District Goal: Proficiency
Demonstrate a 6.5% increase in the overall percentage of students meeting proficiency standards on the MCA-IIs in math, and demonstrate a 5.2% increase in the overall percentage of students meeting proficiency standards on the MCA-IIs in reading.

Supporting Data (evidence of need)**:**
The BHM district is currently cited as a district "needing improvement" because it has not met the AYP standards.

Students demonstrating proficiency	Math	Reading
Actual results 2007-2008	65.4%	71.5%
Actual results 2008-2009	67.7%	74.2%
Target results 2009-2010	74.2%	79.4%

Building Goal: By the end of the 09-10 school year, Parkside students in grades 3-5 will demonstrate a 5.2% increase in the overall percentage of students meeting proficiency in reading and a 6.5% increase in math, as measured by the MCA IIs.

Supporting Data:

PES students demonstrating proficiency	Math	Reading
Actual results 2006-2007	73.8%	75.0%
Actual results 2007-2008	80.73%	79.73%
Actual results 2008-2009	75.8%	75.0%

Measures:	Targets:

1. Summative: 2010 MCA II Reading and Math Assessments in grades 3, 4, 5
   Formative: AIMS Web probes
              Everyday Math and LbD assessments
	1. Reading Target = 80.2% of gr. 3-5 students proficient
	   Math Target = 82.3% of gr. 3-5 students proficient

2. Formative/Summative: MAP assessment in Reading and Math
  Formative: AIMS Web probes
              Everyday Math and LbD assessments
	2. 85% of gr. 2 students meet spring MAP target
	   RIT Score of 189.6 in reading and 190.8 in math

3. Formative/Summative: District Classroom Assessments
  Formative: AIMS Web probes
	3. 85% of gr. K-1 students proficient on end-of-year
	   district classroom assessments

Strategies	Person(s) Responsible	Timeline
1. *Set* grade level/department goals that correlate with BIP as appropriate with available data	Grade levels and departments	September – November
2. *Implement* Rocket Math facts program	Classroom teachers	November – May
3. *Train* staff and *implement* VMath and Ticket to Read	Jacobs/Robinson/Rothstein	Sept. or as determined by district
4. *Explore* use of Targeted Services to provide specific interventions for students in reading and/or math	Robinson/Staff	September – May
5. *Explore* implementation of AIMS Web math probe in grades K-5	Jacobs/Grade Level Reps	September – May
6. *Explore* implementation of increased physical activity throughout the day to enhance student learning	Wills/Grade Level Reps	September – May
7. *Explore* and *implement* Fountas & Pinnell phonics curriculum in the primary grades	K-2 and Title I Teachers	September – May
8. *Review and* revise BIP throughout the school year based on MAP and probe data collected	Building Leadership Team	Monthly - Ongoing

To be completed in August:

Accomplished: x Yes   x   No   x   In Progress

Actual Results:
Percentage of Students Proficient in Math and Reading on MCA IIs

Grade	Math Proficiency Target	Math Actual Proficiency	Reading Proficiency Target	Reading Actual Proficiency
3	82.3%	89.4%	80.2%	74.3%
4	82.3%	74.2%	80.2%	87.1%
5	82.3%	71.8%	80.2%	81.2%
Gr. 3-5 Average	82.3%	**78.5%**	80.2%	**80.87% ***

Analysis: First, acknowledgement and celebration that, *as a building,* we achieved our reading goal. Both math and reading results were nice increases from last year, but short of our goal. That said, what is most interesting is noting the significant discrepancy between reading and math *at each grade level,* particularly at grade three since children would struggle with reading often score somewhat lower in math due to difficulty with the text. Did we see this same pattern in the classroom and with our fluency probes and RtI data walls? Were appropriate interventions in place for those students showing difficulty? These are areas we can examine next fall. In looking more

closely at which students grades 3-4-5 did not or only partially met standards, it is apparent that in addition to our SPED students, we also need to continue to understand and meet the needs of our free and reduced population, perhaps even more so than our LEP students.

Percentage of Grade 2 Students Meeting Target Spring MAP RIT Scores

Target % Meeting Math RIT of 190.8	Actual % Meeting Math RIT of 190.8	Target % Meeting Reading RIT of 189.6	Actual % Meeting Reading RIT of 189.6
85%	55%	85%	77%

Analysis: The *mean* Math RIT for this group was 196.3, significantly higher than the target, but obviously not representative of the group as a whole. Fall mean RIT for Math was 176.2, a district high growth of 20.1, but unfortunately not enough to bring a larger number of students up to target. Hopefully the new math curriculum will provide additional support for this group. We have also purchased grade 2 teacher resources for VMath, which may be of benefit. Just as with math, this group had a district high in growth points from fall to spring in reading: 19.5. However, mean Reading RIT was 188.4, short of the targeted 189.6. Classroom and Title I teachers implemented a number of interventions for this group, and that is reflective in the large amount of growth these students made. We will continue to implement interventions, especially right away in September to counteract summer regression, so that these students can hopefully continue their rapid pace toward proficiency.

Percentage of K-1 Students Proficient on End of Yr District Fluency Probes

Grade	Target % Proficient	Actual % Proficient
K	85%	71.6%
1	85%	73.1%
Gr. K-1 Average	85%	72.35%

Analysis: The above data is from the RtI data wall fluency probes. Classroom assessment of district outcomes reflects somewhat higher levels of proficiency. This year's first graders were a needy group, with significant emotional and behavioral needs. In addition, a significant number of them qualified for SPED services. In spite of this, the classroom and Title I interventions resulted in some very positive growth for many of these students. (Fall assessments identified nearly half of the first graders as needing interventions.) Likewise, the kindergarten students that participated in the KDK program showed positive growth – both catching up with their grade mates as well as some even surpassing them. Many of the needs of these grade K and 1 students can be directly traced to our high poverty level and the students' lack of vocabulary and exposure to literacy and math activities, as well as turbulent home lives. We will continue to address these needs as best we can through Title I and RtI, as well as increasing our skills in working with families in poverty.

Commentary on Strategies:
1) All grade levels K-5 set goals and reported that they were met. Teams that had goals related directly to percentages of students reaching MAP growth targets realized that annually increasing the MAP target goal growth percentages is a nonviable use of this measure. Next year we will refocus goals accordingly.
2) (Data not available at this time to determine extend of implementation of the Rocket Math facts program)

3) VMath and Ticket to Read continued to be used to a great extent in most gr. 2-5 and SPED classrooms. Teachers expressed the desire to continue with this software license, so we purchased a site license for an additional year.

4) We implemented to Targeted Services programs aimed at students in grades 3-5: Brain Boost for gr. 3-4-5, a literacy/movement class that met before school two mornings a week from November through April, and Eagle's Club – for gr. 4-5 students needing extra support in reading and math. This class met during the same time frame. We will revisit these two programs for next year to see if we can determine how to reach more at-risk students and transportation in the early morning was an issue.

5) Implementation of AIMS Web math probes was not wide spread across the grade levels. We need to revisit this strategy and see if it merits continuation for next year.

6) In addition to Brain Boost, Marci Wills offered before (Morning Movers) and afternoon (Afternoon Movers) for 15 minutes a different grade level (gr. 1-5) each day. Due to specialists' heavy loads, this needed to be reduced later in the year.

7) All grade 1 teachers were trained in the Fountas & Pinnell phonics curriculum, and put together unit packets that were implemented for the remainder of the year.

8) While the actual BIP plan was not revisited directly during the year, we put a great deal of effort into establishing and continuing to develop our TAT, BAT and PST initiatives as a means to understand and support RtI for our students and staff. Our efforts resulted in significant growth for a number of our at-risk students, even if all of our BIP target goals were not met.

Future Steps:
This year we realized the need to understand our changing demographics and the unique needs of our students in poverty. We will continue as a staff to build our skills in this area and implement interventions aligned to meet the students' needs. We are revamping our Title I program, and plan to align services and staff more directly with RtI as a means to effectively deliver Tier 2 and 3 interventions. We will also structure our ESP's roles, responsibilities, and schedules to likewise give preference to supporting our students needing interventions, particularly during the month of September, and as a means to consistently implement progress monitoring assessments without needing to utilize SPED staff. We will further our skills in utilizing resources to better meet the needs of our struggling learners: LbD, IbD, EnVision Math, VMath and Ticket to Read, Rocket Math, AIMS Web math probes, Fountas & Pinnell Phonics. We also realize the need to help parents understand our curriculum and how important their efforts are at home to value school and learning – this needs is actually higher than expecting increased level of parent volunteerism, etc. Next year this building will greatly miss the support and skills offered by Sheri Tesch in dealing with our at-risk families. That said, we cannot lose sight of the needs of our high achieving students. With so much focus on interventions at the low end, we need to be mindful of differentiation that will allow these students to excel as well.

District Goal: Academic Growth (Year 1 of 2)
Demonstrate a 5% increase in the overall percentage of students meeting annual MAP growth targets within two years.

Supporting Data (evidence of need)**:**

Students meeting growth targets	Math	Reading
Actual results 2008-2009	71%	68%
Target results 2010-2011	76%	73%

Building Goal: By the end of the 09-10 school year, Parkside students in grades 2-5 will demonstrate a 2.5% increase in the overall percentage of students meeting targeted measurable growth in the areas of reading and math as measured by the MAP assessments.

Supporting Data:

Students meeting growth targets	Math	Reading
Baseline 2006-2007	69.65%	69.9%
Actual results 2007-2008	80.38%	73.22%
Actual results 2008-2009	77.54% (80%*)	73.86% (76.1%*)
Target results 2009-2010	82.5%	78.6%

* Actual results for current 09-10 gr. 2-5 students

Measures:	Targets:

1. Formative/Summative: MAP assessment results
    for reading and math for students in grades 2-5
    Formative: AIMS Web probes, LbD reading level
    progress
	1. Reading Target = 78.6% of gr. 2-5 students meet
	    growth target
	    Math Target = 82.5% of gr. 2-5 students meet
	    growth target

Strategies	Person(s) Responsible	Timeline
1. *Set* grade level/department goals that correlate with BIP as appropriate with available data	Grade levels and departments	September – November
2. *Implement* Rocket Math facts program	Classroom teachers	November – May
3. *Train* staff and *implement* VMath and Ticket to Read	Jacobs/Robinson/Rothstein	Sept. or as determined by district

4. *Explore* use of Targeted Services to provide specific interventions for students in reading and/or math	Robinson/Staff	September – May
5. *Explore* implementation of AIMS Web math probe in grades K-5	Jacobs/Grade Level Reps	September – May
6. *Explore* implementation of increased physical activity throughout the day to enhance student learning	Wills/Grade Level Reps	September – May
7. *Explore* and *implement* Fountas & Pinnell phonics curriculum in the primary grades	K-2 and Title I Teachers	September – May
8. *Review and* revise BIP throughout the school year based on MAP and probe data collected	Building Leadership Team	Monthly - Ongoing

---

To be completed in August:

Accomplished: ☐ **Yes** x **No*** x **In Progress***

Actual Results:
Percentage of Students Meeting MAP Growth Targets

Grade	Math Target %	Math Actual %	Reading Target %	Reading Actual %
2	82.5%	84.1%	78.6%	65.2%
3	82.5%	69.6%	78.6%	62.3%
4	82.5%	63.3%	78.6%	75.0%
5	82.5%	75.3%	78.6%	71.4%
Average Gr. 2-5	**82.5%**	**73.1%**	**78.6%**	**68.5%**

Analysis: As was discussed as an administrative group, setting a school-wide growth target for MAP at 82.5% and 78.6% was an unrealistic goal, and not an appropriate use of this measure's intent. Nonetheless, with the exception of Gr. 3 Reading, all PES Spring Mean RIT scores were at or above the NWEA norms, some a number significantly so. *When looking at MAP's target growth for each individual grade level's Mean Fall RIT, PES reached that goal at each grade level.

*Mean Fall RIT Growth Targets by Grade Level – PES Spring Results

Grade	Fall Mean RIT Math	PES Fall Mean RIT Math	MAP Target Growth Math	PES Actual Growth Math	Fall Mean RIT Reading	PES Fall Mean RIT Reading	MAP Target Growth Reading	PES Actual Growth Reading
2	179.5	176.2	14	20.1*	179.7	168.9	14	19.5*
3	192.1	192.8	10	13.4*	191.6	188.5	9	11.1*
4	203	205.2	9	11.2*	200.1	201.4	6	10.5*
5	211.7	218.2	7	12.3*	206.7	210.5	5	6.9*

Commentary on Strategies:

1) All grade levels K-5 set goals and reported that they were met. Teams that had goals related directly to percentages of students reaching MAP growth targets realized that annually increasing the MAP target goal growth percentages is a nonviable use of this measure. Next year we will refocus goals accordingly.
2) (Data not available at this time to determine extend of implementation of the Rocket Math facts program)
3) VMath and Ticket to Read continued to be used to a great extent in most gr. 2-5 and SPED classrooms. Teachers expressed the desire to continue with this software license, so we purchased a site license for an additional year.
4) We implemented to Targeted Services programs aimed at students in grades 3-5: Brain Boost for gr. 3-4-5, a literacy/movement class that met before school two mornings a week from November through April, and Eagle's Club – for gr. 4-5 students needing extra support in reading and math. This class met during the same time frame. We will revisit these two programs for next year to see if we can determine how to reach more at-risk students and transportation in the early morning was an issue.
5) Implementation of AIMS Web math probes was not wide spread across the grade levels. We need to revisit this strategy and see if it merits continuation for next year.
6) In addition to Brain Boost, Marci Wills offered before (Morning Movers) and afternoon (Afternoon Movers) for 15 minutes a different grade level (gr. 1-5) each day. Due to specialists' heavy loads, this needed to be reduced later in the year.
7) All grade 1 teachers were trained in the Fountas & Pinnell phonics curriculum, and put together unit packets that were implemented for the remainder of the year.
8) While the actual BIP plan was not revisited directly during the year, we put a great deal of effort into establishing and continuing to develop our TAT, BAT and PST initiatives as a means to understand and support RtI for our students and staff. Our efforts resulted in significant growth for a number of our at-risk students, even if all of our BIP target goals were not met.

Future Steps:
As stated above: This year we realized the need to understand our changing demographics and the unique needs of our students in poverty. We will continue as a staff to build our skills in this area and implement interventions aligned to meet the students' needs. We are revamping our Title I program, and plan to align services and staff more directly with RtI as a means to effectively deliver Tier 2 and 3 interventions. We will also structure our ESP's roles, responsibilities, and schedules to likewise give preference to supporting our students needing interventions, particularly during the month of September, and as a means to consistently implement progress monitoring assessments without needing to utilize SPED staff. We will further our skills in utilizing resources to better meet the needs of our struggling learners: LbD, IbD, EnVision Math, VMath and Ticket to Read, Rocket Math, AIMS Web math probes, Fountas & Pinnell Phonics. We also realize the need to help parents understand our curriculum and how important their efforts are at home to value school and learning – this needs is actually higher than expecting increased level of parent volunteerism, etc.   Next year this building will greatly miss the support and skills offered by Sheri Tesch in dealing with our at-risk families. That said, we cannot lose sight of the needs of our high achieving students. With so much focus on interventions at the low end, we need to be mindful of differentiation that will allow these students to excel as well.

*Additional note on student **growth**: While MAP is a great tool to measure individual student growth and is a detailed and useful resource for teachers to tailor instruction for individuals and groups of students, our building's focus on monitoring student data using the RtI process and data walls, combined with our revamped delivery of Title I services, should hopefully provide an additional measure of individual student progress, with interventions at all grade levels K-5 for students who are struggling.