

SHARON PUBLIC SCHOOLS
2012 MCAS PERFORMANCE REPORT

Submitted to the Sharon School Committee

&

Timothy J. Farmer
Superintendent of Schools

November 9, 2012

Prepared By Glenn A. Brand
Assistant Superintendent for Administration & Finance

Overview of the Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System

What is MCAS?

- MCAS is the state’s standard-based student assessment program
- There are three primary purposes: 1) to inform and improve curriculum and instruction; 2) to evaluate student, school and district performance according to the MA curriculum framework content standards; 3) to determine whether a students has met the state requirements for the Competency Determination
- A total of 552,549 students in MA participated in a total of 17 MCAS tests in English Language Arts, Mathematics, and Science/Technology/Engineering
- The department focuses on trends over a five-year period (from 2008-12) and where an increase of five or more percentage points exists such indicates improvement that has been sustained
- Last spring, the MCAS tests were administered to Sharon students for the fourteenth time since 1998 when the system was introduced
- The information in the pages that follows highlights the 2012 MCAS results for the Sharon Public Schools

2012 MCAS Tests Administered By Grade

| | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
|----------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|
| ELA | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | ✓ |
| Math | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | ✓ |
| Science & Technology | | | ✓ | | | ✓ | ✓ | |

How Are Results Reported?

| <i>Achievement Level</i> | <i>Definition</i> |
|-------------------------------------|---|
| <i>Advanced</i> 260-280 | Students demonstrate a comprehensive and in-depth understanding of rigorous subject matter and provide sophisticated solutions to complex problems. |
| <i>Proficient</i> 240-258 | Students demonstrate a solid understanding of challenging subject matter and solve a wide variety of problems. |
| <i>Needs Improvement</i> 220-238 | Students at this level demonstrate a partial understanding of subject matter and solve some simple problems. |
| <i>Warning/Failing</i> 200-218 | Students demonstrate a minimal understanding of subject matter and do not solve simple problems. |

District Analysis

The state provides the ability to compare district from a variety of factors. The table below represents data using the MA Department of Education’s DART tool and provides one way of examining our district in comparison to those of others.

| Comparable | Total Enrollment Oct. 2011 | % Low Income | % Spec. Ed. | % ELL | 2012 MCAS P/A ELA | 2012 MCAS P/A Math | 2012 MCAS P/A Sci/T/E | 2012 Median SGP ELA | 2012 Median SGP MATH |
|---------------|----------------------------|--------------|-------------|------------|-------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|----------------------|
| Sharon | 3364 | 7.7 | 13.9 | 2.1 | 87 | 80 | 78 | 54.0 | 57.0 |
| Belmont | 3961 | 6.5 | 9.9 | 2.7 | 90 | 82 | 80 | 63.0 | 60.0 |
| Burlington | 3626 | 9.6 | 12.9 | 1.8 | 76 | 61 | 65 | 46.0 | 47.0 |
| Hopkinton | 3414 | 2.9 | 13.2 | 1.2 | 90 | 83 | 77 | 59.0 | 60.0 |
| Needham | 5409 | 6.2 | 13.8 | 1.1 | 85 | 78 | 75 | 56.0 | 55.0 |
| Natick | 4947 | 8.4 | 14.0 | 1.1 | 83 | 75 | 75 | 51.0 | 48.0 |
| Scituate | 3275 | 8.5 | 12.8 | 0.9 | 87 | 81 | 75 | 54.0 | 56.0 |

*Data from the MA Department of Elementary & Secondary Education’s District Analysis and Review Tool (DART) that compiled district’s most similar to Sharon in terms of grade span, total enrollment, and special populations.

2012 District Accountability Report

Sharon Public Schools has been designated a ‘Level 2/Accountability & Assistance Level’ district based upon our 2012 MCAS results. This status is given based upon the fact that one or more schools in the district are classified into Level 2.

District’s Progress Towards Narrowing Proficiency Gaps

The Cumulative Progress and Performance Index (PPI) between 1 and 100 is indicative of the group’s overall performance relative to information about narrowing proficiency gaps, growth, and graduation and dropout rates over four years into a single number. For a group to be considered to be making progress toward narrowing the proficiency gaps, it cumulative PPI must be 75 or higher.

| Student Group | Cumulative Progress & Performance Index 1-100 | Status (On Target -75 or Higher) |
|----------------------------|---|----------------------------------|
| All Students | 91 | Met Target |
| High Needs | 73 | Did Not Meet Target |
| Low Income | 75 | Met Target |
| English Language Learners | 85 | Met Target |
| Students with Disabilities | 70 | Did Not Meet Target |
| Asian | 100 | Met Target |
| African American/Black | 65 | Did Not Meet Target |

Sharon Public Schools 2012 MCAS Performance Report

| | | |
|-------------------------|----|---------------------|
| Hispanic/Latino | 68 | Did Not Meet Target |
| Multi Race/Non Hispanic | 62 | Did Not Meet Target |
| White | 99 | Met Target |

School Accountability Information

All MA schools and districts are classified into one of five accountability and assistance levels (1-5) with the highest performing in Level 1 and lowest performing in Level 5. In general, a district is classified into the level of its lowest performing schools.

| <i>School</i> | <i>School Type</i> | <i>Title I Status</i> | <i>Accountability & Assistance Level</i> |
|--------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|--|
| Cottage Street | Elementary | Title I | Level 1 |
| East Elementary | Elementary | Non-Title I | Level 1 |
| Heights Elementary | Elementary | Title I | Level 2 |
| SMS | Middle School | Non-Title I | Level 2 |
| SHS | High School | Non-Title I | Level 1 |

English Language Arts

2012 Results

| <i>Grade & Subject</i> | <i>Proficient or Higher</i> | | <i>Advanced</i> | | <i>Proficient</i> | | <i>Needs Improvement</i> | | <i>Warning/Failing</i> | |
|----------------------------|-----------------------------|-------|-----------------|-------|-------------------|-------|--------------------------|-------|------------------------|-------|
| | District | State | District | State | District | State | District | State | District | State |
| Gr. 3 Reading | 83 | 61 | 31 | 15 | 52 | 46 | 14 | 30 | 4 | 9 |
| Gr. 4 ELA | 80 | 57 | 27 | 13 | 53 | 44 | 16 | 30 | 4 | 14 |
| Gr. 5 ELA | 82 | 61 | 36 | 17 | 46 | 44 | 13 | 28 | 5 | 11 |
| Gr. 6 ELA | 88 | 66 | 38 | 18 | 50 | 48 | 9 | 22 | 3 | 11 |
| Gr. 7 ELA | 84 | 71 | 28 | 15 | 56 | 56 | 12 | 21 | 4 | 7 |
| Gr. 8 ELA | 93 | 81 | 28 | 18 | 65 | 63 | 6 | 14 | 2 | 16 |

| Grade 3 ELA Level | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
|--------------------------|------|------|------|------|
| <i>Advanced</i> | 21 | 24 | 26 | 31 |
| <i>Proficient</i> | 60 | 56 | 58 | 52 |
| <i>Needs Improvement</i> | 17 | 16 | 12 | 14 |
| <i>Warning</i> | 2 | 3 | 3 | 4 |

| Grade 4 ELA | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
|--------------------|------|------|------|------|
|--------------------|------|------|------|------|

Sharon Public Schools 2012 MCAS Performance Report

| Level | | | | |
|--------------------------|----|----|----|----|
| <i>Advanced</i> | 23 | 28 | 24 | 27 |
| <i>Proficient</i> | 51 | 50 | 59 | 53 |
| <i>Needs Improvement</i> | 21 | 18 | 15 | 16 |
| <i>Warning</i> | 5 | 3 | 2 | 4 |

| Grade 5 ELA Level | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
|-----------------------------|------|------|------|------|
| <i>Advanced</i> | 30 | 32 | 34 | 36 |
| <i>Proficient</i> | 56 | 48 | 56 | 46 |
| <i>Needs Improvement</i> | 14 | 16 | 8 | 13 |
| <i>Warning</i> | 1 | 5 | 2 | 5 |

| Grade 6 ELA Level | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
|-----------------------------|------|------|------|------|
| <i>Advanced</i> | 33 | 31 | 31 | 38 |
| <i>Proficient</i> | 57 | 57 | 55 | 50 |
| <i>Needs Improvement</i> | 8 | 9 | 11 | 9 |
| <i>Warning</i> | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 |

| Grade 7 ELA Level | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
|-----------------------------|------|------|------|------|
| <i>Advanced</i> | 34 | 20 | 23 | 28 |
| <i>Proficient</i> | 56 | 74 | 64 | 56 |
| <i>Needs Improvement</i> | 8 | 5 | 12 | 12 |
| <i>Warning</i> | 2 | 1 | 2 | 4 |

| Grade 8 ELA Level | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
|-----------------------------|------|------|------|------|
| <i>Advanced</i> | 29 | 40 | 33 | 28 |
| <i>Proficient</i> | 66 | 53 | 60 | 65 |
| <i>Needs Improvement</i> | 4 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| <i>Warning</i> | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 |

| Grade 10 ELA Level | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
|------------------------------|------|------|------|------|
| <i>Advanced</i> | 58 | 61 | 68 | 64 |
| <i>Proficient</i> | 38 | 35 | 29 | 33 |
| <i>Needs Improvement</i> | 3 | 3 | 3 | 1 |
| <i>Failing</i> | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 |

Elementary ELA

Student Performance Analysis

- All three elementary schools are 80% or higher in Proficient or Advanced category.
- Composite Performance Index (CPI) for grade 3 is at 94.7 pts. toward proficiency, grade 4 is at 92.9 pts. and grade 5 is 93.1 pts. toward proficiency.
- Based on the new 2011 standards, Sharon does well on multiple-choice questions with scores between 84-89% range.
- Grade 3 Short Response questions have improved from three years ago when it was first introduced, although this year scores were down 5%.

| | | | |
|--------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Sharon | <u>2012</u> | <u>2011</u> | <u>2010</u> |
|--------|-------------|-------------|-------------|

Sharon Public Schools 2012 MCAS Performance Report

| | | | |
|----------------|-----|-----|-----|
| Short Response | 60% | 65% | 43% |
|----------------|-----|-----|-----|

Areas of Concern

- New standard Key Ideas and Details is an area students have struggled with across the district in all grades 3-5. It is a new standard that requires a student to be able to read closely to determine what a text says explicitly and to make logical inferences from it.
- Our writing prompt scores or long composition scores in Grade 4 have flat-lined over the last four years ranging between 69% -78% district-wide.

| | | | | |
|----------------|------|------|------|------|
| Sharon | 2012 | 2011 | 2010 | 2009 |
| Writing Prompt | 72% | 72% | 78% | 69% |

- Sharon has continually been above the State in Open Response scores in all three-grade levels but scores have remained stagnate in recent years.

| | | | | |
|---------|--------|------|------|------|
| Sharon | 2012 | 2011 | 2010 | 2009 |
| Grade 5 | OR 63% | 60% | 63% | 59% |
| Grade 4 | OR 55% | 61% | 58% | 51% |
| Grade 4 | WP 72% | 72% | 78% | 69% |
| Grade 3 | OR 60% | 65% | 44% | 44% |
| Grade 3 | SR 75% | 74% | 68% | |

Action Steps:

- Focus with teachers around teaching explicitly strategies for reading comprehension and writing using the new standards.
- Provide ample opportunities for students to practice strategies and engage in conversations (accountable talk).
- Allow students time to read, write and think in small groups, pairs and individually. (Gradual Release of Responsibility)
- Increase the amount of time students have to write about their thinking and extended time to write routinely.
- Check student understanding often and ensure they understand the strategy and how to use it.
- Provide timely corrective feedback and remodel strategies as needed.
- Provide students with multiple opportunities to do “close reading” of text to analyze, evaluate, determine explicitly what text says, make logical inferences, determine ideas and themes and cite specific evidence from text.

ELA Secondary Analysis

Student Performance Analysis

- Teachers have tried to impact performance in this area and scores do improve through the upper grades.

Sharon Public Schools 2012 MCAS Performance Report

- 6th grade students performed 7-12% higher than the state average and Open Response scores were 11% higher than the state markers for this grade level.
- 7th Grade students, generally, did well on Reading/Literature strands for both fiction and nonfiction and scored 9-13% higher than the state markers on these questions.
- Strong results for 9th grade students on the Open Response questions and on the long composition students performed 7% better than the state marker.
- Within the 7th grade the Advanced and Warning scores have both trended upward with Advanced scores going from 20% to 28% and Needs Improvement scores increasing from 5% to 12%.

Areas of Concern

- Open Response Questions for 6th grade remains a focus area of growth – and has been – for the last five years.
- For 7th grade Open Response questions were 13% higher than state markers; however, students did not significantly outpace their state peers on the long composition – only a 3% differential. This will serve as a focus area for growth this year.
- 8th Grade demonstrated strong performance in Reading/Literature in all strands however the differential vs. the state for many strands was lower than seemingly expected.
- Within the 7th grade the Needs Improvement scores have increased from 5% to 12%.

Science/Technology & Engineering

2012 Results

| Grade & Subject | Proficient or Higher | | Advanced | | Proficient | | Needs Improvement | | Warning/Failing | |
|-----------------|----------------------|-------|----------|-------|------------|-------|-------------------|-------|-----------------|-------|
| | District | State | District | State | District | State | District | State | District | State |
| Gr. 5 STE | 82 | 52 | 51 | 22 | 31 | 30 | 13 | 34 | 4 | 14 |
| Gr. 8 STE | 58 | 43 | 9 | 5 | 49 | 38 | 32 | 38 | 9 | 20 |
| Gr. 10 STE | 92 | 69 | 55 | 24 | 37 | 45 | 6 | 25 | 2 | 6 |

| Grade 5 STE Level | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
|-------------------|------|------|------|------|
| Advanced | 38 | 37 | 34 | 51 |
| Proficient | 35 | 40 | 43 | 31 |
| Needs Improvement | 24 | 20 | 19 | 13 |
| Warning | 3 | 4 | 3 | 4 |

| Grade 8 STE Level | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
|-------------------|------|------|------|------|
| Advanced | 11 | 11 | 11 | 9 |
| Proficient | 57 | 51 | 53 | 49 |
| Needs Improvement | 27 | 33 | 32 | 32 |
| Warning | 5 | 5 | 5 | 9 |

| Grade 10 STE Level | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
|--------------------|------|------|------|------|
| Advanced | 45 | 56 | 56 | 55 |
| Proficient | 41 | 38 | 38 | 37 |
| Needs Improvement | 13 | 4 | 6 | 6 |
| Warning/Failing | 1 | 2 | 0 | 2 |

Elementary Science

Student Performance Analysis

- 82% of our students performed at an Advanced or Proficient level, the highest since 2007.
- Students at the three elementary schools continue to perform well when compared to the state.
- The district's students receiving Advanced/Proficient designation has been consistently at least 24% above the state, and this year was a full 30% above the state.
- Students Needing Improvement or receiving Warning/Failing designation are also well below the state average and also improved this year, falling to 17%.

Areas of Concern

1. Although the district has outlined a specific course of study for the 3rd through 5th grade span, the curriculum is not presented uniformly across the district or from year to year. Time on learning for science is not standard across the district.

2. The Composite Performance Index of the district and two of three elementary schools has shown steady growth.
3. Scores from the item analysis reports fluctuate widely among some topics. Although many scores are above the 80th percentile, many are below the 70th percentile. This may indicate a review of curriculum/instruction in regards to particular standards.
4. Open response items continue to present a greater challenge with scores usually in the mid to high 60s. The frequency and degree to which students are required to communicate (in speaking and writing) their thinking and understanding for science topics is not standard across the district.
5. There is a wide disparity between the performance of all students and some student subgroups.
6. There is a growing disparity (11%) between the performance of the male and female students.

Action Steps

1. Continue to review the science curriculum for coherence and alignment and the instructional program for best practices at grades 3, 4 and 5.
2. Teachers must meet in district-wide grade level teams to analyze this data and to share instructional strategies and resources. Student work should be reviewed with performance expectations.
3. Continue to utilize previous recommendations to raise the level of rigor during daily instruction. This includes infusing more critical thinking with guided questioning, requiring students to communicate their thinking in speaking and writing by making and justifying claims with evidence, embedding open response prompts more frequently into units, and explicitly presenting content specific and operational vocabulary.
4. As student science performance is now included in district accountability formulas, it is important to prepare elementary students for middle and high school science. Although the district has outlined a specific course of study for the 3rd through 5th grade span, the curriculum is not presented uniformly across the district or from year to year. Time on learning for science is not standard across the district, but it is critical that students receive a minimum of 120 minutes per week.
5. Consult with Special Education teachers to determine best supports for students. Consider “Power Standards” and alternative resources.
6. Research the disparity between the genders’ achievement. Consider “wait-time, feedback quality, eye contact etc.

Secondary Science

Student Performance Analysis

- 8th grade tests was composed of questions from four strands of the MA Curriculum Frameworks for Science, Technology and Engineering
- By strand, the Physical Science strand is the one for which the district performed the best.
- The table below shows the results by strand:

| Strand | District % Correct | State % Correct | District-State Difference |
|-----------------------|--------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|
| Earth & Space Science | 69% | 61% | +8% |
| Life Science | 68% | 60% | +8% |

Sharon Public Schools 2012 MCAS Performance Report

| | | | |
|------------------------|-----|-----|------|
| Physical Science | 71% | 60% | +11% |
| Technology/Engineering | 70% | 66% | +4% |

* At the 10th grade students outperformed the State in all strands from a minimum of 11% to a maximum of 21%.

Target Areas

- At the 8th grade students in Open-response questions students performed at 52% below the target of 70%
- At the 8th grade students in the Earth and Space Science strand, performance was below the 70% target, particularly as it related to the topic areas of Earth's Structure and Mapping the Earth.
- Within the Life Science area, the student's overall performance of 68% is below the target of 70% with a particular need to focus on Changes in Ecosystems, Reproduction and Systems in Living Things.

Action Steps

- Middle schools science teachers have established a target goal of 70% on all multiple-choice questions for all strands. To support this goal, teachers plan to continue to integrate formative assessments into the curriculum to regularly and frequently gauge student understanding of the material.
- Starting in grade 6, provide students with a specific science writing strategy (Claim, Evidence etc.) to ensure that students are employing a standard method for answering open-response questions.
- Additional review of MCAS data and integrate the use of past MCAS questions at each appropriate grade-level as a formative assessment tool so that students have experience with MCAS style questions prior to the 8th grade.

Mathematics

2012 Results

| Grade & Subject | Proficient or Higher | | Advanced | | Proficient | | Needs Improvement | | Warning/Failing | |
|-----------------|----------------------|-------|----------|-------|------------|-------|-------------------|-------|-----------------|-------|
| | District | State | District | State | District | State | District | State | District | State |
| Gr. 3 Math | 87 | 61 | 62 | 27 | 25 | 34 | 9 | 25 | 4 | 14 |
| Gr. 4 Math | 76 | 51 | 38 | 16 | 38 | 35 | 19 | 36 | 5 | 12 |
| Gr. 5 Math | 78 | 57 | 52 | 25 | 26 | 32 | 14 | 26 | 7 | 17 |
| Gr. 6 Math | 85 | 60 | 47 | 27 | 38 | 33 | 10 | 24 | 5 | 16 |
| Gr. 7 Math | 63 | 51 | 32 | 20 | 31 | 31 | 28 | 30 | 8 | 18 |
| Gr. 8 Math | 75 | 52 | 41 | 22 | 34 | 30 | 17 | 28 | 8 | 19 |
| Gr. 10 Math | 94 | 78 | 82 | 50 | 12 | 28 | 4 | 15 | 2 | 7 |

| Grade 3 MATH Level | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
|--------------------|------|------|------|------|
| Advanced | 37 | 48 | 26 | 62 |
| Proficient | 44 | 34 | 57 | 25 |
| Needs Improvement | 15 | 14 | 13 | 9 |
| Warning | 4 | 5 | 4 | 4 |

| Grade 4 MATH Level | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
|--------------------|------|------|------|------|
| Advanced | 22 | 32 | 30 | 38 |
| Proficient | 36 | 37 | 41 | 38 |
| Needs Improvement | 35 | 26 | 24 | 19 |
| Warning | 8 | 5 | 5 | 5 |

| Grade 5 MATH Level | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
|--------------------|------|------|------|------|
| Advanced | 48 | 43 | 50 | 52 |
| Proficient | 34 | 32 | 34 | 26 |
| Needs Improvement | 14 | 17 | 12 | 14 |
| Warning | 4 | 7 | 3 | 7 |

| Grade 6 MATH Level | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
|--------------------|------|------|------|------|
| Advanced | 45 | 45 | 44 | 47 |
| Proficient | 37 | 32 | 34 | 38 |
| Needs Improvement | 12 | 16 | 14 | 10 |
| Warning | 6 | 7 | 7 | 5 |

| Grade 7 MATH Level | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
|--------------------|------|------|------|------|
| Advanced | 38 | 23 | 31 | 32 |
| Proficient | 41 | 49 | 33 | 31 |
| Needs Improvement | 14 | 22 | 23 | 28 |
| Warning | 7 | 5 | 12 | 8 |

| Grade 8 MATH Level | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
|--------------------|------|------|------|------|
| Advanced | 47 | 44 | 46 | 41 |
| Proficient | 30 | 30 | 28 | 34 |
| Needs Improvement | 19 | 19 | 20 | 17 |

Sharon Public Schools
2012 MCAS Performance Report

| | | | | |
|---------|---|---|---|---|
| Warning | 4 | 7 | 5 | 8 |
|---------|---|---|---|---|

| Grade 10 MATH Level | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
|---------------------|------|------|------|------|
| Advanced | 78 | 80 | 82 | 82 |
| Proficient | 15 | 15 | 15 | 12 |
| Needs Improvement | 4 | 4 | 2 | 4 |
| Failing | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 |

Elementary

Student Performance Analysis:

Domain Summary – Percent Correct (District/State Comparison)

| | Grade 3 | Grade 4 | Grade 5 |
|-----------------------------------|----------------|---------|---------|
| Geometry | Not calculated | 83(+12) | 85(+15) |
| Measurement and Data | 84 (+15) | 79(+11) | 72(+16) |
| Numbers and Operations Base Ten | 89 (+13) | 82(+6) | 80(+12) |
| Numbers and Operations-Fractions | 82 (+19) | 74(+13) | 84(+16) |
| Operations and Algebraic Thinking | 87 (+12) | 80(+8) | 90(+5) |

Domains lower than 80%

15 or more points above the state average

Question Type-Percent Correct (District/State Comparison)

| | Grade 3 | Grade 4 | Grade 5 |
|-----------------|----------|---------|---------|
| Multiple Choice | 92 (+12) | 81(+11) | 85(+11) |
| Open Response | 78 (+16) | 76(+11) | 77(+19) |
| Short Answer | 85 (+16) | 83(+11) | 79(+14) |

Question types less than 80%

15 or more points above the state average

Action Steps

Numbers and Operations-Fractions and Measurement and Data Domains

- Action Steps
 - Develop a deeper understanding of fractions at grades 3 and 4. Supplement Everyday Math with lessons from additional resources
 - Integrate the standards from the Measurement and Data domain into science units. Provide students with meaningful contexts for measurement as well as the collection and representation of data.
 - Shift from a transmission model of instruction to a student centered model where students are actively engaged in learning mathematics.

- Action Steps
 - Limit the number of problems or tasks with which students are to work and use tasks that are rich enough to warrant exploration. Practicing procedures is important, but should not be the primary mode of operation for classwork and homework.
 - Encourage reasoning and sense making. Use effective questions that require students to explain and justify their thinking and the thinking of others.
 - Integrate problem solving activities more regularly into daily lessons so that students have an ongoing opportunity to make sense of problems and persevere in solving them

Implementation of the 2011 Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks

- Action Steps
 - Continue to follow alignment documents (Unit Planners), revised September 2011-October 2012, that align Everyday Math lessons to new standards, provide supplementary resources and suggest guidelines for pacing
 - Incorporate the Standards of Mathematical Practice¹ into lesson planning and classroom practice.
 - Continue to update Edline resources regarding the new standards. Encourage teachers to consult these resources.
 - Continue to explore core programs that are aligned to the frameworks and develop a deeper understanding of concepts

Addressing the Learning Needs of All Students

- Action Steps
 - Continue to use math workshop and math stations to teach math in small, guided groups. This small group-work has allowed teachers to provide differentiated instruction, corrective feedback, conferencing, questioning, small group problem solving, and concrete “hands on” experiences
 - Continue to use the “push in” math specialist model of instruction to meet the needs of all learners within the classroom.
 - Implement iReady, an online Universal Screening tool. Continue to investigate scheduling options to provide additional intervention periods for remedial students.
 - Continue to share individual student data (iReady, MCAS, fact data, K baseline data) with math specialists, special educators and classroom teachers. Identify students who may need additional support, early intervention, and/or MCAS modifications. Identify areas for intervention for these students.

Secondary

Student Performance Analysis

- * In 6th grade 45-48% of the students score in the advanced category, 33-38% were Proficient, 10-14% were needs improvement, and 4-7% are in the Warning range.
- * In the 8th grade data mirrors that of the 6th grade, with 41-48% of students receiving Advanced, 29-34% in Proficient, 17-20% in Needs Improvement, and 4-8% Warning.
- * In the 10th grade 81-84% are Advanced range, 12-15% are Proficient, 2-3% are Needs Improvement, and 0-1% are in the Failing category (called Warning until 10th grade).

Areas of Concern

- * In the 7th grade performance has remained relatively static to 2011 with 64-65% of students in either Advanced or Proficient and 35% in Needs Improvement/Warning.
- * **Within the Data Analysis strand (8 questions)** only 66% of our students answered correctly. Current 8th grade teachers are aware of this and have looked at the questions that were released to see how to address similar topics for this current school year.

Action Steps

- * The middle school is in the planning stages for this year's "before school" MCAS prep sessions. Because of the number of teachers available to teach sessions and the amount of students in need last year, we opened the program to students in the Needs Improvement category only. This year we will be able to expand the sessions to include students who received Warning scores in the previous year (so we will have the same number of sections, but the range in scores is widened).
- * Middle school teachers are also using release time (first day November 13, follow up day in December) to look at MCAS data of both students they currently have, and those from the previous year to look for both areas of focus and trends in individual MCAS performance.

Some data on student's who were in last year's support classes: last year's 6th and 8th grade had an average point gain of 6-9 points, and last year's 7th grade had an average point loss of about 3 points, but some individual losses were extensive, hence bringing down the average. I attached spreadsheets to show the results, I'm not sure if they will be helpful for your report, but just as an FYI.