)
* Grade 5 hit target of 85% at goal in reading strands: Forming General Understanding (98%) Developing Interpretation (85%) Examining Content and Structure (92%)
* Grade 5 hit target of 85% at goal (85%) in reading
* Grades 3-5 hit target of 85% at goal (91%, 92%, 88%) in mathematics
* Grade 4/5 hit target of 85% at goal (86%, 86%) on math strand : Mathematical Understanding
* Grade 4/5 hit target of 85% at goal (88%, 92%) in writing

Challenges

* Grade 1 Aimsweb: Growth points are similar in oral count, number id, quantity discrimination, and missing number across years. Less growth in oral count from fall to spring in 2012-2013 / higher average in the fall.
* Grade 2 DRA decreased from 85% of students reaching benchmark at MOY and 83% of students reaching benchmark at EOY.

CMT

* Grade 3/4 did not hit target of 85% at goal (72%, 67%) in reading
* Grade 3-5 did not hit target of 85% at goal on math strand : Estimating solutions to Problems (76%, 70%, 78%)
* Grade 3 did not hit target of 85% at goal (72%) in writing

Hypotheses

* Work with Data teams to identify strategies that impact instruction
* School Improvement focus on Differentiation and Small Group Instruction
* Curriculum Revisions
* Standards Based Progress Report

|  |
| --- |
| **JenningsDRA2 and F & P Benchmark Mid-Year and EOY DataPercent at or above Goal**  |
|  |  | **2009-2010** | **2010-2011** | **2011-2012** | **2012-2013** | **Jennings****2013****Target** |
| **Kindergarten** |  | **67% (n/a)** | **76% / 83%** | **91% / 83%** | **86% / 92%** | **82%** |
| **1st Grade** |  | **83% / 88%** | **79% / 95%** | **78% / 79%** | **86% / 90%** | **87%** |
| **2nd Grade** |  | **80% / 80%** | **72% / 94%** | **84% / 93%** | **85% / 83%** | **88%** |
| **3rd Grade** |  | **81% / 85%** | **77% / 77%** | **84% / 100%** | **87% / 98%** | **90%** |
| **4th Grade**  |  | **87% / 82%** | **90% / 92%** | **B 84% / 77%** | **81% / 100%** | **95%** |
| **5th Grade** |  | **94% / 92%** | **93% / 96%** | **B 56% / 89%** | **82% / 91%** | **95%** |

|  |
| --- |
| Jennings AIMSweb data-Kindergarten |
|  | WinterAverage 2010 | Spring Average2011 | 2010-2011 point growth | FallAverage 2011 | Spring Average2012 | 2011-2012 point growth | FallAverage2012 | SpringAverage2013 | 2012-2013pointgrowth | FallAverage2013 | Target |
| Oral Counting | 61.0 | 70.0 | 9 points | 52.0 | 76.0 | 24 points | 51.0 | 72.0 | 21 points | 51.0 |  |
| Number Identification | 45.0 | 52.0 | 7 points | 41.0 | 52.0 | 11points | 41.0 | 53.0 | 12 points | 40.0 |  |
| Quantity Discrimination | 22.0 | 25.0 | 3 points | 19.0 | 26.0 | 7 points | 19.0 | 26.0 | 7 points | 18.0 |  |
| Missing Number | 13.0 | 16.0 | 3 points | 9.0 | 16.0 | 7 points | 8.0 | 15.0 | 7 points | 8.0 |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Jennings AIMSweb data- Grade 1 |
|  | Fall Average2010 | Spring Average2011 | 2010-2011 pointgrowth | Fall Average2011 | Spring Average2012 | 2011-2012 pointgrowth | Fall Average2012 | Spring Average2013 | 2012-2013 pointgrowth | Fall Average2013 | Target |
| Oral count | 72.0 | 90.0 | 18 | 67.0 | 87.0 | 20 | 79.0 | 92.0 | 13 | 75.0 |  |
| Number Identification | 48.0 | 66.0 | 18 | 43.0 | 62.0 | 19 | 48.0 | 64.0 | 16 | 48.0 |  |
| Quantity Discrimination | 24.0 | 35.0 | 11 | 21.0 | 34.0 | 13 | 25.0 | 35.0 | 10 | 26.0 |  |
| Missing Number | 13.0 | 21.0 | 8 | 12.0 | 20.0 | 8 | 14.0 | 20.0 | 6 | 13.0 |  |
| Mathematics | 3.0 | 14.0 | 11 | 14.0 | 32.0 | 18 | 16.0 | 35.0 | 19 | 18.0 |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Jennings AIMSweb data- Grade 2 |
|  | Fall Average2010 | Spring Average2011 | 2010-2011 point growth | Fall Average2011 | Spring Average2012 | 2011-2012 point growth | Fall Average2012 | Spring Average2013 | 2012-2013 point growth | Fall Average2013 | Target |
| M-COMP | 13.0 | 32.0 | 19 | 18.0 | 39.0 | 18 | 25.0 | 37.0 | 12 | 25.0 |  |
| M-CAP | 10.0 | 26.0 | 16 | 7.0 | 21.0 | 14 | 9.0 | 21.0 | 12 | 9.0 |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Jennings School Blue Ribbon Data-Grades 3, 4, and 5  |
| Students At or Above Goal \* At or above goal = 65% or higher on test |
|  |
|  | Fall 2011 | Spring 2012 | Point Gain | Fall 2012 | Spring 2013 | Point Gain | Fall 2013 |
| Grade 3 | 68% | 100% | +32% point gain | 74% | 98% | +24% point gain | 81% |
| Grade 4 | 50% | 87% | +37% point gain | 71% | 100% | +29% point gain | 60% |
| Grade 5 | 50% | 94% | +44% point gain | 60% | 98% | +38% point gain | 65% |

|  |
| --- |
| Jennings School Blue Ribbon-Integrated UnderstandingPercent Average |
|  | Fall 2011 | Spring 2012 | Growth | Fall 2012 | Spring 2013 | Growth | **Spring 2012- Spring 2013****Jennings****Point Gain** | Fall 2013 |
| Grade 3 | 44% | 67% | +23% point gain | 40% | 71% | +31% point gain | +4% point gain | 28% |
| Grade 4 | 46% | 66% | +20% point gain | 47% | 72% | +25% point gain | +6% point gain | 45% |
| Grade 5 | 58% | 77% | +19% point gain | 48% | 88% | +40% point gain | +10% point gain | 50% |

|  |
| --- |
| Blue Ribbon Testing forCurrent Grade 5 StudentsPercentage of Students At or above Goal |
|  | Fall 2011 (gr 3) | Spring 2012 (gr 3) | Fall 2012 (gr 4) | Spring 2013 (gr 4) | Fall 2013 (gr 5) |
| Blue Ribbon Testing | 68% | 100% | 71% | 100% | 65% |

CMT Analysis Data (click on link to document) [H:\CMT 2013\2013 CMT Analysis\Jennings CMT Analysis 2013 all strands.pdf](file:///H%3A%5CCMT%202013%5C2013%20CMT%20Analysis%5CJennings%20CMT%20Analysis%202013%20all%20strands.pdf)

Student Data and School achievement targets for June 2014

82% of Kindergarten students will reach benchmark by June 2013 as measured by DRA (Data obtained from 3 year trend)

87% of Grade 1 students will reach benchmark by June 2013 as measured by DRA (2013 Baseline is 74%)

88% of Grade 2 students will reach benchmark by June 2013 as measured by DRA (2013 Baseline is 83%

K-2 will continue increase in similar areas on Aimsweb measures documented above

91% of Grades 3-5 students will reach goal by June 2014 as measured by Blue Ribbon Universal Screen (2013 baseline 71%

Problem of Practice

*Based on student achievement data and on-going formative assessments, students will engage in differentiated curriculum tasks that are open-ended and rigorous through whole group, small group and individual instruction.*

School-wide Focused Strategy

*If we plan, implement, and adjust for rigorous curriculum tasks that are open-ended and differentiated, then the percentage of students meeting or exceeding the school achievement targets for June 2014 will increase, as listed on the School Improvement Plan.*

Theory of Action Underlying This Plan

*If we create a level of professional development support for and within staff to assist teachers in practice and pedagogy around rigor and questioning techniques, then teaching and learning will improve and student achievement will increase.*

*If we teach, reinforce and value perseverance, students will be better equipped to handle more complex tasks and student achievement will increase.*

*If we effectively monitor data trends through school and grade level data teams, then we will identify and replicate successful instructional strategies that improve student achievement.*

*If we foster and sustain a collegial school culture, student academic, social and emotional growth will benefit, then staff will be better equipped to utilize best practices and student achievement will improve.*

*If we plan effective questions and student tasks consistent with Webb’s DOK (Depth of Knowledge) and Bloom’s levels 4 (Analyze), 5 (Evaluate), 6 (Create), then student achievement will increase.*

*If we clearly articulate learning targets to our students and begin using student and teacher rubrics, student achievement will improve.*

|  |
| --- |
| **PRINCIPAL STRATEGIES****FOCUSED STRATEGY (addresses the problem of practice and are limited in number and high leverage):***If we plan, implement, and adjust for rigorous curriculum tasks that are open-ended and differentiated, then the percentage of students meeting or exceeding the school achievement targets for June 2014 will increase, as listed on the School Improvement Plan.*  |
| ADULT ACTIONS(Include persons responsible and the timeline. | ACCOUNTABLILITY MEASURES TO ENSURE IMPLEMENTATION(Include specific actions taken to monitor the adult actions for implementation) | EVIDENCE OF SUCCESSFUL IMPLEMENTATION(identify student achievement measures and timeline) | SPECIFIC SUPPORT NEEDED |
| Provide ongoing professional development regarding the Marzano teaching and learning framework | Monitor effectiveness of teaching practices by observing and providing feedback to staff using Marzano protocolsUse of Protraxx to organize and manage feedback for TEP | Percentage of staff at proficient and exemplary as defined by the TEPData collected in Protraxx | Marzano text for all staffOngoing Professional Development for administratorsSupport with use of Protraxx |
| Provide ongoing professional development on data teams with a focus on improving building team and beginning work with grade level teams  | Data teams will meet regularly to review formative and summative data | Improvement on rubric for data teams | Professional development Time to organize and plan |
| Train selected staff to facilitate and organize instructional rounds | Selected staff member will organize and facilitate internal and external instructional rounds | Feedback for staff member facilitating the roundsData collected from instructional rounds | Professional development for staff |
| Plan and organize Parent Universities on current educational topics (Infinite Campus, SBAC, Curriculum etc.) | Parent Universities will be planned throughout the year based upon stakeholder feedback | Presentations and feedback from parent sessionsFeedback regarding the use of Infinite Campus as a means to communicate | District collaboration regarding PD plansDistrict training and consultation (i.e. IT for infinite Campus) |
| Support implementation of School Climate initiatives | Facilitate Leadership committee to organize ongoing activities regarding school climate. (CARES, Character assemblies, Bucket filling, Project Wisdom, Community Club etc.) | School Climate Survey dataOngoing data from office referrals and Community Club | Resources:Project WisdomSecond StepResponsive ClassroomMaterials for ClubSurvey |

|  |
| --- |
| **SCHOOL-WIDE STRATEGIES****FOCUSED STRATEGY (addresses the problem of practice and are limited in number and high leverage):***If we plan, implement, and adjust for rigorous curriculum tasks that are open-ended and differentiated, then the percentage of students meeting or exceeding the school achievement targets for June 2014 will increase, as listed on the School Improvement Plan.*  |
| ADULT ACTIONS(Include persons responsible and the timeline. | ACCOUNTABLILITY MEASURES TO ENSURE IMPLEMENTATION(Include specific actions taken to monitor the adult actions for implementation) | EVIDENCE OF SUCCESSFUL IMPLEMENTATION(identify student achievement measures and timeline) | SPECIFIC SUPPORT NEEDED |
| The staff will continue to refine thinking regarding differentiation and rigor | The staff will conduct Instructional Rounds. An Internal and External Rounds will be planned each yearData collected from Internal and External Rounds |  | Time to plan and organize and debrief rounds data Resources supporting learning about rigor |
| The staff will implement and supplement the curriculum with an increased number of open ended and differentiated tasks that raise the rigor in their classrooms | The staff will review curriculum tasks at PLC and curriculum meetings. |  | Professional Development (Blooms, Webb’s DOK)Rubric to assess tasks  |
| The staff will learn and refine thinking about Marzano protocols with a focus on Design Questions 2, 3 and 4 which directly addresses learning content | The staff will be directly observed by principal with feedback given in these areasPercentage of staff scoring proficient or exemplary in these areas will increase throughout SIP cycle as measured by TEP |  | Marzano professional development  |
| A committee of teachers will work with Dr. Richard Cash to learn higher order thinking and teaching strategies | Committee of teachers will implement strategies and share with the rest of the Jennings staffMonthly sharing sessions Evidence of strategies in classroomsIncrease in number of rigorous tasks that are open ended and differentiated |   | Ongoing PD with Richard CashTime to plan and deliver PD |