## LEADERSHIP

**Wood Acres' mission is to establish a learning community that promotes academic excellence, empowerment, collaboration, and perseverance. We promote and communicate the successful academic, social and emotional and personal development of each student by:**

- **Setting high expectations for each student**
- **Establishing accountability among all stakeholders by using data to measure success and attainment of goals**
- **Providing specific information regarding student progress and procedures, processes, and changes related to math groupings through written communications sent directly to parents and/or conferences**
- **Providing communication of general school announcements through routine class/school communication methods**

## PERFORMANCE RESULTS

See attached page 2.

## STUDENT AND STAKEHOLDER FOCUS

Student Survey Data:

See attached page 3.

## STRATEGIC PLANNING

By June 2010, students at Wood Acres will demonstrate an improvement in academic achievement as measured by the following target goals:

mClass K: 100% level 4 or above/81% level 6
grade 1: 90% level 16 or above/ 55% level J
grade 2: 87% level M or above/ 57% level N

TN/2: reading subtest: 75% of our students will score at 70th percentile or above (all students)
MSA: an overall increase of all students scoring advanced, in reading and math, grades 3 – 5, through an increase of 5% in each subgroup

## FACULTY AND STAFF FOCUS

Training/embedded support will be provided to increase staff capacity in:

- Peer observations
- Guided reading practices
- Building strategies to increase math rigor
- Implementation of Writers' Workshop
- Team data chats

## PROCESS MANAGEMENT

- Data chats to analyze student performance data and refine instructional plans
- Staff will increase knowledge of math rigor, guided reading and Writers' Workshop during school workshops and study groups
- Peer observations/walk-throughs
- Strategic interventions to meet needs of students

## MEASUREMENT, ANALYSIS, AND KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT

Running Records/ progress monitoring
Walk throughs
Common BCRs/group scoring
Data notebooks
Math unit assessments
MAP-R
Math BCR's
Focus groups
Student survey
mClass
TN/2
MSA
Informal measurements to measure effectiveness of interventions

## PERFORMANCE RESULTS

### 2008-2009 mClass End of Year Benchmark

**Kindergarten**

End of Year Target – Level 4

Text Level 6 has been identified as the goal for the end of kindergarten, in accordance with the 7 Keys to College Readiness Advanced Reading in Grades K-2

| Total Number of Students | # at text level 4 or higher | % at text level 4 or higher | # at text level 6 or higher | % at text level 6 or higher |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 118 | 117 | 99% | 94 | 80.3% |

**Grade 1**

End of Year Target – Level 16

| Total Number of Students | # at text level 16 or higher | % at text level 16 or higher | # at text level J or higher | % at text level J or higher |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 108 | 95 | 88% | 49 | 54.6% |

**Grade 2**

End of Year Target- Level M

| Total Number of Students | # at text level M or higher | % at text level M or higher | # at text level N or higher | % at text level N or higher |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 114 | 95 | 83.3% | 51 | 55.2% |

***** MCPS Strategic Plan Target for 2009 is ≥ 86.5%*****

## PERFORMANCE RESULTS

Number and Percentage of Wood Acres' Grade 2 Students
Who Scored at or Above 70th Percentile on TN/2 **Reading** Subtest in 2009

| Demographic | Number ≥ 70th %tile | Percent ≥ 70th %tile |
|---|---|---|
| All students (110) | 81 | 73.6% |
| African-American (3) | 2 | 66.7% |
| Asian (16) | 12 | 75% |
| Hispanic (7) | 5 | 71.4% |
| White (82) | 61 | 74.4% |
| Special Education (5) | 0 | 0% |
| ELL (8) | 6 | 75% |

Number and Percentage of Wood Acres' Grade 2 Students
Who Scored at or Above 50th & 70th Percentile on TN/2 **Mathematics** Subtest in 2009

| Demographic | Number ≥ 50th %tile | Percent ≥ 50th %tile | Number ≥ 70th %tile | Percent ≥ 70th %tile |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| All students (114) | 21 | 18.4% | 75 | 62.8% |
| African-American (3) | 0 | 0 | 2 | 66.7% |
| Asian (18) | 1 | 5.6% | 15 | 83.3% |
| Hispanic (7) | 4 | 57.0% | 3 | 43.0% |
| White (82) | 17 | 20.7% | 53 | 64.6% |
| Special Education (5) | 1 | 20% | 0 | 0% |
| ELL (12) | 1 | 8.3% | 6 | 50.0% |

2008-09 MSA Results

| Grade | Test Area | % Overall Met 2009/2008 | % Basic 2009/2008 | % Proficient 2009/2008 | % Advanced 2009/2008 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 3 | Reading | **97.1**/99.2% | **2.9**/0% | **55.8**/60.2% | **41.3**/39.0% |
| 3 | Math | **86.5**/98.3% | **13.5**/1.7% | **44.1**/36.4% | **42.3**/61.9% |
| 4 | Reading | **98.2**/95.3% | **1.8**/4.7% | **42.7**/36.0% | **55.5**/59.3% |
| 4 | Math | **99.1**/95.4% | **.01**/4.7% | **23.1**/25.6% | **76.1**/69.8% |
| 5 | Reading | **94.4**/97.0% | **5.6**/3.0% | **21.1**/8.1% | **73.3**/88.9% |
| 5 | Math | **95.7**/98.0% | **4.3**/2.0% | **31.9**/35.4% | **63.8**/62.6% |

| 2008 – 09 Math 6 Students | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Total number | Male | Female | Race | | |
| | | | White | Asian | Hispanic |
| 51 | 30 | 21 | 44 | 6 | 1 |
| 94 | | | | | |
| 55% | 31% | 24% | | | |

Math Survey, 2008 -09

I meet in small groups with my teacher

| Grades K – 2 | | Grades 3 – 5 | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Yes | 76% | Every day | 4% |
| No | 24% | A few times a week | 41% |
| | | Once a week or less | 55% |

When my teacher is working with a group, I usually work

| | K – 2 | 3 – 5 |
|---|---|---|
| Alone | 27% | 51% |
| At a center/math game | 25% | 2% |
| With a buddy | 14% | 20% |
| All of the above | 34% | 27% |
| | | |

(3 – 5) During the school day, how often do you work with a classmate or small group without your teacher?

| | |
|---|---|
| Often (4 times or more a week) | 17% |
| Sometimes (2-3 times a week) | 59% |
| Rarely (0 – 1 time a week) | 24% |

Work in my class:

| K – 2: I think the work in my class is: | 3 – 5: How often does your classwork really challenge you? |
|---|---|
| Too easy: 32% | Rarely: 29% |
| Too hard: 6% | Often: 45% |
| Just right: 62% | Sometimes: 26% |

Reading Survey
I meet in small groups with my teacher

| Grades K – 2 | | Grades 3 – 5 | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Yes | 90% | Every day | 9% |
| No | 10% | A few times a week | 51% |
| | | Once a week or less | 40% |

When my teacher is working with a group, I usually work

| | K – 2 | 3 – 5 |
|---|---|---|
| Alone | 22% | 56% |
| At a center/math game | 31% | 1% |
| With a buddy | 10% | 12% |
| All of the above | 37% | 31% |

(3 – 5) During the school day, how often do you work with a classmate or small group without your teacher?

| | |
|---|---|
| Often (4 times or more a week) | 21% |
| Sometimes (2-3 times a week) | 61% |
| Rarely (0 – 1 time a week) | 19% |

Work in my class:

| K – 2: I think the work in my class is: | 3 – 5: How often does your classwork really challenge you? |
|---|---|
| Too easy: 25% | Rarely: 25% |
| Too hard: 5% | Often: 7% |
| Just right: 70% | Sometimes: 68% |

## PERFORMANCE RESULTS

See attached page 2.

# STUDENT AND
# STAKEHOLDER FOCUS

## MSA

**Based on the 2009 data:**

**Third grade reading:** 41% of students scored advanced, 56% scored proficient, and 3% were basic. 33% of students scored proficient, while 66 % scored on the basic level. Additionally, other students received extra support in reading, and all but one of these students scored in the proficient range. Therefore, interventions should be continued.

**Fourth grade reading**: 98% of students scored proficient or higher, 55% scored advanced. 100% of students with IEP's/504's scored proficient. Therefore, data indicates a need to continue instructional strategies and practices used in 2008 – 09, particularly the interventions for students with special needs.

**Fifth grade reading**: 73% scored advanced, 21% scored proficient, and 6% scored basic. While 6% of students scored basic, 40% of students with IEP's scored in basic.

**Third grade math:** 52% scored advanced, 44% scored proficient, and 14% scored basic. The data indicates that 100% of students with IEP's scored basic and that males (57%) scored disproportionately higher than females (29%) in the advanced range. Therefore, implications are to increase the proficiency levels of students with IEP's, as well as to close the gap between genders in the advanced levels.

**Fourth grade math**: 76% scored advanced, 23% proficient, and 1% scored basic. Implications are to continue to see the high levels of advanced scores in all subgroups.

**Fifth grade math**: 64% scored advanced, 32% proficient, and 4% basic. Implications are to continue to see the high levels of advanced scores in all subgroups.

**mClass**: Based on 2008 -09 mClass data, 99% of kindergarten students were reading at level 4 or higher, 88% of first grade students were reading at a level 16 or higher, and 83% of second grade students were reading at a text level M or higher. Therefore, the data indicate a need to focus on specific components of reading instruction.

**TN/2:** Based on 2008 – 09 TN/2 reading data, 73.6% of second grade students were at or above the 70$^{th}$ percentile. 0% of special education students scored at or above the 70$^{th}$ percentile. Based on 08 - 09 TN/2 math data, 81.2% of second grade students scored at or above the 50$^{th}$ percentile. One special education student (20%) scored in the 50$^{th}$ percentile or better. Therefore, those students are identified as an area of concentration.

**Math 6:** Based on 2008 -09 math 6 data, 55% of all fifth grade students were enrolled in math 6 or above. 33% of fifth grade boys and 22% of fifth grade girls were enrolled in math 6 or above. Therefore, an instructional implication is that close monitoring of accelerated math participation will be made in earlier grades.

### Student Survey Data:

Based on K – 2 math data , 76% of students meet in small groups for math. 62% of students perceive math instruction to be just right. 32% of students perceive math instruction to be too easy. Therefore, data indicate that instruction needs to focus on challenge work.

Based on K – 2 reading data, 90% of students meet in small groups for reading and 70% perceive instruction as just right. 25% of students perceive reading instruction as too easy. Therefore, the data indicate an instructional focus on making sure students are reading appropriate instructional level text – progress monitoring.

Based on 3 – 5 reading data, 60% of students reported they met in small groups at least a few times a week, while 75% of students found their work "often" or "sometimes" challenging. 56% of students reported that they work alone when they are not meeting with their teacher in a reading group. Therefore, our instructional need is to better challenge students in grades 3 – 5 in reading. (25% reported being rarely challenged.)

Based on 3 – 5 math data, 45% of students report that they met in small math groups at least a few times per week, while 71% of students found their work "often" or "sometimes" challenging. 57% of students report that they work alone when they are not meeting with their teacher in a math group. Therefore, 45% of students report that they are "often" challenged. An instructional need is to better challenge grades 3 – 5 students in math. (29% report that they were "rarely" challenged.)