Discovery Elementary
Building Improvement Plan
2009-2010

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, 87% of gr. 3-5 students will meet or exceed proficiency as measured by the MCA IIs in math; 90% of our gr. 1-2 students will score 90% or better on the End-of-the-Year Math Test; 90% of kindergartners will meet proficiency on classroom assessments.

Supporting Data:
Students meeting proficiency

Actual results 2007-2008	77.5%
Actual results 2008-2009	74.7% (current gr. 4-5 – 80.8%)
Target results 2009-2010	87%

Measures:	**Targets:**
1. Summative: 2010 MCA II Math Assessments in grades 3, 4, 5 Formative: AIMS Web probes Common classroom assessments	1. 87% of gr. 3-5 students meet or exceed proficiency on MCA IIs
2. Summative: Everyday Math End-of-Year Test Formative: AIMS Web probes Common classroom assessments	2. 90% of gr. 1-2 students score 90% or better on End-of-Year Math Test
3. Formative/Summative: District Classroom Assessments Formative: AIMS Web probes	3. 90% of gr. K students proficient on district K classroom assessments

---

Strategies	Person(s) Responsible	Timeline
1. *Form* a collaborative support network among teachers for identified lowest 20% of math students	Classroom/math teachers	September
2. *Implement* Voyager Math program gr. 2-5	Math teachers	September – May
3. *Focus* Teacher Academic Choice during faculty meetings on math and math vocabulary-building activities	DES teachers	September – May
4. *Refocus* Targeted Services Lunch Bunch program on math remediation only	Lunch Bunch staff	October – April
5. *Explore* implementation of AIMS Web math probe for the lowest 20% of students	Math teachers	September – May 2 X / month
6. *Create* opportunities for additional math practice during the instructional day	Michelle and DES teachers	September - June
8. *Review* BIP throughout the school year based on MAP and probe data collected	Michelle and DES staff	Monthly - Ongoing

---

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

Actual Results:
Percentage of Gr. 3-5 DES Students Proficient on MCA II Math

Grade	Target % Proficient	Actual % Proficient
3	87%	87.8%
4	87%	76.2%
5	87%	78.5%
Gr 3-5 Average	**87%**	**80.83%**

Analysis: The 87% proficiency target for students in grades 3-4-5 on the MCA II Math was based on the high performance the previous year by this year's fourth and fifth graders, as well as the high percentage of prior year's second graders who made their MAP growth targets (this year's third graders). While the third graders made this target, it is surprising that the fourth and fifth graders performed at such a lower level on this year's test. A high number of this year's third graders commented that this year's test was "easy" and they were finished in a short period of time. We will need to further analyze results for grades 4 and 5 and compare to district and other building averages. Interestingly, NWEA projected 92.5% MCA II proficiency for gr. 3 (they scored 87.8%), yet both grades 4 and 5 scored higher than projected by NWEA: gr. 4 projected was 73.8% (actual 76.2%) and gr. 5 projected was 76.2% (actual 78.5%). Was the gr. 3 test easier this year? Were the grades 4 and 5 tests that much more difficult than last year? With those questions unanswered, it appears that our 87% target was way out of line this year. Given the results above, an 80 -85% proficiency goal would have been more appropriate.

Percentage of Gr. K DES Students Proficient on End of Year District K Math Assessments

Target % Proficient	Actual % Proficient
90%	90.5%

Analysis: DES Kindergarten students met targeted proficiency. Four students did not meet this goal – one of whom is a significantly delayed SPED student.

Percentage of Gr. 1-2 DES Students Proficient on End of Year Math Assessment

Grade/Section	Target % Proficient	Actual % Scoring 90% or Above	Percent Scoring 80% or Above
1 A *math pilot	90%	45%	86%
1 B	90%	25%	58%
2 A *math pilot	90%	48%	91%
2 B	90%	57%	80%
Gr 1-2 Average	**90%**	**43.75%**	**78.75%**

Analysis: The results for the grades 1-2 students did not fall anywhere near targeted level. However, the scores should actually be invalidated as the two teachers piloting the math curriculums during the year did not give the same end of year assessment as the other two teachers. (They used EnVision versus Everyday Math). Their students did not have an entire year of either curriculum, so either measure would not be a valid assessment of the students' skills. This being the case, and given that there are only two sections at each of these two grade levels, it is difficult to explain the discrepancy between the actual and targeted scores. However, just at a glance, it would appear that a goal of 80% of students reaching 80% proficiency would have been a more realistic goal for this group.

Commentary on Strategies:

1) Teachers worked collaboratively with each other and with the instructional paras to ensure that identified students struggling in math received extra interventions.
2) VMath program was implemented by gr. 2-5 teachers and utilized regularly for the gr. 3-5 Lunch Bunch Targeted Math Program.
3) Focusing Teacher Academic Choice at staff meetings on math had a strong start, but became hit or miss as the year progressed. Interest in preparing for TAC seems to be waning…
4) We ran two Math Lunch Bunch programs – one for gr. 2, and one for gr. 3-5. These ran twice a week from November through April. Gr. 2 was a small remediation group with a single teacher, gr. 3-5 was a larger group with two teachers – group would split into small group/individual remediation while others worked on VMath on the laptops.
5) Use of the AIMS Web Math Probes was very sporadic. Teachers experimented with other probes that provided more specific data to meet individual students' needs. Also, two teachers were participating in the math pilot program, so were using those materials.
6) Teacher preps and para schedules were adjusted so that the instructional paras were available at the end of the day to facilitate additional math skill practice or use of VMath for students needing more practice.
7) Since the final measures for the BIP involved end-of-year data, we didn't analyze the BIP specifically mid-year. However, we kept math as a focus and a priority, and made necessary modifications as needed during the year (ie. Restructuring the gr. 3 math instruction/staff position mid year, etc.)

Future Steps:

(See comments below on the growth goal regarding programming issues and possible solutions.) Given the proficiency levels for grades 3-5 students in particular, it would appear that continuing to address math

as a building goal would be necessary. It will be interesting to follow the current grade 3 students' progress on the MCA IIs next spring to see if there is the same drop in scores that the current grades 4-5 students experienced. We will renew our subscription to VMath and continue to incorporate as many math interventions as possible next year.

Discovery Elementary
Building Improvement Plan
2009-10

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, 70% of our students in grades 2-5 will meet their spring growth targets as measured by the MAP math assessment.

Supporting Data:

Students meeting growth targets	Math
Baseline 2006-2007	65.3%
Actual results 2007-2008	57.4%
Actual results 2008-2009	67.4% (current gr. 2-5 – 70%)
Target results 2009-2010	70%

Measures:	**Targets:**
1. Summative: MAP math assessment results Formative: AIMS Web probes Everyday Math assessments Classroom assessments	1. 70% of students in gr. 2-5 meet MAP math growth targets

---

Strategies	**Person(s) Responsible**	**Timeline**
1. *Form* a collaborative support network among teachers for identified lowest 20% of math students	Classroom/math teachers	September
2. *Implement* Voyager Math program gr. 2-5	Math teachers	September – May
3. *Focus* Teacher Academic Choice during faculty meetings on math and math vocabulary-building activities	DES teachers	September – May
4. *Refocus* Targeted Services Lunch Bunch program on math remediation only	Lunch Bunch staff	October – April
5. *Explore* implementation of AIMS Web math probe for	Math teachers	September – May

lowest 20% of students		2 X / month
6. *Create* opportunities for additional math practice during the instructional day	Michelle and DES teachers	September - June
7. *Review* BIP throughout the school year based on MAP and probe data collected	Michelle and DES staff	Monthly - Ongoing

---

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

Actual Results:
Percentage of Students Meeting MAP Math Growth Targets

Grade	Target	Actual Result
2	70%	68.9% *However, NWEA Mean RIT score =190.8; DES Gr. 2 district high with 197.1 Mean RIT
3	70%	57.5% *However, NWEA Mean RIT = 202.4; DES Gr. 3 = 208.3 Mean RIT
4	70%	69.0%
5	70%	76.2% *Met target goal
Average Gr. 2-5	**70%**	**67.9%**

Analysis: As was discussed as an administrative group, setting a school-wide growth target for MAP at 70% was an unrealistic goal, and not an appropriate use of this measure's intent. *However, when looking at MAP's target growth for each individual grade level's Mean Fall RIT, DES reached that goal at each grade level:

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

Grade	MAP Fall Mean RIT	DES Fall Mean RIT	MAP Target Growth Based on DES Fall Mean RIT	DES Actual Growth
2	179.5	181.1	13	16.0
3	192.1	197.5	10	10.8
4	203.0	203.2	9	10.7
5	211.7	217.4	7	13.2

Commentary on Strategies:

8) Teachers worked collaboratively with each other and with the instructional paras to ensure that identified students struggling in math received extra interventions.
9) VMath program was implemented by gr. 2-5 teachers and utilized regularly for the gr. 3-5 Lunch Bunch Targeted Math Program.
10) Focusing Teacher Academic Choice at staff meetings on math had a strong start, but became hit or miss as the year progressed. Interest in preparing for TAC seems to be waning…
11) We ran two Math Lunch Bunch programs – one for gr. 2, and one for gr. 3-5. These ran twice a week from November through April. Gr. 2 was a small remediation group with a single teacher, gr. 3-5 was a larger group with two teachers – group would split into small group/individual remediation while others worked on VMath on the laptops.
12) Use of the AIMS Web Math Probes was very sporadic. Teachers experimented with other probes that provided more specific data to meet individual students' needs. Also, two teachers were participating in the math pilot program, so were using those materials.

13) Teacher preps and para schedules were adjusted so that the instructional paras were available at the end of the day to facilitate additional math skill practice or use of VMath for students needing more practice.
14) Since the final measures for the BIP involved end-of-year data, we didn't analyze the BIP specifically mid-year. However, we kept math as a focus and a priority, and made necessary modifications as needed during the year (i.e. Restructuring the gr. 3 math instruction/staff position mid year, etc.)

Future Steps:

Our focus on math instruction this year appeared to be successful from a student growth perspective. Each year since we expanded we have worked at the intermediate level to implement a format to deliver quality instruction at third grade. We piloted a team teaching model for grade 5 this year that was very promising, but needed to make adjustments mid-year in order to support gr. 3. For next year, the entire grade 5 group of 41 students will be team taught by both a classroom and a SPED teacher, along with para support. This will address the high number of SPED students at this grade level who need more intervention to reach MCA II proficiency. This will also allow us to provide more stability to gr. 3 math instruction as we will again have a new teacher at this grade level. The new EnVision math curriculum looks promising and we are hoping it will provide not only the math intervention support we need, but will also address the needs of the higher achieving students, as this appears to be a need for focus as well. We also need to become more adept with the RtI process and the necessary progress monitoring, and by doing so in the area of reading, we will hopefully be better able to see how we might use this process for math as well. We only touched a bit this year on using a progress monitoring tool like AIMS Web probes for math, but can compare this tool with what might be available to us with EnVision. Bottom line – DES students showed successful *growth* in the area of math this past year.