

DISTRICT 180 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANT (1003g)

SEMESTER REPORT 2010-2013 For Tier III Schools

School Name:
Monroe County Middle School
NCLB Consequence:
Tier III

Reporting Dates

2011		2012		2013	
January	June	January	June	January	June
13		13			

NON-COGNITIVE DATA

Attendance [**Report in Percentages**]

	Baseline	2011		2012		2013	
	2009-2010	Aug-Dec	Jan-June	Aug-Dec	Jan-June	Aug-Dec	Jan-June
Grade 6	95.12	95.16	96.58	97.03			
Grade 7	94.45	96.13	95.66	96.07			
Grade 8	94.61	96.00	95.72	95.70			
Total School	94.73	96.24	95.88	96.26			
Teacher Attendance %	93.75	94.8	93.3	95.1			

Student attendance continues to show an increase.

Teacher attendance is up substantially, especially since we had one on maternity leave.

We also had a maternity leave in the Fall of this year and will have one in the Spring.

Retention Rate [**Report in Percentages**]

	Baseline 2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
Grade 6	0	0		
Grade 7	.6	0		
Grade 8	0	0		

Behavior Interventions (Beyond Universal)

	Baseline % of students served 2009-2010	2010-2011				Additional Comments about the increase or decrease of students with disability referrals: Less intensive is a larger % because they are coming from our District assignment to our school assignment.
		% of students served		% of students progressing to a less intensive tiered intervention		
		Aug-Dec	Jan-June	Aug-Dec	Jan-June	
Grade 6	.7	.5	.5	5.7	8.9	Additional Comments about the increase or decrease of African American students' referrals: No significant changes in African American numbers
Grade 7	1.4	1.4	4.3	12.1	16.4	
Grade 8	4.9	2.8	2.0	12.8	18.8	
	2011-2012					
	% of students served	% of students progressing to a less intensive		Additional Comments about the increase or decrease of students with disability referrals:		

			tiered intervention		Same as above
	Aug-Dec	Jan-June	Aug-Dec	Jan-June	
Grade 6	0		8.6		Additional Comments about the increase or decrease of African American students' referrals: Above
Grade 7	1.3		10.7		
Grade 8	4.2		15.7		
2012-2013					
	% of students served		% of students progressing to a less intensive tiered intervention		Additional Comments about the increase or decrease of students with disability referrals:
	Aug-Dec	Jan-June	Aug-Dec	Jan-June	
Grade 6					Additional Comments about the increase or decrease of African American students' referrals:
Grade 7					
Grade 8					
Additional Comments Concerning Non-Cognitive Data:					

ACADEMIC/COGNITIVE DATA

KPREP Core Content Test [**Proficient/Distinguished Results in Percentages**]

	Baseline 2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
Reading Grade 6	64.71	70.07		
Reading Grade 7	66.00	64.75		
Reading Grade 8	64.81	67.35		
Mathematics Grade 6	67.65	76.87		
Mathematics Grade 7	54.00	57.55		
Mathematics Grade 8	59.88	51.70		
Science Grade 7	53.33	64.03		
Social Studies Grade 8	55.56	58.50		

On-Demand Writing Grade 8	40.74	42.18		
---------------------------	-------	-------	--	--

Our 7th grade reading scores were down primarily due to a maternity leave for our reading teacher.

Our 8th grade math scores are down due to having a new inexperienced teacher.

Our 6th grade math scores are up due to the additional teacher we added with the SIG funds.

Reading Interventions

	Baseline % of students served 2009-2010	2010-2011				Additional Comments about the increase or decrease of students with disability referrals: These less intensive are my best estimates, because I failed to report these last year.
		% of students served		% of students progressing to a less intensive tiered intervention		
		Aug- Dec	Jan- June	Aug-Dec	Jan-June	
Grade 6		37.0	28.8	21.6	15.0	Additional Comments about the increase or decrease of African American students' referrals:
Grade 7		56.0	19.4	31.5	11.3	
Grade 8		61.0	35.6	38.0	20.0	
2011-2012						
	% of students served	% of students progressing to a less intensive tiered intervention		Additional Comments about the increase or decrease of students with disability referrals: RTI has changed to a teacher recommendation/score program. Much more effective in both identifying and intervening.		
		Aug-Dec	Jan- June			Aug- Dec
Grade 6	26.16		7.55			Additional Comments about the increase or decrease of African American students' referrals:
Grade 7	52.00		42.00			
Grade 8	45.32		15.82			
2012-2013						
	% of students served	% of students progressing to a less intensive tiered intervention		Additional Comments about the increase or decrease of students with disability referrals:		
		Aug-Dec	Jan- June			Aug- Dec
Grade 6						
Grade 7						

Grade 8					Additional Comments about the increase or decrease of African American students' referrals:

I can't determine the baseline scores for the reading interventions in 09-10.

Math Interventions

	Baseline % of students served 2009-2010 School Year	2010-2011				Additional Comments about the increase or decrease of students with disability referrals: The less intensive are my best estimates, because it was failed to be reported last year.
		% of students served		% of students progressing to a less intensive tiered intervention		
		Aug-Dec	Jan-June	Aug-Dec	Jan-June	
Grade 6		37.0	24.4	20.0	16.5	
Grade 7		60.0	32.37	42.0	18.0	
Grade 8		77.0	26.8	50.5	20.0	Additional Comments about the increase or decrease of African American students' referrals:
	2011-2012					Additional Comments about the increase or decrease of students with disability referrals:
	% of students served		% of students progressing to a less intensive tiered intervention			
	Aug-Dec	Jan-June	Aug-Dec	Jan-June		
Grade 6	43.60		36.04			
Grade 7	30.00		16.66			
Grade 8	26.61		38.12			Additional Comments about the increase or decrease of African American students' referrals:
	2012-2013					Additional Comments about the increase or decrease of students with disability referrals:
	% of students served		% of students progressing to a less intensive tiered intervention			
	Aug-Dec	Jan-June	Aug-Dec	Jan-June		
Grade 6						
Grade 7						
Grade 8						Additional Comments about the increase

or decrease of African American students' referrals:

I can't determine the baseline scores for the math interventions for 09-10.

Explore [% Below Benchmark]

	Baseline 2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
English	38	39	46	
Math	57	77	82	
Reading	59	61	72	
Science	86	85	90	
Composite	14.9	14.9	14.4	

Interventions for Explore [Report in Percentages]

		<i>Percent of students receiving support as a result of Explore scores.</i>	Describe interventions and/or supports	Data to show results for the interventions and/or supports	Comments
2010-2011	Aug-Dec	65.5	RTI, All Math and reading interventionist, Math and Reading Tutoring after school,	RTI Prep. For Explore for 4 weeks prior to test	
	Jan-June	65.5	RTI, Students self analyze their scores, Explore/Plan/ACT EPAS night, Math and Reading Tutoring after school	Analyzing explore scores after KCCT test	Self analyzing of scores will improve students awareness of importance of test
2011-2012	Aug-Dec	72.5	Improved RTI, All classroom assessment now timed, Self analyzing of scores by student, EPAS night, Math and reading interventionist	RTI Prep for 5 weeks prior to test, bellringer	Formative assessments daily (bellringer)
	Jan-June	72.5	RTI, Timed assessments, Math and Reading interventionist, After school tutoring	Analyzing personal scores, Given to 7 th grade in addition to 8 th , Referral to RTI if benchmark not reached, bellringer	Student acknowledgment of test scores. Explore was given to 7 th grade also. We will also give to 6 th next year. MCMS is in a GEAR UP District and will receive funding to assist in raising Explore test scores effective in the Fall of 2012

		<i>Percent</i> of students receiving support as a result of Explore scores.	Describe interventions and/or supports	Data to show results for the interventions and/or supports	Comments
2012-2013	Aug-Dec				
	Jan-June				

7th grade Explore Scores 2011-12

English	48	13.5
Math	83	14.7
Reading	72	13.2
Science	94	15.1

Composite 74.25

7th grade scored essentially the same as the 8th grade. Promising for next year. Planning to give to 6th grade next year, also.

CONTENT FOCUS – English Language Arts/Literacy

SIG ANNUAL SMART GOAL FOR ALL STUDENTS (Report of Progress on SMART Goals listed in SIG Application)	Goal: Teachers will implement Adolescent Literacy strategies for 2 lessons per week, as measured by: walk-thrus, guided planning checklists, and teacher developed formative assessments. The anticipated outcome will be a decrease in novice and apprentice students as measured on our thinklink results.
	Person Responsible: Tony Harlan, Debbie Crowe

Name of Measurement:	Baseline 2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
Thinklink	32.0	31.43	41.5	
Was goal met? (Yes or No)		yes	After 3 rd assessment	

Showed a decrease of app. 1% in 10-11.

If goal was not met, what will the district be doing to assist the school in reaching goals?

2010-11 average of all 3 thinklink test
 2011-11 average of all 3 thinklink test
 Percent will drop after administration of 3rd thinklink assessment

SIG BENCHMARK DATA FOR <u>ALL</u> STUDENTS (Report of Progress on Benchmark Goals listed in SIG Application)							
Name of Assessment: Thinklink	Baseline 2009-2010	2010-2011		2011-2012		2012-2013	
		Aug-Dec	Jan-June	Aug-Dec	Jan-June	Aug-Dec	Jan-June
% Proficient or above	68.0	69.4	67.6	60.7			
% Novice	6.0	5.7	7.8	12.4			

SIG BENCHMARK DATA FOR SUB GROUPS (Report of Progress on Benchmark Goals listed in SIG Application)								
		Baseline 2009-2010	2010-2011		2011-2012		2012-2013	
			Aug-Dec	Jan-June	Aug-Dec	Jan-June	Aug-Dec	Jan-June
African-American	% Proficient		90.0	75.0	55.6			
	% Novice		10.0	0	11.0			
Free/Reduced Lunch	% Proficient		65.7	63.4	50.2			
	% Novice		6.3	7.9	13.2			
Students with Disabilities	% Proficient		18.4	35.3	0			
	% Novice		28.9	8.8	40.9			

I can't accurately determine the baseline scores, because they haven't been asked for in the past. We also didn't keep up with data as efficiently then as we do now.

CONTENT FOCUS – Mathematics

SIG ANNUAL SMART GOAL FOR <u>ALL</u> STUDENTS	Goal: All teachers will implement differentiated math strategies for two lessons per week, measured by walk-thrus, guided planning checklists, and teacher developed formative assessments. The anticipated
--	--

(Report of Progress on SMART Goals listed in SIG Application)	outcome will be a decrease in novice and apprentice students as measured on our thinklink scores.
	Person Responsible: Tony Harlan, Debbie Crowe

Name of Measurement:	Baseline 2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
Thinklink	46.0	45.61	55.7, 37.8 46.75	
Was goal met? (Yes or No)		yes	Yes, add 3 rd test after administered	

10-11 By less than 1 percent

If goal was not met, what will the district be doing to assist the school in reaching goals?
<p>2010-11 an average of all 3 Thinklink test 2011-12 an average of the first two Thinklink test I anticipate the percentage to drop even lower after the third assessment, since we dropped by 10% from the second to the third last year.</p>

SIG BENCHMARK DATA FOR <u>ALL</u> STUDENTS (Report of Progress on Benchmark Goals listed in SIG Application)							
Name of Assessment: Thinklink	Baseline 2009-2010	2010-2011		2011-2012		2012-2013	
		Aug-Dec	Jan-June	Aug-Dec	Jan-June	Aug-Dec	Jan-June
% Proficient or above	67.0	41.4	51.5	62.2			
% Novice	11.0	20.2	18.0	11.2			

SIG BENCHMARK DATA FOR SUB GROUPS (Report of Progress on Benchmark Goals listed in SIG Application)								
		Baseline 2009-2010	2010-2011		2011-2012		2012-2013	
			Aug-Dec	Jan-June	Aug-Dec	Jan-June	Aug-Dec	Jan-June
African-American	% Proficient		30.0	55.5	80.0			
	% Novice		30.0	11.1	10.0			
Free/Reduced Lunch	% Proficient		32.5	45.2	60.6			

	% Novice		23.6	23.4	13.3			
Students with Disabilities	% Proficient		2.6	14.3	34.6			
	% Novice		78.9	51.4	30.8			

I can't accurately determine the 09-10 baselines, because they weren't asked for before. We also didn't keep data as efficiently then as we do now.

From our original app. dated Spring 2010

On July 1st 2010, we began implementation of instructional practice and data collection. This will be to determine the intervention and instructional practices that are occurring.

2010-11

-As based by the 2011 KCCT, 45% of sixth grade students with disabilities will score proficient/distinguished in reading and 25% will score proficient /distinguished in math.

-As based by the 2011 KCCT, 27% of seventh grade students with disabilities will score proficient/distinguished in reading and 35% will score proficient/distinguished in math.

-As based by the 2011 KCCT, 19% of eighth grade students with disabilities will score proficient/distinguished in reading and 32% will score proficient/distinguished in math.

-As based by the 2011 KCCT, 57% of all students that are on free/reduced lunch will score proficient/distinguished in reading and 52% will score proficient/distinguished in math.

Actual Scores:

	6 th	7 th	8 th	F/R
Year 09-10				
Math	16	14	16	50
Reading	39	20	20	56
Year 10-11				
Math	36	40	0	55
Reading	36	46	10	60

We reached our goals with the exception of 8th grade Math and reading and 6th grade reading. Very proud of these results. It is evident the goals helped exceed the year 09-10 versus 10-11, with the exception of 8th grade. We changed our

teaching assignments for the disabled at the beginning of 10-11 also, with our 6th and 7th teachers accepting this with open arms and the 8th grade teacher not as well. The same teacher is now staying with the same grade level all day, whereas in the past our assignments were by content. This has helped our special ed. culture also.

Additional SMART Goals

(May duplicate as necessary)

OTHER SIG SMART GOALS (Report of Progress on any and all other SMART Goals listed in SIG Application)	Goal:
	PROGRESS TOWARD GOAL (NARRATIVE):
	SUPPORTING EVIDENCE (name of assessment):

Data Summary Questions

Data Summary for January 2012

1. What does the data tell us?

Student and teacher attendance has improved for teachers by 1.4% over our baseline year, and by 1.5 for students over the baseline year. Our largest decline on KCCT has been in 8th grade math with the largest increase in 7th grade science, followed by 6th grade math and 8th grade social studies. Reading scores have become stagnant with novice students from special ed. numbers decreasing. Novice students in math show steady decrease along with free/reduce and African American students.

A majority of our students are in an intensive intervention setting and moving to a less intensive intervention setting due to our improved RTI program along with better instructional strategies.

Over the past three years our explore scores have shown to be decreasing. Our thinklink scores show increases in both math and reading; we feel confident that this indicates our scores will increase on the K-PREP.

2. What does the data not tell us? Example: Report such things as reasons for lower student or teacher attendance, reductions in novice levels, increases in interventions, etc. Why our explore interventions are not working? We use explore bellringers, timed assessments, timed bellringers, and a focus on test taking strategies for the explore. Why were our 7th grade explore scores essentially the same as the 8th? Why our math scores show improvement while reading are not moving.

3. What are causes for celebration?

Our overall KCCT scores show increases in reading, math, science, social studies and on demand writing. Our current thinklink scores and our improved RTI program are also cause for celebration. Improved attendance of both students and teachers over the same time period last year are celebration worthy.

4. What are the opportunities for improvement?

Increased explore scores to reach benchmarks, refine formative assessment and guided planning, and continued improvement of our RTI program.

5. What are our next steps?

Monitor results of our walk-through data and provide better feedback to teachers for improvement in instructional strategies and the use of formative assessment.

Ensure instructional practice, assessments, learning targets and classroom activities are aligned with common core and college readiness standards.