# **LRSP Status Report – June 2012**



## 1.01 LO Personalize Learning SR 2012

### **Strategic Objective (SO):**

1.01 Personalize learning plans for every student using the Proficient Plus (P+) Concept.

## **Topic of Strategic Objective (SO):**

Math, Science, Reading

**Department/School:** Longfellow Elementary

Leader: Principal Team Members:

All certified staff and Longfellow's Instructional Coach

# In a year, we hope to see the following progress on this strategic objective:

- 1. Targeted groups at each grade level will demonstrate 3% or more growth in identified academic areas, on identified assessments as follows:
- K Students identified as "intensive" for Reading on the fall DIBELS Benchmarks.
- 1st Students identified as "intensive" for Reading on the fall DIBELS Benchmarks.
- 2nd Students identified as "strategic" for Reading on the fall DIBELS Benchmarks.
- 3rd Students identified as "strategic" for Math on multiple measures and easyCBM fall Benchmark.
- 4th Students identified as "strategic and intensive" in Math on multiple measures and easyCBM fall Benchmark.
- 5th Students identified as "strategic" for Reading comprehension on the fall easyCBM Benchmarks.
- 2. Increase in understanding and use of Understanding by Design (UbD) Framework and Quadrant D Model by certified staff.

#### PROGRESS SUMMARY

1. Objective 1 was completed by all grade levels.

Students at each grade level were identified using fall assessment benchmarks. Identified students were provided with targeted interventions and monitored throughout the year. As student progress indicated, teachers adjusted instructional interventions. Teachers sought to show that each student in the grade level sub-group was making academic gains on multiple measures. An arbitrary target of a 3% gain in the identified subject area was set as the standard. Teachers monitored growth, adjusted interventions and reported on the outcomes. Those outcomes are summarized here.

Some of the observations that appear to be consistent across grade levels include:

- A. A 3% growth on some measures can be insignificant (i.e. Oral Reading Fluency) while it is substantial on others (i.e Criterion Referenced Test).
  - B. Some measures are more reliable indicators of growth than others.
- C. Consistency in administration and scoring of assessments is critical for collecting valid and reliable data.
- D. Quantifying teacher professional judgment for the purposes of assessing student growth is difficult at best, yet this data plays an important role in classroom based assessments and in designing intervention strategies.

Grade level progress toward the 3% growth goal is summarized below:

## Kindergarten:

Target Group: Four (4) "intensive" students in reading as identified on Fall DIBELS.

Measures: SightWords,

DIBELS (Initial Sound Word Fluency, Letter Naming, Nonsense word Fluency),

Book Level.

All students in the identified sub group made substantially greater than the 3% gains in reading. Growth indicators ranged from 26% in Initial Sound Fluency to 6100% growth in Letter naming.

### First Grade:

Target Group: Eight (8) "intensive" students in reading as identified on Fall DIBELS.

Measures: High Frequency Word Lists,

DIBELS Nonsense Word Fluency (Words Read),

Rigby Book Level.

Growth across measures was evidenced with growth from 18% to 93% on various measures.

### Second Grade:

Target Group: Six (6) students "strategic" in Reading

Measures: DIBELS Oral Reading Fluency,

EasyCBM,

**Reading Levels** 

Growth across all measures was evidenced. Student gains were from 17% to 100% on various assessments.

### Third Grade:

Target Group: Five (5) "intensive" Math.

Measures: Everyday Math End of the Year Test,

Addition Facts,

Subtraction Facts.

Growth was evidenced in all 5 students that exceeded the 3% growth target significantly. Growth ranged from 35% to 81% for the identified 3<sup>rd</sup> grade students.

### Fourth Grade:

Target Group: Seven (7) students found to be "intensive" in Math.

Measures: EasyCBM,

Math Facts Test (Beginning to End),

District Mid-Year Math Test to District Eod of Year Math Test.

Most students made positive gains in excess of 3% on the indicated measures.

Three students showed negative progress on one measure while posting substantial gains on the other two measures.

Fifth Grade:

Target Group: Seven (7) students identified as "strategic" in reading.

Measures: EasyCBM,

CORE Maze,

Time for Kids

Students demonstrated positive gains on the measures indicate.

Consistency between measures was lacking and do not appear to give a reliable picture of student growth.

Fourth grade to 5<sup>th</sup> grade CRT Reading score comparisons showed 4 students making 11 to 14 point gains. The remaining 3 students earned perfect scores of 300 on both 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> grade CRT Reading exams. Consistency between the easyCBM and the CRT appear to be lacking.

## 2. Objective 2 continues as a work in progress.

Longfellow staff will continue to pursue opportunities for students that include Quadrant A, B, C & D lessons and activities. The Understanding by Design Framework will remain a focus for Longfellow.

#### 3. Additional Growth Measure.

The results of the 2012 MONTCAS CRT have been released. A cursory review of the data indicates that students at Longfellow scored quite well on this statewide assessment. The chart below summarizes the results. The scores reflect the percent of students at each grade level who scored at the "Proficient and Above" level in each subject.

| Grade     | Reading | Math | Science |
|-----------|---------|------|---------|
| 3 (n=53)  | 98      | 94   | N/A     |
| 4 (n= 56) | 95      | 93   | 88      |
| 5 (n=52)  | 97      | 96   | N/A     |

Also of note was the disaggregated data for low Socio-Economic Status (SES) populations. Students in this subgroup are reviewed as a group when the number qualifying in a grade level exceeds 10 students. This occurred in 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> grades. The "n" for each grade was 11 students. Ninety-one percent (92%) and 90% of the 11 5th grade students in this subgroup scored proficient and/or above in reading and math respectively.

Eighty-two percent (82%) and 100% of the 11 4th grade students in this subgroup scored proficient and/or above in reading and math respectively. Eighty-two percent (82%) of this group scored proficient and/or above in scence on this test.