



2010-2011  
Semester Report and School Data Questions

**What does the data tell us?**

The data tells us that the RtI programs we have in place are working. We have fewer students in Tier III.

**What does the data not tell us?**

This particular data does not tell us the specific skills and strategies that students need additional support with.

**What are causes for celebration?**

We can celebrate that the number of Tier III students is decreasing.

**What are the opportunities for improvement?**

The goal is to have every student reaching proficiency in reading and math. We have shown improvement but must monitor every student's progress to see that they continue to move forward.

**Next Steps**

Our next steps are to continue what we are doing, We will continue to formatively assess students, analyze student work, and differentiate instruction to meet the needs of all students.

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

School Name: Stonestreet Elementary School District Name Jefferson

Date Report Completed: 11/30/10

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
Kindergarten ADA	92.7	95.4	94.0		93.7	94.3		
1 <sup>st</sup> grade ADA	95.7	95.0	96.2		95.2	94.0		
2 <sup>nd</sup> grade ADA	95.5	96.1	95.2		95.4	95.3		
3 <sup>rd</sup> grade ADA	95.0	95.8	96.0		95.1	95.2		
4 <sup>th</sup> grade ADA	95.7	98.6	95.5		94.9	94.9		
5 <sup>th</sup> grade ADA	94.6	95.3	96.2		95.0	94.8		
	DEC/JAN				JUNE			
	2009 Baseline	2010	2011	2012	2010 Baseline	2011	2012	2013
Total School ADA	94.9	95.7	94.6		94.9	94.8		
*Teacher Attendance %	94.69	95.44	95.12					
*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
4 <sup>th</sup> Grade	0	0		
5 <sup>th</sup> Grade	1	0		

### 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
Kindergarten	54	21	0	33	0		0	
1 <sup>st</sup> grade	28	18	0	10	11		0	
2 <sup>nd</sup> grade	20	20	0	0	5		0	
3 <sup>rd</sup> grade	32	27	0	5	16		1	
4 <sup>th</sup> grade	29	21	2	8	10		2	
5 <sup>th</sup> grade	26	26	0	0	13		1	

<b>Additional Comments for RTI - Reading</b>	<p>Kindergarten teachers and assistants have been focused and intentional on the instruction to see that all students leave kindergarten on grade level. Stonestreet had a Reading Recovery teacher who focused on interventions for first grade students. Interventions were provided for all second through fifth grade Tier students as well. Progress was made in third and fourth grade. Students moving in and out of the school in grade two and five are the reason for the data showing no difference in the numbers. 1/2012 RtI has just started for Kindergarten students. All staff members are working to see that all students are reading on grade level.</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
Kindergarten	N/A	12		0	N/A			
1 <sup>st</sup> grade	47	15	5	32	N/A			
2 <sup>nd</sup> grade	28	32	2	0	3		0	
3 <sup>rd</sup> grade	40	11	4	29	2		0	
4 <sup>th</sup> grade	24	12	0	12	3		0	
5 <sup>th</sup> grade	21	13	2	8	5		0	

Additional Comments for RTI - Math	Intentional small group focus, ESS and Successmaker helped students move forward. 1/2012 ELL students are not included in this data. RTI for Math is focused and intentional which is keeping more students from falling behind.
------------------------------------	--

### 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
Kindergarten	4	3	0	2	1		0	
1 <sup>st</sup> grade	2	1	0	1	5		5	
2 <sup>nd</sup> grade	3	6	0	2	0		0	
3 <sup>rd</sup> grade	12	3	0	2	1		1	
4 <sup>th</sup> grade	8	8	0	7	0		0	
5 <sup>th</sup> grade	10	13	0	9	2		0	

<b>Additional Comments for RTI - Behavior</b>	<b>We have had no referrals for special education services in behavior. Rti and the school wide discipline plan have helped to decrease referrals. 1/2012 We utilize Seven Counties Services, the Positive Outreach Program, Bucket Filling through Safe and Drug Free Schools, CARE for Kids and Second Steps to reach out to students with behavior issues. We also have ongoing parent communication.</b>
---	--

<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 56.51% in 2011, as measured by KCCT Mathematics. The percentage of free/reduced lunch students scoring Proficient or Distinguished in Mathematics will be 49.11%, as measured by KCCT Mathematics.			
	Person Responsible  Barbara Harris, Principal			
FORMATIVE ASSESSMENT (December/June)	SUPPORTING EVIDENCE (name of assessment)  Mathematics Performance Assessment (MPA)			
DATE OF ASSESSMENT	Each MPA assessment corresponds to the 12-week grading period.			
PERFORMANCE DATA FROM BENCHMARK (% Proficient)	All Students		F/R Lunch	
	2010-2011	2011-2012	2010-2011	2011-2012
	MPA1: 50.48 MPA2: 61.43 MPA3: 57.69	MPA 1: 47.80	MPA1: 42.25 MPA2: 55.63 MPA3: 51.06	MPA 1: 41.73
PERFORMANCE DATA FROM BENCHMARK (% Novice Reduction)	MPA1: 36.06 MPA2: 17.62 MPA3: 19.23	MPA 1: 32.68	MPA1: 42.25 MPA2: 19.01 MPA3: 22.70	MPA 1: 36.69

\*\*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 61.75% in 2011, as measured by KCCT Reading. The percentage of free/reduced lunch students scoring Proficient or Distinguished in Reading will be 53.93%, as measured by KCCT Reading.			
	Person Responsible  Barbara Harris, Principal			
FORMATIVE ASSESSMENT	SUPPORTING EVIDENCE (name of assessment)  Reading Performance Assessment (RPA)			
DATE OF ASSESSMENT	Each RPA assessment corresponds to the 12-week grading period.			
PERFORMANCE DATA FROM BENCHMARK (% Proficient)	All Students		F/R Lunch	
	2010-2011	2011-2012	2010-2011	2011-2012
	RPA1: 72.04 RPA2: 70.28 RPA3: 67.79	RPA 1: 56.54	RPA1: 65.73 RPA2: 67.36 RPA3: 62.59	RPA 1: 52.74
PERFORMANCE DATA FROM BENCHMARK (% Novice Reduction)	RPA1: 6.64 RPA2: 10.38 RPA3: 5.77	RPA 1: 17.29	RPA1: 8.39 RPA2: 11.81 RPA3: 7.19	RPA 1: 17.12

\*\*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.