

**Crossett Elementary School**  
**2012-2013**  
**Mid-Year Analysis of Student Academic Performance**  
**DATA**

*Please complete the table below with your school's AMO Goals for 2012-2013*

**2011-12 Status for Literacy: Achieving**\_\_\_\_\_

**2011-11 Status for Math: Needs Improvement**\_\_\_\_\_

<b>2013 AMO Goals for Proficiency</b>	<b>% Proficient in Literacy 2012</b>	<b>Year 2013 Literacy AMO</b>	<b>% Proficient in Math in 2012</b>	<b>Year 2013 Math AMO</b>
All Students	86.45	79.71	80.95	82.61
TAGG Group	81.48	72.45	76.19	76.95
African Americans	82.41	72.60	73.15	76.82
Hispanic	n<10	n<10	n<10	n<10
White	89.24	85.01	86.08	87.89
Economically Disadvantaged	82.42	72.38	76.92	76.50
English Learners	n<10	n<10	n<10	n<10
Students w/Disabilities	40.63	31.25	40.63	35.07

<b>2013 AMO Goals for Growth</b>	<b>% Making Growth in Literacy 2012</b>	<b>Growth AMO for 2013</b>	<b>% Making Growth in Math 2012</b>	<b>Growth AMO for 2013</b>
All Students	82.26	79.71	36.29	80.14
TAGG Group	81.93	72.45	34.94	80.63
African Americans	84.00	72.60	30.00	82.26
Hispanic	n<10	n<10	n<10	n<10
White	82.86	85.01	38.57	80.59
Economically Disadvantaged	83.54	72.38	35.44	82.47
English Learners	n<10	n<10	n<10	n<10
Students w/Disabilities	57.14	31.25	35.71	69.45

**The Learning Institute Forecast (Student Snapshot)**

<b>12-13 Proficiency Forecast</b>	<b># of Students</b>	<b>Literacy Proficient</b>	<b>Literacy Growth</b>	<b>Math Proficient</b>	<b>Math Growth</b>
2 <sup>nd</sup> Grade	138	78	NA	50	NA
3 <sup>rd</sup> Grade	144	99	NA	114	NA
4 <sup>th</sup> Grade	154	121	59	124	56
Total (3 <sup>rd</sup> -4 <sup>th</sup> )	298	220	59	238	56

<b>12-13 Basic/Below Basic Forecast</b>					
2 <sup>nd</sup> Grade		23	NA	46	NA
3 <sup>rd</sup> Grade		22	NA	10	NA
4 <sup>th</sup> Grade		13	21	11	26
Total (3 <sup>rd</sup> -4 <sup>th</sup> )		35	21	21	26
<b>TAGG Group Forecast</b>					
(set up as a special group on TLI) 3 <sup>rd</sup> & 4 <sup>th</sup>	194	125	40	153	40
2 <sup>nd</sup> grade	76	40	NA	24	NA

**2. List students in each grade level with a D or an F in math and/or literacy and their current Combined Adjusted Percent from the Learning Institute interim assessments (Snapshot Report).**

<b>3<sup>rd</sup> Grade</b>		<b>R/W</b>		<b>Math</b>
<b>Student Name</b>	<b>Literacy Grade</b>	<b>TLI Score</b>	<b>Math Grade</b>	<b>TLI Score</b>
Billy Hampton	68	52/70	56	72
Tkia Montgomery	63	54/53	85	50
James Nichols	68	81/58	79	71
DaQuon Johnson	88	50/58	67	37
Quinlawous Penn	50	52/58	53	39
Molly Smith	64	79/75	65	73
Malliyah Hendrix	69	60/65	57	56
Milagros Vargas	55	50/67	64	42
Cole Williams	64	56/62	61	45
Ariana Bell	66	84/79	85	87
Evan Kelley	60	60/73	84	72
Marqueze Mitchell	50	50/69	74	80
Lakelsie Johnson	67	65/70	84	68
Marquise Mitchell	64	79/69	76	83

<b>4<sup>th</sup> Grade</b>				
<b>Student Name</b>	<b>Literacy Grade</b>	<b>TLI Score</b>	<b>Math Grade</b>	<b>TLI Score</b>
Joshua Couser	67	43/59	81	64
Hope King	82	67/72	67	55
Sunny Stephenson	92	75/79	68	47
Shaynna Kippen	74	42/73	63	55
Britney White	89	73/75	64	56

<b>Maleik Russ</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>57/67</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>53</b>
<b>Amya Smedley</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>43/50</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>59</b>
<b>Charla Montgomery</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>30/55</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>70</b>

What does the comparison of grades and TLI scores indicate that your “next steps” should be?

We are examining our data in our next PLC to see what teachers whose students scored high did with their students. We are sharing strategies and keeping “what works” and monitoring and adjusting “what is not working.” Teachers have been told to print their reports so that we can examine the data and create plans. We are going to look at assignments and decide if they are relevant to common core state standards. Reflect on “the work.” Data making decision continues to be the focus of helping our students achieve.

What are the current weaknesses identified in literacy from your TLI and classroom assessments and how are they being addressed?

Vocabulary and open response in reading and writing. Thea Capps from Coop came in December to help teachers with the read aloud-vocabulary sequence model with literacy teachers. She modeled how to teach vocabulary by contextualizing, saying, using meaning and having the students to practice using the word. She also explained to teachers the importance of comprehension and connecting word meanings. I also require that vocabulary echo throughout the day. They are continuing to embed the vocabulary in all areas of guided reading, Quick Reads, Read Aloud, Independent assignments while connecting other content areas.

What are the current weaknesses identified in math from your TLI and classroom assessments and how are they being addressed?

Measurement and Data were the consistent low areas. We discuss in PLCs, math teachers are working on open response items weekly. We are doing a better job of integrating literacy strategies with other content areas.

Interventions are done by certified activity teachers who work on skills with the students who are struggling. Each student has an intervention plan.

Assignments in math require students to use real life skills of gathering data and measurement.

How are you assessing the progress of your TAGG (Economically Disadvantaged, English Language Learners, and Students with Disabilities) group? Please provide data of TAGG group progress.

Teachers keep a record of TAGG group progress in their assessment binders. The Assessment binders have the data of students, their assessments, and grades. When they do poorly on an assignment or assessment, the assignments are flagged. The teachers reteach and interventions are added for these students.

Provide documentation that indicates improvement or mastery of the weaknesses identified on your students' Academic Improvement Plans.

=

### **Reading Data (grades 1-6)**

<b>Number and Percentage of Students Reading Above Grade Level</b>	
<b>-At Grade Level</b>	
<b>-Below Grade Level</b>	
<b>-Struggling Readers</b>	


What are your plans to address the needs of the struggling readers?

**We have a RTI that is used for struggling learners. Teachers identify students in need; interventions are scheduled for those students.**

**We address the needs of struggling readers through our literacy block daily. In Kindergarten, teachers started with assisted groups. Students have oral language development by reciting nursery rhymes, reading alphabet chart, sight words, Shared Reading by reading repetitive text and working on comprehension skills of predicting, sequencing-Beginning, Middle, End of stories. The echo read, choral read, and thus learn to read independently. In First grade, this process is continued as students read in groups as the teacher provides them with background knowledge and strategies of using picture support, beginning sounds, and connecting the alphabet chart and blends chart to say words. Our phonics program addresses decoding, blending of words etc... these practices continue to help our students become better readers. Second grade students are reading higher level text and teachers are still providing background knowledge, strategies, vocabulary building with meaning. Students are having conversations about the text and working on comprehension strategies that connect the reader to the text and provide them with deeper understanding of what they are reading. Extension assignments are given to help the teacher or provide the teacher with informal data on student comprehension.**

Please report the progress of your students (based on data) who participate in the following programs implemented in your school.

1. Compass Learning
2. System 44
3. After-School Tutoring

**Reports will be sent through school mail.**

List ideas and who is responsible for keeping students on track and providing extra help between now and the Benchmark test.

Teachers are responsible for keeping students on track. After school tutoring is providing extra help for students who are proficient, basic, below basic. Students were given a pretest, and will be given a post test at the end of tutoring.