LRSP Status Report – June 2012

1.01 WH 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, Reading, Writing, Science

Department/School: Whittier Elementary

Leader: Building Principal
Team Members:
Whittier teaching staff members and instructional coach

In a year, we hope to see the following progress on this strategic objective:
All students identified will have made 3% growth in their targeted area by the end of the 2011 - 2012 school year.

PROGRESS SUMMARY
All certified staff followed the same protocol: 1. Collect data, 2. Review data, 3. Determine target group(s) of students, 4. Determine 3% growth for this group, 5. Identify best practices to achieve growth goal, 6. Monitor the action plan

Kindergarten: Each of the four kindergarten. teachers chose a group of students from their room to track during the school year. The results follow: Terese Alexander progress monitored four students on their DIBELS scores in Nonsense Word Fluency and Phoneme Segmentation Fluency. The four students midyear NWF average score was 40 and their end of year was 55, approxmately a 38% gain.   In PSF the four students midyear score was 14 and their end of year score was 34, a 143% gain. Mrs. Alexander felt the gains were contributed to reading intervention and classroom support of intervention strategies and collaboration between herself and the intervention teacher.

Ms. Madsen chose to progress monitor three students in the areas of Nonsense Word Fluency and Phoneme Segementation Fluency. The three students midyear NWF average score was 14 and their end of year score was 31, approximately a 121% gain. In PSF the three students midyear average score was 33 and their end of year score was 53, approximately a 61% gain. Ms. Madsen contributes the gains to collaboration, interventions, and small group work.

Mrs. Nelson chose to progress monitor four students in the area of Nonsense Word Fluency and Phoneme Segmentation Fluency also. The four students midyear NWF average score was 27 and their end of year score was 36, a gain of about 33%. In PSF the midyear average was 48 and

the end of year average was 68, a 42% gain. Mrs. Nelson felt that the support of interventionist and weekly collaboration helped support student gains.

Mrs. Wessel also chose to progress monitor four students using Nonsense Work Fluency and Phoneme Segmentation Fluency. The four students midyear NWF average score was 17 and their end of year score was 33, approximately a 94% gain. In PSF the four students midyear average was 40 and their year end score was 59, about a 48% gain. Mrs. Wessel felt the gains were contributed to interventions, collaboration, and application of intervention skills from small group to the whole class.

1st Grade: Grade one teachers used DIBELS and Rigby Reading Assessment data to track student progress. They chose to progress monitor five students. One student moved during the school year. The four remaining students were monitored using DIBELS Oral Reading Fluency. The midyear ORF average was 47 and the year end was 133, approximately a 183% gain. The five students Rigby results follow: one student started at Level A and ended the year at Level E (beginning of kindergarten to midyear 1st grade), three students started the year at Level B (beginning of 1st grade). Two of the students ended the year at Level E (mid year first grade) and one student ended the year at Level I (end of first grade). The fifth student started the year at Level C (end of kindergarten) and ended the year at Level G (latter part of first grade).

2nd Grade: Grade two teachers progress monitored nine students using three assessments, DIBELS, Rigby Levels, and District Easy CBM Reading Comprhension. Progress monitoring shows all nine students making significantly more gains than 3%. Fall DIBEL reading fluency scores for the nine students averaged 32 words per minute and an average score of 15 words per minute retelling on the comprehension measure. Spring average scores showed 92 words per minute, an increase of 60 words per minute, and a comprehension average score of 47 words retold, an increase of 32 words per minute. On the Rigby Levels, the nine students averaged a gain of seven book levels. All but one student reached or surpassed the end of second grade book level M.

3rd Grade: Grade three teachers chose to progress monitor twelve students. In reading they used the EasyCBM comprehension and passage reading fluency benchmark scores to determine whether the targeted group reached the 3% goal. They began with a group of 12 students and ended with 10 students. The targeted group began with an average score of 5 on the EasyCBM comprehension assessment and ended the year with an average score of 13. This is about a 160% gain. The group began the year with an average EasyCBM passage reading fluency rate of 51 and ended the year with an average score of 89. This showed an increase of about 75%. Third Grade teachers felt RTI implementation was a leading factor in student gains.

Third Grade teachers also chose to progress monitor the same 12 students in math. They used the EasyCBM math benchmark scores and the district math facts test to determine whether the targeted group reached the 3% goal. They began with a group of 12 students and ended with 10 students. The targeted group began with an average score of 26 on the district math facts test and ended the year with an average score of 51. This was an approximate gain of 96%. The group began the year with an average EasyCBM math benchmark score of 28 and ended the year with an average score of 33. This showed an increase of 18%. The third grade teachers felt

student success was contributed both to the implementation of the Common Core Standards and use of the math paraprofessional who provided differentiated instruction in both classrooms.

4th Grade: Fourth Grade progress monitored eight students using Easy CBM Comprehension assessments, Easy CBM fluency benchmarks, and CRT results from last year and this year. Six of the eight students gained an average of 41 words per minute on CBM fluency benchmarks. The fall average was 59 words per minute and the spring average score was 100.   The Easy CBM comprehension tests showed growth across the board, however, the results were inconsistent. Results on the comprehension test showed a fall average of seven correct responses out of 20, and the spring average was 13 correct responses out of 20.   The same students showed CRT reading average from the 2010 - 2011 school year as 233 or Nearing Proficient, and the 2011 - 2012 school year score as 254 or Proficient.

5th Grade: After reviewing the data on the fifth grade students selected, the fifth grade team determined that on average the targeted students surpassed the 3% goal set on their fall to spring Easy CBM math scores. The student scores raised by the following: (#1)fall:26, spring:31 (#2)fall:22, spring:30 (#3)fall:29, spring 34 (#4)fall:24, spring:37 (#5)fall:19, spring:20 (#6)fall:21, spring:34 (#7)fall:27, spring:34. Together this averaged around a 31% gain.

These same students achieved a higher rate of achievement when we compared their 2011 to their 2012 Montana CRT math test scores. (#1)4th grade:214, 5th grade:265 (#2)4th grade:231, 5th grade:242 (#3) 4th grade:229, 5th grade:245(#4)4th grade:211, 5th grade:224 (#5)4th grade:223, 5th grade:254 (#6)4th grade:240, 5th grade:251(#7)4th grade:231, 5th grade:271.

Overall, our 5th grade targeted students exceeded the 3% growth by a much larger margin.