

## Semester Report and School Data Questions 2011-2012



### What does the data tell us?

The data reflects that all interventions that have been established need to continue to support students and their growth. Continuing to identify students based on CASCADE/Dashboard data, classroom data, and recommendations has proven to support those who need remediation and enrichment based on standards. Departments need to continue to follow the systematic approach developed to identify and place students in programs that support student learning to ensure competency and proficiency.

### What does the data not tell us?

The data does not reflect the specific steps used to identify and place students in programs is necessary for grades 6-12 interventions. There is an increase of consistency for data collection and data access between grades 6-8 and grades 9-12 when using CASCADE/Dashboard and Project Proficiency guidelines. Grades 6-8 made significant gains with record keeping and tracking student growth through individual data sheets and the PLC SharePoint site. Middle school staff is unable to use Dashboard, therefore we must build tracking tools as we go. Middle school staff continues to struggle with the time needed to remediate due to the middle school structure. The five period school day, continues to reduce the opportunities for middle level students to receive tier II and tier III services as all courses are year long. Grades 9-12 also made gains with student interventions, yet interventions were directed toward those students who were to be accountable based on assessment guidelines. With EOC now in action in high school, time and support becomes a variable. Many students who need interventions also require support in other areas, therefore time and money spent has been spread thin. High school interventions are primarily held after school, due to the unavailability of pulling students from other required courses. Based on the time and cost of the interventions that have taken place 6-12, a continued concern is the sustainability of the intensive and intentional remediation and enrichment activities. During the 2010-11 school year additional staff members were brought on board to work with students in small groups during the school day. This has not taken place in the 2011-12 school year due to the lack of additional funding/support. Additional variables to the data are: new core content standards, CHETL, EOC, high school staff turnover.

### What are causes for celebration?

The high school and middle school math PLCs continue to be highly functioning, providing interventions to address standards and gaps. High school Social Studies and Science PLCs have been established and are meeting regularly. Reviewing of student work and assessment discussions are taking place among staff on a weekly basis through mandatory after school PLC meetings. Middle school math and language arts staff members have participated fully in the (Project Proficiency) program and have made it a part of the school composition. Student failures and retentions have dropped significantly with the practice of weekly interventions for struggling individual students in Math and Language Arts and the Team Assisted Student Enrichment & Recovery (TASER) program in grades 6-8. Students are taking assessments more seriously as they continued to attend tutoring sessions – the awareness continues to grow as the students participate in programs that are embedded during the day and after school. Moore University (established in January 2011) will again offer additional support to students who to ensure proficiency. 465 students have been targeted, and contact with families has been made, inviting each to share in our success. Session #1 will be held after school 2/14, 2/16, 2/21, 2/23, 2/28, 3/1. Instructional plans are currently being made, involving multiple stake holders.

### What are the opportunities for improvement?

Continue to follow systematic approach to identifying students based on CASCADE/Dashboard data, classroom data, and recommendations. There is an opportunity for improved data collection in MS Language Arts, HS English, HS Science, HS Social Studies and data access for grades 6-12 overall. CASCADE issues concerning the HS Trimester courses have also proven to be time consuming when trying to identify students and standards that support is needed for. High school Science, English and Social Studies PLCs continue to struggle with the norms of collaboration and standards based grading. Improved data collection (from district down to classroom) will support accountability of students and staff and will enable interventionist to better structure time and tracking student growth. Making Dashboard available to all grades and contents would also be another tool to support better student identification. We know the interventions are valuable, and see the need to continue to support student growth in all content areas with the introduction of KCAS. It has become apparent that time is an issue. Recovery of students and standards during the school day would be beneficial, yet the 5 period day is a constraint. PLC (Project Proficiency) structures are embedded on a weekly basis yet the clear understanding of the process and purpose needs support.

### Next Steps

Continue to support a systematic approach of data collection, recording student growth in grades 6-12. Continue to support the PLC norms of collaboration and standards based grading to increase buy in with the PLCs. Determine best schedule to sustain student growth in grades 6-8 and to support tier II and tier III services. We must ensure that all teachers fully participate in the identification and the intervention of students to reach proficiency. We must also discuss the sustainability of services to reach proficiency

**DISTRICT 180**  
**TIER III SCHOOL SEMESTER PROGRESS REPORT**

School Name: Moore Traditional School District Name Jefferson

Date Report Completed: 11/30/10

January and June are KDE reporting dates. School data collection dates are at the discretion of the school and district. Reports will be reviewed by a regional team in collaboration with the Educational Recovery Director and Center for Learning Excellence.

**Non-Cognitive Data**

Attendance <u>Report in Percentages</u>	DEC/JAN				JUNE			
	2009 Baseline	2010	2011	2012	2010 Baseline	2011	2012	2013
6th grade ADA	94.3	95.5	95.4		93.0	94.1		
7 <sup>th</sup> grade ADA	93.8	95.3	95.0		93.1	93.2		
8th grade ADA	94.0	95.3	95.6		92.7	93.2		
9th grade ADA	92.0	94.1	93.8		91.0	91.6		
10th grade ADA	93.3	93.7	93.4		91.8	91.8		
11th grade ADA	92.1	93.4	93.4		88.8	91.2		
12th grade ADA	93.0	92.1	94.9		87.8	89.9		
	DEC/JAN				JUNE			
	2009 Baseline	2010	2011	2012	2010 Baseline	2011	2012	2013
Total School ADA	93.3	94.4	94.6		91.5	92.4		
*Teacher Attendance %	94.98	95.34	95.74					
Dropout %	0.4%	0.5%	0.2%		1.5%	1.3%		
*Teacher absence due to PD or other work outside the classroom should not be calculated into the attendance rate. It may be calculated and reviewed at the local level but is not required for this report.								

**Academic Data**

Number of Retentions	JUNE			
	2010 Baseline	2011	2012	2013
6 <sup>th</sup> Grade	1	4		
7 <sup>th</sup> Grade	2	3		
8 <sup>th</sup> Grade	4	2		

Graduation Rate						2010 Baseline	2011	2012	2013
						62.06 (AFGR)			
* 9 <sup>th</sup> Grade Course Failures Report in Percentages	DEC/JAN				JUNE				
	2009 Baseline	2010	2011	2012	2010 Baseline	2011	2012	2013	
Language Arts	11.06	11.40	13.73		11.63/19.71	11.35/8.82			
Math	11.21	4.74	9.20		10.63/12.14	8.63/13.69			
Science	20.12	26.88	14.71		37.25/27.60	15.23/20.00			
Social-Studies	18.82	20.77	22.81		31.11/25.93	25.17/27.21			
*Failures for each semester should be cumulative through that point (i.e. not a 9-weeks or quarterly grade) NOTE: DEC/JAN are Trimester A Final Grades, JUNE has Trimester B/Trimester C Final Grades									

College Readiness Report in Percentages	DEC/JAN				JUNE				
	2009 Baseline	2010	2011	2012	2010 Baseline	2011	2012	2013	2014
<b>ACT</b>									
<b>% Below CPE Benchmark</b>									
<b># Students</b>	151	141	146		163	151			
<b>English</b>	66.9%	78%	64.4%		63.8%	69.5%			
<b>Math</b>	83.4%	87.2%	69.9%		82.2%	82.8%			
<b>Reading</b>	80.8%	83%	72.6%		75.5%	74.8%			
<b>Combined</b>	94%	94.3%	83.6%		92.6%	90.7%			
<b>% Seniors with Interventions</b>	100	100	100		100	100			
Senior Interventions include: 4 <sup>th</sup> year mathematics, in-school JCHS course recovery, ACT Prep, College-Bound, and Credit Recovery through outside sources. (ACT, COMPAS)									
<b>% Seniors Passing College Placement Exams after interventions</b>	NA	NA	NA		NA	8.0%			
<b>Total % College Ready ACT or COMPASS</b>	NA	NA	NA		NA	16.6%			
<b>Career Readiness *(PRINTED)</b>	NA	0	NA		3	24			
<b>*Work Keys or any industry recognized certificates (examples: CISCO; Microsoft) that a school may use.</b>									

Report in Percentages	DEC/JAN Baseline			
	2009	2010	2011	2012
<b>EXPLORE % Below Benchmark</b>				
# Students	245	248	257	
English	64.9%	64.11%	63.81%	
Math	80.8%	85.48%	86.77%	
Reading	79.6%	82.26%	77.82%	
Combined	90.2%	92.34%	91.1%	
<b>PLAN % Below Benchmark</b>				
# Students	201	200	187	
English	56.7%	67.00%	66.3%	
Math	91.5%	92.00%	88.8%	
Reading	77.9%	72.50%	77.5%	
Combined	95.5%	94.50%	92.0%	

*Interventions for Explore and/or Plan	Number of students receiving support as a result of scores	Describe interventions/supports	Show results including data to support	Comments
	200	Tiered Course Placements	200 Schedules	Scheduling data
<p>Scores received in late November. The ACT Plan scores have been used to best determine placement into tiered English and Math courses. Counselors review data with department chairs to ensure students are placed in appropriate settings. Next steps include the correlation of the scheduling data with the 2011-12 ACT score.</p> <p>The Explore scores have been used as a piece of information to further identify students in need of interventions on team. Results were shared with teachers and students as career inventories were explored through the MS CART. The numbers receiving interventions are counted below in the RTI for Reading and the RTI for Math sections based on all data available.</p>				

### RTI for Reading

Response to Interventions for Reading (beyond universal)	Year 1 of Tier III Status				Year 2 of Tier III Status			
	Number of students being served		Number of students progressing to a less intensive tiered intervention		Number of students being served		Number of students progressing to a less intensive tiered intervention	
	DEC/JAN	June	DEC/JAN	June	DEC/JAN	June	DEC/JAN	June
6 <sup>th</sup> grade	100	144	0	144	98		0	
7 <sup>th</sup> grade	110	234	0	234	130		0	
8 <sup>th</sup> grade	90	204	0	204	82		0	
9 <sup>th</sup> grade	110	11	0	11	74		0	
10 <sup>th</sup> grade	161	148	0	148	30		0	
11 <sup>th</sup> grade	10	57	0	57	15		0	
12 <sup>th</sup> grade	0	1	0	1	3		0	

<b>Additional Comments for RTI - Reading</b>	<p><i>Students identified through Tier III programs (MS CR, R180, 6-12 ECE Resource), and ALL pullout interventions.</i></p> <p>CASCADE data is used to track proficiency. Interventions and tiered programs for support continued for all students identified through various programs including: HS &amp; MS Project Proficiency, Ramp-Up, Corrective Reading, Read 180, Success Maker, GOAL, Pullout programs, 6<sup>th</sup> grade reading course, Pullout programs, Team Assisted Student Recovery &amp; Enrichment (TASER), Moore University. As students reached proficiency levels interventions continued based on each assessment. Growth by the student directed the intervention as each student continued to receive support. <b>DATA#1 – AUG-JAN, DATA#2 JAN-JUNE</b></p>
--	---

### RTI for Math

Response to Interventions for Math (beyond universal)	Year 1 of Tier III Status				Year 2 of Tier III Status			
	Number of students being served		Number of students progressing to a less intensive tiered intervention		Number of students being served		Number of students progressing to a less intensive tiered intervention	
	DEC/JAN	June	DEC/JAN	June	DEC/JAN	June	DEC/JAN	June
6 <sup>th</sup> grade	125	262	0	262	155		0	
7 <sup>th</sup> grade	100	120	0	120	139		0	
8 <sup>th</sup> grade	90	237	0	237	119		0	
9 <sup>th</sup> grade	165	150	0	150	124		0	
10 <sup>th</sup> grade	108	281	0	281	111		0	
11 <sup>th</sup> grade	65	197	0	197	86		0	
12 <sup>th</sup> grade	50	0	0	0	4		0	

<b>Additional Comments for RTI - Math</b>	<p><i>Students identified through Tier III programs (MS Math Lab, 6-12 ECE Resource), and ALL pullout interventions.</i></p> <p>CASCADE data is used to track proficiency. Interventions and tiered programs for support continued for all students identified through various programs including: HS &amp; MS Project Proficiency, HS Math Tutors, MS Math Lab, Success Maker, Pullout programs, Team Assisted Student Recovery &amp; Enrichment (TASER), Moore University. As students reached proficiency levels interventions continued based on each assessment. Growth by the student directed the intervention as each student continued to receive support.</p> <p><b>DATA#1 – AUG-JAN, DATA#2 JAN-JUNE</b></p>
---	---

### RTI for Behavior

Response to Interventions for Behavior (beyond universal)	Year 1 of Tier III Status				Year 2 of Tier III Status			
	Number of students being served*		Number of students progressing to a less intensive tiered intervention**		Number of students being served*		Number of students progressing to a less intensive tiered intervention**	
	DEC/JAN	June	DEC/JAN	June	DEC/JAN	June	DEC/JAN	June
6 <sup>th</sup> grade	9	6	2	0	6		3	
7 <sup>th</sup> grade	8	10	1	5	12		4	
8 <sup>th</sup> grade	19	6	3	6	8		4	
9 <sup>th</sup> grade	7	10	3	10	9		6	
10 <sup>th</sup> grade	15	10	2	5	6		2	
11 <sup>th</sup> grade	6	7	1	5	15		1	
12 <sup>th</sup> grade	8	6	2	3	6		1	

<b>Additional Comments for RTI - Behavior</b>	<p>These numbers indicate students who have been referred to services that include: counseling, support through the Youth Service Center, hospital and alternate settings that best meet student needs. *(KMM, Peace Academy, Waller-Williams, TAPP, The Brook, Liberty, Wellstone, BMS, e-School, Youth Build, LMYD, Ackerly, JCHS). **Less intensive interventions continued through support with the Youth Service Center (7 Counties).</p> <p><b>DATA#1 – AUG-JAN, DATA#2 JAN-JUNE. DATA gathered through *RC office, **YSC</b></p>
---	---

<b>Additional Comments about decrease or increase of special education referrals as a result of total RTI programs</b>
<p>As students intervened with adults, the opportunity to build school based relationships also increased. This is an added bonus of academic intervention time. Academic Interventions and tiered programs for content support continued for all students identified through various programs including: HS &amp; MS Project Proficiency, Math /Rd Tutors, MS Math Lab, Success Maker Reading/Math, Pullout programs, Team Assisted Student Recovery &amp; Enrichment (TASER), Moore University. Growth by the student directed the intervention and the support that continued.</p>

**\*\*School Status Report**

**Content Focus: MATH**

<b>SIG SMART GOAL</b> (Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Realistic and Timely)	<b>OBJECTIVE 1</b> The percentage of all students scoring Proficient or Distinguished in Mathematics will be 36.92% in 2011, as measured by KCCT Mathematics. The percentage of free/reduced lunch students scoring Proficient or Distinguished in Mathematics will be 33.52%, as measured by KCCT Mathematics.							
	Person Responsible  Vicki Lete, Principal							
<b>FORMATIVE ASSESSMENT</b> (December/June)	<b>SUPPORTING EVIDENCE</b> (name of assessment)  Mathematics Performance Assessment (MPA) – Combined MS & HS							
<b>DATE OF ASSESSMENT</b>	Each MPA assessment corresponds with the corresponding six weeks grading periods.							
<b>PERFORMANCE DATA FROM BENCHMARK (% Proficient)</b>	<b>All Students</b>				<b>F/R Lunch</b>			
	<b>MS – 2011</b>	<b>MS – 2012</b>	<b>HS – 2011</b>	<b>HS 2012</b>	<b>MS – 2011</b>	<b>MS – 2012</b>	<b>HS – 2011</b>	<b>HS 2012</b>
	MPA 1 - 35.63 MPA 2 - 23.58 MPA 3 - 30.27 MPA 4 - 25.25 MPA 5 - 48.97 MPA 6 - 51.17	MPA 1 – 55.53	MPA 1 - 50.76 MPA 2 - 63.24 MPA 3 - 54.80 MPA 4 - 74.39 MPA 5 - 56.39	MPA 1 – 54.91 MPA 2 – 41.85 MPA 3 – 19.62	MPA 1 - 35.09 MPA 2 - 24.20 MPA 3 - 28.50 MPA 4 - 24.93 MPA 5 - 47.06 MPA 6 - 50.22	MPA 1 – 53.39	MPA 1 - 43.33 MPA 2 - 61.26 MPA 3 - 53.77 MPA 4 - 71.67 MPA 5 - 51.16	MPA 1 – 56.67 MPA 2 – 40.41 MPA 3 – 20.63
<b>PERFORMANCE DATA FROM BENCHMARK (% Novice Reduction)</b>	MPA 1 - 29.93 MPA 2 - 47.67 MPA 3 - 43.56 MPA 4 - 45.66 MPA 5 - 27.24 MPA 6 - 25.75	MPA 1 – 18.59	MPA 1 - 8.63 MPA 2 - 12.97 MPA 3 - 10.17 MPA 4 - 3.08 MPA 5 - 13.53	MPA 1 – 12.00 MPA 2 – 13.59 MPA 3 – 40.51	MPA 1 - 31.68 MPA 2 - 50.89 MPA 3 - 45.65 MPA 4 - 44.83 MPA 5 - 29.64 MPA 6 - 27.29	MPA 1 – 20.32	MPA 1 - 12.50 MPA 2 - 18.02 MPA 3 - 11.32 MPA 4 - 2.50 MPA 5 - 17.44	MPA 1 – 11.90 MPA 2 – 14.38 MPA 3 – 38.89

\*\*Report progress on SMART Goals in SIG Application; Narrative of the interventions in place; date and add to the narrative for each semester so cumulative notes will appear.

**\*\*School Status Report**

**Content Focus: LITERACY**

<b>SIG SMART GOAL</b> (Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Realistic and Timely)	<b>OBJECTIVE 1</b> The percentage of all students scoring Proficient or Distinguished in Reading will be 51.04% in 2011, as measured by KCCT Reading. The percentage of free/reduced lunch students scoring Proficient or Distinguished in Reading will be 47.00%, as measured by KCCT Reading.							
	Person Responsible  Vicki Lete, Principal							
<b>FORMATIVE ASSESSMENT</b>	SUPPORTING EVIDENCE (name of assessment)  Reading Performance Assessment (RPA)							
<b>DATE OF ASSESSMENT</b>	Each HS - RPA assessment corresponds with the first 5 six weeks grading periods; Each MS – RPA corresponds with each 12 week grading period.							
<b>PERFORMANCE DATA FROM BENCHMARK</b> (% Proficient)	<b>All Students</b>				<b>F/R Lunch</b>			
	<b>MS – 2011</b>	<b>MS – 2012</b>	<b>HS – 2011</b>	<b>HS 2012</b>	<b>MS – 2011</b>	<b>MS – 2012</b>	<b>HS – 2011</b>	<b>HS 2012</b>
	RPA1 - 48.97 RPA2 - 39.66 RPA3 - 37.90	RPA 1 – 51.44	RPA 1 - 60.80 RPA 2 - 55.63 RPA3 - 68.68 RPA 4 - 26.28 RPA 5 - 72.50 RPA 1 - 18.18	RPA 1 – 60.80 RPA2 – 40.72	RPA1 - 46.57 RPA2 - 37.22 RPA3 - 35.51	RPA 1 – 48.87	RPA 1 - 59.84 RPA 2 - 58.93 RPA3 - 62.70 RPA 4 - 28.97 RPA 5 - 67.26	RPA 1 – 58.44 RPA 2 – 35.43
<b>PERFORMANCE DATA FROM BENCHMARK</b> (% Novice Reduction)	RPA1 - 12.52 RPA2 - 24.19 RPA3 - 27.85	RPA 1 – 11.17	RPA 2 - 19.38 RPA 3 - 13.74 RPA 4 - 30.13 RPA 5 - 9.38	RPA 1 – 26.13 RPA 2 – 33.33	RPA1 - 14.29 RPA2 - 26.09 RPA3 - 29.39	RPA 1 – 12.18	RPA 1 - 18.85 RPA 2 - 20.54 RPA 3 - 17.46 RPA 4 - 31.78 RPA 5 - 12.39	RPA 1 – 26.62 RPA 2 – 36.22

\*\*Report progress on SMART Goals in SIG Application; Narrative of the interventions in place; date and add to the narrative for each semester so cumulative notes will appear.