

Albany Middle School
S.P.S.A. 2011-13
(updated DRAFT 04-11-2012)

School Goal Number FIVE: Math
***“We will increase the percentage of students scoring at
Proficient or Advanced levels of performance.”***

Introduction: The following goal number FIVE I is designed to meet Annual Yearly Progress (AYP) as defined by No Child Left Behind (NCLB) federal legislation. This goal addresses the need to increase performance in the current year's student body as compared to the previous year's student body. Federal AYP focuses on the percentage of students at Proficient or Advanced.

On the 2011 STAR exam, 68.5% of all students, including all subgroups of students, were expected to perform at Proficient or Advanced levels. On the 2012 STAR exam, 77.2% of all students, including all subgroups of students will be expected to perform at Proficient or Advanced levels.

In the cases where student groups are already outperforming these levels, we can name a reasonable percentage of increase. In the cases where student groups are underperforming these levels, we can name a reasonable increase of 5 to 10%. It is not reasonable to name increases of more than 10% even if that means we won't meet AYP requirements.

Goal Number FIVE: *Albany Middle School students in the current year will demonstrate increased levels of performance on the STAR Exam as compared to students in the previous year.*

- *The percentage of total students scoring Proficient or Advanced will increase by 5% from 77.2% to 82.2%. In 2011 there were 659/854 students at Proficient or Advanced. So, for 2012, this translates to approximately 701 students total and approximately 42 who need to increase their performance.*
- *The percentage of Black/African American students will increase by 5% from 56.2% to 61.2%. In 2011 there were 41/73 students at Proficient or Advanced. So, for 2012, this translates to approximately 45 students total and approximately 4 who need to increase their performance.*
- *The percentage of Asian students scoring Proficient or Advanced will increase by 5% from 86.6% to 91.6%. In 2011, there were 232/268 students at Proficient or Advanced. So, this translates to approximately 245 students total and approximately 13 who need to increase their performance.*
- *The percentage of Hispanic/Latino students scoring Proficient or Advanced will increase by 5% from 58.5% to 63.5%. In 2011, there were 72/123 students at Proficient or Advanced. So, for 2012, this translates to approximately 78 total students and approximately 6 students who need to increase their performance.*
- *The percentage of White students scoring Proficient or Advanced will increase by 5% from 81.7% to 86.7%. In 2011 there were 277/339 students at Proficient or Advanced. So, for 2012, this translates to approximately 294 total students and approximately 17 students who need to increase their performance.*
- *The percentage of Socioeconomically Disadvantaged students scoring Proficient or Advanced will increase by 5% from 56.3% to 61.3%. In 2011, there were 94/167 students at Proficient or Advanced. So, for 2012, this translates to approximately 102 total students and approximately 8 students who need to increase their performance.*
- *The percentage of English Language Learners scoring Proficient or Advanced will increase by 5% from 77.0% to 82.0%. In 2011, there were 161/209 students at Proficient or Advanced. So, for 2012, this translates to approximately 171 total students and approximately 10 students who need to increase their performance.*
- *The percentage of Students with Disabilities scoring Proficient or Advanced will increase by 5% from 44.6% to 49.6%. In, 2011, there were 41/92 students at Proficient or Advanced. So, for 2012, this translates to approximately 46 total students and approximately 5 students who need to increase their performance.*

<p>Student groups and grade levels to participate in this goal</p> <p><i>All students in Sixth, Seventh, and Eighth grades grouped in a variety of ways:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Grade level</i> • <i>Ethnic groups</i> • <i>Sub groups (SPED, SED, ELL)</i> 	<p>Anticipated annual performance growth for each group</p> <p><i>Total students by 5% from 77.2% to 82.2%. (approx. 701 students total and approx.. 42 who need to increase performance)</i></p> <p><i>Black/African American students by 5% from 56.2% to 61.2%. (approx. 45 students total and approx. 4 who need to increase performance)</i></p> <p><i>Asian students by 5% from 86.6% to 91.6%. (approx. 245 students total and approx. 13 who need to increase performance)</i></p> <p><i>Hispanic/Latino students by 5% from 58.5% to 63.5%. (approx. 78 total students and approx.. 6 students who need to increase performance)</i></p> <p><i>White students by 5% from 81.7% to 86.7%. (approx. 294 total students and approx. 17 students who need to increase performance.)</i></p> <p><i>Socioeconomically Disadvantaged by 5% from 56.3% to 61.3%. (approx. 102 total students and approx. 8 students who need to increase performance.)</i></p> <p><i>English Language Learners by 5% from 77.0% to 82.0%. (approx. 171 total students and approx. 10 students who need to increase their performance.)</i></p> <p><i>Students with Disabilities by 5% from 44.6% to 49.6%. (approx. 46 total students and approx. 5 students who need to increase performance.)</i></p>
<p>Means of evaluating progress toward this goal</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>We recognize that at this point, we have very limited methods at evaluating progress in the interim period. We have no periodic benchmark exams that all students take in Math that directly correlate to the test formats of the STAR Exams. This may become an action step we take this year in pursuit of our long-term goals.</i> • <i>We can review report card grades in Math. However, current report card grades are not exclusively a demonstration of standards-based learning. The calculation of grades includes other factors such as participation, homework completion, attendance, and other areas of responsible behavior.</i> 	<p>Group data to be collected to measure academic gains</p> <p><i>We will analyze data from the School Accountability Report Card 2011 and compare it to the School Accountability Report Card 2012. We will identify the following statistics:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>% of students scoring Proficient or Advanced in all subgroups in 2011.</i> • <i>% of students scoring Proficient or Advanced in all subgroups in 2012.</i> <p><i>We will analyze data from our student achievement monitoring systems in the following areas:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Overall Lexile Scores</i> • <i>Performance bands</i> • <i>Cluster Scores</i>

Action Steps	Start Date and Completion Date	Proposed Expenditure	Estimated Cost	Funding Source	Evidence of Success	Linked to District Strategic Plan Strategies 1, 2, and/or 3
1. We will review every student's current performance levels on State exams and identify those who need additional support.	August 31 st , 2012				Class lists of all current students, lists of students newly enrolled to AUD. Reports of CST and CELDT Scores from 2012 exams. Lists of students identified for additional support.	1, 2, 3
2. Grade Level Teams and the Math Department will meet at least once per month to discuss common curriculum, common instructional practices, and common assessments. These meetings will include a review of at-risk student performance in Math (EPC #8)	September, 2011 – June, 2013	Textbooks, Supplemental Materials, Computers and other technology, Supplies			Grade-Level Meeting Agendas and Minutes, Samples of common assessments, student achievement results from common assessments, Year-at-a-Glance timeline of Wednesday staff meeting and grade-level meeting schedules	1, 2, 3
3. We will provide a daily period of math for 6 th grade students who are identified as needing extra support. (EPC #1)	January 2012 – June, 2013	0.4 FTE Credentialed Teacher Instructional Materials Professional Development Instructional Assistants			Class lists of all current students. Reports of student performance on benchmark assessments and STAR exams. Reports of student performance on grades. Master Schedule	
4. We will provide a tracked program of Mathematics instruction in grades 7 and 8 that includes an intervention course.	August, 2011 – June, 2013	Instructional Materials Professional Development Instructional Assistants			Meeting Agendas, Meeting Minutes, Feedback reflections from participants, sample work products	1, 2, 3
5. We will provide individualized parent-teacher-counselor conferences in November and May to gather information and explore strategies for success.	November, 2011 May, 2012 November, 2012 May 2013	Counselor time Substitute Release time			Meeting Agendas, Meeting Minutes, Feedback reflections from participants, sample work products	1, 2, 3

Action Steps	Start Date and Completion Date	Proposed Expenditure	Estimated Cost	Funding Source	Evidence of Success	Linked to District Strategic Plan Strategies 1, 2, and/or 3
6. Establish a system of teacher-to-teacher modeling and reciprocal learning relationships for instructional practices.	April, 2012 through June, 2013	Substitute Release Time			Teacher notes, teacher survey feedback	