**School Improvement Action Plan – Goal One**

**SY 2011-2012**

**PART I: OVERVIEW**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Amelia Earhart Intermediate School (AEIS)** | | | | |  | | **May 31, 2012** |
| **Goal Statement:** By June 2012, all students will increase performance on targeted **Literacy Skills** using instructional interventions implemented in all curricular areas as measured by the *TerraNova* 3rd Edition Reading and Language Arts subtests and other System-wide and school based assessments. | | | | | | | |
| **Essence of the goal:**   * Reading comprehension through vocabulary * Proficiency in conventions of writing * Clarify or explain thinking through writing | | | | | | | |
| **Targeted Subgroup: 4th/5th Grade Students receiving Read 180 services** | | | | | | | |
| **Triangulation of Data:**  Local Assessment for Reading Comprehension  Scholastic Reading Inventories  *TerraNova,* 3rd Edition Top Two National Quarters  *TerraNova,* 3rd Edition Bottom National Quarter  *TerraNova* Performance Assessment of Communication Arts (TNPACA)  DoDEA Writing Assessment  Parent Survey  December 07 AEIS Data Carousel | | | | | | | |
| **System-wide Assessment(s)**  *Name: TerraNova* Multiple Assessments 3rd Edition Reading and Language Arts sub-tests.  **Indicator of success:** There is a meaningful increase in the percentage of students performing in the Top Two National Quarters, and a meaningful decrease in the percentage of students performing in the Bottom National Quarter on the *TerraNova*, 2nd Edition, Reading and Language Arts subtests.  A “meaningful increase” is determined to be a z-score change of 0.1 or higher. | | | | **Local Assessment(s)**  ***Name:* Scholastic Reading Inventory Indicator of success:** There is a meaningful increase in the percentage of students scoring at the standard or higher as measured by the Scholastic Reading Inventory (SRI).  ***Name:* AEIS Local Writing Assessments**  **Indicator of success:** There is a meaningful increase in the percentage of students scoring at the standard or higher on the AEIS Local Writing Assessment.  ***Name:* Scholastic Reading Inventory (Targeted Subgroup)**  **Indicator of success:** There is a meaningful increase in the percentage of targeted subgroup students scoring at the targeted subgroup standard or higher as measured by the Scholastic Reading Inventory (SRI).  ***Name:*  AEIS Local Writing Assessments (Targeted Subgroup)**  **Indicator of success:** There is a meaningful increase in the percentage of targeted subgroup students scoring at the targeted subgroup standard or higher on the AEIS Local Writing Assessment. | | | |
| **Interventions and their descriptions applicable to ALL Students** | | | | | | | |
| **Intervention**  **6+1 Trait® Writing Trait Model** | | **Brief Description:**  The traits of the 6+1 Trait® model are: ideas, organization, voice, word choice, sentence fluency, conventions, and presentation. This strategy targets the basic skills and forms the descriptive criteria used to define the qualities of good writing at different levels of achievement. | | | | | |
| **Interventions and their descriptions applicable to the Targeted Subgroup** | | | | | | | |
| **Targeted Subgroup Intervention:**  **Read 180 services** | READ 180 is a reading intervention program for struggling readers that uses adaptive instructional software, high-interest literature, and direct instruction as the primary tools and instructional strategies. The program focuses on enhancing skills in phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, text comprehension, spelling, and writing. | | | | | | |
| **Interventions Implementation Timeline** | | | | | | | |
| **Interventions**  1. **6+1 Trait® Writing Model** | | | **Resources**  **Writer’s Workshop**  **Graphic Organizers**  **District ELA ISS**  **Teacher mentoring**  **Evan-Moor Daily Paragraph Editing**  **Evan-Moore 6+1 Writing Traits** | | | **POC**  **Literacy Skills Goal**  **Committee** | |

**Part II**

**Amelia Earhart Intermediate School**

**Results-Based Staff Development Plan Intervention**

**6+1 writing traits**

# Staff Development Outcome Teacher Indicators Student Outcome

(What do teachers need to know and (What teacher accountability evidence will we accept (What do we want students

be able to do?) to verify staff development was effective.) to know, learn, demonstrate?)

Teachers will teach the traits of the 6+1 writing model.

Teachers will instruct students to use proper writing conventions.

Teachers will assist students in clarifying their thinking in writing through improved vocabulary/word choice.

Teacher will present samples once a month at grade level meetings.

Teachers will create whole group and small group situations for

student discussions and hands-on UPSL usage.

Students will prove their reading comprehension through vocabulary, proficiency in conventions of writing, and clarify or explain their thinking through writing

Teachers need to be able to introduce new vocabulary for students to increase their word choice in writing and reading comprehension. Teachers also need to be able to teach proper conventions of writing and help students explain their thinking.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***Effective Staff***  ***Development Steps*** | ***Implementation***  ***Activities*** | ***Person/Group***  ***Responsible*** | ***Documented Evidence***  ***of Each Step*** | ***Resources***  ***Needed*** | ***Timeline***  ***Date/Time*** |
| **Knowledge**  *What you want people to walk away with* | How to use the 6+1 Trait® trait model across the curriculum in order to provide a better understanding  of writing | Teachers, Specialists, District  ELA ISS | Teachers will receive  written guidance and  a presentation of the  6+1 Trait® trait model at  school-wide training  sessions | Smartboard, Infocus,  computer,  written documentation,  student writing samples | .5 in-service  training session led  District ISS October  5, 2011. |
| **Model/Demonstrate**  *How this knowledge will be shown to the staff* | Facilitators will present 6+1 Trait® to staff using small discussion groups, student writing samples and experiences | Teachers, Specialists  District ELA ISS | Faculty-scored writing products, documented in-service training, pictures of classroom activities | Student writing  Products, camera | .5 in-service  training session led  District ISS October  5, 2011. |
| **Low Risk Practice**  **with Feedback**  *What will be in place for the teachers to try and how will they receive feedback* | Teachers will implement  the 6+1 Trait® writing  model through Writer’s  Workshop and classroom lessons. As well as  Evan Moor 6 + 1 Writing  Traits Resource and the  EMoor Daily Paragraph  Editing Resource | Literacy Skills Goal  Committee | Lesson Plans  Student writing samples  Classroom displays of  writing traits | Writing prompts  Teacher observations  Feedback for teachers/  students | Begins first  Semester and will  continuous weekly  throughout the  school year. |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **On-the-Job Practice**  **with Feedback**  *What programs will be in place: Teachers teaching teachers, Mentoring, Paired Learning, etc.* | Writer’s workshop within classrooms.  Collaborative meetings  with teachers. | Teacher Specialists  Literacy  Skills Goal  Committee | Student writing samples  Minutes of collaborative  Meetings. | Scheduled time for  Writer’s workshop  Scheduled time for  collaborative meetings | Begins first  Semester and will  continuous weekly  throughout the  school year. |
| **Follow-up for**  **Current Staff**  *Collaborative meetings* | Faculty meetings,  In-service training | Teachers, Specialists | Student writing samples  Minutes of collaborative  Meetings | Scheduled time for  faculty meetings/  collaborative meetings | Begins first  Semester and will  continuous weekly  throughout the  school year.  Monthly meetings |
| **Long-Term**  **Maintenance Plan**  **for New Staff**  *What is in place for long-term maintenance* | New staff members will be paired with a mentor teacher to observe and practice teaching  and using 6+1 Trait® writing traits in the classroom  setting | Teachers  Specialists  Mentor Teachers | Training in-service  Agendas | Documentation binder | Begins first  Semester and will  continuous weekly  throughout the  school year.  Monthly feedback  from mentors |

**PART III: MONITORING PLAN**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Date** | **CSI Goal** | **Intervention** | **Monitoring Plan** | **Point of Contact** |
| First Quarter –  29 Aug – 4 Nov | All students will increase their **Literacy Skills** across the curriculum | 6+1 Trait® Writing Traits | Teachers will meet quarterly at grade level meetings to look at student work (LASW). Each teacher will grade one student sample according to the trait rubric, specifically Ideas, Conventions, and Word Choice. Teachers will discuss the student work and record notes in the team notebook together with the graded student sample the third week of every other month. During each quarter, teachers will address one of the traits aligned with the essence of the goal (ideas, word choice, and conventions) along with a supporting 6+1 writing trait. In the fourth quarter, teachers will re-focus on the three traits aligned with the literacy skills goal.  Grade level meeting to LASW  Results will be shared at Sub-Committee  Meetings | Teachers  Specialists  LSS  First quarter 2011  CSI co-chairs  SILT  meeting October 25, 2011 |
| Second Quarter –  7 Nov – 26 Jan | All students will increase their **Literacy Skills** across the curriculum | 6+1 Trait® Writing Traits | Teachers continue to LASW during quarterly grade level meetings. Each teacher will grade one student sample according to the trait rubric.  Grade level meeting to LASW  Results will be shared at Sub-Committee  Meetings | Second quarter 2011  CSI co-chairs  SILT meeting  Nov. 22, 2011 and January 17, 2012. |
| Third Quarter –  30 Jan – 5 Apr | All students will increase their **Literacy Skills** across the curriculum | 6+1 Trait® Writing Traits | Grade level meeting to LASW  Results will be shared at Sub-Committee  Meetings | Third quarter 2012  SILT  meeting March 20, 2012 and April 17, 2012 |
| Fourth Quarter –  16 Apr – 14 Jun | All students will increase their **Literacy Skills** across the curriculum | 6+1 Trait® Writing Traits | Grade level meeting to LASW  CSI local writing assessments prepared for distribution  CSI local writing assessments administered  CSI local writing assessments scored, entered into excel spreadsheet  All CSI end of year data collected and reported via Excel spreadsheet. Action Plan updated.  Data Shared with Faculty and parents | Fourth quarter 2012  Literacy Skills Goal  Committee - April 2012  Classroom Teachers  Last week of April 2012  Literacy Skills Goal  Committee – May CSI  In-service - 2012  CSI co-chairs  May -2012  Principal – June - 2012 |

**PART IV: STATUS REPORT**

**Goal Statement**: All students will increase their Literacy Skills across the curriculum.

## DATA ANALYSIS PROCEDURES

Baseline data and data collected at the end of each year of the school improvement cycle were disaggregated by grade level (and targeted subgroup) and were analyzed. Using NCA Data Analysis software, data were converted to standard scores (z-scores) and analyzed. The *TerraNova* Multiple Assessments (TNMA) 3rd Edition was administered for the first time during the 2008-2009 school year. Although the following charts reflect the DoDEA standards for the TNMA, the two additions are not compared between each other. Z Scores are also not computed between editions. 2008–2009 school year will reflect baseline data. For local assessment data for 3rd grade is considered baseline for 2008-2009. Local assessments include the Scholastic Reading Inventory, and the local Literacy Skills Assessment.

1. A standard score difference of .3 or greater is a substantial improvement and a difference of -.3 or greater is a substantial decline in student performance.
2. A standard score difference of .2 to .3 is quite good and a negative difference of -.2 to -.3 is a quite bad.
3. A standard score difference of .1 to .2 is enough to mention and a difference of -.1 to -.2 is enough to mention.
4. A standard score difference of -.1 to .1 is not enough to mention.

***DATA DISPLAY: TerraNova Multiple Assessments 3rd Edition Reading sub-test. (Grades3-5)***

**Indicator of Success**: There is a meaningful increase in the percentage of students performing in the Top Two National Quarters on the *TerraNova* 3rd Edition, Reading subtests.

**Top Two National Quarters**

**Findings: (z-score analysis)**

1. The difference in performance at the 3rd grade is not enough to mention.

(z score = -.03)

2. The difference in performance at the 4th grade is substantially better than the performance of the baseline year.

(z score = .38)

3. The difference in performance at the 5th grade is not enough to mention.

(z score = .0)

**Bottom National Quarters**

**Indicator of Success**: There is a meaningful decrease in the percentage of students performing in the Bottom National Quarter on the *TerraNova* 3rd Edition, Reading subtests.

**Findings: (z-score analysis)**

1. The difference in performance at the 3rd grade is worse by enough to mention when comparing the results of the baseline year (2009).

(z score = -.10)

2. The difference in performance at the 4th grade is worse by enough to mention.

(z score = -.10)

3. The difference in performance at the 5th grade is worse by enough to mention.

(z score = -.10)

***DATA DISPLAY: TerraNova Multiple Assessments 3rd Edition***

***Language Arts sub-test. (Grades3-5)***

**Indicator of Success**: There is a meaningful increase in the percentage of students performing in the Top Two National Quarters on the *TerraNova* 3rd Edition, Reading subtests.

**Findings: (z-score analysis)**

1. The difference in performance at the 3rd grade is better by enough to mention.

(z score = .19)

2. The difference in 4th grade performance is not enough to mention when comparing the results from the current year (2012) to the baseline year (2009)

(z score = .08)

3. The difference in performance at the 5th grade is not enough to mention.

(z score= -.02)

**Bottom National Quarter**

**Indicator of Success**: There is a meaningful decrease in the percentage of students performing in the Bottom National Quarter on the *TerraNova* 3rd Edition, Language Arts subtest.

**Findings: (z-score analysis)**

1. The difference in performance in the percentage of 3rd grade students who scored in the bottom national quarter between 2009 and 2012 is better by enough to mention. (z score = .18)

2. The difference in 4th grade performance is not enough to mention when comparing the results from the current year (2012) to the baseline year (2009).

(z score = 0)

3. The difference in 5th grade performance is not enough to mention when comparing the results from the current year (2011) to the baseline year (2009).

(z score = -.05)

## DISPLAY: Scholastic Reading Inventory (3rd – 5th)

**Indicator of Success**: There is a meaningful increase in the percentage of students scoring at the standard or higher as measured by the Scholastic Reading Inventory (SRI).

**Findings: (z-score analysis)**

1. The difference in performance of 3rd grade students is not enough to mention when comparing the results of the baseline year. (2009)

(z - score = .03)

2. The difference in performance of 4th grade students is better by enough to mention when comparing the results of the baseline year. (2008)

(z - score = .14)

3. The difference in performance at the 5th grade is substantially better than the performance of the baseline year (2008).

(z - score = .34)

## DATA DISPLAY: AEIS Local Writing Assessments (3rd - 5th)

**Indicator of Success**: There is a meaningful increase in the percentage of students scoring at the standard or higher on the AEIS Local Writing Assessment.

**Findings: (z-score analysis)**

**Word Choice Skill Area**

1. The difference in performance at the 3rd grade in 2012 is much better than enough to mention when compared to the performance of the baseline year (2009). (z = .23)

2. The difference in performance at the 4th grade in 2012 is substantially better than the performance of the baseline year (2008). (z = 1.0)

3. The difference in performance at the 5th grade in 2012 is substantially better than the performance of the comparison group or standard (2008). (z= 1.20)

**Conventions Skill Area**

4. The difference in performance at the 3rd grade is better by enough to mention than the performance of the comparison group or standard. (z = .14)

5. The performance of 4th grade is substantially better than the performance of the comparison group or standard. (z = 1.27)

6. The difference in performance at the 5th grade is substantially better than the performance of the comparison group or standard. (z = 1.02)

**Ideas Skill Area**

7. The performance of 3rd grade is substantially better by enough to mention than the performance of the comparison group or standard. (z = .66)

8. The performance of 4th grade is substantially better than the performance of the comparison group or standard. (z = 1.51)

9. The performance of 5th grade is substantially better than the performance of the comparison group or standard. (z= 1.61)

## DATA DISPLAY: Scholastic Reading Inventory Targeted Subgroup Students

**Indicator of Success**: There is a meaningful increase in the percentage of targeted subgroup students scoring at the standard or higher as measured by the Scholastic Reading Inventory (SRI).

**Findings: (z-score analysis)**

1. The difference in performance for the targeted subgroup is substantially better than the performance of the comparison group or standard. (z= 1.36)

## DATA DISPLAY: AEIS Local Writing Assessments Targeted Subgroup Students

**Indicator of Success**: There is a substantial increase in the percentage of targeted subgroup students scoring at the standard or higher as measured by the AEIS Local Writing Assessment.

**Findings: (z-score analysis)**

**Word Choice Skill Area**

1. The difference in performance for the targeted subgroup is substantially better than the performance of the comparison group or standard. (z score = 2.42)

**Conventions Skill Area**

2. The difference in performance for the targeted subgroup is substantially better than the performance of the comparison group or standard. (z score = 2.42)

**Ideas Skill Area**

3. The difference in performance for the targeted subgroup is substantially better than the performance of the comparison group or standard. (z score = 2.42)

**ANALYSIS**

**Summary of student performance (z-score differences) for Assessment One (*TerraNova Multiple Assessments 3rd Edition Reading sub-test. (Grades3-5*):**

**Top Two National Quarters:**

The *TerraNova* Multiple Assessments (TNMA) 3rd Edition was administered for the fourth time during the 2011-2012 school year. The DoDEA expectation is that 75% of all students score in the top two national quarters. The reading subtest data shows that difference in performance between current year and baseline year for 3rd and 5th grade was not enough to mention (z-scores of -.03 and 0.0 respectively.) However, 4th grade scores are substantially better than the baseline year (.38).

**Bottom National Quarter:**

The *TerraNova* Multiple Assessments (TNMA) 3rd Edition was administered for the fourth time during the 2011-2012 school year. The DoDEA standard for students at each grade level in the bottom national quarter is fewer than 8%. There was no meaningful increase for 3rd through 5th grade students scoring in the bottom national quarter to mention (z- scores of -.10 across the board)

**Summary of student performance (z-score differences) for Assessment Two (*TerraNova Multiple Assessments 3rd Edition Language Arts sub-tests.***

***(Grades3-5*):**

**Top Two National Quarters:**

The *TerraNova* Multiple Assessments (TNMA) 3rd Edition was administered for the fourth time during the 2011-2012 school year. The DoDEA expectation is that 75% of all students score in the top two national quarters. The Language Arts subtest data shows that the difference in performance between current year and baseline year for 3rd and 4th grade students is meaningful enough to mention (z-scores of .19 and .08, respectively). Whereas, 5th grade performance on the Language Arts subtest revealed a decline but not enough to mention (z-score = .02).

**Bottom National Quarter:**

The *TerraNova* Multiple Assessments (TNMA) 3rd Edition was administered for the fourth time during the 2011-2012 school year. The DoDEA standard for students at each grade level in the bottom national quarter is fewer than 8%. According to the overall data yielded from the Language Arts subtest, there is a meaningful difference in the percentage of 3rd graders performing in the bottom national quarter (z-scores of .18) and change that is not enough to mention for both 4th and 5th grade (0.0 and -.05 respectively).

**Summary of student performance (z-score differences) for Assessment Three (Scholastic Reading Inventory (3rd – 5th):**

**Indicator of Success**: There is a meaningful increase in the percentage of students scoring at the standard or higher as measured by the Scholastic Reading Inventory (SRI).

According to the overall data yielded from the SRI, there was no meaningful difference in the percentage of 3rd grade students scoring at or above the standard (z-score of .03). The 4th grade students scoring at or above the standard, is better by enough to mention (z-scores of .14). Finally, the 5th grade students scoring at or above the standard, is significantly greater than the baseline year (2008) (z-score of .34)

**Summary of student performance (z-score differences) for Assessment Four: (AEIS Local Writing Assessments 3rd-5th**)

**Indicator of Success**: There is a meaningful increase in the percentage of students scoring at the standard or higher on the AEIS Local Writing Assessment.

**Findings: (z-score analysis)**

**Word Choice Skill Area**

The difference in performance at the 3rd grade is much better by enough to mention when compared to the performance of the baseline year (2009), (z score of .23) while the performance of 4th and 5th grade students in 2012 is substantially better than the performance of the baseline year (2008) (z scores of 1.0, and 1.20 respectively).

**Conventions Skill Area**

The difference in performance at the 3rd grade is better than the performance of students during the baseline year (2009), (z-score = .14). The performance of 4th grade and 5th grade students in 2012 is substantially better than the performance of students during the baseline year (2008), (z-scores of 1.27 and 1.02 respectively).

**Ideas Skill Area**

The performance of 3rd grade is better than the performance of the baseline year (2009), (z-score = .66) while the performance of 4th and 5th grade students is substantially better than the performance of the baseline year (2008) (z scores of = 1.51 and 1.61 respectively).

**Summary of student performance (z-score differences) for Assessment Five: (Scholastic Reading Inventory –Targeted Subgroup Students)**

**Indicator of Success**: There is a meaningful increase in the percentage of targeted subgroup students scoring at the standard or higher as measured by the Scholastic Reading Inventory.

There was a significantly higher performance in the targeted subgroup on the Scholastic Reading Inventory when compared to the baseline year (2008) by enough to mention (z-score = 1.36).

**Summary of student performance (z-score differences) for Assessment Six: (Local Writing Assessment –Targeted Subgroup Students)**

**Indicator of Success**: There is a significantly meaningful increase in the percentage of targeted subgroup students scoring at the standard or higher as measured by the local writing assessment

The difference in 2012 performance for the targeted subgroup in all three scored areas of local writing assessment was substantially better than the performance of the baseline year (2008) by enough to mention (z scores of 2.42 across the board).

**Impact of each intervention on student performance:**

The *TerraNova* 3rd edition was initially administered during the 2008-2009 school year and is used as a baseline comparison for the 2011-2012 results. A review of the results of the TerraNova and other system-wide and local results revealed significant increases after four years of the 6+1 writing traits intervention for 4th and 5th grade students and three years for 3rd grade students. After a dip in results for the 2010-2011 school year, our faculty reviewed and discussed the fidelity of implementation of our 6+1 Traits of Writing intervention. The previous two years had shown a marked improvement in the students’ writing performance, but a marked decline during 2011 year, although it was still better than baseline performance.

We can attribute our gains to several factors that occurred during SY 2011-2012.

* In-depth staff training from district personnel
* Peer review of classrooms allowing teachers to share ideas and see how the

interventions were being taught across grade levels

* Digital access of intervention posters and curricular resources
* Staff training on scoring writing samples with the 6+1 scoring rubric
* Consistent use of the intervention in all areas

School wide commitment has had a positive impact on student performance.

**Action Needed: (How will the School Improvement Plan be modified in light of these assessment results? Which intervention(s) will continue? Why**

After reviewing the scores for our Literacy goal at a faculty meeting (June 2012), the staff decided that our school has not just met, but exceeded, the Literacy goal. During the 2012-2013 school year, the AEIS faculty will triangulate and analyze data. Based on this analysis a new goal and intervention will be established.

**PART V: DOCUMENTATION REPORT**

**(A documentation report will be developed when you have baseline data and at least two consecutive years of meaningful increases in student performance on this goal, and the school has made the decision that they have met this goal.) To facilitate the completion of this report, please complete the first 2 items of the executive summary.**

**Selection of Goals:**

The two student performance goals (Literacy Skills across the curriculum/Problem Solving across the curriculum) were selected by the AEIS faculty after a combined effort of parents, military liaisons, faculty and student council members compiling data for the School Profile. Two data carousel meetings which included parents, military liaisons and student council members on 5 and 19 December 2007 revealed opportunities for student performance goals in the areas of Reading Comprehension, Writing Skills, Math Problem Solving, and Science. We considered our student needs based on the data reflected in the profile. With suggestions offered by the faculty, each goal possibility was discussed and the supporting data reviewed. Because we had more than two goal possibilities for the new cycle, we triangulated each separately looking for the highest number of occurrences a need appeared in the profile. With two goal proposals emerging from this process, we presented our findings to the faculty on January 23, 2008 and received unanimous approval and collectively defined the essence for each goal.

**Selection of Interventions:**

The 6+1 Trait® writing trait Intervention for the Literacy Skills goal was chosen by a committee of faculty and staff members. The Literacy Skills committee used a process of examining research-based strategies to choose an intervention that could target each essence of the goal. The committee reached consensus for this intervention on March 19th, 2008, and was presented to the faculty on May 2 and 7, 2008 and agreed upon.

Staff development for the 6+1 Writing Traits was implemented during school year 2008, 2009, and then revisited during school year 2011-12. The decline in student scores and turnover of faculty at AEIS proved that additional staff development was needed during 2011-12. There is evidence of increased usage of the 6+1 Writing Traits within the classroom and consistent monitoring of the interventions.

**ADDENDUM 1: DoDEA CURRICULAR STANDARDS RELATED TO THE GOAL**

**Goal 1**-- Allstudents will increase their Literacy Skills across the curriculum.

**Essence**:

• Reading comprehension through vocabulary

• Proficiency in conventions of writing

• Clarify or explain thinking through writing

***Third Grade***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **E1 English/ Language Arts** | The ultimate goal of reading is understanding the meaning of written language. But getting the meaning is a complex task that doesn’t just happen by reading individual words. Readers also must use a variety of skills and strategies, drawing on what they know about words and their concepts, to build a sense of what the author means to say. |
| **E2 English/ Language Arts** | Third graders meeting standards have a well-defined sense of themselves as writers. They know their strengths as poets, as fiction writers, as memoir writers, as experts about various nonfiction forms. They can talk knowledgeably about their writing and about the strategies of their favorite published writers. Once these third-graders plan what to write about, often drawing inspiration from notebooks, they can choose from several genres a form that will allow them to develop effectively what they have to say. |
| **M5 Mathematics** | M5a: develop and implement a plan to collect and organize data to address a given question;  M5b: translate information from one data representation to another, i.e., graph to table;  M5c: support a conclusion or a prediction with evidence from data;  **M5d:** organize and graphically display data using a variety of categories and intervals;  M5e: describe the characteristics of graphically represented data, i.e., identify the mode;  M5f: examine graphs and tables that display the same set of data to identify what each representation contributes to the interpretation of data and conclusions drawn;  M5g: select a question for study, predict possible outcomes, conduct simple experiments, and compare results to predictions. |
| **S1 Scientific Inquiry** | The student demonstrates abilities necessary to do scientific inquiry and an  understanding about scientific inquiry; that is, the student:   * S1a: asks questions about objects, organisms, events, and relationships in the environment. |
| **SK1e Social Studies Skills** | The Social Studies program promotes essential skills to increase the students ability to acquire information and manipulate data, develop and present policies and debates, construct new knowledge, and participate in groups. Each skill is dependent upon and enriched by all other skills, so that the learner can:   * use title page, table of contents, and glossary to locate information |
| **HESK Health Literacy Skills** | The student applies health literacy skills in concert with health concepts to enhance personal, family and community health; that is, the student will:  HESK1: access valid health information |

***Fourth Grade***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **E1 Reading** | The student reads at least twenty-five books or book equivalents each year. The quality and complexity of materials to be read is based on the lexile level of grade four (600L-900L). The materials should include traditional and contemporary literature (both fiction and non-fiction) as well as magazines, newspapers, textbooks, and on-line material. Such reading should represent a diverse collection of material from at least three different literary forms and from at least five different writers. |
| **E2 Writing** | The student produces a report that:   * engages the reader by establishing a context, creating a persona, and otherwise developing reader interest; * develops a controlling idea that conveys a perspective on the subject; * creates an organizing structure appropriate to a speCSIic purpose, audience and context; * includes appropriate facts and details; * excludes extraneous and inappropriate information; * uses a range of appropriate strategies, such as providing facts and details, describing or analyzing the subject, and narrating a relevant anecdote; and * provides a sense of closure to the writing. |
| M2 Algebra | Pre-Kindergarten through Grade 12 instructional programs should enable all students to:  understand patterns, relations, and functions; represent and analyze mathematical situations and structures using algebraic symbols; use mathematical models to represent and understand quantitative relationships; analyze change in various contexts.  In Grade 4, all students should:  M2a: use models and words to describe, extend, and generalize patterns and relationships;  M2b: represent and analyze patterns and functions using words, tables, and graphs;  M2c: describe mathematical relationships using expressions, equations or inequalities;  M2d: apply order of operations and the commutative and associative properties to algebraic expressions, equations, and inequalities;  M2e: use and interpret variables, mathematical symbols, and properties to write and simplify mathematical expressions and sentences;  M2f: develop and solve equations or inequalities using variables that represent problem situations;  M2g: identify and describe patterns of change to make predictions that identify the relationship represented in a table or graph. |
| **S1 Scientific Inquiry** | The student demonstrates abilities necessary to do scientific inquiry and an  understanding about scientific inquiry; that is, the student:  S1b: accesses, evaluates and uses information from a variety of sources. |
| SK1a Social Studies Skills | SK1a: locate and analyze information from a variety of sources (books, newspapers, periodicals, and computer resources.) |
| **HESK Health Literacy Skills** | The student applies health literacy skills in concert with health concepts to enhance personal, family and community health; that is, the student will:  HESK2: analyze influences on health |

***Fifth Grade***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| E1b Reading | The student reads and comprehends at least four books (or book equivalents) about one issue or subject, or four books by a single writer, or four books in one genre, and produces evidence of reading that:  E1b.1: makes and supports warranted and responsible assertions about the texts;  E1b.2: supports assertions with elaborated and convincing evidence;  E1b.3: draws the text together to compare and contrast themes, characters, and ideas;  E1b.4: makes perceptive and well developed connections; and  E1b.5: evaluates writing strategies and elements of the author’s craft. |
| E2b Writing | The student produces a response to literature that:  E2b.1: engages the reader by establishing a context, creating a persona, and otherwise developing reader interest;  E2b.2: advances a judgment that is interpretive, analytic, evaluative, or reflective;  E2b.3: supports judgment through references to the text, references to other works, authors, or non-print media, or references to personal knowledge;  E2b.4: demonstrates an understanding of the literary work;  E2b.5: provides a sense of closure to the writing.  E2b.6: anticipates and answers a reader’s questions;  Examples of responses to literature include:  A literary response paper.  A book review.  A parody.  A literary analysis paper.  A comparison of a children’s literary classic with a televised version of the same work.  A brochure.  A journal  A newspaper or magazine article. |
| M7 Reasoning  and Proof | M7a: Instructional programs from Pre-Kindergarten through Grade 12 should enable all students to:   * recognize reasoning and proof as fundamental aspects of mathematics; * make and investigate mathematical conjectures; * develop and evaluate mathematical arguments and proofs; * select and use various types of reasoning and methods of proof. |
| **S1 Scientific Inquiry** | The student demonstrates abilities necessary to do scientific inquiry and an  understanding about scientific inquiry; that is, the student:  S1d: employs appropriate tools and techniques to systematically collect, record, analyze, interpret, and present data.  S1e: uses evidence from reliable sources to develop logical descriptions, predictions, explanations, and models. |
| SS4 Social Studies Space and Place | Social studies program SS4b: use maps, globes, charts, graphs, technology, geographic tools, maps, and symbols to gather and interpret data and to draw conclusions about American regions |
| **HESK Health Literacy Skills** | The student applies health literacy skills in concert with health concepts to enhance personal, family and community health; that is, the student will:  HESK3: analyze influences on health;  HESK4: use interpersonal communications skills to enhance health |

**ADDENDUM 2: Research Related to the Interventions Selected**

**Identify the research base for each of the interventions you selected for the goal area. Provide a summary of the study done and its outcome on students.**

**Intervention: 6+1 Trait® Writing Traits**

**Supporting Research:**

The intervention of 6+1 Trait® Writing model, is an approach to teaching and assessing student writing, consisting of a set of strategies to facilitate the integration of assessment and instruction. These strategies are supported by classroom materials and professional development designed to build teacher understanding of these strategies and teacher knowledge of the characteristics of quality writing, and to improve teachers’ skills in implementing these strategies to help students write more effectively. (Kozlow, Bellamy, 2005)

Kozlow M., Bellamy, P. (2005) Experimental Study on the Impact of the 6+Trait®Writing Model on Student Achievement in Writing. Retrieved 20, April 2008 from http://www.nwrel.org/ascd05/traits.pdf