



2011-2012

## Semester Report and School Data Questions

What does the data tell us?
<p>The proficiency assessment data in Cascade show that students are making gains in math, science, and social studies. The reading proficiency assessment scores are not showing growth. December MAP results, however, show gains in reading and math. The growth of our students matches the typical growth expected as reported by NWEA. Further, students in targeted interventions are making greater gains, on average, than students not in interventions, showing that the interventions are having an effect. ACT Explore scores show that our students are not college-ready.</p>
What does the data not tell us?
<p>We are serving more students in interventions this year because of available funds and staffing decisions. Also, we had a large influx of 8<sup>th</sup> grade students this year that was unanticipated, which has resulted in larger class sizes and master schedule changes to accommodate the increased number of 8<sup>th</sup> grade students. Many positive supports are in place for at-risk and struggling students to help motivate and support them and to get them involved in school activities. Finally, the majority of our student population begins 6<sup>th</sup> grade below grade level.</p>

What are causes for celebration?

December MAP scores show gains across the board. We are able to serve more students in interventions this year. Teachers are becoming more adept at interpreting and utilizing student assessment data. Increased enrollment in the 8<sup>th</sup> grade is positive. We are pleased with the 1<sup>st</sup> year of implementation of our Montessori program. We have worked hard to increase student attendance this year and are seeing small improvements.

What are the opportunities for improvement?

ACT Explore scores are very low. We need to continue our work in language arts classes and intervention classes to increase reading proficiency. We continuously work to improve classroom instruction and increase rigor and active engagement for students.

Next Steps

We will begin developing and implementing interventions for ACT Explore. We will refocus embedded and school-wide PD efforts to focus on differentiated instruction and active student engagement in class.

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

School Name: Westport Middle School District Name Jefferson

Date Report Completed: 1/20/2012

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	95.5	95.0	94.5		94.2	92.2		
7 <sup>th</sup> grade ADA	94.8	94.7	94.5		93.1	92.9		
8th grade ADA	94.7	95.2	94.2		93.3	92.7		
	DEC/JAN				JUNE			
	2009 Baseline	2010	2011	2012	2010 Baseline	2011	2012	2013
Total School ADA	95.0	95.0	94.4		92.6	93.6		
*Teacher Attendance %	96.52	97.94	96.90					
Dropout %	0.0%	0.2%	0.2%		0.0%	0.4%		
*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	0	1		
7 <sup>th</sup> Grade	0	0		
8 <sup>th</sup> Grade	2	0		

Report in Percentages	DEC/JAN Baseline			
	2009	2010	2011	2012
<b>EXPLORE % Below Benchmark</b>				
# Students	222	249	267	
English	57.7%	64.66%	69.29%	
Math	76.1%	87.15%	91.39%	
Reading	73.4%	82.33%	82.40%	
Combined	83.8%	92.37%	95.9%	

*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
	0	NA	NA	
<p>With a majority of students performing below grade level in reading and math, we have not implemented intensive Explore interventions to date. From August to October, 8<sup>th</sup> grade teachers planned lessons during ICE (Interventions-Connections-Enrichments) utilizing released Explore items, practice questions, and test-taking strategies.</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	67	97	0	0	122		6	
7 <sup>th</sup> grade	31	104	0	0	103		20	
8 <sup>th</sup> grade	33	91	0	0	59		0	

Additional Comments for RTI - Reading	<p>1/20/12 After the August implementation of MAP testing, students were placed in reading interventions specific to their needs. We have a full-time Read 180 teacher who has students during a related arts period, and we have an additional reading intervention teacher who uses SuccessMaker and various reading materials selected based on student needs. We also have students assigned to SuccessMaker during related arts period. Each grade level team has a reading intervention class every other day during ICE as well.</p> <p>6/1/11 Students were placed in small group interventions for our ICE (Interventions-Connections-Enrichments) program by MAP scores and specific skill deficiencies. Also, some students received additional reading interventions during one of their related arts periods. Because we implemented MAP testing for the first time in November, we did not test again until May, so intervention groups were not reconstituted, i.e. students did not change to a less or more intensive intervention. We monitored progress biweekly and saw consistent gains but decided not to change intervention groups. Our rationale for maintaining these groups was to provide enough instructional time for meaningful growth. Next year, we will test in August, December, and March, so we will have more movement in and out of interventions with each round of new data.</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	36	72	0		158		0	
7 <sup>th</sup> grade	36	83	0		143		0	
8 <sup>th</sup> grade	36	50	0		102		0	

<b>Additional Comments for RTI - Math</b>	<p>1/20/12 Students were placed in math interventions based on August MAP scores. We have a math intervention teacher who works with students daily during a related arts period using Do the Math Now and SuccessMaker. We also assign students to SuccessMaker lab during related arts. Also, each grade level team has a teacher using Do the Math Now for intervention lessons every other day during team ICE. Our December MAP results show that students in all 3 types of interventions have made gains greater than their peers not in math interventions. We made the decision not to move students to a less intensive tiered intervention until they are closer to being on grade level in math.</p> <p>6/1/11 Students were placed in small group interventions for our ICE (Interventions-Connections-Enrichments) program by MAP scores and specific skill deficiencies. Also, some students received additional math interventions during one of their related arts periods. Because we implemented MAP testing for the first time in November, we did not test again until May, so intervention groups were not reconstituted, i.e. students did not change to a less or more intensive intervention. We monitored progress biweekly and saw consistent gains but decided not to change intervention groups. Our rationale for maintaining these groups was to provide enough instructional time for meaningful growth. Next year, we will test in August, December, and March, so we will have more movement in and out of interventions with each round of new data.</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	22	25	0	0	30		0	
7 <sup>th</sup> grade	13	4	0	9	15		0	
8 <sup>th</sup> grade	10	3	0	7	10		10	

<b>Additional Comments for RTI - Behavior</b>	<p>1/20/12 Self-contained special education students are receiving behavior interventions during ICE. Teachers are using the Second Steps curriculum for this. Also, the 6<sup>th</sup> grade assistant principal began DIG (Discipline Intervention Group) for 6<sup>th</sup> graders having behavior issues in the classroom. The program utilizes behavior contracts and counseling/mentoring with the Home-School Coordinator. This semester all grade levels are implementing SOAR. When a student's behavior prevents him/her from remaining in the classroom, the student meets with a mentor to reflect on the behaviors, develop a plan, and refocus in order to return to class, thus minimizing loss of instruction and assignments to ISAP.</p> <p>Most behavior interventions were focused on 6<sup>th</sup> grade students.</p>
---	---

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

## \*\*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 43.99% in 2011, as measured by KCCT Mathematics. The percentage of free/reduced lunch students scoring Proficient or Distinguished in Mathematics will be 40.19%, as measured by KCCT Mathematics.			
	Person Responsible  Dr. Staci Eddleman, 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: 34.27 MPA 2: 19.41 MPA 3: 32.90 MPA 4: 41.56 MPA 5: 33.11 MPA 6: 42.91 MPA 7: 0.00	FALL MAP: 28.93  WINTER MAP: 32.5	MPA 1: 31.60 MPA 2: 15.68 MPA 3: 29.62 MPA 4: 39.38 MPA 5: 28.76 MPA 6: 39.20 MPA 7: 0.00	FALL MAP: 23.81  WINTER MAP: 28.2
PERFORMANCE DATA FROM BENCHMARK (% Novice Reduction)	MPA 1: 33.49 MPA 2: 60.90 MPA 3: 37.76 MPA 4: 23.38 MPA 5: 39.93 MPA 6: 31.52 MPA 7: 90.00	FALL MAP: 27.55	MPA 1: 35.80 MPA 2: 66.90 MPA 3: 42.18 MPA 4: 23.89 MPA 5: 44.66 MPA 6: 36.08 MPA 7: 86.96	FALL MAP: 33.00

\*\*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 49.80% in 2011, as measured by KCCT Reading. The percentage of free/reduced lunch students scoring Proficient or Distinguished in Reading will be 46.27%, as measured by KCCT Reading.			
	Person Responsible  Dr. Staci Eddleman, 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: 46.63 RPA2: 41.60 RPA3: 44.63	FALL MAP: 45.83	RPA1: 42.96 RPA2: 37.43 RPA3: 40.56	FALL MAP: 39.50
PERFORMANCE DATA FROM BENCHMARK (% Novice Reduction)	RPA1: 13.20 RPA2: 16.81 RPA3: 10.18	FALL MAP: 6.69	RPA1: 14.07 RPA2: 19.09 RPA3: 11.85	FALL MAP: 7.60

\*\*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.