

**LETFORD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL UIP
2016-17**

District: **JOHNSTOWN-MILLIKEN RE-5J** | Org ID: **3110** | School ID: **5078** |
Framework: **Priority Improvement Plan** | **Draft UIP**

Colorado's Unified Improvement Plan for School (2016-2017)

Table of Contents

Executive Summary
Improvement Plan Information
Narrative on Data Analysis and Root Cause Identification
Action Plans
Addenda

Executive Summary

How are students performing? Where will the school focus attention?

Priority Performance Challenges: Specific statements about the school's performance challenges (not budgeting, staffing curriculum, instruction, etc.), with at least one priority identified for each performance indicator (Achievement, Growth, PWR), where the School did not meet federal, state and/or local expectations.

Name: All Letford Students are on a decline in the area of Math Achievement.

Description: Our MSS went from a 732.3 to a 730.2 on the TCAP to CMAS PARCC Comparison to the 2016 SPF.

Name: All Letford Students are on a decline in Academic Growth in Math.

Description: We went from a MGP of 46 to a MGP of 31 in our 2016 SPF.

Name: All Letford Students are on a decline in the area of ELA Academic Growth.

Description: We went from a 51 Percentile Rank to a 31 Percentile Rank in ELA.

Name: Our Students with Disabilities showed a decrease in the area of ELA.

Description: We went from a MSS of 705.6 in 2015 to 699.3 in our 2016 SPF.

Why is the education system continuing to have these challenges?

Root Causes: Statements describing the deepest underlying cause, or causes, or performance challenges, that, if dissolved, would result in elimination, or substantial reduction of the performance challenge(s).

Name: Embracing and utilizing the New Go Math Program to a maximum.

Description: Embracing this Common Core Curriculum, using it to the maximum, the technology training piece and more training.

Name: Embracing and utilizing New Go Math Program to a maximum

Description: Embracing this Common Core Curriculum, using it to the maximum, the technology training piece and more training.

Name: Adopting and adjusting our Literacy Curriculum.

Description: Adoption, usage and embrace the Lucy Calkins Writing, Use the Literacy 5 and Literacy Cafe program. Add where and when needed. Vocabulary!

Name: Adopting and adjusting our Intervention Literacy so it is aligned.

Description: With the adoption of a new Literacy Program, we can then purchase a tiered program for the Special Education students.

Major Improvement Strategies

Major Improvement Strategies: Identify the major improvement strategy(s) that will address the root causes determined in the data narrative.

Name: Embracing and utilizing the New Go Math Program to a maximum.

Description: Teacher observations of usage of Go Math Program, Test Data that shows implementation of Go Math, sharing during our Inservice days what we like about the tech piece of Go Math, Improvement of SPF in Math Achievement and Academic Growth for all students.

Name: Updating our Reading series and utilizing Lucy Caukins to the maximizing

Description: Teacher observations of conferences with children of Lucy Writing, samples of Lucy Writing, Inservice times used for scoring consistency of Lucy writing, Lucy tests, interjecting more vocabulary into the Treasures series, using the Literacy Cafe model along with the 5 program. DIBELS Benchmarking. and improvement in our 2017 SPF in ELA Achievement and Growth Rates.

Name: Adopting and adjusting our Intervention Literacy for our IEP.

Description: The adoption of an Intervention program to help our IEP and ELL Students. Usage of strategies learned through triage, Inservice and other workshops. Usage of the workshop approach to allow for Intervention to happen within the classrooms.

Name: Embracing and utilizing the Go Math Program to the maximum.

Description: Improved test scores, children understanding and following the spiral flow, Gaps will decrease.

Access the School Performance Framework here: <http://www.cde.state.co.us/schoolview/performance>

Improvement Plan Information

Additional Information about the school

Comprehensive Review and Selected Grant History

Related Grant Awards

Has the school received a grant that supports school improvement efforts? When was the grant awarded?

No

School Support Team or Expedited Review

Has (or will) the school participated in an SST or Expedited Review? If so, when?

No

External Evaluator

Has the school partnered with an external evaluator to provide comprehensive evaluation? Indicate the year and the name of the provider/tool used.

No

Improvement Plan Information

The school/district is submitting this improvement plan to satisfy requirements for (check all that apply):

- State Accreditation
- Title I Focus School
- Tiered Intervention Grant (TIG)
- Colorado Graduation Pathways Program (CGP)

School Improvement Support Grant

Other

School Contact Information

Kerry Boren

Principal

Phone: (970) 587-6153

Email: kboren@weldre5j.k12.co.us

Narrative on Data Analysis and Root Cause Identification

Description of school Setting and Process for Data Analysis

Provide a brief description of the school to set the context for readers. Include the general process for developing the UIP and participants (e.g., SAC involvement). The description may include demographics and local context, such as location, performance status, notable recent events or changes, stakeholders involved in writing the UIP, and an overview of the general process.

Letford Elementary School is in the smaller rural area of Johnstown, Colorado. Letford Elementary School houses Grades Pre K to Grade 5. We have 473 students total this year (2016-2017). According to the Dashboard at the CDE website:

Our overall population has increased during the years. In 2010 our population was 404 students. In 2011 our population was 459 students. In 2012 we were at 551 students. In 2013 we had 524 students and in 2014 we had 539 students.

When considering our Ethnicity Breakdown, the Hispanic population has decreased our white population has increased. In 2010 our Hispanic or other was at 31.9%, our White was at 66.1%. In 2011 our Hispanic and other was at 31.2% and White was at 65.6%. In 2012 our Hispanic and other was at 31.4% and the White was at 64.6%. In 2013 our Hispanic and other was at 29.8% and our White was at 66.6%. In 2014 our Hispanic and Other was at 28.8% and our White was at 67.9%.

Our enrollment by subgroups includes the following:

Our ELL have decreased over time. In 2010 we had 16% ELL and then in 2011 we had 13% ELL Learners. In 2012 we had 13% ELL Learners, In 2013 we had 9% ELL Learners and in 2014 we had 9% ELL Learners.

Our FRE has decreased. over time. In 2010 we had 33% on Free and Reduced lunch, in 2011 we had 41%, In 2012 we had 32% and in 2013 we had 26% Free and Reduced lunch. In 2014 we had 25% on Free and Reduced lunch.

Our GT identified population has decreased over time. In 2010 we had 4% GT Identified, in 2011 we had 3%, in 2013 we had 1%, in 2013 we had 2% and in 2014 we had 1% GT Identified students.

Our IEP population has increased. In 2010 we had 12% of our students identified as Special Education. In 2011 we had 14%, in 2012 we had 14% and in 2013 we had 12% where in 2014 we had 14% of our students identified as students in need of an IEP.

Our overall attendance rate decreased back in 2012 but has now increased. Our Attendance in 2010 was 95.6%, our Attendance in 2011 was 96.5%, in 2012 94.8%, in 2013 it was 95.8% and in 2014 it was 96.5%.

Letford's mobility rate is well below the state average of 14%. In 2010 our Mobility rate was 28.9%, in 2011 it was 32.8%, in 2012 it was 20.8%, in 2013 our Mobility rate was 10.9% and in 2014 Letford is at 9%.

The Leadership Team consisting of Grade level teachers, Interventionist and the Specialist Teachers (Music, Art, PE and Media) review and provide input for this Unified Plan. The PTO/SAC team also provided input for the UIP. In addition to that, I had the Assistant Superintendent review and provide input for this plan too.

Prior Year Targets

Consider the previous year's progress toward the school targets. Identify the overall magnitude of the school performance challenges.

Performance Indicator: Academic Achievement (Status)

Prior Year Target: *To Maintain or exceed 77% on track on the PARRC ELA for Grades 3-5.*

Performance: *We improved on the PARRC assessment in Grade 3 (ELA) (we went from a 36 to a 51% on track) and Grade 5 ELA (28-35% on track on the PARCC).) . We did not improve, however, on Grade 4 ELA where we went from a 51% to a 35% of students being on track with the PARCC. We declined in Grade 4.*

Prior Year Target: *To Maintain or exceed 72% on track on the PARRC Math for Grades 3-5.*

Performance: *We improved on the PARRC in Grade 3 Math from a 27% of students on track to a 35% students on track. We improved in 5th Grade Math on the PARRC from a 23% of our students on track to a 24% of our students on track. We did not improve, however, on the 4th Grade Math where we went from an 18% of students on track to 11% of students on the PARCC Math. Here we declined.*

Prior Year Target: *To Maintain or exceed 53% (Percentile rank) for all students on the 5th Grade CMAS Science.*

Performance: *We did not meet this target. We were in the 50% (Percentile rank) for all students on the 5th Grade CMAS Science. Our Free and Reduced population was in the 37% and our Minority Students were at the 20% Rank.*

Academic Achievement (Status) Reflection

The 2016 SPF along with the PARCC on Track over Time shows Letford Elementary School:

Meeting in Academic Achievement in the area of ELA at a 54% for the 2016 School Year. .

We improved on the PARCC assessment in Grade 3 (ELA) (we went from a 36 to a 51% on track) and Grade 5 ELA (28-35% on track on the PARCC).) .

We did not improve, however, on Grade 4 ELA where we went from a 51% to a 35% of students being on track with the PARCC. We declined in Grade 4..

The 2016 SPF shows that when looking at 2016 Academic Achievement and our Student Groups in Achievement we show:

For students whom were previously identified for a Read Plan, we show they are in the 9th Percentile Rank.

For our ELL students we did not meet as we were in the 5th Percentile. To be at the state performance range we would need to score at least in the 53%. .

For our Free and Reduced Lunch Eligible population we are in the 35% Percentile Rank. We are in the Approaching Range. To be at the Performance Range we would need to be at 53% or above.

When looking at our Minority Students we are at the 33% Percentile Rank and we are approaching. To be at the Performance Range we would need to be at least 53% or above.

Our Students with Disabilities are in the does not Meet range as we are at 1% Percentile Rank. where we would need to have at least a 53% to be in the Performance Range.

The 2016 SPF shows In the area of Math on Academic Achievement for all students we are in the approaching range. We have a 39% Percentile Rank. To meet Performance we would need a 53% or above. The PARCC On Track over Time Across Schools report shows:

Letford went from a 27% to 35% of students on track on the 2016 PARCC in Grade 3.

Grade 5 went from a 23% to 24% on track on the 2016 PARCC. .

Grade 4, however, declined from 18%to 11% of students on track on the 2016 PARCC.

When looking at 2016 Academic Achievement and our Student Groups in Achievement on the SPF we show:

For our ELL students, we did not meet as we are in the 5th Percentile Rank and to be in the Performance Range we would need to be at least at 53% on the PARCC.

In Free and Reduced Price Lunch Eligible we are at the 27th Percentile Rank and we are approaching; To be at the Performance Range we would need to be at least at 53% on the PARCC.

In our Minority Students we are at the approaching range with a 19% Percentile Rank. and to be at Performance we need at least a 53%.

With our Students with Disabilities we have a 1% so we did not meet here! Again to be at the Performance range we would need at least a 53%.

The 2016 SPF shows In the area of Science on Academic Achievement for all students we were in the Meets range at 50% Percentile Rank. We are very proud of that. However, when looking at our student groups we show:

In Free and Reduced Lunch we are in the 37% Percentile Rank so we are approaching. To meet Performance we would need at least a 53%.

In Minority Students we are in the 20% Percentile Rank so we are approaching. To meet Performance we would need at least a 53% .

When looking at the TCAP to CMAS PARCC comparison report in Reading and our 2016 SPF we see:

*All students improved in Reading. We went from a 734.4 MSS in 2015 to a 741.2 MSS in 2016., thus increasing.
Our Minority students went from a 725.2 MSS in 2015 to a 732.0 MSS in 2016 thus increasing. .
Our Free and Reduced Lunch Eligible report shows we went from a 724.4 MSS to 732.9 MSS. thus increasing.
Our Students with Disabilities shows we went from a 697.0 MSS to a 699.3 Mean Scale Score thus increasing.
When looking at the TCAP to CMAS PARCC comparison report in Writing to the 2016 SPF we see:
All students went from a 734.4 MSS to a 741.2 MSS, thus increasing in 2016.
Minority students went from a 725.2 MSS to a 732.0 MSS, thus increasing in 2016.
Free and Reduced Lunch Eligible went from a 724.4 MSS to a 732.9 MSS thus increasing in 2016.
Students with Disabilities went from a 697. 0 MSS to 699.3,MSS thus increasing in 2016.
When looking at the TCAP to CMAS PARCC comparison report in Math to the 2016 SPF we see:
All students decreased in Math going from a 732.3 Mean SS in 2015 to a 730.2 MSS in 2016.
Minority students in 2015 had a MSS of 721.4. in 2015 to a 721.2 MSS in 2016. We decreased in this area.
Free and Reduced Lunch Eligible went from 726.3 MSS in 2015 to a 725.2 MSS in 2016. We decreased in this area.
Our Students with Disabilities went from a 705.4 MSS in 2015 to a 701.9 MSS in 2016. We decreased in this area.*

Performance Indicator: Academic Growth

Prior Year Target: *Meet or exceed the state expected growth of 50% for all students in the 2016 ELA on PARCC for Grades 4-5.*

Performance: *When looking at Academic Growth in the 2016 ELA on PARCC, all students had an MGP of 31% for Grades 4-5. Our Grade 4 Academic Growth on the 2016 ELA was 33.0%. Our Grade 5 Academic Growth on the ELA was 27.5%. The state would like for us to have 50% MGP. We are below that in both Grade 4 and Grade 5 at Letford.*

Prior Year Target: *Meet or exceed the state expected growth of 50% for all students in 2016 Math on the PARCC for Grades 4-5.*

Performance: *We did not meet the state expected growth in Math. All students in Math showed a 25% MGP, less then the state 50% growth on the 2016 PARCC for all students. .*

Academic Growth Reflection

When looking at Academic Growth on the 2016 SPF, Letford did not meet in ELA for all students. We were at a 31% Percentile Rank for All Students, where to be at the State level we would need at 50% for all students.

When looking at our ELA School Growth Report, we see:

*Grade 4 ELA at Letford is at a 33% MGP for all students. The state would like 50% MGP.
Grade 5 ELA at Letford is at 27.5 % MGP for all students. The state would like 50% MGP.*

When looking at subgroups we show (on the 2016 School Growth Report):

Our Non English Learners were at the 32.0% MGP and the state wants 50.0%MGP.

Our Free and Reduced Lunch Eligible kids were at the 24.5% MGP and the state wants 50% MGP.

Our Gender groups of female is 33.0%MGP in ELA on the PARCC where the state wants a 54% MGP.

Our Gender group of male is 29.0 and the state wants a 46% MGP.

Our Non Gifted and Talented show a 31.5% MGP and the state wants 49.0%MGP.

Our Non Migrant showed 30.5%MGP and the state wants 50% MGP.

Performance Level: We had 25.0% at or above Benchmark. The state wants 50% MGP. We had 34.5%MGP below benchmark.

Letford Hispanic students MGP was at a 30.0 and the state was at 47.0%MGP.

Letford White Students were at 30.5%MGP and the state was at 51.0%MGP.

When looking at Academic Growth on the 2016 SPF, Letford did not meet in Math for all students. We were at a 25.0% MGP and the state level would be at 50.0% MGP. When looking at our 2016Math School Growth Report we see:

Grade 4 Math at Letford is at 19.0%MGP and the state wants 50%MGP.

Grade 5 Math at Letford is at a 31.5% MGP and the state wants 50%MGP.

When looking at subgroups (on the 2016 School Growth Report):

Our Non English Learners were at 24.0%MGP and the state wants 51% MGP.

Our Free and Reduced Lunch Eligible kids were at a 28.5% MGP and the state was at 51%MGP.

Our females were at 29.0 and the state MGP was 51.0%.

Our males were at 25.0 and our state was at a 49.0%MGP.

Our Non Gifted and Talented were at 24.5%MGP and the state was at a 51.%MGP.

Our Minority students were at 23.0%MGP and the state was at 47.0%MGP.

19.0%MGP were at or above Benchmark where the state was at 50%MGP.

Hispanic students were at 32.0 MGP and the state was at 46%MGP.

White students were at 23.0 MGP and the state was at 52%MGP.

Prior Year Target: To maintain or exceed our 53% MGP for ELL and IEP students in ELA.

Performance: Current SPF shows we are below n to identify growth rates for the two gaps, however, we show for all students (again) 31% for ELA Growth and 25% for Math Growth. This is well below the state's expectations.

Disaggregated Achievement Reflection

- While it is difficult to determine how far below we rated on Growth Gaps, we would like to note prior trends. Progress monitoring of students in intervention programs along with gen ed programs is vital. Targeted intervention and planning needs to be solidified to assist with analysis.

Performance Indicator: Disaggregated Growth

Prior Year Target: To maintain or exceed our 53% MGP for ELL and IEP students in ELA.

Performance: Current SPF shows we are below n to identify growth rates for the two gaps, however, we show for all students (again) 31% for ELA Growth and 25 for Math Growth. This is well below the state's expectations.

Disaggregated Growth Reflection

This year we have no Academic Growth in the ELA for our ELL and our IEP children as the n is less than 20. Our Free and Reduced lunch show a 25% (well below our whole school 31% MGP) while our minority students were above the whole school MGP of 31%. When looking at our Math, the whole school was below the state target of 50% MGP. We were at 25% MGP. Our Free and Reduced and Minority students were at 28 and 29% MGP.

Performance Indicator: English Language Development and Attainment

English Language Development and Attainment Reflection

Letford's score on the ELP for 2015 was 40.0% MGP. This is in the Approaching area. We are still below the state MGP goal of 50%.

Performance Indicator: Other

Other Reflection

-

Performance Indicator: Postsecondary & Workforce Readiness

Postsecondary & Workforce Readiness Reflection

Performance Indicator: Student Behavior

Student Behavior Reflection

- *Through tracking referrals and my Discipline reports we see that referrals have decreased. We are utilizing our Positive Behavior Integrated Systems along with our Rubric. We also utilize the Time to Teach to support our PBIS. Lastly, the school discipline code helps.*

Performance Indicator: Student Engagement

Prior Year Target: *Our goal is to increase student engagement.*

Performance: *We feel like this is increasing through the use of Kagan techniques.*

Student Engagement Reflection

Current Performance

Provide a description of the trend analysis that includes at least three years of data (state and local data). Trend statements should be provided in the four performance indicator areas and by disaggregated groups. Trend statements should include the direction of the trend and a comparison (e.g. state expectations, state average) to indicate why the trend is notable.

Letford Elementary School is in the smaller rural area of Johnstown, Colorado. Letford Elementary School houses Grades PreK to Grade 5. According to the School Dashboard:

We have 473 students total this year (2016-2017). Our overall population has increased during the years. In 2010 our population was 404 students. In 2011 our population was 459 students. In 2012 we were at 551 students. In 2013 we had 524 students and in 2014 we had 539 students.

When considering our Ethnicity Breakdown, the Hispanic population has decreased our white population has increased. In 2010 our Hispanic or other was at 31.9%, our White was at 66.1%. In 2011 our Hispanic and other was at 31.2% and White was at 65.6%. In 2012 our Hispanic and other was at 31.4% and the White was at 64.6%. In 2013 our Hispanic and other was at 29.8% and our White was at 66.6%. In 2014 our Hispanic and Other was at 28.8% and our White was at 67.9%.

Our enrollment by subgroups includes the following:

Our ELL have decreased over time. In 2010 we had 16% ELL and then in 2011 we had 13% ELL Learners. In 2012 we had 13% ELL Learners, In 2013 we had 9% ELL Learners and in 2014 we had 9% ELL Learners.

Our FRE has decreased. over time. In 2010 we had 33% on Free and Reduced lunch, in 2011 we had 41%, In 2012 we had 32% and in 2013 we had 26% Free and Reduced lunch. In 2014 we had 25% on Free and Reduced lunch.

Our GT identified population has decreased over time. In 2010 we had 4% GT Identified, in 2011 we had 3%, in 2013 we had 1%, in 2013 we had 2% and in 2014 we had 1% GT Identified students.

Our IEP population has increased. In 2010 we had 12% of our students identified as Special Education. In 2011 we had 14%, in 2012 we had 14% and in 2013 we had 12% where in 2014 we had 14% of our students identified as students in need of an IEP.

Our overall attendance rate decreased back in 2012 but has now increased. Our Attendance in 2010 was 95.6%, our Attendance in 2011 was 96.5%, in 2012 94.8%, in 2013 it was 95.8% and in 2014 it was 96.5%.

Letford's mobility rate is well below the state average of 14%. In 2010 our Mobility rate was 28.9%, in 2011 it was 32.8%, in 2012 it was 20.8%, in 2013 our Mobility rate was 10.9% and in 2014 Letford is at 9%.

The Leadership Team consisting of Grade level teachers, Interventionist and the Specialist Teachers review and provide input for this Unified Plan. The PTO/SAC team also provided input for the UIP. In addition to that, I had the Assistant Superintendent review and provide input for this plan.

Upon review of the 2016 SPF and our data, we find several areas where we would like to improve.

Our SPF shows the following:

We are in the Approaching range in Academic Achievement. We had a 23.5/40.

We are in the Does Not Meet range in Academic Growth as we had a 17.5/60.

We met in the area of participation rates. We had 6 parent excuses for ELA and Math. We had 3 parent excuses for Science.

When looking at our data of the 2016 SPF we show the following in ELA Academic Achievement:

We met in ELA for All Students. We had a 741.2 Mean Scaled Score and here we improved. In 2015 we had 739.7 MSS. Here we increased.

Our ELL students did not meet and we had a 714.9 Mean Scaled Score. Last year we did not have this data as N less.

Our Free and Reduced Lunch Mean Scaled score was 732.9. Last year we were 733.8 MSS. Here we decreased.

Our Minority Students were at 732.0 Mean Score and last year we were at 729.3 MSS. Here we increased.

Our Students with Disabilities were at 699.3 MSS and last year we were at 705.6 MSS. Here we decreased.

When looking at our Grouping Data on the 2016 SPF on Math Academic Achievement:

We are approaching in the area of All students. We had a 730 Mean scaled score and last year we were at 732 MSS. Here we decreased.

We did not meet with our ELL students scoring a 711.4 Mean Scaled Score and last year we were at the N less (no data).

We are approaching in Free and Reduced at 725 Mean Scaled Score and last year we were at 726 Mean Scaled Score. Here we increased.

We are approaching in Minority students at 721.2 Mean Scaled Score and last year we were at 721.4 MSS. Here we decreased slightly.

We did not meet with our Students with Disabilities. We had a 701.9 Mean Scaled Score. Last year we had a 705.4 MSS. Here we decreased.

When looking at Science we met with all students. We are approaching with our Free and Reduced at 579.3 MSS and also with our Minority students. We had a 546.3 Mean.

When looking at the Academic Growth on the 2016 SPF we show in ELA:

We do not Meet the state expected MGP. We have a 31 MGP and the state expects 50.

In Free and Reduced lunch we show a 24.5 MGP and the state expects 50.

We show a 24.5 MGP in Minority students and the state expects 50. When looking at the 2016 SPF Academic Growth in Math:

We do not Meet the state expected MGP. We have a 25 MGP and the state wants 50. In Free and Reduced lunch we have a 28 MGP and the state expects 50. We had a 29 MGP in Minority students and the state wants 50.

When looking at our ELP we are approaching with a 40.0.

Upon review of the PARCC on Track over Time % of Students report we see:

Our Grade 3 ELA grew from 36% to a 51%. Our Grade 5 ELA grew from 28% to 35%. Our Grade 4 decreased from 51% to 28% of students on Track.

Our Grade 3 Math grew from 27% to 35% of students on track. Our Grade 5 Math increased from 23 % to 24% however our Grade 4 Math decreased from 18% of students on track to 11%.

When looking at 2016 Academic Achievement and our Student Groups in Achievement on the 2016 SPF we show:

The 2016 SPF along with the PARCC on Track over Time shows Letford Elementary School:

Meeting in Academic Achievement in the area of ELA at a 54% for the 2016 School Year. .

We improved on the PARCC assessment in Grade 3 (ELA) (we went from a 36 to a 51% on track) and Grade 5 ELA (28-35% on track on the PARCC).) .

We did not improve, however, on Grade 4 ELA where we went from a 51% to a 35% of students being on track with the PARCC. We declined in Grade 4..

The 2016 SPF shows that when looking at 2016 Academic Achievement and our Student Groups in Achievement we show:

For students whom were previously identified for a Read Plan, we show they are in the 9th Percentile Rank.

For our ELL students we did not meet as were were in the 5th Percentile. To be at the state performance range we would need to score at least in the 53%. .

For our Free and Reduced Lunch Eligible population we are in the 35% Percentile Rank. We are in the Approaching Range. To be at the Performance Range we would need to be at 53% or above.

When looking at our Minority Students we are at the 33% Percentile Rank and we are approaching. To be at the Performance Range we would need to be at least 53% or above.

Our Students with Disabilities are in the does not Meet range as we are at 1% Percentile Rank. where we would need to have at least a 53% to be in the Performance Range.

The 2016 SPF shows In the area of Math on Academic Achievement for all students we are in the approaching range. We have a 39% Percentile Rank. To meet Performance we would need a 53% or above. The PARCC On Track over Time Across Schools report shows:

Letford went from a 27% to 35% of students on track on the 2016 PARCC in Grade 3.

Grade 5 went from a 23% to 24% on track on the 2016 PARCC. .

Grade 4, however, declined from 18%to 11% of students on track on the 2016 PARCC. When looking at 2016 Academic Achievement and our Student Groups in Achievement on the SPF we show:

For our ELL students, we did not meet as we are in the 5th Percentile Rank and to be in the Performance Range we would need to be at least at 53% on the PARCC.

In Free and Reduced Price Lunch Eligible we are at the 27th Percentile Rank and we are approaching; To be at the Performance Range we would need to be at least at 53% on the PARCC.

In our Minority Students we are at the approaching range with a 19% Percentile Rank. and to be at Performance we need at least a 53%.

With our Students with Disabilities we have a 1% so we did not meet here! Again to be at the Performance range we would need at least a 53%.

The 2016 SPF shows In the area of Science on Academic Achievement for all students we were in the Meets range at 50% Percentile Rank. We are very proud of that. However, when looking at our student groups we show:

In Free and Reduced Lunch we are in the 37% Percentile Rank so we are approaching. To meet Performance we would need at least a 53%.

In Minority Students we are in the 20% Percentile Rank so we are approaching. To meet Performance we would need at least a 53% .

When looking at the TCAP to CMAS PARCC comparison report in Reading and our 2016 SPF we see:

All students improved in Reading. We went from a 734.4 MSS in 2015 to a 741.2 MSS in 2016., thus increasing.

Our Minority students went from a 725.2 MSS in 2015 to a 732.0 MSS in 2016 thus increasing. .

Our Free and Reduced Lunch Eligible report shows we went from a 724.4 MSS to 732.9 MSS. thus increasing.

Our Students with Disabilities shows we went from a 697.0 MSS to a 699.3 Mean Scale Score thus increasing.

When looking at the TCAP to CMAS PARCC comparison report in Writing to the 2016 SPF we see:

All students went from a 734.4 MSS to a 741.2 MSS, thus increasing in 2016.

Minority students went from a 725.2 MSS to a 732.0 MSS, thus increasing in 2016.

Free and Reduced Lunch Eligible went from a 724.4 MSS to a 732.9 MSS thus increasing in 2016.

Students with Disabilities went from a 697. 0 MSS to 699.3,MSS thus increasing in 2016.

When looking at the TCAP to CMAS PARCC comparison report in Math to the 2016 SPF we see:

All students decreased in Math going from a 732.3 Mean SS in 2015 to a 730.2 MSS in 2016.

Minority students in 2015 had a MSS of 721.4. in 2015 to a 721.2 MSS in 2016. We decreased in this area.

Free and Reduced Lunch Eligible went from 726.3 MSS in 2015 to a 725.2 MSS in 2016. We decreased in this area.

Our Students with Disabilities went from a 705.4 MSS in 2015 to a 701.9 MSS in 2016. We decreased in this area.

2015-2016 DIBELS DATA
Benchmark Data

Letford

12-13	56%
13-14	64%
14-15	66%
15-16	68%

District

63%
66%
67%

Benchmark Growth in Each Grade Level

Gr. K	+20
Gr. 1	-8
Gr. 2	+5
Gr. 3	+10
Gr. 4	+21
Gr. 5	+18

Letford

BOY

EOY At Benchmark

Gr. K	49%	69%
Gr. 1	54%	46%
Gr. 2	57%	62%
Gr. 3	61%	71%
Gr. 4	54%	75%
Gr. 5	71%	89%

In looking at our Data along with the SPF, our challenges are:

Academic Achievement for All Students in Math


Academic Growth for all Students in ELA.

Academic Growth for all students in Math.


Student Group Achievement for our Students with disabilities in ELA.

Trend Analysis


Review the DPF and local data. Document any areas where the school did not at least meet state/federal expectations.

 All Letford Students are on a decline in the area of Math on the TCAP/CMAS PARCC comparison going from a 732.3 (46% Percentile Rank) Mean Scale Score in 2015 to a 730.2 (39% Percentile Rank) Mean Scale Score on the 2016 SPF. This is a notable trend as it does not meet the state expected Academic Growth Goal of 50% (According to the School Growth Report).


*Trend Direction: **Decreasing** - Notable Trend: **Yes** - Performance Indicator Target: **Academic Achievement (Status)***

 Letford Students are on a decline in the Academic Growth area of Math for All Students (According to the 2016 SPF). In Math we went from a median Growth Percentile of 46 (on the TCAP to CMAS PARCC Comparison report) to a 31 Median Growth Percentile on the 2016 SPF. The state would like 50%. This is a notable trend as our MGP had decreased.

*Trend Direction: **Decreasing** - Notable Trend: **Yes** - Performance Indicator Target: **Academic Growth***

 All Letford students are on a decline in academic growth in the area of ELA according to our 2016 SPF. On the 2015 TCAP to CMAS PARCC comparison Report we went from a 51 Percentile rank to a 31 Percentile Rank. This growth is well below the state goal of 50% growth.

*Trend Direction: **Decreasing** - Notable Trend: **Yes** - Performance Indicator Target: **Academic Growth***

 Letford Elementary students show we decreased in the area of Students with Disabilities in the area ELA showing we were at the MSS of 705.6 in 2015 to a 699.3 in our 2016 SPF. This is a trend as we are decreasing. We decreased by 6 percentage points.

*Trend Direction: **Decreasing** - Notable Trend: **Yes** - Performance Indicator Target: **Disaggregated Achievement***

Additional Trend Information:

Priority Performance Challenges and Root Cause Analysis

Review the DPF and local data. Document any areas where the school did not at least meet state/federal expectations. Priority Performance Challenges and Root Cause Analysis Priority Performance Challenges: Identify notable trends (or a combination of trends) that are the highest priority to address (priority performance challenges). No more than 3-5 are recommended. Provide a rationale for why these challenges have been selected and address the magnitude of the school's overall performance challenges. Root Cause: Identify at least one root cause for every priority performance challenge. Root causes should address adult actions, be under the control of the school, and address the priority performance challenge(s). Provide evidence that the root cause was verified through the use of additional data. A description of the selection process for the corresponding major improvement strategies is recommended.

Relationship of UIP Elements

Priority Performance Challenges

Root Cause

All Letford Students are on a decline in the area of Math Achievement.



Embracing and utilizing the New Go Math Program to a maximum.

All Letford Students are on a decline in Academic Growth in Math.



Embracing and utilizing New Go Math Program to a maximum



All Letford Students are on a decline in the area of ELA Academic Growth.



Adopting and adjusting our Literacy Curriculum.

Our Students with Disabilities showed a decrease in the area of ELA.



Adopting and adjusting our Intervention Literacy so it is alligned.



Provide a rationale for why these challenges have been selected and address the magnitude of the overall performance challenges:

In Academic Achievement and growth our Math challenges have been:

- A new Math Curriculum
- The technology in our New Math Curriculum
- Our gaps in the implementation of the Go Math Program
- Due to the spiraling effect of the new Math Curriculum, we are finding the need to close gaps.
- Fidelity to Math Program
- How to meet the needs of our Intervention Population

In Academic Growth of ELA our challenges have been:

- The need for a new Literacy Program
- Fidelity to programming
- Consistency of programming
- Student exposure
- Spiraling effect
- Removing children from Read Plans
- Looking at our wide variety of needs

Our SPF shows the following:

- We are in the Approaching range in Academic Achievement. We had a 23.5/40.
- We are in the Does Not Meet range in Academic Growth as we had a 17.5/60.
- We met in the area of participation rates. We had 6 parent excuses for ELA and Math. We had 3 parent excuses for Science.

When looking at our Disaggregation of the 2016 SPF we show the following in ELA Academic Achievement:

- We met in ELA for All Students. We had a 741.2 Mean and here we improved. In 2015 we had 739.7. Here we increased.
- Our ELL students did not meet and we had a 714.9 Mean. Last year we did not have this data as N less.
- Our Free and Reduced Lunch Mean score was 732.9. Last year we were 733.8. Here we decreased.
- Our Minority Students were at 732.0 Mean Score and last year we were at 729.3. Here we increased.
- Our Students with Disabilities were at 699.3 and last year we were at 705.6. Here we decreased.

When looking at our Disaggregation of the 2016 SPF on Math Academic Achievement:

- We are approaching in the area of All students. We had a 730 Mean and last year we were at 732. Here we decreased.

- We did not meet with our ELL students scoring a 711.4 Mean and last year we were at the N less (no data).
- We are approaching in Free and Reduced at 725 Mean and last year we were at 726. Here we increased.
- We are approaching in Minority students at 721.2 Mean and last year we were at 721.4. Here we decreased slightly.
- We did not meet with our Students with Disabilities. We had a 701.9 Mean. Last year we had a 705.4. Here we decreased.

When looking at Science we met with all students. We are approaching with our Free and Reduced at 579.3 and also with our Minority students. We had a 546.3 Mean.

When looking at the Academic Growth on the 2016 SPF we show in ELA:

- We do not Meet the state expected MGP. We have a 31 and the state expects 50. In Free and Reduced lunch we show a 24.5 and the state expects 50. We show a 24.5 in Minority students and the state expects 50.

When looking at the 2016 SPF Academic Growth in Math:

- We do not Meet the state expected MGP. We have a 25 and the state wants 50. In Free and Reduced lunch we have a 28 and the state expects 50. We had a 29 in Minority students and the state wants 50.

When looking at our ELP we are approaching with a 40.0.

Upon review of the PARCC on Track over Time % of Students report we see:

- Our Grade 3 ELA grew from 36 to a 51. Our Grade 5 ELA grew from 28 to 35. Our Grade 4 decreased from 51 to 28% of students on Track.
- Our Grade 3 Math grew from 27 to 35% of students on track. Our Grade 5 Math increased from 23 to 24% however our Grade 4 Math decreased from 18% of students on track to 11.
- The 2016 SPF along with the PARCC on Track over Time shows Letford Elementary School:
- Meeting in Academic Achievement in the area of ELA at a 54% for the 2016 School Year. .
- We improved on the PARCC assessment in Grade 3 (ELA) (we went from a 36 to a 51% on track) and Grade 5 ELA (28-35% on track on the PARCC). .
- We did not improve, however, on Grade 4 ELA where we went from a 51% to a 35% of students being on track with the PARCC. We declined in Grade 4..

The 2016 SPF shows that when looking at 2016 Academic Achievement and our Student Groups in Achievement we show:

- For students whom were previously identified for a Read Plan, we show they are in the 9th Percentile Rank.
- For our ELL students we did not meet as we were in the 5th Percentile. To be at the state performance range we would need to score at least in the 53%. .
- For our Free and Reduced Lunch Eligible population we are in the 35% Percentile Rank. We are in the Approaching Range. To be at the Performance Range we would need to be at 53% or above.
- When looking at our Minority Students we are at the 33% Percentile Rank and we are approaching. To be at the Performance Range we would need to be at least 53% or above.
- Our Students with Disabilities are in the does not Meet range as we are at 1% Percentile Rank. where we would need to have at least a 53% to be in the Performance Range.

The 2016 SPF shows In the area of Math on Academic Achievement for all students we are in the approaching range. We have a 39% Percentile Rank. To meet Performance we would need a 53% or above. The PARCC On Track over Time Across Schools report shows:

- Letford went from a 27% to 35% of students on track on the 2016 PARCC in Grade 3.
- Grade 5 went from a 23% to 24% on track on the 2016 PARCC. .
- Grade 4, however, declined from 18%to 11% of students on track on the 2016 PARCC. When looking at 2016 Academic Achievement and our Student Groups in Achievement on the SPF we show:
- For our ELL students, we did not meet as we are in the 5th Percentile Rank and to be in the Performance Range we would need to be at least at 53% on the PARCC.
- In Free and Reduced Price Lunch Eligible we are at the 27th Percentile Rank and we are approaching; To be at the Performance Range we would need to be at least at 53% on the PARCC.
- In our Minority Students we are at the approaching range with a 19% Percentile Rank. and to be at Performance we need at least a 53%.
- With our Students with Disabilities we have a 1% so we did not meet here! Again to be at the Performance range we would need at least a 53%.

The 2016 SPF shows In the area of Science on Academic Achievement for all students we were in the Meets range at 50% Percentile Rank. We are very proud of that. However, when looking at our student groups we show:

- In Free and Reduced Lunch we are in the 37% Percentile Rank so we are approaching. To meet Performance we would need at least a 53%.
- In Minority Students we are in the 20% Percentile Rank so we are approaching. To meet Performance we would need at least a 53% .

When looking at the TCAP to CMAS PARCC comparison report in Reading and our 2016 SPF we see:

- All students improved in Reading. We went from a 734.4 MSS in 2015 to a 741.2 MSS in 2016., thus increasing.
- Our Minority students went from a 725.2 MSS in 2015 to a 732.0 MSS in 2016 thus increasing. .
- Our Free and Reduced Lunch Eligible report shows we went from a 724.4 MSS to 732.9 MSS. thus increasing.
- Our Students with Disabilities shows we went from a 697.0 MSS to a 699.3 Mean Scale Score thus increasing.

When looking at the TCAP to CMAS PARCC comparison report in Writing to the 2016 SPF we see:

- All students went from a 734.4 MSS to a 741.2 MSS, thus increasing in 2016.
- Minority students went from a 725.2 MSS to a 732.0 MSS, thus increasing in 2016.
- Free and Reduced Lunch Eligible went from a 724.4 MSS to a 732.9 MSS thus increasing in 2016.
- Students with Disabilities went from a 697. 0 MSS to 699.3,MSS thus increasing in 2016.

When looking at the TCAP to CMAS PARCC comparison report in Math to the 2016 SPF we see:

- All students decreased in Math going from a 732.3 Mean SS in 2015 to a 730.2 MSS in 2016.
- Minority students in 2015 had a MSS of 721.4. in 2015 to a 721.2 MSS in 2016. We decreased in this area.
- Free and Reduced Lunch Eligible went from 726.3 MSS in 2015 to a 725.2 MSS in 2016. We decreased in this area.
- Our Students with Disabilities went from a 705.4 MSS in 2015 to a 701.9 MSS in 2016. We decreased in this area.

Provide a rationale for how these Root Causes were selected and verified:

Typically, when we look at Root Causes, we choose to see all things combined. So when considering the Root Cause for our Math Achievement and Math growth, we had some very honest discussions. While we were happy to get the Go Math Program and this is the second year we are utilizing it, we did have some hurdles. Last year was the first year and some of us utilized Go Math but not to the maximum. There were many parts of the program that we did not utilize or know about. 2015-2016 was tough because we all got the new program with some training but not enough. This Fall we had Go Math and the Go Math technology people come to Letford. Now that staff members see the usefulness and ease of the program, more are embracing it. We are also watching for that spiraling piece to see how this program flows from one classroom to another. Another thing that we need to do when going forward with Go Math is to have the children test online and then use the Administrative Report pages to help us determine gaps and repetitions. The main thing here (in regards to our Root Causes selection and verification) is that we all embrace the Go Math Program and utilize it within all classrooms with 100% fidelity.

Verification includes:

- When looking at the SPF we did not meet in Math for Academic Achievement and Academic Growth.
- When looking at our Disaggregation of the 2016 SPF In Math Academic Achievement we are approaching however did not meet with our ELL and with our Students with Disabilities.
- When looking at our SPF of 2016 in Math growth we did not meet the state expected MGP of 50. We are at 25 MGP. In Free and Reduced Lunch we were at 28 and the state wants 50. We had 39 in Minority and the state wants 50.
- On PARCC on Track over Time our Grade 4 Math decreased from 18% on track to 11% on track.

When considering noting the Root Cause selection and verification for our decline of ELA Academic Growth we note that our Reading series is at least 12 years old. In addition to that, our Writing program "Lucy Calkins" is newer. This is our second year using Lucy Calkins. All staff members had to be trained in Lucy Writing. Again, we need to embrace this writing curriculum and utilize it to the maximum. Some concerns include, "this writing program does not have enough direct instruction", or "this is too much for the children", or "it is very difficult to score the writing" for the

Intermediate teachers. We are still working on a curve to maximize the amount and quality of writing the children do along with using the rubrics in a consistent manner. Both the Treasures Reading Series and the Lucy Calkin's show needs in the area of vocabulary. This is an area we need to work on school wide.

Verification includes:

- While we met in ELA in Academic Achievement, we did not meet in Academic Growth. The state expected MGP is 50 and we have 25 for all students. Also in Free and Reduced lunch we have a 28 and the state expects 50. We had a 29 in Minority students and the state wants 50.
- Upon review of our PARCC on Track over Time 5 of Students report we see while our Grade 3 ELA grew from 36 to a 51 and our Grade 5 ELA grew from 28 to 35 our Grade 4 ELA decreased from 51 to 28% of students on Track.
- When looking at the TCAP to CMAS PARCC comparison report in Reading and our 2016 SPF we see: All students went from a 734.4 to a 741.2, thus increasing in 2016.

Lastly, when considering Root Cause for selection and verification of our Students with Disabilities, we also note that there is no tiering when it comes to our Treasures series for the Interventionist in Special Education to utilize.

Verification includes:

- Our 2016 SPF shows our students with Disabilities declined in the area of Academic Achievement going from a 705.6 to a 699.3.

Additional Narrative / Conclusion

Section IV: Target Setting, Major Improvement Strategies and Action Plans

Target Setting

Directions: Schools are expected to set their own annual targets for academic achievement, academic growth, and postsecondary and workforce readiness. At a minimum, schools should set targets for each of the performance indicators where state expectations are not met; targets should also be connected to prioritized performance challenges. For each annual performance target, identify interim measures that will be used to monitor progress toward the annual targets at least quarterly during the school year.

Priority Performance Challenge : All Letford Students are on a decline in the area of Math Achievement.

Performance Indicator:		Academic Achievement (Status)
Measures / Metrics:		M
Annual Performance Targets	2016-2017:	Because we declined to an approaching for all students at 730.2 MSS on the SPF of 2016, Our target for 2017 will be 733.0 MSS on our new 2017 SPF.
	2017-2018:	Our target for 2017-2018 will be 736.o on the MSS on our 2018 SPF.
Interim Measures for 2016-2017:		Interim measures will be the Go Math Chapter Assesments.

Priority Performance Challenge : All Letford Students are on a decline in Academic Growth in Math.

Performance Indicator:	Academic Growth
-------------------------------	-----------------

Measures / Metrics:		M
Annual Performance Targets	2016-2017:	Because we declined in Academic Growth in Math from a 38% to a 25.0% on our SPF for 2016, our target for 2017 will be 28% for our MGP.
	2017-2018:	Our Target for 2017-2018 will be 32% MGP on our SPF.
Interim Measures for 2016-2017:		Go Math Chapter tests.

Priority Performance Challenge : All Letford Students are on a decline in the area of ELA Academic Growth.

Performance Indicator:		Academic Growth
Measures / Metrics:		ELA
Annual Performance Targets	2016-2017:	Because we declined in ELA Academic Growth from a 39% to a 31% on our 2016 SPF. Our target for 2017 SPF would be a 34% growth.
	2017-2018:	Our target for the 2018 SPF would be 39%.
Interim Measures for 2016-2017:		The DIBELS assessment and Lucy Cauken's writing assessments.

Priority Performance Challenge : Our Students with Disabilities showed a decrease in the area of ELA.

Performance Indicator:		Disaggregated Achievement
Measures / Metrics:		ELA
Annual Performance	2016-2017:	While we increased from 697 to 699.3 MSS on the TCAP to CMAS PARCC comparison report, we do not meet the state's expectations. Our goal is that of 700 MSS on the Academic Achievement portion of the 2017 SPF.

Targets**2017-2018:**

Our goal of 2018 SPF is that of 704 MSS on the Academic Achievement Portion of the 2018 SPF.

Interim Measures for 2016-2017:

DIBELS, CBM and the Lucy writing.

Planning Form

Major Improvement Strategy Name:

Embracing and utilizing the New Go Math Program to a maximum.

Major Improvement Strategy Description:

Teacher observations of usage of Go Math Program, Test Data that shows implementation of Go Math, sharing during our Inservice days what we like about the tech piece of Go Math, Improvement of SPF in Math Achievement and Academic Growth for all students.

Associated Root Causes:

Embracing and utilizing the New Go Math Program to a maximum.: Embracing this Common Core Curriculum, using it to the maximum, the technology training piece and more training.

Action Steps Associated with MIS

Name	Description	Start/End Date	Resource	Key Personnel	Status	School Year
LES Teachers	Classroom Teachers	12/15/2016 08/25/2017	Go Math Materials	Classroom Teachers	In Progress	This School Year

Implementation Benchmark Associated with MIS

Action Step Name (Association)	IB Name	Description	Start/End/Repeats	Key Personnel	Status	School Year
	Go Math Program	Go Math	12/15/2016 08/25/2017	Classroom Teachers and Principal	Not Met	This School Year

Major Improvement Strategy Name:

Updating our Reading series and utilizing Lucy Caukins to the maximizing

Major Improvement Strategy Description:

Teacher observations of conferences with children of Lucy Writing, samples of Lucy Writing, Inservice times used for scoring consistency of Lucy writing, Lucy tests, interjecting more vocabulary into the Treasures series, using the Literacy Cafe model along with the 5 program. DIBELS Benchmarking. and improvement in our 2017 SPF in ELA Achievement and Growth Rates.

Associated Root Causes:

Adopting and adjusting our Literacy Curriculum.: Adoption, usage and embrace the Lucy Caukins Writing, Use the Literacy 5 and Literacy Cafe program. Add where and when needed. Vocabulary!

Action Steps Associated with MIS

Name	Description	Start/End Date	Resource	Key Personnel	Status	School Year
------	-------------	----------------	----------	---------------	--------	-------------

Implementation Benchmark Associated with MIS

Action Step Name (Association)	IB Name	Description	Start/End/Repeats	Key Personnel	Status	School Year
	Literacy	Improve Reading/Writing	12/05/2016 05/05/2017	Teachers/Principal	Not Met	This School Year

Major Improvement Strategy Name:

Adopting and adjusting our Intervention Literacy for our IEP.

The adoption of an Intervention program to help our IEP and ELL Students. Usage of strategies

Major Improvement Strategy Description:

learned through triage, Inservice and other workshops. Usage of the workshop approach to allow for Intervention to happen within the classrooms.

Associated Root Causes:

Adopting and adjusting our Intervention Literacy so it is aligned.: With the adoption of a new Literacy Program, we can then purchase a tiered program for the Special Education students.

Action Steps Associated with MIS

Name	Description	Start/End Date	Resource	Key Personnel	Status	School Year
Intervention Literacy for IEP	Intervention	12/05/2016 12/05/2017	Intervention materials	Special Ed/Teachers/Principal	In Progress	This School Year

Implementation Benchmark Associated with MIS

Action Step Name (Association)	IB Name	Description	Start/End/Repeats	Key Personnel	Status	School Year
	Intervention Literacy	Improve our IEP	12/05/2016 12/05/2017	Special Ed/Teachers/Principal	Not Met	This School Year

Major Improvement Strategy Name:

Embracing and utilizing the Go Math Program to the maximum.

Major Improvement Strategy Description:

Improved test scores, children understanding and following the spiral flow, Gaps will decrease.

Associated Root Causes:

Embracing and utilizing New Go Math Program to a maximum: Embracing this Common Core Curriculum, using it to the maximum, the technology training piece and more training.

Action Steps Associated with MIS

Name	Description	Start/End Date	Resource	Key Personnel	Status	School Year
------	-------------	----------------	----------	---------------	--------	-------------

Implementation Benchmark Associated with MIS

Action Step Name (Association)	IB Name	Description	Start/End/Repeats	Key Personnel	Status	School Year
--------------------------------	---------	-------------	-------------------	---------------	--------	-------------

Addenda

Attachments List