



## Semester Report and School Data Questions

### What does the data tell us?

Formative data shows academic achievement growth. Summative data shows that these assessments still prove to be difficult for students. Younger students progress quicker while intermediate students have more difficulty due to the complexity of the tasks. The implementation of the new KCAS standards has impacted student achievement. This first year implementation of the standards has heightened the learning gaps for students.

### What does the data not tell us?

This data does not reflect the variety and depth of the multiple data points Young Elementary utilizes to meet student needs. The data in this report shows that students are progressing to less intensive tiered interventions.

### What are causes for celebration?

A cause for celebration is having and utilizing end of year data 2010-11 to begin the new 2011-12 in a data driven informed manner. Another celebration is the creation and development of the master schedule allowing support staff the time to meet and collaborate. An additional cause for celebration is RTI is requiring the staff to use the checks and balances of interventions, progress monitoring data, the services, and each other to do what is best for student achievement. The staff is holding each other accountable. The staff asks, is the service effective for students. There is also increased and consistent staff communication to parents regarding student performance.

### What are the opportunities for improvement?

There is a logistics opportunity for improvement. In other words, handling the number of tiered students in interventions while differentiating for the same students in the core program while addressing inconsistent student achievement across the KCAS standards and various content areas.

### Next Steps

To have a true analysis of student work to pinpoint achievement/learning gaps in relation to KCAS standards to ensure the best match of interventions for students is the next step for Young Elementary.

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

School Name: Whitney Young 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	94.2	95.4	94.7		94.6	93.4		
1 <sup>st</sup> grade ADA	93.8	96.4	96.6		94.6	95.7		
2 <sup>nd</sup> grade ADA	94.2	96.7	97.0		94.3	95.4		
3 <sup>rd</sup> grade ADA	95.5	96.8	96.7		95.8	95.9		
4 <sup>th</sup> grade ADA	95.1	97.0	95.7		95.1	96.1		
5 <sup>th</sup> grade ADA	95.1	95.9	97.5		94.9	95.3		
	DEC/JAN				JUNE			
	2009 Baseline	2010	2011	2012	2010 Baseline	2011	2012	2013
<b>Total School ADA</b>	<b>94.7</b>	<b>96.4</b>	<b>96.8</b>		<b>94.9</b>	<b>95.3</b>		
<b>*Teacher Attendance %</b>	<b>95.84</b>	<b>96.76</b>	<b>97.19</b>					
*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	0	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	40	20	7	20	21		11	
1 <sup>st</sup> grade	24	24	1	18	16		7	
2 <sup>nd</sup> grade	25	23	0	11	19		7	
3 <sup>rd</sup> grade	22	21	0	5	13		2	
4 <sup>th</sup> grade	25	25	0	9	9		2	
5 <sup>th</sup> grade	29	15	0	14	12		5	

<b>Additional Comments for RTI - Reading</b>	<p>There are English as a Second Language students who are unable to access the Core program however we are not able to get baseline data to progress monitor. I am checking with Pearson to see how to progress monitor with their Discovering English program. I am concerned because the number is significant to make our figures in the Spring to increase rather than decrease. Rebecca Doyel is supporting our RTI implementation.</p> <p>ESL students have made great progress and are being served by any interventionists as their running records inform the teachers of their needs. 2<sup>nd</sup> graders not meeting benchmark is due to a fluency or writing issue. RTI staff is analyzing to ensure intervention is targeted. We will double up interventions in first grade to continue to support the achievements made in Kindergarten. Successmaker Reading licenses will be upgraded and we will access this along with Great Leaps in 2-5.</p> <p>1-12 Primary students are responding at a quicker rate to the interventions. Those students not responding are being referred to ECE/ESL for further review.</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	6	4	0	3	13		11	
1 <sup>st</sup> grade	7	7	0	5	2		0	
2 <sup>nd</sup> grade	4	7	0	1	6		6	
3 <sup>rd</sup> grade	16	20	0	15	14		12	
4 <sup>th</sup> grade	31	26	0	17	6		0	
5 <sup>th</sup> grade	16	10	0	6	11		0	

<b>Additional Comments for RTI - Math</b>	<p>K-2 students were identified using a variety of assessment data both formative and summative, relying heavily on teacher input. Their data is monitored by the classroom teacher.</p> <p>Grade 3 students were identified using the District MDA and teacher input.</p> <p>Grade 4 and 5 were identified using KCCT results and teacher input.</p> <p>The end of the year summative grades were used to provide data for K-2. CASCADE data was triangulated with Successmaker data and report card grades to report these figures. 1-12 As students progress to a higher grade level their tier level sometimes returns to tier 3 due to the complexity of the standards and the students' math strategies and skills are not fully retained from the previous grade.</p>
---	--

### 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	2	4	0	3	1		0	
1 <sup>st</sup> grade	4	7	0	5	0		0	
2 <sup>nd</sup> grade	8	7	0	1	6		5	
3 <sup>rd</sup> grade	4	20	0	15	2		0	
4 <sup>th</sup> grade	4	26	0	17	6		6	
5 <sup>th</sup> grade	6	10	0	6	0		0	

<b>Additional Comments for RTI - Behavior</b>	<p>Tier 2 and 3 students are identified based on this year's data. Teacher referral for support services and need for extra scaffolding of interventions for students provided information. PACES data collect in March 2010-March 2011 reported 101 referrals with 59 being bus referrals. This is a significant decrease. Students in primary grades and moved to a less intensive tiered intervention also showed an increase in academic achievement. 1-12 An influx of 70 new NCLB students choosing to attend Whitney Young Elementary on 11-28-11 have affected the climate and culture. The staff strongly believes the tier 3 students in this population will progress to a less intensive tiered intervention and to tier 1 eventually. The strong teacher focus on academic achievement has positively impacted student goal setting and student behavior as well. Strong academic achievement supports positive behavioral achievement. Care for Kids Program implementation school wide has a dramatic affect on positive behaviors for all students and staff members.</p>
---	---

<b>Additional Comments about decrease or increase of special education referrals as a result of total RTI programs</b>	
<p>Many students have been identified for RTI because of a variety of needs and situations. There are only two students at this time that are possible ECE referrals. 1-12 Because of the RTI process and frequent data analysis, ALL ECE referrals are appropriate and necessary to further support the students.</p>	

## \*\*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 53.36% in 2011, as measured by KCCT Mathematics. The percentage of free/reduced lunch students scoring Proficient or Distinguished in Mathematics will be 52.68%, as measured by KCCT Mathematics.			
	Person Responsible  Mary Minyard, 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: 32.47 MPA2: 19.21 MPA3: 47.20	MPA 1: 27.55 FALL MAP: 35.00	MPA1: 30.41 MPA2: 17.36 MPA3: 45.45	MPA 1: 26.34 FALL MAP: 34.07
PERFORMANCE DATA FROM BENCHMARK (% Novice Reduction)	MPA1: 51.30 MPA2: 50.99 MPA3: 27.95	MPA 1: 55.61 FALL MAP: 25.00	MPA1: 52.70 MPA2: 52.08 MPA3: 29.22	MPA 1: 56.45 FALL MAP: 25.27

\*\*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 56.65% in 2011, as measured by KCCT Reading. The percentage of free/reduced lunch students scoring Proficient or Distinguished in Reading will be 56.48%, as measured by KCCT Reading.			
	Person Responsible  Mary Minyard, 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: 42.48 RPA2: 36.02 RPA3: 40.13	RPA 1: 31.63 FALL MAP: 47.25	RPA1: 42.18 RPA2: 34.19 RPA3: 39.07	RPA 1: 30.11 FALL MAP: 47.62
PERFORMANCE DATA FROM BENCHMARK (% Novice Reduction)	RPA1: 28.76 RPA2: 29.81 RPA3: 17.83	RPA 1: 36.22 FALL MAP: 15.93	RPA1: 29.25 RPA2: 30.32 RPA3: 18.54	RPA 1: 37.63 FALL MAP: 16.67

\*\*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.