**Goals Assessment: June, 2015**

**PLC Team: Samantha Kaminski, Danielle Guay & Trisha Black Date: June 10, 2015**

**2014-2015 School Goals**

**1.) By June of 2015, staff will meet in teams to improve inter-rater reliability while scoring student writing using a Lucy Calkins assessment tool (or comparable rubric).**

**2.) By June of 2015, teams will create and validate three Common Core aligned performance assessments. Each QPA will be submitted to the CCE task bank for review and uploaded into Atlas.**

**1. Please list your team’s SMART goals for the 2014-2015 school year.**

* By June of 2015, our team will create, validate and submit 3 Common Core aligned Performance Assessments that integrate different content areas.

**•** By June 2015 75 % (of original 44 tested) will score at or above 80% on the place value assessment.

**2. Please report, using specific data, where your grade level is with each of these goals.**

**•** Our team created and validated 3 Common Core Aligned Performance Assessments that integrated different content area. We are currently waiting for the Task Bank to notify us that they are accepting submissions again. We have submitted our first QPA which focused on mapping and they have uploaded it to the Task Bank. Our other QPAs focused on science/ weather forecasts and Math/coins.

**•** We administered the place value assessment 3times throughout the year. The first time, 16% of students scored above 80%. In the Winter, 86% scored above 80%. We met our goal in the winter but however we reassessed to assure the students retained the place value concepts.

1. **Which goal(s) has your team met?** We have met on both our goals.
2. **Which goal(s) has your team not met?** None
3. **What percentage of your grade met their growth targets in:** We are reporting on the NWEA data from the spring but cannot do a spring to spring growth target report since it was a different test.

**Reading:** 7% (3 students) scored in the low percentile, 7% (3 students) scored in the low-average percentile, 24% (11 students) scored in the average percentile, 20% (9 students) scored in the high average percentile and 43% (20 students) scored in the high percentile. In total 87% (40 students) scored average or above and 14% (6 students) scored below average.

**Math:**  12% (6 students) scored in the low-average percentile, 20% (10 students) scored in the average percentile, 39% (13 students) scored in the high average percentile and 22% (11 students) scored in the high percentile. In total 81% (40 students) scored average or above and 14% (6 students) scored below average.

**Language:** 4% (2 students) scored in the low-average percentile, 20% (9 students) scored in the average percentile, 30% (14 students) scored in the high average percentile and 46% (21 students) scored in the high percentile. In total 96% (44 students) scored average or above and 4% (2 students) scored below average.

\*\*Fountas & Pinnell: 91% (42 out of 46 students) are instructional at an M or above.

1. **What are some potential areas of focus for next school year given this data:** We have seen the benefits from having the reading and language interventions/instruction blocks this year. As a result, we will apply this to our math instruction/intervention blocks next school year. Will continue to use QPAs to assess our students learning and application of their learning to real world situations.