



David Stephenson_traversemountain <dstephenson@alpinedistrict.org>

Traverse Mountain EL -- 2011 - 2012 Final Report

1 message

webmaster@schoollandtrust.org <webmaster@schoollandtrust.org>
 To: David Stephenson <dstephenson@alpinedistrict.org>

Thu, Nov 15, 2012 at 3:14 PM

2011 - 2012 Final Report

1. School's identified most critical academic need(s) addressed in the plan.

Please check only the primary area(s). Improvement in some academic areas may improve all other academic areas, but if the goal is to improve reading (or technology), please check only that area.

Academic areas as identified in the plan

Mathematics
 Reading

Academic areas as implemented in the plan

Mathematics
 Reading

2. Financial proposal and report - This report is automatically generated from the School Plan entered in the Spring of 2011 and from the District Business Administrator's date entry of the School LAND Trust expenditures from the 2011 - 2012 school year.

Available Funds	Planned Expenditures (entered by the school)	Actual Expenditures (entered by the District Business Administrator)
Carry-over from 2010 - 2011	\$0	\$242
Distribution for 2011 - 2012	\$21,389	\$25,695
Total Available for expenditure in 2011 - 2012	\$21,389	\$25,937
Salaries and Employee Benefits (100 and 200)	\$20,039	\$20,874
Professional Development and Technical Services (300)	\$1,350	\$3,502
Repairs and Maintenance (400)	\$0	\$0
Other Purchased Services (Admission / Printing) (500)	\$0	\$0
Travel (580)	\$0	\$0
General Supplies (610)	\$0	\$0
Textbooks (641)	\$0	\$0
Library Books / Periodicals / Audiovisual (644, 650, 660)	\$0	\$0

Software / Technology related Hardware / Other Equipment (670, 730)	\$0	\$0
Total Expenditures	\$21,389	\$24,376
Remaining Funds (Carry-over to 2012 - 2013)	\$0	\$1,561

2. a Please describe all expenditures in Other Purchased Services (Admission / Printing) and Travel and how they supported the plan.
2. b Please describe each expenditure in General Supplies and how it supported the plan
2. c Please explain the reason for the carry over to 2012 - 2013.
3. This is what the School Community Council or Trust Lands Committee planned to do and how they planned for the money to be spent

TIMELINE

- June - August 2011:

Teacher grade level teams will use professional development days and collaboration meetings to develop their differentiation lessons/units as well as their grade level common assessments in math and reading.

- July 14 & 15, 20011: Attend the Mike Mattos conference sponsored by the Lehi Cluster.

- August 2011:

Students will be given the BASELINE MATH AND READING ASSESSMENTS and teachers will work together in collaborative teams to identify strategies that will assist these students in their learning environment. For the purposes of tracking, each teacher will provide the names of three students in math and three in reading. These names will be provided to the principal by the last school day in September 2011.

- September 2011 – March 2012:

Each grade level will conduct a minimum of one math common assessment and one reading common assessment per trimester. Grade level teams will use their collaboration time on Mondays to analyze these assessments to make adjustments in teaching based on our professional development goals regarding differentiation.

- September 2011 – March 2012:

In order to establish a culture of professional development and teaching transparency among staff members, each grade level will participate in the lesson study cycle one time per trimester. This is a flexible professional development opportunity for teams of teachers to:

1. set a goal based on student needs
2. plan a lesson
3. observe the lesson
4. debrief and revise the lesson
5. reflecting
6. sharing

This form of professional development will cause teachers to focus on meeting the different needs of their students.

- March 2012:

Have three teachers attend the CITES Literacy Conference.

- April 2012:

Students will be given the same baseline assessments in math and reading that were administered in August 2010. An analysis of the scores will be made to determine the success of student achievement and the degree of achievement with our School LAND Trust goals.

3. a What did the school do and how was the money spent to improve student academic performance? (Be specific)

The faculty of Traverse Mountain Elementary School spent various days in the summer of 2011 preparing for the school year and establishing procedures to implement the goals of the school improvement plan. Teachers met for a two-day conference with Mike Mattos, five teachers attended the CITES Literacy Conference, and all teachers attended curriculum training. With the curriculum information, teachers created and established common grade level assessments in math and reading. The basis for our data collection rests with the common baseline math and reading assessments that were given over the course of the 2011-12 school year. The funding for the various conferences, substitutes, and trainings was \$4500.

As the school year commenced, teachers administered the baseline math and reading assessments to all students. As an indicator of progress, each teacher selected 3 students to track with our school wide Google spreadsheet. Teachers are grouped by grade levels in professional learning communities. The work of these PLC's is to review student data and create opportunities for students to learn better at their differentiated level of learning. Two major ways the Trustlands Grant helped our school is with the hiring of classroom aides to assist with the differentiated learning and the hiring of a part time FTE to reduce class size. The expenditure of these personnel was \$19,000.

4. The following are the committee's specific goals for student improvement entered in the plan

MATH: Three students will be identified in each class as a result of their performance on the grade level BENCHMARK MATH ASSESSMENT. As an overarching goal of differentiating teaching for all students, each teacher will specifically track the performance throughout the school year of three students- one student scoring below average, one scoring average, and one scoring above average. **The goal is for each of these students to improve by either 25 percentage points or reach/surpass 80% mastery on the grade level final benchmark assessment given in April 2012 as compared to the initial evaluation in August 2011.**

READING: Each teacher will identify three students to track, one that performs below average, one performing at average, and one performing above average on the grade level BENCHMARK READING (LANGUAGE) ASSESSMENT. **The goal is for each of these students to make at least one year's growth according to the assessment given at the end of April 2012 as compared to the initial evaluation in August 2011.**

The goals established by our school will be supported by using School LAND Trust money as follows:

In order to establish a culture of professional development and teaching transparency among staff members, each grade level will participate in the lesson study cycle one time per trimester. These flexible professional development opportunities will cause teachers to focus on meeting the different needs of their high, middle and low students. Substitutes will be hired to cover each teacher's class for half a day. The funds for this are calculated the following way: 4 all day substitutes once per trimester = 12 substitutes total @ \$65 per day = **\$780.**

In order for Traverse Mountain Elementary teachers to stay current with research based teaching strategies, a team of 3 teachers will be sent to the

annual CITES Literacy Conference. The cost for this is calculated the following way: Registration fee \$450 multiplied by 3 = \$1,350 plus 2 all day substitutes for two days = 4 substitutes total @ \$65 per day = \$260 = registration \$1,350 = **\$1,610**.

In order for Traverse Mountain Elementary teachers to learn more about Tier 2 interventions, the Lehi Cluster (all schools feeding into Lehi High School) will host Mike Mattos, a leading national expert for a two day conference July 14 & 15, 2011. The cost per school is **\$1,000**.

We would like to continue our extended- day kindergarten program by offering an additional ½ hour for students that need the most support based on the Kindergarten Pre-Assessment. The cost for the teacher = **\$3300**.

Teacher Aides will be hired to assist students in small group reading and math lessons. The aides will help track the performance of the individual students and assist the teacher in providing Tier 2 interventions as well as extensions. The cost for the aides = **\$14,699**.

4. a Please explain how the goals described above were achieved or not achieved and why.

Teachers were able to complete the specific goals of participating in extended professional development opportunities during the summer of 2011. They were instructed extensively on way to improve instruction and using professional learning communities to differentiate instruction for students. Each grade level completed their common baseline math and language assessments that resulted in timely data collection and analysis.

The specific academic goals for math and reading were:

MATH: Three students will be identified in each class as a result of their performance on the grade level BENCHMARK MATH ASSESSMENT. As an overarching goal of differentiating teaching for all students, each teacher will specifically track the performance throughout the school year of three students- one student scoring below average, one scoring average, and one scoring above average. The goal is for each of these students to improve by either 25 percentage points or reach/surpass 80% mastery on the grade level final benchmark assessment given in April 2012 as compared to the initial evaluation in August 2011.

READING: Each teacher will identify three students to track, one that performs below average, one performing at average, and one performing above average on the grade level BENCHMARK READING (LANGUAGE) ASSESSMENT. The goal is for each of these students to make at least one year's growth according to the assessment given at the end of April 2012 as compared to the initial evaluation in August 2011.

Results of these goals based on our data indicate that 65 of the 66 students tracked improved by either 25 percentage points or reached/surpassed 80% mastery. The data was helpful for the one student as we were able to vary tier 1 instruction, add tier 2 instruction, and ultimately provide tier 3 instruction through Special Education services.

Regarding reading, each child was able to reach the goal of at least one year's growth on the grade level baseline assessment.

5. The following is how the committee planned to measure/assess academic improvement

MATH: Percentage correct on the grade level baseline math assessment will determine progress towards the goal in math. This will be determined throughout the year by grade level common assessment measures and ultimately be the percentage points gained between the beginning of year and end of year assessment scores for each student.

READING: Percentage correct on the grade level baseline math assessment will determine progress towards the goal in math. This will be determined throughout the year by grade level common assessment measures and ultimately be the percentage points gained between the beginning of year and end of year assessment scores for each student.

5. a Please show the before and after measurements and how academic performance was improved

Our school developed Google Spreadsheets shared by all teachers on the faculty using Google Drive. The first spreadsheet indicates the math scores. Using the grade level baseline math assessment, teachers entered the scores of one student at the LOW level, one at the AVRG level, and one at the HIGH level. The same assessment was given in August, January, and April. The final column indicates the percentage improvement for each of these three students as indicated by teacher. Finally, at the top is the Average Improvement made by students in each of the 3 student levels.

MATH SCORES

Average Improvement Low: 51% Avrg: 41% High: 22%

Teacher	Student Level	Math August	Math January	Math April	% Improved
K- P	Low	10	49	75	65
	Avrg	30	75	100	70
	High	92	100	100	8
K- S	Low	7	90	100	93
	Avrg	43	92	100	57
	High	80	96	100	20
K- W	Low	23	32	88	65
	Avrg	43	70	100	57
	High	73	100	100	27
1st- A	Low	25	50	88	63

	Avrg	63	63	88	25
	High	75	100	100	25
1st- C	Low	38	85	90	52
	Avrg	63	90	100	37
	High	75	100	100	25
1st- H	Low	38	75	100	62
	Avrg	50	75	100	50
	High	75	88	100	25
1st- S	Low	25	63	88	63
	Avrg	63	100	100	37
	High	63	88	100	37
1st- W	Low	28	44	60	32
	Avrg	45	50	88	43
	High	78	85	100	22
2nd- B	Low	53	77	82	29
	Avrg	75	86	100	25

	High	88	92	100	12
2nd- M	Low	42	50	62	20
	Avrg	62	70	100	38
	High	85	89	98	13
2nd- S	Low	22	45	75	53
	Avrg	42	66	90	48
	High	78	82	95	17
3rd- F	Low	42	71	89	47
	Avrg	50	82	95	45
	High	82	84	97	15
3rd- M	Low	42	81	84	42
	Avrg	64	76	97	33
	High	79	87	100	21
3rd- W	Low	55	66	84	29
	Avrg	66	79	87	21

	High	76	89	100	24
4th- La	Low	57	88	97	40
	Avrg	67	91	100	33
	High	94	100	100	6
4th- Le	Low	58	88	94	36
	Avrg	70	91	97	27
	High	85	94	97	12
4th- N	Low	42	58	85	43
	Avrg	73	82	97	24
	High	87	94	98	11
5th- M	Low	28	56	88	60
	Avrg	45	66	90	45
	High	64	70	98	34
5th- S	Low	34	45	84	50
	Avrg	45	54	82	37

	High	73	81	94	21
5th- V	Low	20	50	85	65
	Avrg	60	75	96	36
	High	69	90	95	26
6th- D	Low	21	68	83	62
	Avrg	36	89	91	55
	High	64	83	97	33
6th- M	Low	36	89	96	60
	Avrg	49	81	98	49
	High	53	87	95	42

Following a similar format to the math spreadsheet, teachers indicated the reading level of three students in their class on a Google Spreadsheet. The spreadsheet is shown below indicating the growth of each of the selected students.

READING SCORES

Teacher	Student Level	Reading August	Reading January	Reading April	Level Improved
K- P	Low		A 3		3
	Avrg	3	6		3

	High		12	14	2
K- S	Low		1	4	3
	Avrg		4	8	4
	High		6	10	4
K- W	Low		1	3	3
	Avrg		1	3	2
	High		4	8	4
1st- A	Low	3	12	16	13
	Avrg	4	14	18	14
	High	16	20	24	8
1st- C	Low	4	10	16	12
	Avrg	12	14	24	12
	High	16	20	24	8
1st- H	Low	2	10	20	18
	Avrg	6	18	24	18

	High	14	20	24	10
1st- S	Low	2	6	12	10
	Avrg	4	18	24	20
	High	14	20	24	10
1st- W	Low	2	3	6	4
	Avrg	8	20	24	16
	High	14	20	24	10
2nd- B	Low	14	20	28	14
	Avrg	18	24	28	10
	High	24	28	30	6
2nd- M	Low	8	14	18	10
	Avrg	18	24	30	12
	High	24	28	30	6
2nd- S	Low	3	18	30	27
	Avrg	12	28	30	18
	High	18	28	30	12

3rd- F	Low	10	16	24	14
	Avrg	24	30	38	14
	High	30	34	38	8
3rd- M	Low	16	28	30	14
	Avrg	24	30	38	14
	High	30	34	38	8
3rd- W	Low	12	18	24	12
	Avrg	28	34	38	10
	High	34	38	38	4
4th- La	Low	71	86	94	23
	Avrg	81	83	90	9
	High	93	94	96	3
4th- Le	Low	63	78	84	21
	Avrg	77	86	91	14
	High	89	95	99	10

4th- N	Low	59	70	88	29
	Avrg	78	86	93	15
	High	89	96	97	8
5th- M	Low	50	50	60	10
	Avrg	50	50	60	10
	High	50	50	60	10
5th- S	Low	40	50	50	10
	Avrg	50	50	60	10
	High	50	50	60	10
5th- V	Low	50	50	60	10
	Avrg	50	50	60	10
	High	50	50	60	10
6th- D	Low	64		94	30
	Avrg	61		91	30
	High	88		97	9

6th- M	Low	64	94	30
	Avrg	67	97	30
	High	76	94	18

6. In the school plan, there was an opportunity to explain how additional funds, exceeding the estimated distribution would be spent. The following is what was approved by your school district.

With the increased funding, additional hours will be allocated to the aides. They will be able to work with students in small group reading and math groups.

6. a The distribution to schools in 2011 - 2012 was approximately 20% more than School Community Councils planned for in the approved School Plans. How were the additional funds spent?

The additional funds were used to provide additional hours for aides to work with small groups in reading and math classes.

7. The school plan was advertised to the community in the following way:

- Letters to State Senators, Representatives, Governor, Attorney General, State Treasurer and Congressional Delegation
- School Newsletter
- School Website
- Other
- Other. Please Explain.

Weekly emails are sent home to parents and at times contained information about the school plan.

8. Please select from the pull down menus the policy makers the council/charter board has communicated with about the School LAND Trust Program.

State Leaders
Governor: Gary R. Herbert.

U.S. Senators
Orrin Hatch
Mike Lee

State Senators
Dist 11 Howard Stephenson

U.S. Representatives
Jason Chaffetz

State Representatives
Dist 27 John Dougall

District School Board
Paula Hill

State School Board
Carol Murphy

Wendy K. Hart
Debbie Taylor
Terry Peterson
John Burton
JoDee Sundberg

Mark Clement

9. The State Board Rule requires reporting of the dates when local boards approved the other four plans community councils are responsible for. Please enter the most recent approval date for each plan listed. **These approval dates are for plans being implemented in the 2012 - 2013 school year and require a 2012 date.**

2012 - 2013 School Plans

School Improvement Plan
(required for all schools)
06/19/2012

Professional Development Plan
(required for all schools)
06/19/2012

Reading Achievement Plan
(required for all schools with K-3 grades)
06/19/2012

Child Access Routing Plan
(required for all elementary, middle & jr high schools)
06/19/2012

A summary of this Final Report must be provided to parents and posted on the website by November 15th of the 2012-2013 school year. When was this task completed?

11/15/2012