



2010-2011

Semester Report and School Data Questions

What does the data tell us?
The data provided in this report tells us to continue to focus and implement the intervention strategies in reading and math. In addition, continue usage of MAPs as a diagnostic tool to support placement of students in intervention classes. Attendance data again show a slight decrease. There is a reduction of novice performing students in reading and math among the subgroups provided in the data.
What does the data not tell us?
The strategic planning of incorporating EPD (embedded professional development), district PD, Mentoring program used to help support and inform teachers instructional practice.
What are causes of celebration?
The ability to schedule students in classes for math and reading based on the utilization of MAPs. The purchase of the 10 material for our reading enrichment program is valuable support for non-reading teachers. Reading probes are used to support identification of student's levels for reading comprehension. The Do The Math program is being implemented as additional support for our math students. The additional support of the positive support staff is beneficial to target the intense students who need the additional support to remove barriers to their learning.
What are the opportunities for improvement?
To continue to analyze data and identify by name the students who are not mastering specific skills and provide the necessary support through RTI structures.
Next Steps
The continuation of the systems and strategies in place, re-evaluate, and make necessary changes based on the needs of our students to meet our goals.

School Name: Stuart Middle 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 Report in Percentages	DEC/JAN				JUNE			
	2009 Baseline	2010	2011	2012	2010 Baseline	2011	2012	2013
6th grade ADA	93.4	94.4	95.2		92.4	91.9		
7 th grade ADA	92.9	94.8	93.3		91.2	92.5		
8th grade ADA	91.5	93.4	93.5		90.5	90.6		
	DEC/JAN				JUNE			
	2009 Baseline	2010	2011	2012	2010 Baseline	2011	2012	2013
Total School ADA	92.6	94.2	94.0		91.4	91.7		
*Teacher Attendance %	94.37	95.67	95.48					
Dropout %	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%		0.1%	0.0%		
*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 th Grade	4	3		
7 th Grade	5	4		
8 th Grade	0	2		

Report in Percentages	DEC/JAN Baseline			
	2009	2010	2011	2012
EXPLORE % Below Benchmark				
# Students	333	337	313	
English	62.8%	63.80%	63.26%	
Math	82.9%	86.05%	90.10%	
Reading	80.5%	81.60%	81.15%	
Combined	90.1%	90.50%	95.2%	

*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
	75	Once data is disaggregated we will focus on student needs and provide intentional support.	Not applicable due to data analysis underway.	Results were received on 11/23 and have not been implemented.
Course recovery and writing, reading and math enrichment classes were implemented to support the struggling students. The 8 th grade counselor has scheduled team meetings to discuss the following: Re-introduction to ACT explore 2. Use a power point explaining their results 3. Discussion with students using their scores and a copy of the standards 4. Importance of ACT scores and being viewed by colleges/university and how it plays a part in scholarship money which relates to income.				

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 th grade	62	60	0	55	70		2	
7 th grade	63	65	0	59	40		0	
8 th grade	64	64	0	60	40		0	

Additional Comments for RTI - Reading	These students were given the Scholastic reading inventory and MAPs the results were used in conjunction with teacher recommendation to place students in the correct reading program. In addition results of corrective reading mastery tests and Success Maker were used to place students.
--	---

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 th grade		32		32	30		10	
7 th grade		94		94	60		20	
8 th grade		21		11	40		15	

Additional Comments for RTI - Math	The MAP's diagnostic tool was utilized and the results were used in conjunction with teacher recommendation to place students in the correct math interventions.
---	--

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 th grade	12	19	0	8	15		4	
7 th grade	0	20	0	5	37		9	
8 th grade	32	37	0	18	29		5	

Additional Comments for RTI - Behavior	We have a behavior coach that works closely with 30 students. We added an ECE positive support staff member, and we added a second positive support staff member to work with regular education students. The typical process for any student is to be referred to the counselor, Youth Service Center for Seven Counties Counseling, the behavior coach, and ECE/Regular positive support staff to assist with curtailing and shaping behavior.
---	--

Additional Comments about decrease or increase of special education referrals as a result of total RTI programs

**School Status Report

Content Focus: MATH

SIG SMART GOAL (Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Realistic and Timely)	OBJECTIVE 1 The percentage of all students scoring Proficient or Distinguished in Mathematics will be 39.18% in 2011, as measured by KCCT Mathematics. The percentage of free/reduced lunch students scoring Proficient or Distinguished in Mathematics will be 36.62%, as measured by KCCT Mathematics.			
	Person Responsible DeLena Alexander, Principal			
FORMATIVE ASSESSMENT (December/June)	SUPPORTING EVIDENCE (name of assessment) Mathematics Performance Assessment (MPA)			
DATE OF ASSESSMENT	MPA assessments correspond to each 6 weeks grading period. Grading period 6 had two assessments (MPA6 & MPA7).			
PERFORMANCE DATA FROM BENCHMARK (% Proficient)	All Students		F/R Lunch	
	2010-2011	2011-2012	2010-2011	2011-2012
	MPA 1: 26.38 MPA 2: 8.47 MPA 3: 19.10 MPA 4: 23.92 MPA 5: 21.11 MPA 6: 21.62 MPA 7: 8.33	FALL MAP: 31.58	MPA 1: 24.05 MPA 2: 7.81 MPA 3: 17.17 MPA 4: 23.63 MPA 5: 19.67 MPA 6: 20.12 MPA 7: 6.8	FALL MAP: 27.93
PERFORMANCE DATA FROM BENCHMARK (% Novice Reduction)	MPA 1: 39.39 MPA 2: 55.38 MPA 3: 49.53 MPA 4: 51.33 MPA 5: 53.30 MPA 6: 43.94 MPA 7: 71.53	FALL MAP: 25.27	MPA 1: 41.65 MPA 2: 58.13 MPA 3: 51.32 MPA 4: 54.01 MPA 5: 56.26 MPA 6: 46.25 MPA 7: 70.87	FALL MAP: 28.46

**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

SIG SMART GOAL (Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Realistic and Timely)	OBJECTIVE 1 The percentage of all students scoring Proficient or Distinguished in Reading will be 53.68% in 2011, as measured by KCCT Reading. The percentage of free/reduced lunch students scoring Proficient or Distinguished in Reading will be 51.73%, as measured by KCCT Reading.			
	Person Responsible DeLena Alexander, Principal			
FORMATIVE ASSESSMENT	SUPPORTING EVIDENCE (name of assessment) Reading Performance Assessment (RPA)			
DATE OF ASSESSMENT	Each RPA exam corresponds to each 12 week grading period.			
PERFORMANCE DATA FROM BENCHMARK (% Proficient)	All Students		F/R Lunch	
	2010-2011	2011-2012	2010-2011	2011-2012
	RPA1: 56.15 RPA2: 50.17 RPA3: 50.56	FALL MAP: 55.03	RPA1: 53.89 RPA2: 48.45 RPA3: 48.92	FALL MAP: 51.85
PERFORMANCE DATA FROM BENCHMARK (% Novice Reduction)	RPA1: 5.82 RPA2: 12.32 RPA3: 10.14	FALL MAP: 4.76	RPA1: 6.81 RPA2: 13.98 RPA3: 11.38	FALL MAP: 5.41

**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.