

ANCHORAGE SCHOOL DISTRICT  
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA

ASD MEMORANDUM #76 (98-99)

September 28, 1998

TO: SCHOOL BOARD

FROM: OFFICE OF THE SUPERINTENDENT

SUBJECT: UNDERACHIEVING SCHOOLS' REPORT FY 1997-98

PERTINENT FACTS:

The past school year marked the third year of at least partial implementation of the Underachieving Schools' Grants in six Anchorage School District Schools. Ptarmigan Elementary, Taku Elementary, Willow Crest Elementary, Central Middle School of Science, Romig Middle School, and West High School all participated in the grants in 1997-98. Principals and staff from those schools have compiled reports detailing both goals and accomplishments related to the Underachieving Schools' Grant funds. Those reports are presented in full with this memorandum as Attachments A through F. Attachment G provides a summary of California Achievement Test (CAT) information related to the schools and to the District as a whole. Additionally, Memorandum #60 (97-98) dated September 21, 1997, provided the Board and public with a review of the programs through the 1996-97 school year.

In the attached school reports, the norm referenced test (CAT) review was compiled by Curriculum and Evaluation staff after the documents were turned in by principals. The remainder of the reports were compiled by principals and others at the school level.

The six schools continued and/or expanded upon their programs in 1997-98. Ptarmigan had five parts to its program: resource tutorial, extended kindergarten program, after school study hall, APU tutorial help, and a social studies tutor. The activities at Ptarmigan are spoken to in Attachment A. That Attachment also contains information showing positive results on various assessment scales used with children in the program and discussion from the principal regarding the overall program worth and its sustainability if the grant funds are removed.

Attachment B provides a similar review of the program at Taku Elementary School. Taku hired tutors to work in the classroom, small group settings, and one-on-one with students in need. They also focused on Project Achieve skills in the classroom. After school tutoring and an after school "achieve club" were part of the program at Taku. Attachment B provides discussion of the program, statistics related to specific measures used with targeted students and showing positive results, and testimonials from participants attesting to the value of the program.

Willow Crest's program is discussed in detail in Attachment C. There were three parts to its program: resource tutorial, temporary school attendants who work in classrooms assisting students with needs on a daily basis, and preparation for implementation of the Accelerated Reader Program in the school in 1998-99. As with the other reports, the principal's report indicates successful implementation and positive results. Under the third component, the school community researched reading programs available for use, and determined that the Accelerated Reader Program with the S.T.A.R. assessment system was a program worthy of use beginning in 1998-99.

Central Middle School of Science continued with its Focus on Comprehension, Understanding, and Skills (F.O.C.U.S) Program in 1997-98. A F.O.C.U.S. teacher/coordinator was hired for the program along with a teacher's aide to assist with the program. Students were served in one-on-one as well as group settings. Summer tutorial and transitional programs were held. Saturday tutorials were held. Attachment D provides the principal's discussion of the program, statistical information showing positive results, and testimonials demonstrating the success of the F.O.C.U.S. Program at Central Middle School of Science.

Romig Middle School has used the Accelerated Reader Program for the past two years. Additionally the school offered corrective reading for identified low performing students. Staff development was also a component of the Romig implementation. The grant funds pay for the reading teacher, who is an integral part of the program at Romig. The principal's report for Romig (Attachment E) also points to both successful implementation and positive results.

West High School is the only high school involved with the grant. The report from the principal and West High staff is provided as Attachment F. West High's Anchored in Reading Program targets three groups of students. The first is students who need to develop their reading skills and take part in "intervention reading classes" in grades 9 and 10 or "individualized reading classes" in grades 11 or 12. The second group of targeted students is all incoming freshmen who are pre and post tested with the S.T.A.R. system (part of Accelerated Reader Program). The third group is the entire student population who receive 90 minutes of free reading time per week to allow reading to occur and to stress the importance of reading as a pass time. The school's report in Attachment F shows positive results on the S.T.A.R. assessments, positive support for the program in formal surveys, and testimonials from various individuals attesting to the value of the Anchored in Reading Program.

Attachment G provides a summary overview of the statistical information related to California Achievement Testing in the grant schools over the past three years. CAT results are presented for the individual schools and for the District as a whole.

As identified above, all of the schools reported successful implementation of their programs and positive results as documented by various assessments, testimonials,

and survey activities. Attachment G shows that the CAT results from Taku, Romig, and Willow Crest exceed those of the District, when growth patterns are examined over the past two years. The results for Ptarmigan are similar to those for the District as a whole. The overall results for Central and West are slightly below the corresponding results for the District as a whole. Central's individual report shows that specifically targeted students performed at a rate higher than the school as a whole on the CAT. The West High reports references the fact that several of the targeted students who exhibited gains on the S.T.A.R. assessment were still not to the point of being on the CAT test for their grade level.

All of the principals suggest that their programs should be continued and say that they would not be able to sustain the activities and programs they have now without the Underachieving Schools' Grant funds. That is, the grant monies are adding to the programs at the schools, and removal of the funds would result in the loss of the ability to offer many of the activities currently being funded.

Overall, the evidence presented in the past two years suggests that the Underachieving Schools' Grant funds have been put to good use. Anecdotal, testimonial, and survey data all suggest support for the programs and activities implemented by the schools. Building specific assessment data have shown positive growth for targeted students for the past two years. The CAT data suggest that growth demonstrated by students from three of the six schools exceeds that demonstrated by students in the District as a whole.

The Underachieving Schools' grants have allowed school communities to focus on problems they identified as significant, to develop their own solutions to those problems, and to document and assess their progress in dealing with those problems. It presents a model for local school improvement, which may be relevant in the future as the state implements its Quality Schools Initiative and specifically holds individual schools accountable for student success.

The reviews of the Underachieving Schools' Grant programs over the past two years have identified specific success. There has been no indication that the activities undertaken by any of the schools are not worthwhile, positive contributors to students' academic and social growth. Certainly, continuing of the programs should be considered during the budget process as competing needs arise for the scarce resources available to the District.

BC/CC/FS

Attachments

Prepared by: Fred Stofflet, Executive Director of Curriculum and Evaluation

Approved by: Carol Comeau, Assistant Superintendent for Instruction

**Anchorage School District  
Underachieving School Program  
1997-98**

**School** Ptarmigan Elementary                      **Program** Underachieving School Grant

**Principal's Name (Type)** Jimmie Daniels

**Compiled and Written by:** Diane Sickles, Cindy Cole, Trish Flannigan, and  
Anna Poole

**Principal's Signature** (On file at Elementary Education)                      **Date** May 22, 1998

---

**Program Description:**

The Underachieving School Grant Program at Ptarmigan has been integrated into our whole school program through five key models of implementation. The Resource Tutorial Program, Kindergarten SEEDS, Alaska Pacific University Student Tutors, the After-School Study Hall and Project Achieve Social Skills Tutor have all evolved into successful methods of meeting the educational needs of our at-risk students.

Central to the entire program is our Resource Tutorial Staff. The grant pays the salary of our one full time tutor. Iris Vail works individually and in small groups with first graders in reading and language arts. Mrs. Vail has expertise in study skills for students in grads 1 - 6 and provides extra support for individual students struggling with classroom social and study skill problems throughout the school. In addition to this instruction, she is responsible for the scheduling and management of the APU tutors in the building and supervises the After-School study hall three afternoons per week for students in grades 1 - 6.

The next major component of our grant is the Kindergarten SEEDS Program. This kindergarten skills enrichment program is sandwiched between the morning and afternoon kindergarten sessions and serves at-risk children from both classes. At a Full-Day Kindergarten Task Force Meeting, this program was recognized as the only extended day kindergarten program in the Anchorage School District. Diane Bowman is our salaried teaching assistant who plans and teaches this program for our young students. She works closely with the kindergarten teacher, Cindy Edwards, in providing instruction that compliments and supports the kindergarten curriculum. Mrs. Bowman and Mrs. Edwards have very successfully encouraged a large percentage of the parents of these targeted students into volunteering to help with the program.

This provides not only needed support to the children, but also exposes the parents to some positive role modeling on how to help their students achieve in school. Mrs. Bowman is the parent of a Ptarmigan Elementary student. She also helped with the after-school study hall.

The third component of our program is the After-School Study Hall for students in grades 1 - 6. Students who are identified as failing, or at risk of failing classroom subjects, or students that may benefit from a regular, quiet study time, were recommended by teachers to participate for one, two, or three days per week in study hall. Mrs. Vail, with the help of Mrs. Bowman and APU student tutors, maintains a positive, quiet, work environment for the students for 45 minutes every Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday afternoon. Mrs. Sickles, a second grade teacher, also provided regular supervision and support in her classroom as the numbers in study hall swelled to over 50 students. This part of the grant grew incredibly this year, as students were more regular in attendance for the full year and the popularity of the program grew with teachers, students, and parents. The P.T.A. supported the program by purchasing snacks for the students to have before beginning study hall. Goals for these students include work completion, organizational skills, study skills, and a better understanding of academic subjects.

Another component of the program is provided by Alaska Pacific University student tutors. These are students in the Language Arts and Reading Methods courses who provide individual tutoring for students on a scheduled basis as part of their class requirements at APU. Dr. Diana Caldwell and Dr. Sue Heinz are our partners at the University in arranging these practicum experiences. This partnership has been mutually beneficial as the University students gain hands-on experience in working with at-risk students over a semester (or, in some cases, full year) and our elementary students enjoy the opportunity to have individual attention and help from an adult as a support for their academics. The student tutor program was expanded this year since APU introduced their January intensive and students fulfilled twelve hours of practicum by helping in the study hall and classrooms for extra time.

The new component of our program this year ins the inclusion of Jenna Shaw, our Social Skills Tutor. As a Project Achieve School, we have become convinced of the importance pro-social skill instruction in overall student achievement. Ms. Shaw's job has been to extinguish off task, disruptive behavior and teach pro-social skills. She accomplishes this by removing the disruptive student, arranging buddy room placement with assigned academic work, then working individually with the students on practicing pro-social skills. She also conducts after school detention and contacts parents about student detentions and classroom problems. Ms. Shaw is also responsible for maintaining records of student behaviors and entering them into our student achievement data base. Not only do the disruptive students benefit from this individual instruction and attention, but the classroom teachers are able to better use their instructional time with the on-task students without having to constantly deal with disrupters.

### **Target Population/Selection Criteria:**

#### **Resource Tutorial first grade reading/language arts intervention programs:**

Students are assessed for basic readiness skills, as determined through the kindergarten report card, and through individual performance assessments by tutor upon entering first grade program at Ptarmigan, whether at the beginning or during the school year. Our first grade staff, including our tutor, received the school District four day training in guided reading and assessment and the benchmark books were used from that point forward to assess student growth and needs in the tutorial program. Teacher recommendation is also used as criteria for students who may exhibit satisfactory individual readiness skills, but are experiencing slow or erratic progress in the classroom and may benefit from individual or small group help. Students may receive services of a short or long-term basis, and the number of hours per week is determined on progress and need.

#### **Kindergarten SEEDS program:**

Students with skills at below grade level are targeted for help through the SEEDS program. Students are individually assessed using a performance assessment by the kindergarten teacher or aide. Students who may demonstrate satisfactory individual skills, but are struggling with social skills, or whose learning is slow or erratic may also be included in the program. Parental permission and agreement for transportation is critical for inclusion in the SEEDS program since students attend as an extension of their school day. Students remain in the program all year.

#### **After-School Study Hall:**

Students were identified by teacher recommendation or parent request for failure of subjects, at risk for failure due to lack of study skill or academic progress, or expressed need for a quiet work time and place to facilitate homework completion. Students entered and left this program throughout the year, based on individual needs. Student participation, particularly for the full year, has been much higher than in past years.

#### **APU Student Tutors:**

Efforts were made to provide an equitable number of tutor hours for each classroom during the school year, based on classroom teacher needs and the APU student schedules. Each classroom teacher selected the student(s) to receive help from the tutor and the nature of the help. Student selection was based on individual need for help and support in subject areas, mainly language arts or reading within the content areas. APU tutors also were a significant help in working with students during study hall time.

### **Social Skills Tutor:**

Students were referred to the social skills tutor for breaking school rules or disruptive behaviors that to beyond the classroom discipline levels. We kept a data base on these behaviors and had an accurate accounting for repeat offenders that needed more social skill training. Contact with the students was dependent upon student behaviors in class and around the school.

### **Major Program Activities During 1997-98:**

Resource tutor Iris Vail focused her efforts on reading and language intervention for first grade. She has given individual or small group instruction to 25 students for the full year of first grade. Another 7 students were provided tutorial services for part of the year. These students were all transient students who were not in attendance at Ptarmigan for the full school year. The amount of help given, both in terms of hours per week and length of intervention, was determined by need and demonstrated growth and achievement of individual students. On an average, students identified to work with Mrs. Vail would spend four or five twenty-minute sessions per week. After our district training in January, Mrs. Vail aligned her tutorial sessions with the district guidelines for guided reading groups using benchmark books to determine placement, and leveled readers for daily instruction, combined with writing practice in word building.

The Kindergarten SEEDS program has served 21 kindergarten students and their parents this year. As during the previous school year, students eat lunch at 10:45, then return to the kindergarten room for academic instruction. Parent volunteers are used extensively to help with the program and since parents are either dropping off or picking up these students, the kindergarten teacher and aide are able to maintain an almost daily dialog about each child's progress. The program extends the half day kindergarten program by one and one quarter hours per day, five days a week.

After-School Study Hall began earlier than ever before, during the month of September. The focus for students was to provide a quiet, organized learning environment for the students with adult support to provide help and tutoring as needed. Mrs. Vail was again in charge of study hall, with Mrs. Bowman assisting. APU student tutors, other teachers, APU tutors, and some parents provided the adult support and supervision for the year. As numbers swelled, Mrs. Sickles, a second grade teacher, began providing study hall supervision in her room for the 11 students from her classroom participating. The study hall grew to 54 students, most of whom attended for more than half of the year. They were spread into the library and two classrooms. The program ended the first week of May, due to packing in the library for our renovation. Next year the program will run throughout the month of May also. Students remaining in the study hall for more than half the year are showing significant improvement in study skills,

work completion, increased learning, organization, and time on task during the work time.

Alaska Pacific University graduate student tutors have worked in the building during both fall and spring semesters as part of their reading and language arts methods courses. Several also supervised the study hall for a total of 12 hours as part of the January student-led practicum program. This has been a mutually beneficial program for our students and the APU teacher education students, providing help for our kids, and hands-on training for future teacher applicants in our district.

Our newest component this year was the Social Skills Tutor. As a Project Achieve school, we have become convinced of the need for our students to have pro-social skills directly taught, so that they may increase their academic learning. All staff are trained in the use of the "Stop and Think" decision-making discipline/pro-social skills. We have a building-wide discipline plan with steps for dealing with problems. At the Step 3 level, the student is assigned to a buddy room for a while. It is at Step 3 or 4 that the student is referred to Ms. Shaw. She does direct pro-social skill teaching and review with the student on the issue at hand and facilitates the successful return to the classroom to resume academic learning. We are looking for a decrease in contact with Ms. Shaw and problems disrupting learning.

### **Specific Achievement Goals:**

1. To provide intense, individual intervention instruction for identified at-risk first grade students in the areas of reading and language arts.
2. To provide a kindergarten intervention program for targeted students, between the morning and afternoon sessions to increase reading and math readiness skills.
3. To provide an after school study hall, starting during the first month of school, to provide support and a study environment conducive to learning for students failing, at risk of failing, or in need of a quiet study environment. Study skills, work completion, and increased learning will be the goals for these students.
4. To continue the tutorial partnership between Alaska Pacific University Education Department and Ptarmigan Elementary, providing a tutorial program for targeted students in grades 1 - 6.
5. To provide pro-social skill instruction to disruptive students so as to increase their on-task time in the classroom and increased academic learning.

## **Examination of Program Outcomes Relative to Goals:**

**Goal 1:** To provide intense, individual intervention instruction for identified at-risk first grade students in the areas of reading and language arts. This goal was addressed primarily by our full time resource tutor, Iris Vail. She pre-tested all incoming first graders, including those entering throughout the year. Based on results and teacher recommendations, students with highest needs were scheduled in a pull-out individual or small group program to work intensely with phonemic awareness, print awareness, and reading skills. In January, she began using the benchmark books to assess reading levels and reassessed each student's level and need for intervention. Adjustments were made as children met goals or showed need for further intervention. At the end of the year all students were re-tested to assess growth.

**Outcome 1:** As our team reviewed professional literature on the desirability of early accelerated assistance in reading as opposed to remediation, we determined a need to provide an intensive primary prevention reading and language arts program for our first grade. We focused our full time resource tutor in this area with targeted students. Pre and post testing in readiness skills, Dolch word lists, CBM reading scores and the Title I reading miscue and writing assessment all show positive gains for student receiving this intervention. It is our overall goal that these students will meet the district-wide goal of independent readers by the third grade and that the early accelerated assistance will sustain the learners over time. We also have made a conscientious effort to include strategies and assessments taught to our first grade team by the ASD reading specialists this winter and feel they are a positive addition to our program.

**Goal 2:** To provide a kindergarten intervention program for targeted students between the morning and afternoon sessions to increase reading and math readiness skills. The SEEDS program addressed the needs of these students by Providing daily intervention in reading and math readiness skills. Students were placed in the program based on a pretest in the fall and reassessed each quarter for growth. Instruction was adjusted based on the assessment data.

**Outcome 2:** This is the second full year of our SEEDS program. Once again positive growth in pre-reading and math readiness skills were shown by the students. Parent awareness and participation was also increased by this program. We continually look to find ways to improve the readiness of our kindergartners for first grade.

**Goal 3:** To provide an after school study hall, starting during the first month of school, to provide support and a study environment conducive to learning for students failing, at risk of failing, or in need of a quiet study environment.

Study skills, work completion, and increased learning will be the goals for these students. Study hall was available to students from September through early May. Students were placed based on teacher recommendation or parent request.

**Outcome 3:** Ongoing participation was stressed for student since last year's data showed the most benefit to students remaining throughout the year. This program showed the most growth in student numbers of any of our areas. Teachers noted a significant increase in homework completion, success on tests, and study skills for students while participating in this program.

**Goal 4:** To continue the tutorial partnership between Alaska Pacific University Education Department and Ptarmigan Elementary, providing a tutorial program for targeted students in grades 1 - 6. The partnership has continued to grow and strengthen each year. APU student tutors expanded both their hours and program involvement over the 96-97 school year.

**Outcome 4:** Contact hours from APU student tutors with Ptarmigan students increased this year, particularly in support of the study hall. The university students expressed satisfaction with their experiences at our school. Dr. Sue Heinz and Dr. Diana Caldwell continue to support our partnership and plan to continue next year. During the summer of 1997, we extended this partnership by providing a summer reading program for 16 primary students. No grant moneys were used to fund this program. Iris Vail and Diane Sickles voluntarily worked with APU students from the Reading Methods Class that summer to provide a five week, three half day reading program at the school. Ptarmigan students and their parents were very enthusiastic about the program and progress achieved in that program was sustained into the fall. This program will not be available this year because of the construction project, but is a direction we would like to move with the grant in the future since we saw such positive results in students, but cannot continue to volunteer each summer without compensation.

**Goal 5:** To provide pro-social skill instruction to disruptive students so as to increase their on-task time in the classroom and increased academic learning. This goal was added to our program this year to address the academic on-task behaviors as they effect academic learning. Just as increased intervention of positive teaching methods helps children, they must learn to conduct themselves and have the social skills to make the most of that instructional time. We feel this not only benefits the disrupters, but also the students whose learning time is negatively effected as teacher energy and time is consumed with behavior management issues.

**Outcome 5:** This goal provided a much needed link to break the disruptive and non-productive cycle of behavior problems in the classroom. Through direct instruction on pro-social skills and intervention in a timely and appropriate manner, academic learning time was recouped for entire classes of students. We are beginning to understand the actual numbers of disrupters, the occasional and chronic disrupters, and develop behavior plans that help extinguish this problem.

**School Achievement Profile:**

Average Scores on California Achievement Tests (CATs)  
 Percentile Rank Scores Corresponding to Mean NCE Scores  
 All Students Tested

<u>Level/School</u>	<u>Year</u>	<u>Total Reading</u>		<u>Total Lang. Arts</u>		<u>Total Math</u>		<u>Battery Composite</u>	
		<u>Num.</u>	<u>%ile</u>	<u>Num.</u>	<u>%ile</u>	<u>Num.</u>	<u>%ile</u>	<u>Num.</u>	<u>%ile</u>
District Grades 3-6	1998	14,424	61	14,375	63	14,411	65	14,243	64
	1997	14,325	62	14,311	63	14,318	66	14,185	65
	1996	14,013	63	14,028	59	14,047	63	13,839	63
Ptarmigan	1998	206	40	207	40	210	42	205	40
	1997	167	44	168	43	168	44	165	44
	1996	196	41	196	34	199	40	195	37

Ptarmigan's scores are lower than the district averages, but the pattern is very similar. Reading scores fluctuated, but did not change greatly over the three testing periods. Language Arts and Math scores both increased. It appears that Ptarmigan's high year, of the three shown, was 1996-97.

"Gain Scores" for Students in Continuing Feeder Pattern  
 1995-96 to 1997-98 -- Analysis Based on 1998 Grade Level  
 Percentile Rank Scores Corresponding to Mean NCE Scores

<u>Level/School</u>	<u>Sub-Test</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Spring 1996</u>	<u>Spring 1998</u>	<u>Gain</u>
District	Reading	3,970	69	68	-1
Grades 3 - 6	Language Arts	3,956	61	74	+13
	Mathematics	3,967	69	72	+3
	Composite	3,870	67	74	+7
Ptarmigan	Reading	43	39	38	-1
	Language Arts	43	27	45	+18
	Mathematics	43	43	41	-2
	Composite	43	33	43	+7

"Gain Scores" for Students in Continuing Feeder Pattern  
 1995-96 to 1996-97 -- Analysis Based on 1997 Grade Level  
 Percentile Rank Scores Corresponding to Mean NCE Scores

<u>Level/School</u>	<u>Sub-Test</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Spring 1996</u>	<u>Spring 1997</u>	<u>Gain</u>
District	Reading	7,371	67	66	-1
Grades 3 - 6	Language Arts	7,384	62	69	+7
	Mathematics	7,387	66	71	+5
	Composite	7,251	67	70	+3
Ptarmigan	Reading	85	44	46	+2
	Language Arts	85	37	45	+8
	Mathematics	85	47	50	+3
	Composite	85	41	47	+6

"Gain Scores" for Students in Continuing Feeder Pattern  
 1996-97 to 1997-98 -- Analysis Based on 1998 Grade Level  
 Percentile Rank Scores Corresponding to Mean NCE Scores

<u>Level/School</u>	<u>Sub-Test</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Spring 1997</u>	<u>Spring 1998</u>	<u>Gain</u>
District	Reading	7,976	66	65	-1
Grades 3 - 6	Language Arts	7,939	65	69	+4
	Mathematics	7,934	69	70	+1
	Composite	7,828	68	70	+2
Ptarmigan	Reading	84	41	36	-6
	Language Arts	85	41	42	+1
	Mathematics	86	40	40	0
	Composite	82	42	39	-3

Ptarmigan Elementary School has a pattern of change for students continuing for two years that shows substantial growth in Language Arts, stability in Reading, and, perhaps, a slight decline in Math. The district's pattern is similar for Language Arts and Reading. The district had an increase in the elementary years in Math. The 1996 to 1997 year had a more positive change pattern for Ptarmigan than did the 1997 to 1998 year.

"Gain Scores" for Students Targeted for Specific Services  
1996-97 to 1997-98 -- Analysis Based on 1998 Grade Level  
Percentile Rank Scores Corresponding to Mean NCE Scores

<u>Level/School</u>	<u>Sub-Test</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Spring 1997</u>	<u>Spring 1998</u>	<u>Gain</u>
Willow Crest	Reading	32	18	17	-1
	Language Arts	33	17	22	+5
	Mathematics	33	20	26	+6
	Composite	30	17	20	+3

Continuing students at Ptarmigan who were targeted for special services were a relative low scoring group. They basically maintained their standing in Reading and improved in Language Arts and Math from 1997 to 1998. This pattern exceeded the performance pattern of the school as a whole over the same time frame.

### **Curriculum Based Measurement, School Wide Scores, Grades 1 - 6**

As part of the Project Achieve program, our school decided to begin to use Curriculum Based Measurements for assessing student progress in the area of reading fluency. Research has shown that in the assessment of reading performance, the oral reading fluency measure compares favorably with comprehension measures, though it is not a perfect relationship. We are looking at growth trends for the individual students as well as our school as a whole.

The reading probes are taken from the Houghton Mifflin Readers and checked to be at the student's grade level. Each student reads three one-minute samples or probes, then an average reading fluency word count is determined. Various standards have been suggested for instructional and mastery standards. One source suggests 11 - 20 words per minute for first and second graders, and 41 - 50 words per minute for third through sixth graders would be considered an instructional level. For mastery levels, the suggested level is up to 30 words per minute for first and second grade and up to 60 words per minute for third through sixth grade.

In determining our school norms, the total range of reading scores were determined by grade level. They increased as the year went by. We then found the median

score and the half-median score. Any student reading below the half-median was considered at risk of not reading at grade level. You will note that at all levels the number of at-risk readers decreased as the year progressed, even though the half-median number of words per minute increased. We also were pleased to note that as the grade level increased, the number of at-risk readers decreased. Schoolwide we had 78 at-risk readers in their first probe (first grade was winter, all others were fall). By the end of the number of at-risk readers dropped to 51 percent, or a decrease of 36 percent. These numbers include our certified special education students.

First Grade CMBs 1997 - 1998

Number of Words Read Per Minute

	Fall	Winter	Spring
# of Students		54	58
Range		0.00 - 154.33	0.00 - 153.33
Median		16.33	21.50
1/2 Median Score		8.17	10.75
# below Median		24	16
0 - 20		21	29
21 - 40		5	8
41 - 60		8	5
61 - 80		2	6
81 - 100		3	3
101 - 120		0	0
121 - 140		3	6
141 - 160		2	1
161 - 180		0	0
181 - 200		0	0
201 - 220		0	0
221 - 240		0	0
241 - 260		0	0

Second Grade CMBs 1997 - 1998

Number of Words Read Per Minute

	Fall	Winter	Spring
# of Students	51	52	53
Range	0.67 - 101.67	0.67 - 134.33	1.00 - 135.67
Median	38.33	85.67	78.33
1/2 Median Score	19.17	42.84	39.17
# below Median	18	10	11
0 - 20	19	5	4
21 - 40	8	5	6
41 - 60	12	6	4
61 - 80	6	8	13
81 - 100	5	13	9
101 - 120	1	10	8
121 - 140	0	5	9
141 - 160	0	0	0
161 - 180	0	0	0
181 - 200	0	0	0
201 - 220	0	0	0
221 - 240	0	0	0
241 - 260	0	0	0

Third Grade CMBs 1997 - 1998

Number of Words Read Per Minute

	Fall	Winter	Spring
# of Students	70	66	72
Range	0.00 - 183.33	8.33 - 176.00	7.33 - 187.00
Median	54.17	83.33	73.34
1/2 Median Score	27.08	41.67	36.67
# below Median	13	12	12
0 - 20	10	6	7
21 - 40	17	6	8
41 - 60	12	10	15
61 - 80	18	11	13
81 - 100	9	8	14
101 - 120	2	17	10
121 - 140	1	4	3
141 - 160	0	2	0
161 - 180	0	1	1
181 - 200	1	0	1
201 - 220	0	0	0
221 - 240	0	0	0
241 - 260	0	0	0

Fourth Grade CMBs 1997 - 1998

Number of Words Read Per Minute

	Fall	Winter	Spring
# of Students	51	45	45
Range	0.00 - 149.67	10.67 - 172.00	18.33 - 181.67
Median	57.17	80.33	81.00
1/2 Median Score	28.58	40.17	40.50
# below Median	10	12	7
0 - 20	8	4	1
21 - 40	7	8	6
41 - 60	13	1	4
61 - 80	3	10	10
81 - 100	7	4	8
101 - 120	5	4	4
121 - 140	6	8	7
141 - 160	2	3	4
161 - 180	0	3	1
181 - 200	0	0	0
201 - 220	0	0	0
221 - 240	0	0	0
241 - 260	0	0	0

Fifth Grade CMBs 1997 - 1998

Number of Words Read Per Minute

	Fall	Winter	Spring
# of Students	47	46	47
Range	0.00 - 194.67	0.00 - 206.33	33.67 - 259.00
Median	79.00	107.33	123.00
1/2 Median Score	39.50	53.67	61.50
# below Median	5	4	3
0 - 20	2	1	1
21 - 40	3	2	2
41 - 60	9	1	6
61 - 80	11	7	11
81 - 100	12	12	18
101 - 120	5	8	9
121 - 140	3	8	2
141 - 160	0	6	3
161 - 180	0	0	1
181 - 200	2	0	0
201 - 220	0	1	0
221 - 240	0	0	0
241 - 260	0	0	1

Sixth Grade CMBs 1997 - 1998

Number of Words Read Per Minute

	Fall	Winter	Spring
# of Students	49	51	53
Range	33.00 - 188.00	47.33 - 220.33	45.67 - 237.00
Median	100.00	127.00	128.33
1/2 Median Score	50.00	63.50	64.17
# below Median	8	1	2
0 - 20	2	0	0
21 - 40	1	0	0
41 - 60	8	1	2
61 - 80	5	8	6
81 - 100	9	5	8
101 - 120	12	7	7
121 - 140	4	15	12
141 - 160	5	9	8
161 - 180	2	2	6
181 - 200	1	3	2
201 - 220	0	0	1
221 - 240	0	1	1
241 - 260	0	0	0

## Kindergarten SEEDS Program

The following table lists the pretest and post-test scores for children enrolled in our SEEDS program. The group as a whole showed a 70 percent gain in language arts skills and a 54 percent gain in math skills and concepts.

### SEEDS Class

	Language Arts				Mathematics			
	Pre Test		Post Test		Pre Test		Post Test	
Students	Raw	Percentage	Raw	Percentage	Raw	Percentage	Raw	Percentage
Student 1	13	25.00%	49	94.23%	1	5.00%	20	100.00%
Student 2	0	0.00%	49	94.23%	5	25.00%	14	70.00%
Student 3	8	15.38%	49	94.23%	0	0.00%	19	95.00%
Student 4	16	30.77%	52	100.00%	6	30.00%	20	100.00%
Student 5	4	7.69%	19	36.54%	6	30.00%	1	5.00%
Student 6	5	9.62%	44	84.62%	3	15.00%	16	80.00%
Student 7	0	0.00%	40	76.92%	3	15.00%	10	50.00%
Student 8	8	15.38%	51	98.08%	3	15.00%	20	100.00%
Student 9	4	7.69%	40	76.92%	6	30.00%	14	70.00%
Student 10	0	0.00%	13	25.00%	5	25.00%	2	10.00%
Student 11	3	5.77%	52	100.00%	1	5.00%	15	75.00%
Student 12	12	23.08%	51	98.08%	2	10.00%	20	100.00%
Student 13	10	19.23%	46	88.46%	7	35.00%	18	90.00%
Student 14	0	0.00%	23	44.23%	3	15.00%	7	35.00%
Student 15	12	23.08%	51	98.08%	9	45.00%	20	100.00%
Student 16	3	5.77%	52	100.00%	2	10.00%	19	95.00%
Student 17	10	19.23%	45	86.54%	7	35.00%	19	95.00%
Student 18	3	5.77%	45	86.54%	7	35.00%	20	100.00%
Student 19	9	17.31%	43	82.69%	9	45.00%	17	85.00%
Total	6.32	12.15%	42.84	82.39%	4.47	22.37%	15.32	76.58%

## Dolch Word List:

All entering first grade students were screened for sight word recognition with the Dolch Word Lists. Most only knew words in the pre-primer level. This table shows each student who was served by the resource tutor with a pre-test score from fall and the post test scores from spring. The growth for some children was truly amazing. Our goal was for students to read at 80 percent of the grade 1 list by spring. Fourteen of the twenty-seven, or 52 percent of the students, met or exceeded the goal.

### Dolch Word List

Students	Pre-Primer		Primer	Grade 1	Grade 2	Grade 3
	Pre Test	Post Test	Post Test	Post Test	Post Test	Post Test
Student 1	33	100	96	100	96	95
Student 2	8	100	84	78		
Student 3	40	100	94	95	91	80
Student 4	5	98				
Student 5	3	100	96	100	93	78
Student 6	25	100	100	100	100	100
Student 7	5	100	100	100	99	99
Student 8	8	100	96	95	85	83
Student 9	13	95	98	93	91	73
Student 10	1	88	54			
Student 11	0	67				
Student 12	0	88	86	80		
Student 13	5	77	66			
Student 14	1	90	72			
Student 15	0	82				
Student 16	0	57				
Student 17	7	25				
Student 18	7	45				
Student 19	10	78	54			
Student 20	0	45				
Student 21	2	75				
Student 22	0	98	84	80		
Student 23	0	90	84	73		
Student 24	50	100	94	98	69	
Student 25	7	100	98	100	100	83
Student 26	0	68				
Student 27	5	100	92	90	74	
Student 28	5	98	86	83		
Total	9%	84%	86%	91%	90%	86%

### **Title I Reading/Writing Assessments:**

Attached to this document are the scores for all targeted students in grades 1 - 6 on their fall - spring writing assessments. Student raw scores are not percentages, but points based on a rubric. Points indicate a need for further support and placement for Title I services. The points range from 5 (high need) to 0 (no need of support). A summary of the grade level averages, changed to percentage of growth, are as follows:

Grade 1	46% increase in skills
Grade 2	11% increase
Grade 3	4% increase
Grade 4	6% increase
Grade 5	-3% decrease
Grade 6	11% increase
Schoolwide	12.5% increase

### **Title I Math Assessments**

Attached to this document are the scores for all targeted students in grades 1 - 6 on their Fall - Spring math assessments. All students in grades 1 - 6 are given a Math Inventory. The scores indicate the number correct. These scores are converted into weighted points. These points indicate the degree of need. They range from 0 (no need of support) to 8 (high need of support).

Only students in grades 2 - 6 are given a Problem Solving Assessment. These assessments are scored on a rubric. This score is then converted into weighted points. The point range fro 0 (no need of support) to 5 (high need of support). The points from both the Math Inventory and the Problem Solving Assessment are combined to give a total. A summary of grade level averages, changed to percentage of growth as follows:

Grade	Increase
First	45%
Second	16.67%
Third	16.15%
Fourth	23.08%
Fifth	18.18%
Sixth	20.05%
Schoolwide	20.21%

## **Overall Program Success and Ongoing Affects on Academic Achievement:**

The community and staff of Ptarmigan Elementary agree that the Underachieving School Grant Program has been a tremendous benefit to all students at our school. As we have increased resources for staffing and supplies to support the student learning in our building, each person benefits either directly or indirectly. The intensive intervention with our youngest students, in kindergarten and first grades show example after example of positive growth in the children. Measurable skills and immeasurable gains in self esteem, confidence, social skills, and an incredible excitement for learning have been experienced all year. Students with minimal entry level skills have made significant progress, some have achieved more than a year's amount of growth with the accelerated assistance.

As in last year's report, our kindergarten and first grade students show the largest growth with the most concentrated intervention. Schoolwide we show a 12.5 percent growth in the Title I writing assessments and overall growth in our CBM testing. The CBM show that the number of at-risk readers drops as the children progress in school. Our students are making growth over time at each reading level. Our Title I math assessment shows a schoolwide growth of 20.31 percent (see attachment scores for students in underachieving school grant inventory and problem solving pp 1 - 6).

Assessment statistics performed on targeted students, as well as our whole school population show positive gains, meeting or exceeding our goals at all levels. This year we had 244 students involved in grant supported services during the school year. The entire population has benefited from this grant, either directly or indirectly.

## **Dependence of Program Results on Continued Funding**

Effective programs require effective staffing for continued success. Through the Underachieving School Grant we have been able to keep our highly professional and talented resource tutors, gain a teacher's aide, and pursue a vision of supporting our at-risk students to the degree that enables them to grow into achieving, motivated, functional students. The data clearly show that the intensive primary prevention programs have had a major impact on our kindergarten and first grade students. Results are good for the intermediate students who took full advantage of the study hall and APU tutors also. This program continues to show great success and has been a boon to our school community.

The intensive primary prevention could continue without the grant if the school district were to commit to excellence for our children and fund a full day kindergarten and the resource tutor program through the general elementary education operating budget. That would also provide the staffing organizing the volunteer APU tutors and maintaining the three day per week study hall.

Without funding for the required staff, either through loss of the grant or non-funding by the district, our children would miss the direct daily services of three staff members, the resource tutors and teaching assistant. The SEEDS program, intensive first grade primary prevention, and study hall would disappear. The tutors from APU would remain committed to the school and plan to continue their support, but there would be no one to schedule their time, answer questions, or guide and direct their activity in the building. These jobs occur at times when the teaching staff could not absorb the responsibilities. The Social Skills tutor would have to be absorbed through other grant money or that position would also disappear.

### **Recommendations for Program Continuation or Change:**

We are becoming more convinced of the success of these interventions for our students over time. More than half of our school population benefited from this program during the 1997-98 school year. Test scores, student confidence, and student competence all reflect the positive effects of our early and intensive intervention. I strongly recommend that you continue this program over the long term and suggest these possible changes to strengthen the interventions:

- Move from an extended day kindergarten using the SEEDS program to a full day kindergarten so all entering kindergartners have sufficient time on task in the classroom to learn the pre-academic and pro-social skills needed for success in school. We pursued this program without success, but would ask for reconsideration with the increased funding from the state. Too many children at this school are not yet ready for first grade.
- Maintain the current grant and increase funding to include another half time resource tutor to provide extra support in grades 2 - 6.
- Extend primary intervention to a funded, midsummer reading program to prevent the loss of reading skills over the summer and provide learning experiences for both our Ptarmigan Students and the APU graduate students preparing to become teachers.



SCORES FOR STUDENTS IN THE UNDERACHIEVING SCHOOL GRANT												
		Miscue				Total	Writing				Total	Title I Notes
		Fall		Spring		Difference	Fall		Spring		Difference	
Student	Grade	Score	Pts.	Score	Pts.	(+/-)	Score	Pts.	Score	Pts.	(+/-)	
Student 1	2	50	10	27	3	7	4	4	10	2	2	*
Student 2	2	50	10	17	0	10	6	4	8	3	1	*
Student 3	2	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	10	2	11	2	0	
Student 4	2	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	10	2	10	2	0	
Student 5	2	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	10	2	11	2	0	
Student 6	2	28	3	N/A	N/A	N/A	9	3	9	3	0	Father doesn't want Title I
Student 7	2	50	10	N/A	N/A	N/A	6	4	N/A	N/A	N/A	* Moved
Student 8	2	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	13	1	10	2	-1	
Student 9	2	49	10	N/A	N/A	N/A	3	5	7	4	1	Resource
Student 10	2	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	5	5	9	3	2	
Student 11	2	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	9	3	9	3	0	
Student 12	2	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	8	3	10	2	1	
Student 13	2	50	10	N/A	N/A	N/A	7	4	N/A	N/A	N/A	* Moved
Student 14	2	50	10	26	2	8	6	4	9	3	1	*
Student 15	2	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	8	3	13	1	2	
Student 16	2	50	10	N/A	N/A	N/A	7	4	N/A	N/A	N/A	* Moved
Student 17	2	50	10	N/A	N/A	N/A	2	5	N/A	N/A	N/A	* Resource
Student 18	2	8	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	12	1	10	2	-1	
Student 19	2	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	10	2	9	3	-1	
Student 20	2	50	10	?			5	5	8	3	2	Resource
Student 21	2	50	10	11	0	10	7	4	10	2	2	*
Student 22	2	50	10	N/A	N/A	N/A	11	2	N/A	N/A	N/A	* Moved
Student 23	2	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	9	3	6	4	-1	Resource
Student 24	2	40	7	27	3	4	8	3	7	4	-1	*
Student 25	2	33	5	11	0	5	10	2	8	3	-1	*
Student 26	2	50	10	N/A	N/A	N/A	2	5	6	4	1	Resource
Student 27	2	11	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	9	3	12	1	2	
Student 28	2	50	10	N/A	N/A	N/A	9	3	N/A	N/A	N/A	* Moved
Student 29	2	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	8	3	10	2	1	
Student 30	2	47	7	12	0	7	6	4	10	2	2	*
Student 31	2	33	5	N/A	N/A	N/A	10	2	9	3	-1	
Student 32	2	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	10	2	10	2	0	
Student 33	2	25	2	9	0	2	8	3	11	2	1	*
Student 34	2	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	10	2	10	2	0	
Student 35	2	34	5	10	0	5	8	3	11	2	1	*
Student 36	2	38	6	21	1	5	8	3	10	2	1	*
Student 37	2	15	0	6	0	0	8	3	13	1	2	
Student 38	2	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	12	1	8	3	-2	
Student 39	2	50	10	24	2	8	4	5	7	4	1	*
Student 40	2	50	10	11	0	10	8	3	10	2	1	*
Student 41	2	50	10	43	8	2	5	5	9	3	2	*
Student 42	2	50	10	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	9	3	N/A	*
Student 43	2	50	10	44	8	2	7	4	7	4	0	*
Average for Second Grade							7.786	3.19	9.16	2.61	0.55556	
Percentage of gain											11.1111	

SCORES FOR STUDENTS IN THE UNDERACHIEVING SCHOOL GRANT												
	Grade	Miscue				Total	Writing				Total	Title I Notes
		Fall		Spring		Difference	Fall		Spring		Difference	
Student	Grade	Score	Pts.	Score	Pts.	(+/-)	Score	Pts.	Score	Pts.	(+/-)	
Student 1	3	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	8	4	9	2	0	
Student 2	3	14	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	7.8	2	6.4	3	-1	
Student 3	3	13	0	21	1	-1	4.6	4	3.84	4.25	-0.25	*
Student 4	3	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	8.8	2	9.6	1.5	0.5	
Student 5	3	7	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	6.8	3	8.4	2	1	
Student 6	3	33	5	N/A	N/A	N/A	5.8	3	5.2	4	-1	
Student 7	3	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	8.2	2	11.2	1	1	
Student 8	3	N/A	N/A	refused	5	N/A	N/A	N/A	5	4	N/A	*
Student 9	3	14	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	10	1	9.9	1	-1	
Student 10	3	5	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	7.6	2	8.8	2	0	
Student 11	3	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	5.8	4.5	N/A	N/A	N/A	Moved
Student 12	3	31	4	19	0	4	6.8	3	1.25	1.25	1.75	*
Student 13	3	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	4.4	4	4	4	0	
Student 14	3	50	10	17	0	10	6.6	3	3	3	0	*
Student 15	3	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	6.6	3	2	2	1	
Student 16	3	35	5	29	3	2	4.6	4	4	4	0	*
Student 17	3	12	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	7.6	2	3	3	-1	
Student 18	3	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	3.6	4.5	5	5	-0.5	
Student 19	3	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	6	4	3	3	1	
Student 20	3	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	9.6	1.5	3	3	-2.5	
Student 21	3	9	0	8	0	0	6.4	3	3	3	0	
Student 22	3	8	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	6.6	3	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Student 23	3	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	6	3	5.4	3.5	-0.5	
Student 24	3	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	6.6	3	8.8	2	1	
Student 25	3	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	7.2	3	9.4	1.5	1.5	
Student 26	3	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	2.4	5	3	5	0	Resource
Student 27	3	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	7	3	7	3	0	
Student 28	3	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	6	3	6.8	3	0	
Student 29	3	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	2.4	5	4	4	1	
Student 30	3	40	7	28	3	4	7.6	3.5	5.6	3.5	0	*
Student 31	3	9	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	6.4	3	11.2	1	2	
Student 32	3	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	7	3	6.1	3	0	
Student 33	3	44	8	20	0	8	6.4	3	4	4	-1	*
Student 34	3	27	3	7	0	3	6	4.5	5.8	3.25	1.25	*
Student 35	3	50	10	N/A	N/A	N/A	0	5	2.4	5	0	* now resource
Student 36	3	50	10	N/A	N/A	N/A	4.6	4	4.6	4	0	* now resource
Student 37	3	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	5.3	3	8.6	2	1	
Student 38	3	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	5	4	8.8	2	2	
Student 39	3	31	4	19	0	4	5.2	4	N/A	N/A	N/A	* moved
Student 40	3	10	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	8	2	4.2	4	-2	
Student 41	3	24	2	9	0	2	5.4	4	6.4	3	1	*
Student 42	3	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	9.4	2	11.6	0.5	1.5	
Student 43	3	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	3.4	5	3.6	4.5	0.5	
Student 44	3	14	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	5.8	3	4.6	4	-1	
Student 45	3	35	5	19	0	5	3.2	5	4	4	1	*
Average for Third Grade							6.012	3.36	6.55	2.99	0.20122	
Percentage of gain											4.02439	





SCORES FOR STUDENTS IN THE UNDERACHIEVING SCHOOL GRANT												
		Miscue				Total	Writing				Total	Title I Notes
		Fall		Spring		Difference	Fall		Spring		Difference	
Student	Grade	Score	Pts.	Score	Pts.	(+/-)	Score	Pts.	Score	Pts.	(+/-)	
Student 1	6	29	3	22	1	2	8	2	7.2	3	-1	CAT above 50
Student 2	6	36	6	38	6	0	7.2	3	6.8	3	0	*
Student 3	6	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	8	2	10.4	1	1	
Student 4	6	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	6.4	3	8.4	2	1	
Student 5	6	11	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	7.4	3	7.8	2.25	0.75	
Student 6	6	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	4.6	4	6.2	3	1	*
Student 7	6	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	7.8	3	8.2	2	1	
Student 8	6	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	5.6	4	7	3	1	
Student 9	6	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	6	3	7.2	3	1	
Student 10	6	27	3	15	0	3	6	3	7.4	2.5	0.5	*
Student 11	6	43	8	N/A	N/A	N/A	7.6	3	7.2	3	0	*
Student 12	6	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	8.4	2	11.1	1	1	
Student 13	6	31	4	N/A	N/A	N/A	5.4	4	6.8	3	1	* moved
Student 14	6	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	7	3	6.8	3	0	
Student 15	6	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	7.8	3	9.8	1.25	1.75	
Student 16	6	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	8.2	2	10.4	1	1	
Student 17	6	49	10	47	9	1	6.4	3	4.6	4	-1	*
Student 18	6	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	6.2	3	N/A	N/A	N/A	moved
Student 19	6	35	5	25	2	3	6.2	3	7.8	2.25	0.75	*
Student 20	6	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	7.6	3	6.4	3	0	
Student 21	6	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	6.4	3	N/A	came last quarter
Student 22	6	23	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	5.8	4	4.6	4	0	
Student 23	6	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	6.8	.	6.4	3	0	
Student 24	6	31	4	N/A	N/A	N/A	7.2	3	9	2	1	
Student 25	6	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	8	2	10.4	1	1	
Student 26	6	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	9.6	2	11.1	1	1	
Student 27	6	37	6	23	1	5	7.6	3	8	2	1	*
Student 28	6	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	7	3	7.2	3	0	
Student 29	6	37	6	38	6	0	6	3	10.4	1	2	*
Student 30	6	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	8.2	2	9	2	0	
Student 31	6	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	8.2	2	9.4	1.75	0.25	
Student 32	6	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	7.2	3	9.4	1.75	1.25	
Student 33	6	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	6.4	3	9.4	1.75	1.25	
Student 34	6	38	6	38	6	0	6.4	3	4.6	4	-1	*
Student 35	6	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	6.4	3	9	2	1	
Student 36	6	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	10.8	1	9.2	1.75	-0.8	
Student 37	6	33	5	N/A	N/A	N/A	0	5	6.6	3	2	
Student 38	6	40	7	35	5	2	7.2	3	7.4	2.5	0.5	*
Student 39	6	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	6	3	8.6	2	1	
Student 40	6	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	6.4	3	7	3	0	
		Average for Fifth Grade					6.795	2.95	7.96	2.35	0.55789	
		Percentage of gain									11.1579	
		Average for Fifth Grade					6.893	3.32	9.66	2.65	0.62737	
		Percentage of gain									12.5473	

SCORES FOR STUDENTS IN THE UNDERACHIEVING SCHOOL GRANT															
Student	Grade	Inventory				Total Pts.	Problem Solving				Total Pts.	Fall	Spring	Total	Titl
		Fall		Spring		Difference	Fall		Spring		Difference	Total	Total	Difference	
		Score	Pts.	Score	Pts.		Score	Pts.	Score	Pts.		Pt.	Pt.		
Student 1	1	12	4	26	0	4	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	4	0	4	*
Student 2	1	N/A	N/A	10	6	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	6	N/A	*
Student 3	1	0	8	6	8	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	8	8	0	*
Student 4	1	6	8	14	4	4	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	8	4	4	
Student 5	1	N/A	N/A	24	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0	N/A	*
Student 6	1	N/A	N/A	26	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0	N/A	*
Student 7	1	N/A	N/A	26	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0	N/A	*
Student 8	1	10	6	10	6	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	6	6	0	*
Student 9	1	8	6	26	0	6	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	6	0	6	
Student 10	1	14	4	28	0	4	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	4	0	4	
Student 11	1	14	4	22	0	4	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	4	0	4	*
Student 12	1	N/A	N/A	18	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	1	N/A	*
Student 13	1	18	1	30	0	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	1	0	1	
Student 14	1	18	1	18	1	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	1	1	0	*
Student 15	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Student 16	1	26	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0	N/A	N/A	
Student 17	1	N/A	N/A	10	6	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	6	N/A	*
Student 18	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	*
Student 19	1	8	4	20	0	4	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	4	0	4	*
Student 20	1	12	4	16	1	3	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	4	1	3	*
Student 21	1	12	4	20	0	4	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	4	0	4	*
Student 22	1	N/A	N/A	20	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0	N/A	*
Student 23	1	6	8	18	1	7	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	8	1	7	*
Student 24	1	8	6	24	0	6	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	6	0	6	
Student 25	1	N/A	N/A	22	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0	N/A	*
Student 26	1	N/A	N/A	28	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0	N/A	*
Student 27	1	N/A	N/A	24	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0	N/A	
Student 28	1	N/A	N/A	28	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0	N/A	*
Student 29	1	N/A	N/A	2	8	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	8	N/A	*
Student 30	1	4	8	16	1	7	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	8	1	7	*
Student 31	1	12	4	20	0	4	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	4	0	4	*
Student 32	1	N/A	N/A	28	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0	N/A	
Student 33	1	8	6	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	6	N/A	N/A	*
Student 34	1	8	6	16	1	5	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	6	1	5	
Student 35	1	N/A	N/A	30	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0	N/A	*
Student 36	1	16	1	24	0	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	1	0	1	
Student 37	1	N/A	N/A	28	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0	N/A	*
Student 38	1	6	8	20	0	8	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	8	0	8	*
Student 39	1	N/A	N/A	0	8	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	8	N/A	
Student 40	1	26	0	30	0	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0	0	0	
Average		11.45	4.6	20.2	1.4	3.6	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	4.59	1,444	3.6	
Percentage of gain						45					N/A			45	

SCORES FOR STUDENTS IN THE UNDERACHIEVING SCHOOL GRANT															
	Grade	Inventory				Total Pts.	Problem Solving				Total Pts.	Fall	Spring	Total	Titl
		Fall		Spring		Difference	Fall		Spring		Difference	Total	Total	Difference	
Student	Grade	Score	Pts.	Score	Pts.	(+/-)	Score	Pts.	Score	Pts.	(+/-)	Pt.	Pt.	(+/-)	
Student 1	2	20	0	22	0	0	2	5	9	2	3	5	2	3	*
Student 2	2	10	6	22	0	6	5	4	3	5	-1	10	5	5	*
Student 3	2	24	0	28	0	0	10	1	9	2	-1	1	2	-1	
Student 4	2	14	4	24	0	4	8	2	7	3	-1	6	3	3	
Student 5	2	26	0	28	0	0	10	1	6	3	-2	1	3	-	
Student 6	2	14	4	26	0	4	11	1	8	2	-1	5	2	3	
Student 7	2	0	8	N/A	N/A	N/A	2	5	N/A	N/A	N/A	13	N/A	N/A	*
Student 8	2	26	0	30	0	0	9	2	8	2	0	2	2	0	
Student 9	2	2	8	22	0	8	1	5	3	5	0	13	5	8	*
Student 10	2	20	0	24	0	0	7	3	10	1	2	3	1	2	
Student 11	2	18	1	24	0	1	6	3	10	1	2	4	1	3	
Student 12	2	16	1	26	0	1	6	3	9	2	1	4	2	2	
Student 13	2	16	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	7	3	N/A	N/A	N/A	4	N/A	N/A	*
Student 14	2	20	0	26	0	0	5	4	8	2	2	4	2	2	*
Student 15	2	22	0	24	0	0	5	4	7	3	1	4	3	1	
Student 16	2	16	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	7	3	N/A	N/A	N/A	4	N/A	N/A	*
Student 17	2	8	6	N/A	N/A	N/A	4	4	N/A	N/A	N/A	10	N/A	N/A	
Student 18	2	22	0	26	0	0	9	2	8	2	0	2	2	0	
Student 19	2	22	0	24	0	0	7	3	7	3	0	3	3	0	
Student 20	2	22	0	24	0	0	5	4	7	3	1	4	3	1	
Student 21	2	16	1	24	0	1	6	3	9	2	1	4	2	2	*
Student 22	2	18	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	4	4	N/A	N/A	N/A	5	N/A	N/A	*
Student 23	2	18	1	20	0	1	6	3	2	5	-2	4	5	-1	
Student 24	2	24	0	16	0	0	4	4	8	2	2	4	2	2	*
Student 25	2	16	1	18	1	0	5	4	5	4	0	5	5	0	*
Student 26	2	6	8	12	4	4	5	4	2	5	-1	12	9	3	
Student 27	2	16	1	24	0	1	8	2	10	1	1	3	1	2	
Student 28	2	20	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	7	3	N/A	N/A	N/A	3	N/A	N/A	*
Student 29	2	20	0	30	0	0	8	2	6	3	-1	2	3	-1	
Student 30	2	20	0	28	0	0	7	3	5	4	-1	3	4	-1	*
Student 31	2	28	0	26	0	0	8	2	9	2	0	2	2	0	
Student 32	2	24	0	28	0	0	9	2	9	2	0	2	2	0	
Student 33	2	22	0	24	0	0	6	3	8	2	1	3	2	1	*
Student 34	2	14	4	22	0	4	7	3	8	2	1	7	2	5	
Student 35	2	10	6	22	0	6	7	3	4	4	-1	9	4	5	
Student 36	2	16	1	22	0	1	3	5	6	3	2	6	3	3	*
Student 37	2	14	4	26	0	4	4	4	10	1	3	8	1	7	*
Student 38	2	18	1	24	0	1	7	3	10	1	2	4	1	3	
Student 39	2	14	4	20	0	4	8	2	5	4	-2	6	4	2	*
Student 40	2	20	0	30	0	0	8	2	9	2	0	2	2	0	*
Student 41	2	2	8	18	1	7	2	5	7	3	2	13	4	9	*
Student 42	2	N/A	N/A	12	4	N/A	N/A	N/A	3	5	N/A	N/A	9	N/A	*
Student 43	2	10	6	20	0	6	6	3	8	2	1	9	2	7	*
Average		16.76	2.1	23.7	0.3	1.778	6.21	3.1	7.08	2.7	0.389	5.19	2.973	2.167	
Percentage of gain						22.23					7.78			16.67	

SCORES FOR STUDENTS IN THE UNDERACHIEVING SCHOOL GRANT															
	Grade	Inventory				Total Pts.	Problem Solving				Total Pts.	Fall	Spring	Total	
		Fall		Spring		Difference	Fall		Spring		Difference	Total	Total	Difference	
Student	Grade	Score	Pts.	Score	Pts.	(+/-)	Score	Pts.	Score	Pts.	(+/-)	Pt.	Pt.	(+/-)	
Student 1	3	18	1	27	0	1	9	2	10	1	1	3	1	2	
Student 2	3	15	4	17	1	3	6	3	6	3	0	7	4	3	*
Student 3	3	9	6	23	0	6	4	4	8	2	2	10	2	8	*
Student 4	3	19	1	27	0	1	6	3	11	1	2	4	1	3	
Student 5	3	16	1	25	0	1	6	3	7	3	0	4	3	1	
Student 6	3	13	4	19	1	3	5	4	8	2	2	8	3	5	
Student 7	3	18	1	26	0	1	8	2	9	2	0	3	2	1	
Student 8	3	N/A	N/A	18	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	8	2	N/A	N/A	3	N/A	*
Student 9	3	13	4	23	0	4	6	3	6	3	0	7	3	4	
Student 10	3	13	4	20	0	4	8	2	9	2	0	6	2	4	*
Student 11	3	15	4	22	0	4	6	3	N/A	N/A	N/A	7	N/A	N/A	
Student 12	3	16	1	20	0	1	8	2	7	3	-1	3	3	0	*
Student 13	3	6	8	14	4	4	6	3	7	3	0	11	7	4	*
Student 14	3	17	1	19	1	0	9	2	7	3	-1	3	4	-1	*
Student 15	3	17	1	22	0	1	9	2	9	2	0	3	2	1	
Student 16	3	13	4	25	0	4	7	3	8	2	1	7	2	5	*
Student 17	3	15	4	17	1	3	8	2	8	2	0	6	3	3	
Student 18	3	9	6	15	4	2	4	4	6	3	1	10	7	3	
Student 19	3	16	1	20	0	1	6	3	9	2	1	4	2	2	
Student 20	3	24	0	28	0	0	8	2	6	3	-1	2	3	-1	
Student 21	3	6	8	11	6	2	4	4	8	2	2	12	8	4	*
Student 22	3	13	4	N/A	N/A	N/A	4	4	N/A	N/A	N/A	8	N/A	N/A	*
Student 23	3	21	0	18	1	-1	7	3	5	4	-1	3	5	-2	
Student 24	3	17	1	25	0	1	9	2	8	2	0	3	2	1	
Student 25	3	20	0	21	0	0	8	2	9	2	0	2	2	0	
Student 26	3	10	6	9	6	0	2	5	4	4	1	11	N/A	N/A	
Student 27	3	11	6	18	1	5	5	4	6	3	1	10	4	6	*
Student 28	3	16	1	26	0	1	6	3	6	3	0	4	3	1	
Student 29	3	24	0	9	6	-6	6	3	4	4	-1	3	10	-7	
Student 30	3	13	4	19	1	3	9	2	6	3	-1	6	4	2	*
Student 31	3	21	0	20	0	0	6	3	9	2	1	3	2	1	
Student 32	3	16	1	25	0	1	7	3	9	2	1	4	2	2	
Student 33	3	8	6	21	0	6	2	5	8	2	3	11	2	9	*
Student 34	3	24	0	23	0	0	8	2	6	3	-1	2	3	-1	*
Student 35	3	2	8	5	8	0	2	5	4	4	1	13	12	1	*
Student 36	3	1	8	21	0	8	2	5	6	3	2	13	3	10	*
Student 37	3	17	1	21	0	1	11	1	6	3	-2	2	3	-1	
Student 38	3	16	1	14	4	-3	6	3	6	3	0	4	7	-3	
Student 39	3	15	4	N/A	N/A	N/A	7	3	N/A	N/A	N/A	7	N/A	N/A	*
Student 40	3	25	0	24	0	0	8	2	7	3	-1	2	3	-1	
Student 41	3	14	4	26	0	4	4	4	8	2	2	8	2	6	*
Student 42	3	29	0	30	0	0	8	2	12	0	2	2	0	2	
Student 43	3	7	8	16	1	7	6	3	6	3	0	11	4	7	
Student 44	3	13	4	10	6	-2	7	3	5	4	-1	7	10	-3	*
Student 45	3	13	4	28	0	4	8	2	7	3	-1	6	3	3	*
Average		14.86	3.1	20.2	1.2	1.786	6.39	3	7.24	2.6	0.341	6.02	3.683	2.1	
Percentage of gain						22.33					6.82			16.15	

SCORES FOR STUDENTS IN THE UNDERACHIEVING SCHOOL GRANT															
	Grade	Inventory				Total Pts.	Problem Solving				Total Pts.	Fall	Spring	Total	Titl
		Fall		Spring		Difference	Fall		Spring		Difference	Total	Total	Difference	
Student	Grade	Score	Pts.	Score	Pts.	(+/-)	Score	Pts.	Score	Pts.	(+/-)	Pt.	Pt.	(+/-)	
Student 1	4	N/A	N/A	5	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	6	3	N/A	N/A	11	N/A	
Student 2	4	10	6	19	1	5	4	4	6	3	1	10	4	6	*
Student 3	4	13	4	13	0	0	2	5	4	4	1	9	8	1	*
Student 4	4	1	8	5	0	0	4	4	4	4	0	12	12	0	*
Student 5	4	15	4	16	0	3	6	3	N/A	N/A	N/A	7	N/A	N/A	*
Student 6	4	7	8	0	1	0	4	4	4	4	0	12	12	0	*
Student 7	4	7	8	N/A	N/A	N/A	4	4	N/A	N/A	N/A	12	N/A	N/A	*
Student 8	4	4	8	14	1	4	4	4	2	5	-1	12	9	3	*
Student 9	4	17	1	25	0	1	4	4	6	3	1	5	3	2	
Student 10	4	7	8	19	0	7	8	2	6	3	-1	10	4	6	*
Student 11	4	16	4	23	0	4	6	3	0	5	-2	7	5	2	
Student 12	4	5	8	N/A	N/A	N/A	2	5	N/A	N/A	N/A	13	N/A	N/A	*
Student 13	4	3	8	N/A	N/A	N/A	4	4	N/A	N/A	N/A	12	N/A	N/A	*
Student 14	4	8	6	8	6	0	2	5	2	5	0	11	11	0	*
Student 15	4	10	6	16	1	5	5	4	7	3	1	10	4	6	
Student 16	4	17	1	18	1	0	6	3	7	3	0	4	4	0	*
Student 17	4	9	6	17	1	5	4	4	7	3	1	10	4	6	*
Student 18	4	20	0	24	0	0	4	4	10	1	3	4	1	3	
Student 19	4	15	4	16	1	3	4	4	4	4	0	8	5	3	*
Student 20	4	17	1	22	0	1	4	4	4	4	0	5	4	1	*
Student 21	4	12	4	23	0	4	4	4	7	3	1	8	3	5	*
Student 22	4	14	4	24	0	4	6	3	11	1	2	7	1	6	
Student 23	4	1	8	2	8	0	2	5	6	3	2	13	11	2	
Student 24	4	13	4	15	4	0	4	4	6	3	1	8	7	1	*
Student 25	4	11	6	16	1	5	4	4	7	3	1	10	4	6	
Student 26	4	7	8	15	4	4	3	5	5	4	1	13	8	5	
Student 27	4	15	4	15	4	0	8	2	5	4	-2	6	8	-2	
Student 28	4	22	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	2	5	N/A	N/A	N/A	5	N/A	N/A	
Student 29	4	12	4	12	4	0	6	3	4	4	-1	7	8	-1	*
Student 30	4	8	6	19	1	5	6	3	7	3	0	9	4	5	*
Student 31	4	15	4	N/A	N/A	N/A	6	3	N/A	N/A	N/A	7	N/A	N/A	*
Student 32	4	N/A	N/A	17	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	4	4	N/A	N/A	5	N/A	*
Student 33	4	8	6	18	1	6	5	4	5	4	0	10	5	5	*
Student 34	4	7	8	14	4	0	0	5	5	4	1	13	8	5	
Student 35	4	10	6	20	0	0	6	3	5	4	-1	9	4	5	*
Student 36	4	12	4	N/A	N/A	N/A	4	4	N/A	N/A	N/A	8	N/A	N/A	
Average		10.82	5.1	15.7	2.6	2.679	4.32	3.9	5.38	3.5	0.333	9	6.103	3	
Percentage of gain						33.49					6.66			23.08	

SCORES FOR STUDENTS IN THE UNDERACHIEVING SCHOOL GRANT															
	Grade	Inventory				Total Pts.	Problem Solving				Total Pts.	Fall	Spring	Total	
		Fall		Spring		Difference	Fall		Spring		Difference	Total	Total	Difference	
Student	Grade	Score	Pts.	Score	Pts.	(+/-)	Score	Pts.	Score	Pts.	(+/-)	Pt.	Pt.	(+/-)	
Student 1	5	16	1	21	0	1	6	6	5	4	2	7	4	3	
Student 2	5	8	6	N/A	N/A	N/A	2	5	2	5	0	11	N/A	N/A	*
Student 3	5	17	1	20	0	1	4	4	3	5	-1	5	5	0	
Student 4	5	6	8	12	4	4	7	3	7	3	0	11	7	4	*
Student 5	5	15	4	20	0	4	4	4	6	3	1	8	3	5	
Student 6	5	14	4	16	1	3	4	4	5	4	0	8	5	3	*
Student 7	5	14	4	21	0	4	4	4	4	4	0	8	4	4	*
Student 8	5	15	4	21	0	4	4	4	6	3	1	8	3	5	*
Student 9	5	8	6	9	6	0	2	5	6	3	2	11	9	2	*
Student 10	5	8	6	9	6	0	2	5	6	3	2	11	9	2	*
Student 11	5	8	6	9	6	0	2	5	6	3	2	11	9	2	*
Student 12	5	15	4	26	0	4	4	4	4	4	0	8	4	4	*
Student 13	5	16	1	23	0	1	5	4	6	3	1	5	3	2	
Student 14	5	10	6	15	4	2	4	4	5	4	0	10	8	2	*
Student 15	5	10	6	12	4	2	2	5	2	5	0	11	9	2	*
Student 16	5	2	8	13	4	4	3	5	6	3	2	13	7	6	*
Student 17	5	22	0	22	0	0	7	3	10	1	2	3	1	2	
Student 18	5	15	4	16	1	3	4	4	2	5	-1	8	6	2	*
Student 19	5	15	4	18	1	3	4	4	5	4	0	8	5	3	*
Student 20	5	7	8	14	4	4	4	4	0	5	-1	12	9	3	
Student 21	5	11	6	7	8	-2	3	5	N/A	N/A	N/A	11	N/A	N/A	*
Student 22	5	3	8	N/A	N/A	N/A	2	5	N/A	N/A	N/A	13	N/A	N/A	*
Student 23	5	3	8	N/A	N/A	N/A	0	5	N/A	N/A	N/A	13	N/A	N/A	
Student 24	5	22	0	23	0	0	8	2	5	4	-2	2	4	-2	
Student 25	5	15	4	18	1	3	5	4	4	4	0	8	5	3	*
Student 26	5	12	4	21	0	4	6	3	4	4	-1	7	4	3	*
Student 27	5	18	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	7	3	N/A	N/A	N/A	4	N/A	N/A	
Student 28	5	0	8	0	8	0	2	5	0	5	0	13	13	0	
Student 29	5	13	4	21	0	4	6	3	0	5	-2	7	5	2	
Student 30	5	6	8	17	1	7	2	5	3	5	0	13	6	7	*
Student 31	5	17	1	23	0	1	6	3	7	3	0	4	3	1	
Student 32	5	9	6	20	0	6	3	5	2	5	0	11	5	6	
Student 33	5	19	1	14	4	-3	6	3	2	5	-2	4	9	-5	
Student 34	5	10	6	15	4	2	2	5	4	4	1	11	8	3	
Student 35	5	10	6	10	6	0	5	4	2	5	-1	10	11	-1	*
Student 36	5	15	4	N/A	N/A	N/A	4	4	4	4	0	8	N/A	N/A	
Student 37	5	8	6	16	1	5	5	4	4	4	0	10	5	5	*
Student 38	5	17	1	20	0	1	6	3	0	5	-2	4	5	-1	
Student 39	5	6	8	11	6	2	4	4	0	5	-1	12	11	1	*
Average		11.67	4.6	16.3	2.4	2.176	4.1	4.1	3.91	4	0.057	8.77	6.182	2.364	
Percentage of gain						27.2					1.14			18.18	

SCORES FOR STUDENTS IN THE UNDERACHIEVING SCHOOL GRANT															
Student	Grade	Inventory				Total Pts.	Problem Solving				Total Pts.	Fall	Spring	Total	Titl
		Fall		Spring		Difference	Fall		Spring		Difference	Total	Total	Difference	
		Score	Pts.	Score	Pts.		Score	Pts.	Score	Pts.		Pt.	Pt.		
Student 1	6	6	8	12	4	4	6	3	6	3	0	11	7	4	*
Student 2	6	9	6	17	1	5	6	3	8	2	1	9	3	6	*
Student 3	6	9	6	19	0	6	10	1	10	1	0	7	1	6	
Student 4	6	9	6	19	0	6	10	1	10	1	0	7	1	6	
Student 5	6	9	6	19	0	6	10	1	10	1	0	7	1	6	*
Student 6	6	N/A	N/A	4	8	N/A	N/A	N/A	5	4	N/A	N/A	12	N/A	*
Student 7	6	18	1	23	0	1	7	3	8	2	1	4	2	2	
Student 8	6	12	4	20	0	4	6	3	9	2	1	7	2	5	
Student 9	6	22	0	15	4	-4	5	4	6	3	1	4	7	-3	
Student 10	6	6	8	9	6	2	6	3	0	5	-2	11	11	0	*
Student 11	6	5	8	8	6	2	7	3	2	5	-2	11	11	0	*
Student 12	6	20	0	27	0	0	9	2	11	1	1	2	1	1	
Student 13	6	2	8	N/A	N/A	N/A	7	3	N/A	N/A	N/A	11	N/A	N/A	*
Student 14	6	8	6	22	0	6	8	2	6	3	-1	8	3	5	
Student 15	6	11	6	18	1	5	10	1	8	2	-1	7	3	4	
Student 16	6	18	1	23	0	1	8	2	7	3	-1	3	3	0	
Student 17	6	2	8	11	6	2	7	3	1	5	-2	11	11	0	*
Student 18	6	17	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	8	2	N/A	N/A	N/A	3	N/A	N/A	
Student 19	6	5	8	13	3	5	5	4	7	3	1	12	6	6	*
Student 20	6	12	4	23	0	4	8	2	6	3	-1	6	3	3	
Student 21	6	N/A	N/A	11	6	N/A	N/A	N/A	3	5	N/A	N/A	11	N/A	
Student 22	6	2	8	8	6	2	5	4	3	5	-1	12	11	1	*
Student 23	6	9	6	11	6	0	8	2	0	5	-3	8	11	-3	
Student 24	6	23	0	26	0	0	8	2	6	3	-1	2	3	-1	
Student 25	6	16	1	18	1	0	4	4	5	4	0	5	5	0	
Student 26	6	19	0	26	0	0	10	1	10	1	0	1	1	0	
Student 27	6	10	6	11	6	0	7	3	8	2	1	9	8	1	*
Student 28	6	10	6	16	1	5	8	2	6	3	-1	8	4	4	
Student 29	6	3	8	7	8	0	4	4	Abst.	N/A	N/A	12	N/A	N/A	*
Student 30	6	11	6	23	0	6	6	3	6	3	0	9	3	6	
Student 31	6	13	4	19	0	4	8	2	0	5	-3	6	5	1	
Student 32	6	15	4	14	4	0	12	0	7	3	-3	4	7	-3	
Student 33	6	6	8	16	1	7	6	3	6	3	0	11	4	7	
Student 34	6	5	8	17	1	7	12	0	8	2	-2	8	3	5	*
Student 35	6	9	6	23	0	6	9	2	10	1	1	8	1	7	
Student 36	6	14	1	25	0	1	8	2	12	0	2	3	0	3	
Student 37	6	1	8	N/A	N/A	N/A	9	2	2	5	-3	10	N/A	N/A	
Student 38	6	7	8	14	4	4	8	2	6	3	-1	10	7	3	*
Student 39	6	N/A	N/A	11	6	N/A	N/A	N/A	9	2	N/A	N/A	8	N/A	
Student 40	6	15	4	18	1	3	4	4	6	3	1	8	4	4	
Average 6th		10.5	5.1	16.6	2.4	2.941	7.54	2.4	6.3	2.9	-0.5	7.43	5.111	2.606	
Percentage of gain						36.76					-10			20.05	
Ave. for Total		12.68	4.1	18.8	1.7	2.493	5.71	3.3	5.98	3.1	0.124	6.83	4.249	2.64	
Percentage of gain						31.16					2.48			20.31	

**Anchorage School District  
Underachieving School Program  
1997-98**

**School** Taku Elementary                      **Program** Tutors for Success

**Principal's Name (Type)** Karlyn Daenzer

**Principal's Signature** On File in Elementary Ed.                      **Date** May 1998

---

**Program Description:**

To improve school success for students who are at risk academically, socially and behaviorally.

**Target Population/Selection Criteria:**

Students delayed/behind their peers academically. Students having difficulty fitting in and/or succeeding in a large classroom setting. Students needing positive interaction with an adult. Teacher recommendation and pre-test data were the two main sources for identification.

**Major Program Activities During 1997-98:**

Aides were hired to work with identified students in the classroom, small group settings or on a one-to-one tutorial setting. Continued focus on Project Achieve Skills by teachers in classroom settings. An after school tutoring program by staff members to target students who were still facing academic challenges at the end of the year. Late in the year we were given additional funding which was used to run an after school "Achieve Club" that targeted students who at year's end were still in difficulty. Three teachers staffed each after school session which consisted of a PE period (focusing on games with a social purpose), a light snack, and tutoring in reading and math. Achieve Club ran from April 13 - May 28, with a primary group meeting two days a week and an intermediate group meeting two days a week. Through the funding we were able to offer 12 of the students transportation home - without this, they would not have been able to attend

## **Specific Achievement Goals:**

To hire Aides.

To improve Math skills.

To improve Reading skills.

To improve Spelling skills.

Continue pro-social skill development through use of Project Achieve.

## **Examination of Program Outcomes Relative to Goals:**

**Goal 1:** To hire Aides.

**Outcome 1:** Were again able to hire a group of 13 - 15 aides who were extremely dedicated to the students they served and committed to providing quality time tutoring students assigned to them. The aides were parents, community members and retired teachers. Several of the aides had early childhood development training. The aides were assigned to classroom teachers in both regular and special education. Teachers provided lessons and materials for the aides that coincided with classroom lessons or remedial skill development. Each aide kept a daily narrative journal recording the names of the students they worked with, skill they worked on and progress made by the students. The aides had an extremely positive effect on students' academic skills and personally as a mentor and an adult they could count on daily. They were a positive role model to their students which directly affected their emotional and social growth. Many of the students gained a great deal of social/classroom confidence that had been lacking earlier in the year. This enabled them to be more successful with their peers and classroom teacher. With our youngest students (Kindergarten and First Graders) the oral language interaction the aides had with the students was especially beneficial. Teachers reported that these children "blossomed" and in several cases became leaders in the room. Several journals are included with this report for examination.

**Goal 2:** To improve Math skills.

**Outcome 2:** Math skills of the students working with aides through the program increased. Teachers made an effort to target students whose pre-test scores indicated a remedial need and students who were transient. Students in Kindergarten increased counting skills as evidenced by data in the attached charts. Students in other grades gained computation and basic skills in learning Math facts and processes. One of the major benefits to the students who worked with tutors was their increased confidence in doing Math with the rest of their peers. Our after school (Achieve Club) focused on Math skill development. The students enjoyed coming and looked forward to the special program and time working on skills with these teachers. Although the results for such a short time

weren't statistically outstanding progress was noted by both groups as seen in the charts attached.

**Goal 3:** To improve Reading skills.

**Outcome 3:** Reading skills were focused on during the entire year, especially with the targeted students. Students who were non readers or very low readers were able to increase their skills and join their peers for class reading activities. Teachers are very positive about the work the tutors did with the students in helping them gain some reading independence. Kindergarten students who worked with the tutors increased their letter/sound knowledge thus better preparing themselves for first grade. First and second graders increased letter/sound relationship skills, sight word vocabulary skills, and comprehension skills. A few students did not appear to make significant gains, it was usually due to poor attendance or low ability. Although, many of their teachers would still say their experiences with a tutor were valuable and skills did improve. Intermediate students were also able to gain skills by working with tutors. (See the attached charts). Reading skills were also addressed in the after school programs. Students were able to better their scores and decrease errors in word recognition and some increased reading rates. Through the additional funds we were able to purchase a quality reading program "Accelerated Reader" for next year. (We were hoping to use the program with our intermediate after school students, but the company had problems in getting it out to use.

**Goal 4:** To increase Spelling skills.

**Outcome 4:** Spelling was targeted this year in many instances by the aides. They were able to help the students prepare for weekly tests and develop fundamental spelling skills. The emphasis placed on spelling by the classroom teachers and the aides paid off as students gained confidence and learned to spell more words. Teachers also indicated that the spelling emphasis paid off in children's writing skills. They were able to write more fluently and accurately.

**Goal 5:** Continue pro-social skill development through continued use of Project Achieve.

**Outcome 5:** Teachers again worked with students on four major skills that were selected as building-wide focuses (Listening, Avoiding Trouble, Dealing With an Accusation, and Accepting Consequences). Each year the program is in place, we see students getting more skilled at solving problems more peacefully. Our PTA group, along with the staff, developed a comprehensive discipline plan for the school that will go into effect next year. In-school suspensions are still more effective for some of our students, especially the ones who have no adult supervision during the day. Keeping Project Achieve going along with our new

discipline policy will make our school more effective in curbing violence. We also intend to make use of a new series of lessons on curbing name calling and bullying next year that fits in nicely with the Project Achieve Skills.

### School Achievement Profile:

Average Scores on California Achievement Tests (CATs)  
Percentile Rank Scores Corresponding to Mean NCE Scores  
All Students Tested

Level/School	Year	Total Reading		Total Lang. Arts		Total Math		Battery Composite	
		Num.	%ile	Num.	%ile	Num.	%ile	Num.	%ile
District Grades 3-6	1998	14,424	61	14,375	63	14,411	65	14,243	64
	1997	14,325	62	14,311	63	14,318	66	14,185	65
	1996	14,013	63	14,028	59	14,047	63	13,839	63
Taku	1998	179	55	181	56	181	62	178	58
	1997	208	53	208	54	212	61	208	57
	1996	187	55	185	52	185	55	182	54

Taku's scores are slightly lower than those for the district. Taku had the pattern of increased scores over time in Language Arts and Mathematics. Taku's Reading scores were essentially stable over the period while those for the district may have declined slightly.

Anchorage School District  
"Gain Scores" for Students in Continuing Feeder Pattern  
1995-96 to 1997-98 -- Analysis Based on 1998 Grade Level  
Percentile Rank Scores Corresponding to Mean NCE Scores

Level/School	Sub-Test	Number	Spring 1996	Spring 1998	Gain
District Grades 3 - 6	Reading	3,970	69	68	-1
	Language Arts	3,956	61	74	+13
	Mathematics	3,967	69	72	+3
	Composite	3,870	67	74	+7
Taku	Reading	39	46	53	+7
	Language Arts	39	37	60	+23
	Mathematics	39	47	61	+14
	Composite	38	42	59	+17

"Gain Scores" for Students in Continuing Feeder Pattern  
1995-96 to 1996-97 -- Analysis Based on 1997 Grade Level  
Percentile Rank Scores Corresponding to Mean NCE Scores

<u>Level/School</u>	<u>Sub-Test</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Spring 1996</u>	<u>Spring 1997</u>	<u>Gain</u>
District	Reading	7,371	67	66	-1
Grades 3 - 6	Language Arts	7,384	62	69	+7
	Mathematics	7,387	66	71	+5
	Composite	7,251	67	70	+3
Taku	Reading	83	58	52	-6
	Language Arts	79	48	56	+8
	Mathematics	81	54	63	+9
	Composite	78	52	57	+4

"Gain Scores" for Students in Continuing Feeder Pattern  
1996-97 to 1997-98 -- Analysis Based on 1998 Grade Level  
Percentile Rank Scores Corresponding to Mean NCE Scores

<u>Level/School</u>	<u>Sub-Test</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Spring 1997</u>	<u>Spring 1998</u>	<u>Gain</u>
District	Reading	7,976	66	65	-1
Grades 3 - 6	Language Arts	7,939	65	69	+4
	Mathematics	7,934	69	70	+1
	Composite	7,828	68	70	+2
Taku	Reading	93	58	56	-2
	Language Arts	93	56	56	0
	Mathematics	93	66	64	-2
	Composite	92	61	59	-2

Taku Elementary School's two year change pattern was positive for all grade levels and substantially above that for the district. The year to year patterns for Taku are not as positive, but the patterns indicates that students who stay in the school over time are successful.

There was no separately identified "target" population for continued analyses at Taku. The entire student body was the targeted population.

**Overall Program Success and Ongoing Affects on Academic Achievement:**

Our program has again been successful in boosting academic achievement, more positive social skills, increased student confidence for handling classroom tasks and peer acceptance as students can better handle academic challenges. One of the strongest features of our program is the positive interactions between the children and

the tutors who serve as outstanding consistent role models for them. The students eagerly looked forward to working with the tutors each day. Academic success can be seen in the charts attached to this report.

**Dependence of Program Results on Continued Funding:**

We would like to again secure funding for this program for the 98/99 school year. As we move our students to another location for the entire year during our building's renovation, the tutors will be able to continue working with many of our neediest children and with the ones who are highly transient and joining us next year. With few exceptions, most of the students who entered during the year from another school or out of state were assigned to a tutor who provided academic support and more importantly emotional support as they became accustomed to their new school environment and academic expectations. The neediest students were able to make academic gains that allowed them to become more successful in their classrooms. I believe that data again supports the continuation of the program.

**Recommendation for Program Continuation or Change:**

I believe it is imperative that this program continue. Because of our transient population, our Title I program is severely impacted for the upcoming school year. Although we are most extremely grateful that we will still receive some Title I funding, our neediest children will again rely on our effective, caring tutors to support their academic, social and emotional needs. We will continue to target our youngest children for help from the tutors in order to insure a well grounded beginning in oral language, reading, math, and spelling. One of the changes we would like to make is in the hiring of one or two aides to oversee a Social Skill development room. It would be an area for children who are having extreme behavior problems in the classroom could go for time out, work on pro-social skills, behavior management, and supervised academic work. Receiving the funding will enable us to keep an effective program going, expand it and better meet the School Board goals of children being independent readers by third grade and increasing spelling skills.

Kindergarten										
Student	Counting		Letter Recognition				Sound Knowledge		Number Recognition	
			Lower Case		Capital					
	Sept	Apr	S	M	S	M	Feb	May	Sept	May
A	16	109	17	26	21	26	20	26	20	20
B	30	110	9	26	16	26	15	26	11	20
C	23	69	16	26	25	26	11	21	18	20
D	13	49	3	17	1	18	6	11	7	20
E	13	129	12	26	18	26	16	26	18	20
F	12	129	24	26	26	26	20	26	20	20
G	19	100	9	26	8	26	12	18	7	20
H	16	127	8	26	13	26	18	26	18	20
I	100	200	22	26	26	26	18	26	20	20
J	43	109	19	26	26	26	17	26	20	20
K	29	139	8	26	6	26	19	26	7	20
L	14	29	2	19	11	26	14	23	6	20
M	29	49	5	26	6	26	13	26	8	20
N	19	39	7	26	8	26	12	22	9	20
O	10	39	9	26	13	26	12	26	2	20
P	9	100	1	20	1	24	8	14	4	20
Q	14	109	11	26	13	26	17	26	9	20
R	100	150	19	26	23	26	20	26	20	20
S	28	109	7	26	10	26	18	26	8	20
T	69	140	19	26	26	26	20	26	20	20
U	31	143	21	26	24	26	19	26	10	20

Kindergarten Class PM					
Student	Letter Recognition		Number Recognition	Counting	
	Capital	Lower Case	1-20	0 -->	
A	N/A	1-3	7-17	13-35	
B	9-25	6-19	6-17	39-49	
C	N/A	N/A	N/A	14-29	later entry
D	21-25	12-20	18-20	100+-100+	
E	2-26	1-2	6-18	13-29	
F	13-25	6-24	4-19	15-39	
G	7-26	6-24	10-20	59-100+	
H	26-26	23-26	20-20	100+-100+	
I	18-26	6-25	19-20	19-100+	
J	26-26	26-26	20-20	69-100+	
K	N/A	N/A	N/A	10-39	later entry
L	26-26	20-23	19-20	20-100+	
Average Gain	9 Letters	8.5 Lettrs	4.7 Numbers	29 Numbers	

Multiage Class First/Second Grade							
Student	Math Results		Reading Results		Spelling Level Results		
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post	KDG	K-1	2
A	46	100	PP	2M+	0	99	84
B	32	89	PP	3L	80	90	53
C	25	60	PP	1L	10	74	49
D	28	64	NR	PP	0	34	N/A
E	35	82	NR	PP	0	77	34
F	1	50	NR	NR	0	27	N/A
G	42	85	PP	PP	20	72	N/A
H	10	89	PP	1L	0	89	46
I	78	96	1L	3L	100	99	89
J	75	100	PP	2M	30	98	80
K	89	86	3M	3H	77	97	88
L	89	89	3L	4L	96	98	96
M	36	84	2L	3L	41	78	73
N	23	73	PP	PP	36	80	26
O	18	86	2H	3M	87	99	83
P	18	81	2M	3L	40	97	84
Q	42	86	1L	2L	57	93	59
R	26	84	3L	3M	76	95	82
S	81	86	2M	3L	59	97	90
	PERCENTAGE	L = BEGINNING OF GR. LEVEL					
		M = MIDDLE OF GRADE LEVEL					
		H = END OF GRADE LEVEL					

Multiage First Second							
Student	Reading Gr. Level		Spelling (Given in %)			Math	
	Pre	Post	K Level	K-1st	2nd	Pre	Post
A	NR	1L	10	67		7	86
B	NR	1L	00	14		4	46
C	PP	2H	20	85		57	89
D	N/A		N/A			N/A	
E	PP	3H	70	96		57	96
F	NR	1M+	00	81		7	86
G	2H	3H	100	100	93	60	100
H	NR	2L	10	89		64	93
I	N/A		N/A			N/A	
J	NR	2M	10	89		71	93
K	1L	2H	70	96		43	93
L	NR	1M	N/A			36	93
M	PP	2M	10	92		39	100
N	NR	1M	20	67		50	89
O	NR	1M	10	76		18	82
P	1M	3L	41	95	84	N/A	
Q	3L	4M	90	100	96	60	94
R	N/A		90	100		87	100
S	3L	4L	36	92	76	42	94
T	1L	2H	69	88	76	N/A	
U	PP	1H	11	52	13	44	50
V	2M	3M	75	96	87	87	97
W	2M	3L	50	87	66	60	100
X	N/A		N/A			N/A	
Y	N/A		N/A			N/A	
Z	N/A		10	87		46	82
	L = BEGINNING OF GR. LEVEL					SCORES IN %	
	M = MIDDLE OF GR. LEVEL						
	H = END OF GRADE LEVEL						

Second Grade SMSI																
Math Inventories					Durrell Reading Inv.				Durrell Reading Inv.				Sight Words		Spelling	
Student	#1		#2		Time & Comprehension				Time & Comprehension				PP-3rd Grade		1st & 2nd Gr. I	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post	Pre		Post		Pre		Post		188 Words			
					1st Grade Level				2nd Grade Level				Pre	Post	Pre	Post
					time comp	time comp	time comp	time comp	time comp	time comp	time comp	time comp				
A	23	27	9	12	35	100	30	100	45	100	35	100	159	181	125	20
B	10	15	10	12	N/A				N/A				175	185	165	20
C	27	35	11	13	45	100	30	100	55	100	35	100	161	186	149	20
D	27	33	7	13	50	100	30	100	60	100	45	100	156	179	152	30
E	29	34	12	12	25	83	25	83	40	86	35	100	182	183	257	30
F	15	29	9	10	25	83	30	83	20	86	25	100	181	187	196	30
G	13	19	4	5	45	100	35	100	40	86	45	100	138	181	81	20
H	33	31	12	14	40	100	20	100	60	100	35	100	162	179	165	20
I	22	36	9	11	30	100	30	100	50	100	30	100	125	180	114	20
J	33	34	13	14	65	100	85	100	95	100	95	100	97	138	95	18
K	28	31	13	11	40	100	30	100	55	100	40	100	148	179	154	20
L	22	34	12	15	55	100	45	100	90	100	45	100	85	165	133	20
M	Late entry		Late entry		35	100	25	100	35	100	30	100	N/A		N/A	
N	23	35	9	11	50	100	40	100	55	100	45	100	151	179	120	20
O	28	28	8	10	90	100	90	100	95	100	90	100	63	109	128	18
P	27	31	10	14	40	100	35	100	50	100	35	100	170	188	209	30
Q	26	34	4	5	35	100	25	100	30	71	20	100	154	185	35	18
R	24	28	8	13	55	100	45	100	55	100	40	100	118	184	131	30
S	11	22	7	9	35	100	35	100	55	100	30	100	117	178	54	18
T	Late entry		Late entry		45	100	40	100	65	100	50	100	N/A		148	20
U	28	36	6	7	55	100	50	100	90	86	50	100	87	157	82	18
V	28	34	9	15	90	100	55	100	95	100	60	100	53	110	107	18

Second & Third Grade Class						
Student	Spelling		Math		Reading	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
A	62	90	65	98	50	85
B	92	98	N/A		N/A	
C	64	76	N/A		N/A	
D	N/A		N/A		30	90
E	89	95	N/A		N/A	
F	46	84	40	93	60	95
G	58	92	76	100	60	85
H	67	93	67	98	55	80
I	85	96	75	100	80	85
J	23	77	72	100	30	75
K	68	89	62	100	70	80
L	58	89	69	98	70	95
M	13	69	20	92	35	80
N	52	92	80	99	60	85
O	86	97	N/A		N/A	
P	47	87	80	98	50	85
Q	68	95	85	100	75	95
R	66	95	71	100	75	85
S	41	80	N/A		N/A	
T	91	97	N/A		N/A	
U	N/A		N/A		N/A	
V	35	80	78	95	60	75
W	60	89	N/A		N/A	
X	4	33	N/A		N/A	
ALL NUMBERS ARE IN PERCENTAGES						
CLASS AVERAGE	58	86	67	98	57	85
AVERAGE GAIN	26		31		28	

Fourth Grade SMSI Class						
Student	TORC Paragraph		Brigance Math		S. Anthony List	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post	Spelling Words	
					Pre	Post
A	7	16	12	6	130	156
B	15	17	12	16	N/A	
C	N/A		N/A		N/A	
D	13	19	15	17	N/A	
E	N/A		N/A		N/A	
F	4	14	15	14	45	107
G	17	18	16	18	111	147
H	8	11	12	17	109	131
I	6	14	7	7	81	130
J	6	17	10	9	34	73
K	23	27	N/A		N/A	
L	9	20	14	17	76	140
M	N/A		17	18	N/A	
N	2	5	14	15	81	131
O	7	14	14	17	93	112
P	16	18	17	17	N/A	
Q	N/A		N/A		N/A	
R	17	19	11	16	127	147
S	18	21	15	16	N/A	
T	N/A		N/A		N/A	
U	20	24	16	14	139	156
V	13	11	14	18	67	99
Class Average	12	17	14	15	91	127
Average Gain	Plus 5		Plus 1		Plus 36	

Fourth and Fifth Grade Class					
STUDENTS	TORC Reading (30 = top level)		Math Adding	Math Subtraction	Math Multiplication
A	+23	+24	75 - 98	30 - 70	N/A
B	+25	+24	98 - 99	0 - 95	91 - 100
C	+18	+23	100 - 100	50 - 83	15 - 100
D	+14	+20	0 - 94	73 - 100	99 - 99
E	+20	+29	99 - 98	86 - 100	96 - 100
F	+14	+21	100 - 96	N/A	50 - 97
G	+14	+22	66 - 98	54 - 85	78 - 85
H	N/A		48 - 79	N/A	0 - 92
I	+19	+24	100 - 98	95 - 99	N/A
J	+12	+15	41 - 88	59 - 68	32 - 100
K	+19	+21	100 - 98	75 - 96	85 - 99
L	N/A		98 - 100	0 - 100	100 - 100
M	+18	+24	0 - 100	0 - 99	N/A
N	+16	+20	100 - 97	0 - 100	88 - 100
O	+26	+26	49 - 79	39 - 90	47 - 100
P	+21	+22	100 - 100	100 - 100	0 - 100
Q	N/A		31 - 61	0 - 57	31 - 63
R	+18	+16	100 - 98	77 - 100	100 - 100
S	+20	+24	100 - 99	75 - 99	55 - 100
T	0	+21	0 - 99	0 - 100	0 - 100
U	+18	+21	100 - 97	95 - 100	97 - 100
V	+20	+26	57 - 90	31 - 73	67 - 98
W	+20	+22	99 - 96	91 - 96	89 - 99
X	+06	+07	72 - 97	0 - 78	63 - 88
Y	+17	+14	100 - 99	89 - 100	100 - 100
CLASS AVERAGE	+18	+21	83 - 94	70 - 94	73 - 96
AVERAGE GROWTH	+3.5 PTS.		+10 PTS	+21 PTS	+23 PTS
(ALL 0 SCORES WERE REMOVED BEFORE CALCULATING AVERAGES)					
(ALL STUDENTS WORKED WITH AIDE 1 ON 1 ON MATH SKILLS.)					

Fifth Grade				
Student	Math Inventory		Spelling	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
A	40	76	65	90
B	12	46	20	65
C	36	80	55	80
D	36	80	75	90
E	32	70	40	65
F	N/A	N/A	70	90
G	32	80	40	80
H	48	80	40	85
I	66	82	60	95
J	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
K	42	68	40	85
L	38	68	25	75
M	22	60	15	40
N	28	64	40	80
O	36	68	60	85
P	76	88	75	95
<u>Q</u>	4	26	5	20
ALL SCORES ARE GIVEN IN %				

Fifth/Sixth SMSI							
	Math Inventory			Reading Grade Level		Vocab. Assess. Grade Level	
Student	Pre	Post		Pre	Post	Pre	Post
A	10	23	+13	5	6	5	6
B	13	26	+13	5	6	6	6
C	11	24	+13	6	6	6	6
D	18	24	+06	N/A		N/A	
E	N/A			N/A		N/A	
F	16	20	+04	4	5	4	5
G	3	26	+23	N/A		N/A	
H	17	22	+05	3	4	3	4
I	0	12	+12	PP	PP	PP	PP
J	13	26	+13	5	6	5	6
K	6.5	11	+4.5	2	3	2	3
L	5	07	+02	3	4	3	4
M	14	26	+12	3	3	3	3
N	11	20	+09	4	4	5	6
O	10	23	+13	3	4	4	5
P	11	17	+06	4	4	5	6
Q	5	12	+07	4	5	6	5
R	16	26	+10	3	4	3	4
S	6	11	+05	5	6	6	6
T	3	08	+05	6	6	7	7
U	1	08	+07	4	4	4	4
V	10	19	+09	1	1	2	2
W	15	19	+04	4	5	4	5

Sixth Grade						
Student	Math Inventory			Reading Inventory		
	Pre	Post		Pre	Post	
A	77	83	+06	70	80	+10
B	70	67	-03	70	70	00
C	N/A			N/A		
D	60	73	+13	70	90	+20
E	40	48	+08	70	100	+30
F	63	87	+24	80	90	+10
G	73	80	+07	80	100	+20
H	50	73	+23	70	80	+10
I	N/A			N/A		
J	83	93	+10	80	90	+10
K	43	70	+27	80	85	+05
L	60	60	00	80	90	+10
M	67	93	+26	70	90	+20
N	80	80	00	80	90	+10
O	40	87	+47	80	80	00
P	40	67	+27	70	90	+20
Q	N/A			N/A		
R	43	40	-03	70	80	+10
S	83	87	+04	90	90	00
T	83	90	+07	90	90	00
U	60	90	+30	80	80	00
V	7	50	+43	N/A		
W	60	87	+27	70	70	00
X	N/A			N/A		
ALL SCORES ARE IN %						

	Running Words/								Analysis of				
Achieve Club	Errors		Error Rate		ACC		SC Rate		Errors		Math		A
Primary	Pre	Post	Pre	Post	Pre	Post	Pre	Post	Pre	Post	Pre	Post	
Student													
A	215/13	215/6	1:07	1:16	94%	93%	1:08	1:04	Inst.	Inst.	35/38	35/38	
B	27/9	27/1	1:03	1:27	66%	96%	1:10	1:06	Hard	Easy	10/28	12/28	
C	37/11	37/9	1:02	1:04	30%	75%	1:05	1:19	N/A	Hard	14/28	18/28	
D	50/1	33/4	1:50	1:08	98%	88%	1:2/3	1:04	Easy	Hard	18/28	27/28	
E	56/5	56/3	1:11	1:19	91%	95%	1:03	1:04	Inst	Easy	30/38	28/38	
F	72/8	72/0	1:11	1:72	90%	100%	1:08	1:00	Inst	Easy	31/38	37/38	
G	21/6	21/1	1:04	1:21	75%	95%		1:02	Easy		18/28	25/28	
H	36/4	36/0	1:09	1:36	89%	100%		1:01	Hard	Easy	5/28	7/28	
I	72/7	72/4	1:10	1:18	90%	94%	1:07	1:04	Inst	Inst	11/38	27/38	
J	TESTING INFORMATION NOT AVAILABLE												
K	TESTING INFORMATION NOT AVAILABLE												
L	TESTING INFORMATION NOT AVAILABLE												
M	TESTING INFORMATION NOT AVAILABLE												
N	99/1	160/1	1:99	1:160	99%	99%		1:00	Easy		29/38	29/38	
O	TESTING INFORMATION NOT AVAILABLE											Quit Program	
P	TESTING INFORMATION NOT AVAILABLE												

## Achieve Club Intermediate Level

Seventeen students were targeted and attended regularly. They were given a physical education period with games that developed social skills and cooperation. Then they worked on reading and math skills. Most of the students were significantly behind their peers in multiplication skills so those were heavily emphasized.

The immediate students' progress was assessed by their participation in group activities as well as weekly timed tests in addition, subtraction and multiplication. They were tested to find a beginning level for instruction. Tests were repeated to monitor mastery levels as they were obtained. The scores for subtraction rose an average of 1.8% consistently. Scores for multiplication skills rose an average of 4.7% consistently. The only decline was in addition with an average loss of 2.1%. Teachers commented that the students who participated in the after school program were more willing to attempt their math homework and class work after working with the program. The teachers working in the program noted that the students were able to apply the multiplication skills in various activities they were challenged with.

The overall feeling by staff was that the older students were the neediest and due to the short length of time the program ran significant testing results weren't gained. The students participating were eager to come and participate in each session. They made some new friends with peers and were able to develop better relationships with various staff members.

Only 4 or 5 of these students made use of the transportation. However, without transportation available they would not have been able to participate.

We would like to continue some type of after school program again, as it seems to be a need in the community.

## Journal Entries First Grade

May 8th

Did a little practice for final spelling test with D, T, and M. I practiced a "wee" bit with R before his final test - he whipped through it and got 100% - he has finally become quite a good speller. I don't even need to practice with him every day as in the past - usually just once before his Thursday and Friday practice and final tests.

After the final spelling test I read "Little Hatchy Hen" to the whole class. I LOVE to get to read a story to the whole class - it was always one of my favorite activities. We also did poems and clapping rhymes on our thighs.

Helped with Mother's Day gifts.

May 11

R. was here today so we practiced briefly on her spelling words from last week and then I gave her the weekly test. She was able to score an "O" missing two, but succeeding on the bonus words.

Worked with D on this week's spelling words (OA & OW) - teaching him the rule OA in the middle OW at the end of a word - it seemed to help him.

Decoded IE words with my 6 group and then looked at new words for "NOT YET". Then we read the story aloud. They did VERY WELL. Each said their 5-10 vocabulary words from their envelopes and took them home for more practice.

Had J first then D and read the rest of "Lunch With Friends". We'll be beginning a new story with this group of lowest readers.

\*\*\* The teacher had this aide work with the same reading group all year and was extremely pleased with the progress they made. The aide, under the teachers direction, focused on vocabulary building, fluency and comprehension.

## Journal Entry

March 1998 - 9:00 - 10:30 Fourth and Fifth Grade Class

Practiced multiplication flash cards with:

	Previous time	new time
S.	1:38	1:29
A.	2:09	2:07
P.	2:19	1:43
K.	4:38	2:43*
P.	8:24	6:43*
N.	4:29	3:05
B.	7:26	5:32*
L.	3:08	2:41
B.	1:32	1:15
B.	1:54	2:08 +14 more ans. correct
N.	5:00	5:18 + 18 more ans. correct

\* have really taken off on mastery of multiplication tables

10:30 - 12:00 Third Grade Class

I worked with the class on vocabulary - writing words and definitions in their booklets. Focused most of my efforts with J, F, and P. Then helped them work on answering questions for their stories. I helped H make sure her sentences were complete. Also helped B, TJ, J, & P with same task. Helped with Math and ( ) indicating which part of a problem needs to be solved first. This was new to the class and was difficult for them to grasp - many needed extra help. I took a small group of 4 and rewalked them through the concept - are still having problems understanding it, so will continue to practice with them.

## Journal Entries

March 10 9:00 - 12:00

Class 1 (2/3) - J, C & K did workbook pages 27, 28, 29 - short vowel words, story comprehension and possessives. They all need more practice hearing long and short vowel sounds, distinguishing between long and short sounds. Story comprehension was difficult for the group - they reread parts of the story several times in order to be successful.

Class 2 (2) - Traced patterns for a booklet on chocolate. Helped K, S with their morning work. S had trouble reading the words on the worksheet for the 5 senses. K finished a page on fractions  $\frac{1}{2}$ ,  $\frac{1}{3}$  &  $\frac{1}{4}$  with little trouble. I worked with him on an assignment on using helping verbs, correctly.

April 7 9:00 - 12:00

Class 1 (2/3) - Duplicated pages for Science lesson and assisted teacher with the science lesson categorizing various sizes of sand and varying screen sizes to measure what size sand would go through. Students kept charts.

Class 2 (2) - D. practiced his spelling words with me before taking his test. He was able to get all of the words correct with the class. He also read part of a story "The Egg" aloud to me - this book is at a first grade level - made him a pack of sight words to practice.

May 6 9:00 - 12:00

Class 1 (2/3) - I assisted S with a make-up test on reading. She had a hard time doing it. She didn't know many of the words and didn't understand some of the stories. She appeared to have a difficult time concentrating. Gave her some extra worksheets for practice.

Class 2 (2) - Administered a sight word inventory to J. (student just entering the class) - she scored 154 out of 188 possible.

## Journal entry

Wednesday, January 7, 1998      9:00 - 10:00

Worked with L. on spelling words and writing assignment. Listened to other students recite spelling words. Helped K. with money math page (scored 100%) and listened to M read his written story.

10:00 - 11:00 (Special Ed.) Read "Statue of Liberty" story with C. and guided him through the assigned work sheet. Helped him make a cover for his story. He was able to successfully complete the assignment and make a score of 100% on the work sheet.

11:00 - 12:00 Read a story with C, J, R, and T. They answered questions on a work sheet at a second grade level. They were all successful in completing these pages.

**Anchorage School District  
Underachieving School Program  
1997-98**

**School** Willow Crest Elementary      **Program** Underachieving Schools Grant

**Principal's Name (Type)** Teri A. Regan

**Principal's Signature** On File at Elementary Education      **Date** June 10, 1998

---

**Program Description:**

Willow Crest's Underachieving Schools Grant Program consists of three main components and is an integral and supportive part of our school-wide program focusing on student achievement. The three components focused around one Resource Tutor, nine Temporary School Attendants (TSAs) and funds to support the implementation of the Accelerated Reader Program which is to be implemented in the 98-99 school year.

The Resource Tutor was full time for the complete 97-98 school year. Her primary job responsibilities were to provide support to individual students, to classrooms and was one of our primary technology support persons.

The TSAs each worked 2 1/2 hours each day from October 1, to May 29. This allowed each TSA to work with two classrooms for 1 hour and 15 minutes each day. Most teachers identified approximately five students that received one-to-one or small group support in the areas of reading and math. Many of our TSA positions were filled by parents. Two of the TSAs spoke another language as well as English. One woman spoke Spanish and the other spoke Tagalog. These languages represented many of our bilingual population.

The third component focused on Willow Crest's interest in bringing the Accelerated Reader Program to our school. A committee was formed. This committee looked at research that was available and visited schools implementing the program and felt this would be a good program for promoting reading. Parents were involved in this process. Funds from Underachieving Schools Grant were used to order the materials necessary for the assessment component called STAR and to order books and corresponding test disks.

### **Target Population/Selection Criteria:**

Resource Tutorial (K-6)/Temporary Schools Attendants (K-6):

Pretesting of targeted skills, student observation overall classroom performance, attendance record, teacher recommendation and/or parent recommendation were some of the avenues used for determining the students who could most benefit from the services.

### **Major Program Activities During 1997-98:**

- Our Resource Tutor continued with her support of instructional technology by working directly with students in the computer lab, worked with two Kindergarten classrooms with targeted students as described below and assisted in the coordination of the TSA portion of the program.
- Our Temporary School Attendants performed a wide variety of duties allowing for more hands-on time with students, either by the TSA or the teacher, who were identified as outlined in the Selection Criteria portion of this report. The following identifies some of the ways the TSAs were used:
  - \* One-on-one instruction with selected students on specific problem area skills
  - \* Read daily with students
  - \* Assisting students with make-up assignments and make-up tests because of absences
  - \* Extra help for students who did not understand directions
  - \* With our high rate of transience, provided a person to do some baseline assessment to determine the new student's performance level
  - \* Practicing math facts with 1-2 students at a time.
  - \* Helped with additional paperwork that was generated by modifications being made for specific students, such as make-up work, redoing of assignments, etc.
- Ordering the materials for implementing the Accelerated Reader Program

### **Specific Achievement Goals:**

- To provide resources, through a Resource Tutor and nine Temporary School Attendants, that would result in increased reading and/or math scores of targeted students in grades K-6.
- To reduce transience and promote stability within the student population.
- To promote and support development of technology skills within the student population.
- To investigate programs that promote Reading and identify at least one to focus on for the 98-99 school year.

### **Examination of Program Outcomes Relative to goals**

**Goal 1:** To provide resources, through a Resource Tutor and nine Temporary School Attendants, that would result in increased reading and/or math scores of targeted students in grades K-6.

**Outcome 1:** Our Resource Tutor continued in her position for the entire school year and nine TSAs were hired to work for 2 1/2 hours each day, 5 days a week, from October 1, 1997, through May 29, 1998.

The primary data for showing academic growth in our targeted students in the past was taken from the results of CAT testing. Because of the needs of our targeted students, the growth they make may not be reflected accurately enough through CAT testing alone.

For the 97-98 school year, specific academic areas were identified and pre and post testing was completed to demonstrate gain or lack of gain on more focused skills. We will continue to expand this process to better reflect the benefits to students of these additional resources.

Students did show growth in all areas of focus. Attached are tables (ATTACHMENTS A-C) displaying assessment information using various tools at different grade levels for some of the targeted students.

**Goal 2:** To reduce transience and promote stability within the student population.

**Outcome 2:** Willow Crest has consistently been a school with a highly transient population. Any additional support that can be provided, we believe, can promote stability.

The transience rate for Willow Crest for the 97-98 school year was not available at the time of this report, but the rate was 57% for the 96-97 school year. Only one of the 94 targeted students left Willow Crest this school year. See ATTACHMENT D for additional information.

**Goal 3:** To support and promote development of technology skills within the student population

**Outcome 3:** Willow Crest began receiving the Underachieving Schools Funds during the 95-96 school year, which was the same year that Willow Crest got computers and a computer lab. Most of our students do not have access to technology at home and it was felt that support was needed to help integrate the use of technology into the academic program.

The support provided by the Resource Tutor over the past two years has been successful. She works with many of the classes and their teacher when they are in the computer lab. All classes visit the computer lab at least once during the week with most classes making two trips.

**Goal 4:** To investigate programs that promote reading and identify at least one to implement in the 98-99 school year.

**Outcome 4:** Reading is a primary focus at Willow Crest. We have the Reading is Fundamental Program; a "HANDS" program where after a student reads five books they put their name on a cutout of their hand and it goes up in the hallway of the school; an Artist in the School who guided the students through illustrating and writing their own books; and ongoing training in improving instructional practices.

Historically, students in the intermediate grades don't check out as many books from the library as the primary students. Also, students many times check out or choose books that are not all their level.

A committee worked together to check out the Accelerated Reader Program. The Accelerated Reader program offers an additional incentive by incorporating the computer. Schools who were using

this program felt it was having a positive effect by increasing the number of books students were reading and provided a system to insure students were reading and provided a system to insure students were reading books at their appropriate level. We will begin implementation of this program with the support of the staff and PTA during the 98-99 school year.

**School Achievement Profile:**

Average Scores on California Achievement Tests (CATs)  
 Percentile Rank Scores Corresponding to Mean NCE Scores  
 All Students Tested

<u>Level/School</u>	<u>Year</u>	<u>Total Reading</u>		<u>Total Lang. Arts</u>		<u>Total Math</u>		<u>Battery Composite</u>	
		<u>Num.</u>	<u>%ile</u>	<u>Num.</u>	<u>%ile</u>	<u>Num.</u>	<u>%ile</u>	<u>Num.</u>	<u>%ile</u>
District Grades 3-6	1998	14,424	61	14,375	63	14,411	65	14,243	64
	1997	14,325	62	14,311	63	14,318	66	14,185	65
	1996	14,013	63	14,028	59	14,047	63	13,839	63
Willow Crest	1998	238	49	238	54	240	58	237	54
	1997	233	52	232	56	234	53	231	54
	1996	243	55	243	50	249	48	242	51

Willow Crest's Reading scores have declined over the three testing periods displayed above. Language Arts and Math scores at Willow Crest have improved over the same time frame. The pattern is similar to that for the district, but at a slightly lower absolute performance level.

"Gain Scores" for Students in Continuing Feeder Pattern  
 1995-96 to 1997-98 -- Analysis Based on 1998 Grade Level  
 Percentile Rank Scores Corresponding to Mean NCE Scores

<u>Level/School</u>	<u>Sub-Test</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Spring 1996</u>	<u>Spring 1998</u>	<u>Gain</u>
District	Reading	3,970	69	68	-1
Grades 3 - 6	Language Arts	3,956	61	74	+13
	Mathematics	3,967	69	72	+3
	Composite	3,870	67	74	+7
Willow Crest	Reading	49	57	56	-1
	Language Arts	49	50	70	+20
	Mathematics	50	51	67	+16
	Composite	48	52	65	+13

"Gain Scores" for Students in Continuing Feeder Pattern  
 1995-96 to 1996-97 -- Analysis Based on 1997 Grade Level  
 Percentile Rank Scores Corresponding to Mean NCE Scores

<u>Level/School</u>	<u>Sub-Test</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Spring 1996</u>	<u>Spring 1997</u>	<u>Gain</u>
District	Reading	7,371	67	66	-1
Grades 3 - 6	Language Arts	7,384	62	69	+7
	Mathematics	7,387	66	71	+5
	Composite	7,251	67	70	+3
Willow Crest	Reading	119	55	57	+2
	Language Arts	119	53	65	+12
	Mathematics	121	50	57	+7
	Composite	118	52	61	+9

"Gain Scores" for Students in Continuing Feeder Pattern  
 1996-97 to 1997-98 -- Analysis Based on 1998 Grade Level  
 Percentile Rank Scores Corresponding to Mean NCE Scores

<u>Level/School</u>	<u>Sub-Test</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Spring 1997</u>	<u>Spring 1998</u>	<u>Gain</u>
District	Reading	7,976	66	65	-1
Grades 3 - 6	Language Arts	7,939	65	69	+4
	Mathematics	7,934	69	70	+1
	Composite	7,828	68	70	+2
Willow Crest	Reading	114	53	50	-3
	Language Arts	113	55	60	+5
	Mathematics	113	53	61	+8
	Composite	112	54	57	+3

Willow Crest Elementary School has a pattern similar to, though slightly better than, the pattern for the district. The two year change in Reading at Willow Crest was essentially nil, similar to the district in this area. Language Arts and Math scores increased for students in the school for the two years at a pace greater than that demonstrated by the district as a whole.

"Gain Scores" for Students Targeted for Specific Services  
 1996-97 to 1997-98 -- Analysis Based on 1998 Grade Level  
 Percentile Rank Scores Corresponding to Mean NCE Scores

<u>Level/School</u>	<u>Sub-Test</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Spring 1997</u>	<u>Spring 1998</u>	<u>Gain</u>
Willow Crest	Reading	12	48	43	-5
	Language Arts	11	37	54	+17
	Mathematics	11	42	53	+11
	Composite	11	43	48	+5

The students targeted for special services at Willow Crest in 1997-98 exhibited a year-to-year relative decline in Reading, coupled with substantial growth in Language Arts and Mathematics. The directions of their movements are similar to those exhibited by the student body as a whole, though both the decline and the increases were larger for the targeted group than for the entire school.

**IV. Other Program Student Achievement Indicators that are Program Specific:**

Attached at the end of this report are the assessment summaries and additional data labeled as ATTACHMENTS A-D for some of the targeted students:

- Kindergarten growth in Upper Case Letter, Lower Case Letter and Number Recognition
- 2nd Grade Math/Slossen Reading Scores
- 3rd Grade achievement in Reading, Spelling, & Writing
- 4th/5th Grade achievement in math facts
- Stability Data

There was a lot of data taken within our classrooms that is not presented in a way that facilitates representation in the pre/post format. This is an area that we will address at the beginning of the 98-99 school year to continue to improve our ability to report the successes of our students.

## **Overall Program Success and Ongoing Affects on Academic Achievement:**

The support for the students from the additional resources that are available through the Underachieving Schools Grant Program have been extremely successful. The students are showing progress and are feeling supported when they come to school. Included in this report are some hard data that demonstrates the gains the students are making on a day-to-day basis, but what this report has a more difficult time showing are the successes of the program that are hard to measure. The following are examples of these types of benefits:

- Additional positive adult role models
- The immediate contact each student can receive as they enter our school throughout the year
- Our classroom computers and computer lab are being used much more effectively, less waste of technological resources
- Another pair of eyes and ears to allow monitoring of student well-being
- Parents in the building
- More avenues for building assets in students

The Willow Crest community feels that the resources we receive as a result of the Underachieving Schools Grant Program are extremely beneficial to all students here. By having more adults with the ability to work with students on a one-to-one basis has shown growth in each of these students, but in addition, by having additional resources to meet these students needs, that frees up the teacher to focus on the other students in the class.

## **Dependence of Program Results on Continued Funding:**

The gains the students have made as a result of the resources this program provides will support the students in the short term. They will move on to the next grade having better skills and feeling more confident because of the progress that they have made. However, over the long term, I believe it will be difficult for students to maintain the rate of growth without the opportunity for more individualized support. There is really no replacement for the opportunity to lower the adult to student ratio.

In addition to the human resources that this grant provides, we have invested in the Accelerated Reader Program. The assessment component and a starter set of books and their test disks have been purchased. This program will be implemented in the 98-99 school year. This program motivates students to read because it incorporates the

computer as well as gives the students points for the books that they read. A comprehension test is taken on each book before points are awarded. Because of the assessment component it is easier to monitor the reading level of the books the student is reading. By choosing books at the appropriate level, students will have more success when reading. Funds from the school's budget, PTA and Underachieving Schools Grant will be set aside each year to support this program. These are materials that will be available when the grant moneys are no longer available.

### **Recommendation for Program Continuation or Change:**

I would highly recommend that Willow Crest continue to receive the funding from this program. We have only completed two full years with these additional resources and during that time there has been an administrative change, as well as a large turnover in the primary teaching staff. Because of the number of changes, there has not been a consistent system of tracking the benefits to students.

Each teacher was asked to identify approximately five students that would benefit from the additional support for the Resource Tutor or one of the nine Temporary School Attendants. Ninety-four students were targeted. I feel this has become our baseline group.

A committee was formed and discussed the current program. The following recommendations were made;

1. To implement a lunch time study hall. The teachers can recommend students that are having difficulty with work completion or need extra time. Students can choose to come and use this time to complete work or get additional help with the assigned work. This would be one of the job responsibilities of the Resource Tutor.
2. To use funds in conjunction with Title I funds to provide an after school tutoring program two nights a week and to also provide busing home.
3. To purchase additional Accelerated Reader books and test disks.
4. To continue to have a Resource Tutor, but to focus more of the job responsibilities on assisting students with reading and math in their classrooms and to facilitate the lunch time study hall.
5. To have six Temporary School Attendants work 2 hours/day, 4 days a week from September 14, 1998, to May 29, 1999.

6. To maintain the Underachieving Schools Grant committee to regularly reevaluate the effectiveness of the program and to facilitate communication to reduce the impact of changes in personnel.
7. To work in grade level teams to determine informal assessments that can be administered at least once in the fall and once in the spring to combine with CAT results to determine effectiveness of the resources provided through this grant.

Willow Crest will be a Targeted Title I school for the 98-99 school year. Title I moneys will only be able to be used to support students, who through a series of assessments, are found to be eligible for those services. By combining funds from the Underachieving Schools Grant and Title I, we can make the services available for all students who need them.

## Attachment A -- Willow Crest

Letter/Number Recognition												
Kindergarten												
	Upper Case Letters				Lower Case Letters				Number Recognition			
	Pre-test		Post-test		Pre-test		Post-test		Pre-test		Post-test	
Student	Raw	%	Raw	%	Raw	%	Raw	%	Raw	%	Raw	%
	Score		Score		Score		Score		Score		Score	
1	2		14		5		9		1		9	
2	5		26		7		24		7		21	
3	6		26		12		25		17		20	
4	5		26		6		26		6		21	
5	2		20		1		14		8		19	
6	3		26		8		26		6		21	
7	9		26		11		25		15		21	
8	0		19		0		17		5		12	
9	17		26		16		26		4		21	
10	9		24		11		25		9		21	
11												
12												
13												
14												
15												
16												
17												
18												
19												
20												

## Attachment B -- Willow Crest

Math/Slossen Reading Test				
Second Grade				
	Math		Slossen	
Student	Pre-test	Post-test	Pre-test	Post-test
	%	%	Grade Level	Grade Level
			Achievement	Achievement
1	--	--	1.6	2.1
2	--	--	1.1	2.3
3	--	--	0.6	1.1
4	--	--	1.1	2.8
5	75	91	--	--
6	36	42	--	--
7	25	43	--	--
8	46	40	--	--
9				
10				

Reading/Writing/Spelling								
Third Grade								
	Reading/Slossen		Writing		Spelling			
	Pre-test	Post-test	Pre-test	Post-test	Pre-test		Post-test	
Student	Grade Level	Achievement	Words Written		Raw Score	%	Raw Score	%
1	2.2	2.9	13	70	8	32	19	76
2	2.1	2.9	35	84	5	20	9	36
3	2.7	3.7	25	--	0	0	12	48
4	1.8	2.4	--	--	--	1	4	10
5	3.1	3.5	64	--	--	2	8	10

### Attachment C -- Willow Crest

Multiplication Test		
Fourth/Fifth Grade		
Multiplication		
Student	Pre-test	Post-test
	Raw Score	Raw Score
1	No data	97
2	59	87
3	63	99
4	68	90
5	No data	69
6	40	89
7	50	75
8	19	75
9	40	70
10	34	44
11	62	73
12	51	100
13	67	100
14	50	86
15	46	93

### **Attachment D -- Willow Crest**

Stability Data Based On 94 Targeted Students		
Student Stability	Number	%
Attended entire school year	654	69%
Entered after school year began	25	27%
Student left and returned	3	3%
Student left	1	1%

- Transience rate for targeted students during 1997-98 is to be determined.
- School wide transience rate for 1996-97 school year was 57%.

**Anchorage School District  
Underachieving School Program  
1997-98**

**School** Central Middle School of Science    **Program** Focus Program

**Principal's Name (Type)** Keith Taton

**Compiled and Written by:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Principal's Signature** On File At Mid-Level Education      **Date** May 29, 1998

---

**Program Description:**

The Focus On Comprehension, Understanding, and Skills (F.O.C.U.S.) Program is a Reading and Language Arts Program that specifically targets underachieving students who are having difficulty in school due to reading comprehension and/or writing difficulties. Students work one-on-one or in groups of up to ten with a F.O.C.U.S. teacher to strengthen reading comprehension, learn comprehension and testing strategies, improve reading fluency, encourage active reading behaviors, and practice and improve writing skills.

**Target Population/Selection Criteria:**

We targeted students who performed at or below the 25th percentile in the reading comprehension and/or total reading categories of the CAT. Teachers and teams also referred students who seemed to be failing academically due to difficulties with reading and written expression. In some cases, parents and students themselves requested participation in the program. Students were screened using a metacomprehensive survey and writing sample to assess the appropriateness of their placement in F.O.C.U.S. The program also included some ESL and Special Education students. In a few cases, students who had not been designated ESL or had not qualified for Special Education when they began the program were later assessed for these services.

**Major Program Activities During 1995-96, 1996-97, and 1997-98:**

**1995-1996:**

- 1) Served students in a one-on-one setting.
- 2) Served students in a small group format.
- 3) Offered support and resources to teams and staff.
- 4) Published student writing.
- 5) Promoted reading, writing, and speaking through public readings.
- 6) Distributed information to parents.
- 7) Offered support and resources to other reading programs in ASD.
- 8) Identified sixth grade students entering seventh for participation in Summer Transition Program.
- 9) Held a Summer Transition Program in June.
- 10) Held a Summer Transition Program in August.
- 11) Showed improved scores on pre and post comprehension tests and Metacomprehension Strategy Indexes.

**1996-1997:**

- 1) Hired and trained three temporary school attendants.
- 2) Presented reading strategies at the State Literary Conference.
- 3) Served students with a modified flexible small group approach.
- 4) Offered support and resources to teams and staff.
- 5) Published student writing.
- 6) Promoted reading, writing, and speaking through student readings.
- 7) Distributed information to parents.
- 8) Offered support and resources to other reading programs in the ASD.
- 9) Showed improved scores on pre and post comprehension test and Metacomprehension Strategy Indexes.

At the start of the 1997-1998 school year, Karen Roberts was hired to teach and coordinate the F.O.C.U.S. Program. Mrs. Roberts retained a teacher's aide to help facilitate in the afternoon classes. The F.O.C.U.S. Team, administration and staff worked together to identify students for the program. In the 1997-1998 year, F.O.C.U.S. activities included:

- 1) Served students in a one-on-one setting.
- 2) Served students in a small group format.
- 3) Offered support and resources to teams and staff.
- 4) Published student writing.
- 5) Promoted reading, writing, and speaking through student and public readings.
- 6) Distributed information to parents.
- 7) Offered resources to other reading programs in ASD.
- 8) Identified sixth grade students entering seventh for participation in the Summer Transition Program.

- 9) Held a Summer Tutorial Program in June.
- 10) Held a Summer Transitional Program in August.
- 11) Showed improved scores on pre and post comprehension tests and Metacomprehension Strategy Indexes.
- 12) Coordinated the selection and ordering of F.O.C.U.S. Reading materials to be used in connection with the regular Language Arts program.
- 13) Held a Saturday Tutorial for students missing basic math and reading skills.
- 14) Shared successes and techniques with Language Arts Curriculum Department.
- 15) F.O.C.U.S. staff provided an in-service to discuss and develop those strategies which help middle level students comprehend text, think critically about text and to value active reading participation.

### **Specific Achievement Goals:**

- 1) Improvement of student comprehension.
- 2) Extension and improvement of active reading strategies.
- 3) Enhancement of student writing abilities.
- 4) Improve basic math skills through Saturday Tutorial.
- 5) Foster an enjoyment of reading.
- 6) Give students a successful academic school experience.
- 7) Student success will extend into their Language Arts classes.

### **Examination of Program Outcomes Relative to Goals**

**Goal 1:** Students will show improvement in reading comprehension as measured by pre and post program testing.

**Outcome 1:** In the 1997-1998 school year, the F.O.C.U.S. students showed definite improvement in their reading comprehension when measured with pre and post ITBS reading comprehension tests. Over the course of the year, 69% had increased ITBS scores. Many students who did not show an increase in test scores had poor attendance.

**Goal 2:** Students will show understanding of active reading strategies as measured by a pre and post Metacomprehension Strategies Index.

**Outcome 2:** In the 1997-1998 school year, 85% of the students in the F.O.C.U.S. Program improved their Metacomprehension Strategy Index scores.

- Goal 3:** Students will demonstrate mastery of a variety of writing forms as measured through student writing workshop portfolios.
- Outcome 3:** Students have shown progress through the compilation of individual writing portfolios and student published projects.
- Goal 4:** Students will demonstrate improvement of their basic math skills through small group tutorials on Saturdays.
- Outcome 4:** See *Attachment A*.
- Goal 5:** Students will develop an enjoyment of reading as demonstrated by an informal survey.
- Outcome 5:** See *Attachment B*.
- Goal 6:** Students will build their self-esteem by having a positive and successful experience at school.
- Outcome 6:** F.O.C.U.S. gives at-risk students the opportunity to take risks and discover that they, too, can be successful. See *Attachment C*.
- Goal 7:** Student success will extend into their Language Arts classrooms.
- Outcome 7:** See *Attachment D*.

**School Achievement Profile:**

Average Scores on California Achievement Tests (CATs)  
Percentile Rank Scores Corresponding to Mean NCE Scores  
All Students Tested

<u>Level/School</u>	<u>Year</u>	<u>Total Reading</u>		<u>Total Lang. Arts</u>		<u>Total Math</u>		<u>Battery Composite</u>	
		<u>Num.</u>	<u>%ile</u>	<u>Num.</u>	<u>%ile</u>	<u>Num.</u>	<u>%ile</u>	<u>Num.</u>	<u>%ile</u>
District	1998	6,776	64	6,753	60	6,761	64	6,621	64
Grades 7-8	1997	6,384	63	6,387	59	6,400	64	6,277	64
	1996	6,379	64	6,385	56	6,353	63	6,248	62
Central	1998	724	66	724	62	719	62	716	65
	1997	652	68	645	66	647	66	639	69
	1996	613	69	616	54	613	65	608	68

Central Middle School of Science had a pattern of decline in Reading scores over the period while the district's overall middle school pattern was one of stability in this area. The Math scores also declined slightly at Central while the Language Arts scores increased over time. The district level Math scores were stable and the Language Arts scores increased, though slightly less than the increase at Central.

"Gain Scores" for Students in Continuing Feeder Pattern  
1995-96 to 1997-98 -- Analysis Based on 1998 Grade Level  
Percentile Rank Scores Corresponding to Mean NCE Scores

<u>Level/School</u>	<u>Sub-Test</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Spring 1996</u>	<u>Spring 1998</u>	<u>Gain</u>
District	Reading	3,845	66	69	+3
Grades 7 - 8	Language Arts	3,850	68	65	-3
	Mathematics	3,846	69	68	-1
	Composite	3,705	70	70	0
Central	Reading	305	61	66	+5
	Language Arts	304	67	64	-3
	Mathematics	301	68	63	-5
	Composite	296	67	66	-1

"Gain Scores" for Students in Continuing Feeder Pattern  
1995-96 to 1996-97 -- Analysis Based on 1997 Grade Level  
Percentile Rank Scores Corresponding to Mean NCE Scores

<u>Level/School</u>	<u>Sub-Test</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Spring 1996</u>	<u>Spring 1997</u>	<u>Gain</u>
District	Reading	4,857	65	66	+1
Grades 7 - 8	Language Arts	4,872	63	62	-1
	Mathematics	4,872	68	67	-1
	Composite	4,727	67	67	0
Central	Reading	448	64	66	+2
	Language Arts	441	64	66	+2
	Mathematics	444	68	65	-3
	Composite	438	67	67	0

Anchorage School District  
 "Gain Scores" for Students in Continuing Feeder Pattern  
 1996-97 to 1997-98 -- Analysis Based on 1998 Grade Level  
 Percentile Rank Scores Corresponding to Mean NCE Scores

<u>Level/School</u>	<u>Sub-Test</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Spring 1997</u>	<u>Spring 1998</u>	<u>Gain</u>
District	Reading	5,103	65	66	+1
Grades 7 - 8	Language Arts	5,093	66	63	-3
	Mathematics	5,113	70	66	-4
	Composite	4,960	68	67	-1
Central	Reading	491	66	67	+1
	Language Arts	490	67	64	-3
	Mathematics	486	70	64	-6
	Composite	481	69	66	-3

Central Middle School of Science had a two year change pattern very like the district's overall middle school pattern. Reading scores increased for the continuing Central students over the two year, while Language Arts and Math scores declined. The Reading increase at Central was slightly larger than that for the district; the Math decrease was also slightly larger. Overall, Central was similar to the district as a whole in terms of changes in scores over the two year.

"Gain Scores" for Students Targeted for Specific Services  
 1996-97 to 1997-98 -- Analysis Based on 1998 Grade Level  
 Percentile Rank Scores Corresponding to Mean NCE Scores

<u>Level/School</u>	<u>Sub-Test</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Spring 1997</u>	<u>Spring 1998</u>	<u>Gain</u>
Central	Reading	53	24	31	+7
	Language Arts	53	34	34	0
	Mathematics	53	36	37	+1
	Composite	51	28	32	+4

Students who were targeted to receive special services at Central Middle School of Science were a lower scoring group than the school as a whole. Their year to year growth pattern shows improvement in Reading and stability in Language Arts and Math. The pattern for the targeted students presents improved performances at a rate higher than that demonstrated for the school as a whole.

**Overall Program Success and Ongoing Affects on Academic Achievement:**

The F.O.C.U.S. Program has served as a model and reference for other reading programs within the District. F.O.C.U.S. techniques were presented in District in-

services and at curriculum meetings. Teachers, parents, and particularly students have expressed positive experiences with regard to F.O.C.U.S., and student reading strategy and comprehension tests done at the beginning and end of students' participation have shown strong student improvement. The Saturday Tutorial in Reading and Math was very successful. Most of the students enrolled were failing academically with attendance problems at school. With a total of 21 students enrolled, 67% were regularly in attendance.

**Dependence of Program Results on Continued Funding:**

The F.O.C.U.S. Program had funding fully restored for the 1997-1998 school year. Because of this, the F.O.C.U.S. staff was able to re implement the Saturday Reading and Math Tutorial, the June Transitional program, and the August Transitional Program. The F.O.C.U.S. staff was also able to meet with the other Language Arts teams to plan strategies to meet the District's Reading and Spelling goals for next year and was able to obtain materials to help reach these goals within the school.

**Recommendation for Program Continuation or Change:**

The F.O.C.U.S. Program has become a valuable part of our school-wide focus on reading and spelling. As we work toward accomplishing the District goal of addressing the reading and spelling needs of students and promoting the training and development of teachers, the work begun with F.O.C.U.S. will be vital to our success. As the number of students from the bilingual program continues to increase, the F.O.C.U.S. Program helps provide needed support to the classroom teacher.

***Attachment A -- Central***

May 29, 1998

To Whom It May Concern:

This year I taught the math portion of the Saturday Tutorial. I had a fantastic experience. I never had more than 7 students at a time. Having small groups gave me the opportunity to work one on one with the students. This one on one time helped me to individualize instruction to fit the needs of the students. It also gave students the attention and confidence they needed to excel.

The best testimony to the program is when a teacher came to me and said "What are you doing in Saturday School? My students like it and think math is fun now that they understand the concepts. I have noticed an improvement in their motivation and attitude." Comments like this one are why we teach. Students tend to tune out when they don't understand and the material is beyond them. This program helps students who need that little extra help and attention to succeed! I enjoyed being a part of this program.

Sincerely,

Jean Thompson

## ***Attachment B -- Central***

I like reading more now because FOCUS is a class that gets you going on reading. I hadn't read any books when I was not in this class. I read three books when I was here.

- W. B.

Before FOCUS I used to hate to read and I didn't read any books. As I started coming here, I read a whole lot of books. I had not read any books before this class and now I have read four.

- D. J.

I like reading now that I'm in FOCUS. I used to hate reading. I had read about 1 book (before FOCUS) in about the 6th grade. I have read about eight books in FOCUS, but my goal is exactly ten.

- J. B.

I like reading a lot more. I had never really read a novel. I have read three books in FOCUS.

- A. R.

I had never read many books. I have read four books while in FOCUS.

- N. L.

I don't know when the last time I read a book was before FOCUS. Now I have read two and a half books

- T. S.

## ***Attachment C -- Central***

I think FOCUS is a cool class. I like the way Mrs. Roberts reads with me on my story instead of just me reading or just Mrs. Roberts. The computers are fun. The class altogether is fun. We're in a fun class. I don't ever want to leave when it is time. I even come in sometimes at lunch. Mrs. Roberts is unlike any other teacher. She is cool.

- A. J. A.

I do like this class because it's a small group of people and you learn good stuff.

- W. B.

I like FOCUS because it's fun and I learn a whole lot of stuff.

- D. J.

(I like FOCUS) because it is fun and it helps me.

- T. S.

(I like FOCUS) because it's fun and we do some cool stuff like play games, read, or write stories.

- J. C.

(I like FOCUS) because there are few people.

- A. B/

(I like FOCUS) because now I like to read.

- J. P.

I like FOCUS because it's fun and we read a lot.

- N. L.

I like FOCUS because now I feel better about myself because I know how to do more things in other classes.

- J. S.

## ***Attachment D -- Central***

(FOCUS has) helped me in my English class when we have to do reports and when we do our paragraphs.

- W. B.

In my language class I had an F when I started coming here (FOCUS) now I have a B.

- D. J.

(FOCUS) helps me in Language Arts so I can understand what I am reading about. I learned more study skills and how to understand what I'm reading about.

- T. S.

In Language Arts I used to hate to read so much, but now that I read in FOCUS I feel more confident about reading out loud and I can read faster and understand it more. I learned how to take notes a lot better than I did before I came in here. When I do paragraphs, I know how to write them and now it is easier to do.

- J. S.

(FOCUS helped in my other classes) because I am not afraid to read aloud to the class!

- J. P.

When I write, it helps me to write complete sentences. I learned that you will use reading comprehension in your everyday life.

- S. M.

I learned how to write stories and paragraphs better. I also learned how to do the KWL (what you know, what you want to know, and what you learned.)

- J. C.

In FOCUS I learned reading strategies, how to read better and it helped me with reports.

- J. B.

I've learned how to write a complete paragraph.

- J. B.

***Attachment D -- Central***

May 22, 1998

My name is Vicki Patterson and I am an 8th grade teacher with the Maroon Team. I teach LA and SS. I am a firm believer in the F.O.C.U.S. program. During the first couple of weeks of school, I give all my students a writing assessment and a pre-CAT test. I can determine from the testing those that qualify for the F.O.C.U.S. program. Mrs. Karen Roberts, the F.O.C.U.S. teacher, and I choose students for the first semester based on students needs. Some students I need to observe for the first half of the year to get a better understanding of their instructional needs. These students then go to F.O.C.U.S. during the second semester.

Karen works equally well with all teams. The program is wonderful for students that have made it to the 8th grade and did not acquire certain skills during their education. I have seen major differences in students on my team while they are in the F.O.C.U.S. program.

Student #1's work and concentration were extremely better when he was in F.O.C.U.S. versus when he was not. He needed the "double learning" of LA so that he could comprehend the material. He needed that smaller class and individual attention. I could see a big difference in his LA abilities.

Student #2 did not want to go to F.O.C.U.S. first semester and we did not push it. By the second semester his grades were sliding badly (he is a repeat 8th grader) and his parents stepped in. They were told of F.O.C.U.S. and his parents signed him up for the second semester. Student #2's participation, behavior, and grades have gone WAY UP in all academic classes. I observed him in F.O.C.U.S. and he takes it seriously, he works hard, his individual reading is increasing, and he is doing great.

Student #3 had trouble writing and understanding the organization involved at the 8th grade level. Karen worked with him very closely on a research paper that the team was working on, and I have seen a big improvement in his writing skills.

Student #4's writing skills were poor. He would quickly write all his ideas and believe he had a paper instead of going through the whole writing process. He seems to have a writing power struggle with his dad/ he does not like his father to help him. Karen was able to reiterate the writing process that I was going through in my classes, so he received a lot of writing practice. His writing has improved because of it.

There are other students that go into the program and with intense teaching improve their skills. The F.O.C.U.S. program has made a significant difference for many of our kids.

January 12, 1998

To: Karen Roberts

From: Beth Johnson

Re: FOCUS

Dear Karen,

This is to congratulate you on a job well done. The reports from my students are positive and reflective of their newfound success thanks to the reading strategies you have taught them. Mario Bazan enthusiastically shared the techniques he is now employing while independently reading Stephen Crane's The Red Badge of Courage. These techniques are enabling him to understand a complex text.

Your efforts are paying off and are recognized by others. Thanks for doing a great job for the students of Central.

Sincerely,

Beth Lynch

cc: Dr. Keith Taton

**Anchorage School District  
Underachieving School Program  
1997-98**

**School** Romig Middle School      **Program** Instructional Support Program

**Principal's Name (Type)** Sophia M. Dawson

**Principal's Signature** On File in Mid-Level Education      **Date** 6/11/98

---

**Program Description:**

The Instructional Support Program in reading provides diagnostic and corrective reading instruction to low achieving students. The program addresses the phonological and language deficiencies of students. The teachers utilize Romalda Spalding methods, "Writing Road to Reading", and other reading strategies. The Spalding program is a systematic, direct teaching approach. Students learn the basic seventy phonograms of the Spalding program and are exposed to a variety of reading material. The targeted students are pretested in the areas of vocabulary, spelling, and reading comprehension. The Instructional Support Program also includes funding for a school-wide reading program called 'The Accelerated Readers'. The Accelerated Readers' program is a computerized management system that encourages students to read more and better books. The Accelerated Readers' program combines the best in adolescent literature with software that tests comprehension. The software manages all student records and tracks reading performance. This program provides several hundred books for students in a wide range of reading levels. All students in the school are tested and assigned the range of their reading ability. Students then select books from this broad reading range and then can read and pass computerized tests on books and earn points for various prizes. Additional books were purchased through this funding in this school year.

**Target Population/Selection Criteria:**

Students were selected for the corrective reading program based on their California Achievement Test score in reading comprehension of 30 percentile and below, a teacher recommendation, and/or consistent failing grades in language arts. Students with IEP's addressing reading were excluded for consideration. A few English as a Second Language students were included in the program. The program primarily identified low achieving students who were not receiving academic assistance through another

programs. 73 students were assigned to the program throughout the school year. 45 students remained in the program for at least 6 months.

### **Major Program Activities During 1997-98:**

1. Low reading ability students were scheduled into corrective reading classes.
2. Language Arts teachers directed the school-wide reading program, 'The Accelerated Readers'.
3. In September, reading, special education, and language arts teachers attended an inservice on literary presented by nationally known reading consultant, Janet Allen.
4. In June, several staff members will attend an institute on literary presented by reading consultant, Janet Allen.

### **Specific Achievement Goals:**

1. To provide corrective and remedial instruction to identified students.
2. To improve the academic performance of students in reading.
3. To continue staff development in the area of reading.

### **Examination of Program Outcomes Relative to Goals:**

**Goal 1:** To provide corrective and remedial instruction to identified students.

**Outcome 1:** Students were selected for the corrective reading program based on their California Achievement Test score of 30 percentile and below in reading comprehension, a teacher recommendation, and/or consistent failing grades. 73 students were assigned to reading classes over the school year. As of May, 1998, 45 students were in the program for more than 6 months. The mobility rate was 39%. Students with less than 6 months in the program transferred to Romig later in the school year, moved out of the attendance area or Anchorage, or were withdrawn for other reasons.

**Goal 2:** To improve the academic performance of students in reading.

**Outcome 2:** Students showed improvement in the area of reading in the following manner:

	<b>Grade Distribution</b>				
	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>F</b>
<b>1st Quarter Percentages</b>	<b>15.4</b>	<b>19.3</b>	<b>26.9</b>	<b>11.5</b>	<b>26.9</b>
<b>2nd Quarter Percentages</b>	<b>13.4</b>	<b>43.3</b>	<b>23.3</b>	<b>6.6</b>	<b>13.4</b>
<b>3rd Quarter Percentages</b>	<b>20.0</b>	<b>28.5</b>	<b>20.0</b>	<b>20.0</b>	<b>11.5</b>
<b>4th Quarter Percentages</b>	<b>21.7</b>	<b>27.0</b>	<b>10.8</b>	<b>10.8</b>	<b>29.7</b>

**The individual diagnostic instruments listed below were administered to students:**

1. San Diego Quick Assessment
2. Comprehension: Brigance Assessment
3. Spelling: Morrison-McCall Assessment

Students who were pre and post tested showed positive gains in vocabulary, spelling and reading comprehension. The lowest gain in vocabulary was .5 months and the highest was 3.0 years. In spelling, the lowest gain was .4 months and the highest gain was 2.3 years. Reading comprehension lowest gain was .5 months and the highest gain was 3 years.

**The mobility rate of students in the program was high - 39%.**

**Goal 3:** To continue staff development in the area of reading.

**Outcome 3:** The reading teacher, a language arts teacher, and two special education teachers were involved in a full day of inservice in the fall related to reading. 9 teachers are scheduled to take the Janet Allen Institute on literary in June, 1998.

## School Achievement Profile:

Average Scores on California Achievement Tests (CATs)  
Percentile Rank Scores Corresponding to Mean NCE Scores  
All Students Tested

<u>Level/School</u>	<u>Year</u>	<u>Total Reading</u>		<u>Total Lang. Arts</u>		<u>Total Math</u>		<u>Battery Composite</u>	
		<u>Num.</u>	<u>%ile</u>	<u>Num.</u>	<u>%ile</u>	<u>Num.</u>	<u>%ile</u>	<u>Num.</u>	<u>%ile</u>
District	1998	6,776	64	6,753	60	6,761	64	6,621	64
Grades 7-8	1997	6,384	63	6,387	59	6,400	64	6,277	64
	1996	6,379	64	6,385	56	6,353	63	6,248	62
Romig	1998	614	57	608	58	615	63	606	61
	1997	493	57	491	56	500	61	490	59
	1996	500	56	504	50	506	60	499	56

Romig Middle School had stable Reading scores over the three year period, with increasing Language Arts and Math scores. The scores for Romig are slightly lower than those for the district as a whole, but the change pattern for Reading and Language Arts is similar. Math scores increased at Romig and remained stable for the district over the past three testing periods.

"Gain Scores" for Students in Continuing Feeder Pattern  
1995-96 to 1997-98 -- Analysis Based on 1998 Grade Level  
Percentile Rank Scores Corresponding to Mean NCE Scores

<u>Level/School</u>	<u>Sub-Test</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Spring 1996</u>	<u>Spring 1998</u>	<u>Gain</u>
District	Reading	3,845	66	69	+3
Grades 7-8	Language Arts	3,850	68	65	-3
	Mathematics	3,846	69	68	-1
	Composite	3,705	70	70	0
Romig	Reading	297	65	68	+3
	Language Arts	295	69	70	+1
	Mathematics	302	65	72	+7
	Composite	291	69	73	+4

"Gain Scores" for Students in Continuing Feeder Pattern  
1995-96 to 1996-97 -- Analysis Based on 1997 Grade Level  
Percentile Rank Scores Corresponding to Mean NCE Scores

<u>Level/School</u>	<u>Sub-Test</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Spring 1996</u>	<u>Spring 1997</u>	<u>Gain</u>
District Grades 7 - 8	Reading	4,857	65	66	+1
	Language Arts	4,872	63	62	-1
	Mathematics	4,872	68	67	-1
	Composite	4,727	67	67	0
Romig	Reading	363	60	61	+1
	Language Arts	365	61	61	0
	Mathematics	370	64	65	+1
	Composite	358	63	64	+1

"Gain Scores" for Students in Continuing Feeder Pattern  
1996-97 to 1997-98 -- Analysis Based on 1998 Grade Level  
Percentile Rank Scores Corresponding to Mean NCE Scores

<u>Level/School</u>	<u>Sub-Test</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Spring 1997</u>	<u>Spring 1998</u>	<u>Gain</u>
District Grades 7 - 8	Reading	5,103	65	66	+1
	Language Arts	5,093	66	63	-3
	Mathematics	5,113	70	66	-4
	Composite	4,960	68	67	-1
Romig	Reading	439	61	61	0
	Language Arts	437	66	64	-2
	Mathematics	448	67	68	+1
	Composite	435	66	66	0

Romig Middle School had slightly positive to positive gains in all areas for students in the feeder pattern over the past two years. The Reading gain matched that for the district, and the Language Arts and Math gains were positive whereas the district's overall pattern was negative in those areas.

"Gain Scores" for Students Targeted for Specific Services  
1996-97 to 1997-98 -- Analysis Based on 1998 Grade Level  
Percentile Rank Scores Corresponding to Mean NCE Scores

<u>Level/School</u>	<u>Sub-Test</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Spring 1997</u>	<u>Spring 1998</u>	<u>Gain</u>
Romig	Reading	33	15	17	+2
	Language Arts	31	19	18	-1
	Mathematics	31	24	25	+1
	Composite	31	17	18	+1

The students targeted for special services were a low scoring group. They did not demonstrate remarkable gain or decline over the year.

### **Overall Program Success and Ongoing Affects on Academic Achievement:**

The school-wide reading program called Accelerated Readers was incorporated into the language arts program at grades 7th and 8th. The language arts teachers managed the computerized system. In some classes students were expected to read an established number of points that were included in their quarterly grades. The Accelerated Readers' store was opened each Friday during lunch for students to redeem their points. A field trip was organized for students who met their reading goal by May 1st. There were several new language arts teachers to the school and they needed assistance in getting the program started in their classes. Overall, students seem to be interested in setting reading goals, reading books, and redeeming their points for prizes.

### **Dependence of Program Results on Continued Funding:**

The funding provides for a reading teacher to work with students. If funding is withdrawn, the available classes would be reduced to 1 or 2 sections. The remedial assistance would not be available to a greater number of students. The school would experience more student failures. Reading at the middle level is a necessary instructional area.

### **Recommendation for Program Continuation or Change:**

The reading program has improved the academic performance of students. Before entering the program, these students had poor academic performance in language arts, several were decertified from the special education program but lack the necessary proficient, reading skills to be successful in the regular language arts classes. As indicated by the Grade Distribution Report (Quarters 1 - 4), students experienced success. Reading students made the respective percentages in the 4 quarters of "C" or better grade - 61.6, 80.0, 68.5, 59.5. Romig will not be able to sustain the corrective reading program without the funding for the 1.0 FTE.

**Anchorage School District  
Underachieving School Program  
1997-98**

**School** West High School                      **Program** Anchored In Reading

**Principal's Name (Type)** Dr. Lance S. Bowie

**Principal's Signature** On File At High School Education                      **Date** May 29, 1998

---

**Program Description:**

The 1997-1998 academic year brought shoots, branches and fruition to this growing enterprise we call ***Anchored In Reading*** at West Anchorage High School. After slightly more than one year of intensive staff development, research into secondary literacy programs, ongoing and frequent contact with leading secondary reading consultants, an investment in books and other reading materials, an in-house assessment tool, and implementation of an intervention program for ninth and tenth graders, we approached the second full year of our Underachieving School Grant with a lattice work upon which to blossom and flourish.

***Anchored in Reading*** was premised on recognizing and responding to five basic needs as established by staff at West Anchorage High School. These core areas include:

- (1) increased academic performance across the curriculum through emphasis on heightening all students' basic reading skills,
- (2) reading skill instruction for students whose skills fall below grade level,
- (3) more time allocated each school day for reading,
- (4) training for teachers school wide to have an awareness of student needs in reading and to be better prepared to meet these needs, and
- (5) an emphasis on the value of reading and the importance of reading strategies in all subject areas.

Enhancing the "skill and the will to read," traits necessary to function as a strategic reader in today's and future society, has been the focus of our program. We have provided ongoing development opportunities for faculty through several special Inservice presentations. This will be continued into the summer by the participation of twelve key staff members who will attend the *Janet Allen "It's Never Too Late" Literacy Institute*, to be presented in Anchorage in mid-June. This team includes teachers and an administrator.

We have extended reading opportunities to the full student audience during the school wide Reading Period, a time when all students and teachers are expected to ‘hunker down’ with books of their own choosing during thirty minutes’ quiet time, three times weekly. In an end-of-the-year survey, sixty-seven percent (67%) of teachers reported seeing a tremendous improvement in student ability to ‘settle into’ reading during **Reading Period**, seventy-four percent (74%) stated that they had urged the reading of books and stories which illustrated and enhanced their content area materials to students during **Reading Period**, and fifty-four percent (54%) said that they themselves were reading more--and enjoying it--than they had in many, many years. Eighty-five percent (85%) of all faculty surveyed recommended that we continue the Reading Period this coming school year.

As well, we have reached out to staff in other schools and inservice venues to present our own fledgling experiences with program-building; and our reading students have found a shared love of story-telling and reading with younger pupils at Turnagain and Government Hill Elementary schools.

The **Anchored In Reading** intervention program was designed to help students overcome reading deficiencies -- to develop vocabulary, to reteach decoding skills, and to improve comprehension, interpretation and assimilation for increased learning. We have found our efforts richly rewarded through confidence-building occasions to anchor student motivation and interest in reading.

We have been privileged to have on staff two Reading Specialists, Leslie Wiederholt and Kathie Steele, whose purpose has been to teach the intervention and individualized reading classes, train teachers in the use of effective reading strategies in all curricular areas, liaison with teachers regarding literacy challenges in their content areas, assimilate research materials, and guide the overall effort in the school wide reading program. In addition, a program coordinator, Barbara Hecker, was provided preparation time during the second semester to coordinate efforts of the **AIR** committee.

We would certainly be amiss to not mention the long arm of inspiration, guidance and support from the ASD Reading Department Coordinator, Mardell Kiesel.

### **Target Population/Selection Criteria:**

We cast the spotlight this year on three target groups:

The first consists of students (grades 9, 10) in intervention reading classes under the direction of Leslie Wiederholt, as well as those in Kathie Steele’s Individualized Reading classes (grades 11 and 12.) Mrs. Wiederholt’s classes were formed by means of recommendations from (1) teachers, (2) counselors, (3) parents and by student self-

recommendation. We will specifically target those students for whom we've been able to collect Pre- and Post Test scores from the S.T.A.R. assessment tool. Ms. Steele's Individualized Reading classes are English elective courses.

The second focus group will be Freshmen students in English classes for whom we have Pre- and Post Test scores from our in-house assessment program, S.T.A.R.

The entire student population will be the third and final group, as all students have been impacted by the ninety minutes of free-reading time per week. We will be heeding results of CAT testing for this overall group.

### **Major Program Activities During 1997-1998:**

- The most remarkable program activity this past year has been the allocation of ninety-minutes of free reading time into our weekly class and bell schedule. On Tuesdays, Wednesdays, and Thursdays (of our longer-period, rotating schedule) we have sculpted three **Reading Periods** of thirty minutes each. We accomplished this feat by cutting two minutes from each passing period, seven minutes from each class period, and several minutes from lunch time. The **Reading Period** is monitored by the students' second hour teacher, thus the teacher has the advantage of prior and continuing relationship with his or her own **Reading Period** students. Two of the three days, the students are in place for both classes contiguously (with a short break in between). On the third day, students pass to their **Reading Period** without also meeting for their second hour class.

The **Reading Period** has met with mixed results from some teachers and students, but by far the response--and the results--have been favorable to enthusiastic. We anticipate that, with time, the **Reading Period** will become accepted as rote practice of 'quiet time' in the otherwise hustle and bustle of a normal day.

- We encouraged teachers to have a mini-library in their classrooms. A very successful student book drive conducted in the Spring of 1997 provided us with over 14,000 items of all tastes and genres from which to choose. Teachers hauled carts and boxes full to their classrooms. A volunteer team of ten current and former teachers in **Delta Kappa Gamma, Eta Chapter**, came to our rescue to sort out inappropriate materials. Once the selection was whittled down to manageable proportions, the remainder were shelved in a small enclave of the teachers' lounge where staff members were invited to rotate their store of classroom reading materials.
- Reading Specialists, Leslie Wiederholt and Kathie Steele, taught *cross-curricular reading strategies* at the **Language Arts Cross-District Inservice**, in August 1997. A panel composed of Jim Bailey (AP), Joe Alvord (Math teacher), Wayne Knight (English teacher and Dept. Chair), and Barbara Hecker (Social Studies teacher and AIR program coordinator) presented on the topic of *creating a secondary reading*

*program* at the same function. In addition, Nick Rothman (ESL Dept. Chair) presented on *implementing reading methodologies in the ESL classroom*.

- During the 1996-97 school year, West invested in a site license for Advantage Learning Systems' **Accelerated Reader**, a computerized reading management tool, and **S.T.A.R. (Standardized Test for Assessment of Reading)**, a computer-adaptive assessment test which provides scores comparing students to national norms, and prepares individual diagnostic reports, class growth reports, parent reports, and much more. First semester pretesting with **S.T.A.R.** was problematic. Server response time was far too slow and we experienced corruption of the data file on the server. During pretesting, the client software was accessing the server via a LocalTalk network. Second semester, however, our lab network was upgraded to Ethernet, which greatly improved the testing environment. Post-testing went smoothly and efficiently, with thirty or more students able to test simultaneously. Assessment reports for individual students were generally printed and delivered to teachers on the same day their students did post-testing. Recently, client software was installed on selected classroom computers at West so that STAR testing can be done from the classroom as well as in the lab. We're learning and improving as we go!
- **Accelerated Reader** books--appreciated for being classified according to reading skill level--and assessments were used faithfully by students in the reading classes, as well as ESL and Special Education classes. Last year the books were placed directly into classrooms on rolling carts. This year they were cataloged and located on library shelves for easier record-keeping as well as wider access by students.
- There has been significant increase in the use (and praise) of **Books on Tape** by students in reading intervention, ESL, and Special Education classes. For lower-level or non-readers, a major source of frustration and hopelessness occurs when their skills do not *propel* them through the print, as would a proficient reader's. Interest and progress flag as they falter on unknown words. The 'leaves and twigs' of reading prohibits the view of even the trees, much less of the grand forest of pleasurable reading. With Books on Tape, the sound, intonation, and flow of the words are provided at a normal reading pace, while the student's eyes are following on print. We've seen non-readers become voracious consumers of novels as they experience the wonder of comprehending--and completing--story after story after story. With such practice they build their own confidence in the reading process, and soon thereafter, move on to read without the crutch of audio-technology.
- **Reading Buddy** programs grew through the largess of (elementary) parent volunteers who provided transportation for West High students to Turnagain Elementary and Government Hill Elementary schools. Students of Kathie Steele visited, read to, and with Turnagain pupils; Nick Rothman's ESL native Spanish-speaking students participated in reading activities within Government Hill's Spanish immersion program.

- **Staff development** progressed with **content area-specific workshops and seminars**.
  - August inservices provided a brief all-faculty colloquium with **Dr. Donna Alvermann**, professor of Reading Education at the University of Georgia, and author of *Content Reading and Literacy: Succeeding in Today's Diverse Classrooms*.
  - Of note was a full day in October with **Dr. Janet Allen**, nationally praised author of *It's Never Too Late: Leading Adolescents to Lifelong Literacy*, consultant, and professor of English education at the University of Central Florida and Director of the Central Florida Writing Project.
  - March brought workshops with **Jan Smith**, Reading Department Chairperson at Mayo High School in Rochester, MN. Because of her school's comprehensive reading program, as well as the model they provide in preparing students for the reading component of the Minnesota Graduation Exit Exam, Mrs. Smith was an ideal spokesperson to address the intervention needs of all levels of readers, couched in expository reading exercises and strategies.
- **Faculty Literacy Circles** continued on a monthly basis with Friday afternoon sessions devoted to the light-hearted sharing of thoughts, interpretations, and feelings about their shared novels.
- In partnership with the **NEA's Read Across America** celebration on March 2, West High broke from customary **Reading Period** practices to enjoy a brief celebration of Dr. Seuss' birthday with student-decorated cakes and radio-style (intercom) reading of *Oh The Places You'll Go!* by Principal Lance Bowie and teacher Gayle Heywood. Other radio-style presentations were provided courtesy of the West High drama department under the guidance of teacher David Block and local performer and human rights activist, Shirley Mae Staton.
- **Library circulation** has increased significantly over the past three years due directly to the challenges presented by the **Anchored In Reading** program.

Books circulated 1995-96: **11,837**

Books circulated 1996-97: **13,058**

Books circulated 1997-98: **13,972**

*I polled my students recently to get responses to the question, "How have your reading habits changed as a result of the Reading Period?" Answers included: "I read more now," "I can read longer because of the Reading Period," "I am a better reader now," and so on.*

*I met one of my students on Saturday morning at Borders Books where he was purchasing a book with money he had earned. This is a turned-on kid!*

*We pretested reading skills with the S.T.A.R. test in October 1997 and post tested in April 1998. The results for my remedial reading groups showed a mean increase from 4.3 G.E. (Grade Equivalency) to 6.4 G.E. in six months.*

### **Specific Achievement Goals:**

The underlying foundation of the **Anchored in Reading** program is faith that **improving reading skills improves student achievement across the curriculum**. We know through our own experience, as well as through the research of others, that reading is basic to accessing, comprehending, and applying information of all kinds. Reading can also be the source of much personal satisfaction.

Our specific achievement goals are:

1. Increased academic performance.
2. Reading skill instruction for students whose skills fall below grade level.
3. More time allocated each school day for reading.
4. Teachers, across the curriculum, trained to have an awareness of student needs in reading and to be better prepared to meet these needs.
5. An emphasis on the value of reading and the importance of reading strategies in all subject areas.

### **Examination of Program Outcomes Relative to Goals:**

**Goal 1:** Increased academic performance.

**N.b.** *The West High School profile indicates a **51% mobility rate**. This indicates that one out of every two students does not complete a year's study with us. While we strive to work with every student individually, we believe one test score does not accurately describe or define our student profile. In particular, the student population which qualifies for intervention assistance in reading classes, is the group most impacted by transience, dropping-out,, and disenfranchisement from the general school system.*

**Outcome 1:** Students in all ninth-grade English classes were pretested in the third week of October, 1997, by the **S.T.A.R.** in-house computerized assessment program. In addition, students in reading classes (intervention classes of 9th and 10th graders) under

the direction of Leslie Wiederholt; and students in *Individualized Reading classes* (non-intervention, mixed skill levels, 11th and 12th graders) under the direction of Kathie Steele, were also pretested at that point in time.

***Six months later***, in May 1998, the same (i.e., those remaining enrolled at West High) students were post-tested using, again, the **S.T.A.R.** computerized program.

**Target Group 1:** In the **intervention classes**, the average improvement was .95 of a year's (grade) skill level. Most notable in this number were K.M. whose scores rocketed upwards by **6.9** years' increase in reading performance, J.R. who raised his scores by **3.6** years' levels, R.M. whose scores rose by a full three (**3.0**) years' levels, N.R. who increased by **2.9** grades' equivalency in reading, J.G. and J.W., whose scores increased by **2.7** and **2.6** grade levels, S.G., J.W., along with J.M., whose reading abilities rose by **2.2** and **2.1** years respectively, and J.R., D.S., and M.K. who registered over one year's growth -- all in six months' time! Something good is happening here!

It must be pointed out that these students, *who normally score well below the range where the secondary C.A.T. testing program even begins to register their abilities*, have never before been privy to score increases...much less the ensuing pride in self for reading accomplishments.

In the four **Individualized Reading** (half-year) courses taught by Kathie Steele, the average increase was **2.25** year's level in reading. These students, in *less than one semester's time*, achieved two and a quarters' years measurable growth in reading skill! This class is not geared toward intervention, but rather toward enrichment of reading ability and literature appreciation. Most worthy of note was V.Z. whose scores soared Grade Equivalency **6.5 to GE 12.7** -- a full **6.2** years' addition! J.S. elevated her scores by **5.2** year's levels, and B.B., M.C., J.C. and D.M. all boosted their reading levels by **3.1** to **3.6** years' grades. Numerous others raised their reading level skills one or more grade levels--in less than a semester's time!

**Target Group 2:** In the non-intervention classes (including several Honors groupings), the average growth of change in reading scores was **1.19** of a year's reading level. Overall, the increase among students with a pretest and a post test, the average growth was **1.14**

year's growth. A serious drawback of the **S.T.A.R.** program for higher readers is that it does not differentiate scores above grade '13'. Thus, students who scored a '13' on the pretest were dropped from the calculations. In the future, we will re-pretest those who score 'off the scale' on another instrument which will evaluate their achievement more specifically.

***Year's GE Increase:***

Intervention 9th Grade Classes:	.95
Individualized Reading Classes:	2.25
Classes other than Intervention:	1.19
Overall:	1.14

***Target Group 3:*** The entire student body has been impacted by an additional ninety minutes of free-reading time per week. We await results of the **CAT** tests to tell if it has had a noticeable effect on the school's reading scores.

**Goal 2: Reading skill instruction for students whose skills fall below grade level.**

**Outcome 2:** Five intervention Reading classes were taught by Reading Specialist Leslie Wiederholt. These courses were refigured from one-semester to full-year offerings as of this year. Class size is kept small so as to provide more individual attention to these, oft-times, neediest of students.

Students receive basic English credit towards graduation while experiencing a classroom setting wherein the reading material is tailored to their own level of reading ability. The challenge comes from the teacher as well as from the student to be aware and accept responsibility for a deficit in their reading level -- the two work as a team to solve the dilemma.

**Goal 3: More time each day is allocated to reading.**

**Outcome 3:** Though in an ideal situation we might be able to create a thirty- to sixty- minute window for reading on a daily basis, we are pleased to have been able to carve ninety minutes from our heavily loaded schedule for literacy pursuits. A recent student survey provided these results:

<b><i>Anchored In Reading</i></b>	<b>Student Survey</b>				
	<b>-May 1998-</b>				
	<b>Overall</b>	<b>Grade 9</b>	<b>Grade 10</b>	<b>Grade 11</b>	<b>Grade 12</b>
I've enjoyed having more time to read what I want to read.	<b>61%</b>	52%	67%	64%	60%
My Reading Period has been quiet and regularly conducive to reading.	<b>64%</b>	56%	76%	70%	52%
My teacher usually reads during Reading Period.	<b>60%</b>	57%	66%	65%	50%
I've read more books this year than in a usual school year.	<b>46%</b>	45%	51%	45%	42%
I can feel my reading skill improving with practice.	<b>54%</b>	40%	100%	35%	42%
I am reading faster now, with practice.	<b>36%</b>	37%	38%	34%	35%
I have discovered and read more books by favorite authors and/or favorite genres.	<b>54%</b>	41%	100%	38%	36%
I've enjoyed being read aloud to by my teacher(s).	<b>18%</b>	16%	16%	19%	19%
My teachers have helped me to better understand my textbook readings.	<b>15%</b>	15%	13%	13%	21%
My teachers have offered suggestions of interesting books and stories to read.	<b>34%</b>	31%	42%	22%	39%
I would recommend for next year's reading program:					
<i>Continue</i> the Reading Period as is.	<b>39%</b>	34%	41%	41%	39%
<i>Expand</i> the Reading Period.	<b>27%</b>	29%	42%	21%	14%
<i>Reduce</i> the Reading Period.	<b>14%</b>	18%	11%	14%	14%
<i>Discontinue</i> the Reading Period.	<b>35%</b>	39%	30%	33%	39%
<i>Include more literacy-based activities</i> during Reading Period.	<b>25%</b>	30%	23%	25%	23%

*My Individualized Reading classes have visited Turnagain Elementary to read to challenged readers, they have read over 400 books, and they have shared their reading with peers and parents. Megan R. brought in **Johnny Got His Gun**, a book about World War I, that her father asked her to read. Nick I.' mom made a point to call me to tell me he was reading **All Quiet on the Western Front**. **It Happened to Nancy** was a favorite this semester with 5th hour. Seven of us read it. We almost had an assembly line. I personally have found my favorite author.*

Gary Paulsen. *I have shared his writings with students. I have also read aloud **Harris and Me** by Paulsen. We laughed until we snorted.*

Kathie Steele  
Reading Specialist and English Teacher

**Goal 4: Teachers, across the curriculum, trained to have an awareness of student needs in reading and to be better prepared to meet those needs.**

**Outcome 4:** Teachers have been offered a variety of staff development opportunities. They have been provided with informative updates on strategies for including reading in their curriculum.

*I have used the **Accelerated Reader** books and tests to implement independent reading. It allows for accountability and increases the amount of student practice. I've seen an increase in comprehension and vocabulary. ESL readers really need vocabulary expansion, and I've found reading to be the best way to accomplish this goal.*

*I've used grants, book drives and advanced scrounging techniques to build an in class library of **AR** books. I'm losing a lot [of books] but many kids are reading and taking advantage of the access to books.*

*I've used graphic organizers, pre- and post reading techniques as taught by Neely, Allen and Smith. They've helped me improve the quality of classroom discussion and engagement of students. I'm reading out loud more to low level readers. I now realize that many unmotivated motivated students are that way because they are frustrated by their inability to read.*

Nick Rothman  
ESL Teacher/Dept. Chair

A recent anonymous faculty survey was conducted with the following results:

**1. How have your classroom teaching practices changed since implementation of the Anchored in Reading grant program?**

*Percentages who v 'ed statements with which they agreed.*

- (67%) I've seen more students "settle into reading" as a source of pleasure, entertainment and learning.
- (44%) I've seen more kids carrying books (besides textbooks) with them.
- (33%) I've seen kids hunger for more books 'of the same ilk', by the same author, etc., as what they just finished reading.
- (33%) I've discussed with my classes, or individual students, storylines from novels as illustrations and/or expansions of my regular content lessons.
- (36%) I've obtained (whether by borrowing or buying) books which have been recommended by the consultants we've heard in workshops.
- (44%) I've read stories aloud to my students.
- (74%) I've recommended particular stories, novels, or non-fiction works to my students.
- (28%) I've used some suggested strategies to assist my students in reading comprehension of our classroom texts.
- (23%) I've used the Accelerated Reader books and tests to evaluate student comprehension and level of reading skills, as well as to provide incentives for reading.
- (31%) I've rewritten some of my goals and expectations in order to enhance reading comprehension of **classroom materials**.
- (51%) I've gained a better understanding of my students' learning abilities through awareness of their reading skills.
- (10%) Nothing has changed for me.

**2. Personally, how has your perspective on reading changed in the past two and a half years that we've had the reading grant?**

- (54%) I've taken the opportunity to read more books for pleasure and relaxation.
- (31%) I've 'felt for the first time' or 'reclaimed' some joy in reading for pleasure.
- (41%) I've spent more money in the bookstores!

**3. Finally, I would recommend for next year's Anchored In Reading program:**

- (85%) *Continue* the Reading Period.
- (13%) *Expand* the Reading Period (i.e., add five minutes/day, meet five days/week, etc.)
- (3%) *Reduce* the Reading Period (i.e. fewer minutes/day, fewer days/week)
- (14%) *Discontinue* the Reading Period.
- (28%) Include other literacy-related activities during Reading Period.

**(28%)** More strategies, please! Have the Reading Specialist assist and demonstrate in my class.

*I have witnessed a great deal of sharing on the part of faculty members. When I approach a group of teachers, they are as likely to be talking about a wonderful book they have read as anything else. It has also given added stature to those staff members who are avid readers. We have fostered a school climate where reading is a socially admirable activity. And we envy those teachers the wonderful books they have read.*

Juliana Armstrong, Dean of Students

**Goal 5: An emphasis on the value of reading and the importance of reading strategies in all subject areas.**

**Outcome 5:** More students are arriving in class prepared to fill possible free moments with a book of their choosing. Students--be they *for* the **Reading Period** or *against* it--are discussing the value of reading in their own lives. They are cognizant of the need for continuous effort to heighten literacy awareness among their peers.

Students are more aware of teachers who read, administrators who read, and staff members who read. A book in the hand becomes a conversation opener, a means to forging a common bond and added respect.

Showcases, bulletin boards, and classroom walls throughout the building are decorated to create an ambiance which says "West High is a reading place... Welcome!"

Reading Buddy partnerships from several of Kathie Steele's reading classes and Nick Rothman's ESL classes formed so that teens could read to and with elementary students, including a group of native Spanish-speaking students who engaged with the Spanish immersion program at Government Hill Elementary School.

*Government Hill Elementary School is primarily a Spanish immersion school. Every few months we set aside a whole day for reading. We invite lots of different people to come and share a book or story with a class or two. Mr. Rothman has on each of our read-ins assembled eight to ten fluent Spanish readers from West High School and Romig Middle School who come and share a book with our Spanish learning kindergartners and fourth graders. After each read-in, I have asked the teachers involved how his student volunteers did, and their reply has always been an emphatic, "Wonderful! Just wonderful!"*

William Owen  
Government Hill Library

## School Achievement Profile:

Average Scores on California Achievement Tests (CATs)  
Percentile Rank Scores Corresponding to Mean NCE Scores  
All Students Tested

<u>Level/School</u>	<u>Year</u>	<u>Total Reading</u>		<u>Total Lang. Arts</u>		<u>Total Math</u>		<u>Battery Composite</u>	
		<u>Num.</u>	<u>%ile</u>	<u>Num.</u>	<u>%ile</u>	<u>Num.</u>	<u>%ile</u>	<u>Num.</u>	<u>%ile</u>
District	1998	8,288	61	8,232	57	8,310	66	8,138	64
Grades 9-11	1997	8,256	61	8,276	55	8,266	66	8,197	63
	1996	6,866	61	7,949	55	7,976	65	6,792	62
West	1998	964	50	944	51	974	60	936	56
	1997	994	52	998	50	1,000	59	989	55
	1996	975	53	969	47	956	61	923	56

West High School tests at the national average in Reading and Language Arts and above the national average in Math. Its scores are slightly lower than those for the district as a whole. The district showed stable scores in Reading and Math over the three testing period and slightly improved scores in Language Arts. West demonstrated similar patterns in Math and Language Arts but had a slight decline in Reading scores over the period.

"Gain Scores" for Students in Continuing Feeder Pattern  
1995-96 to 1997-98 -- Analysis Based on 1998 Grade Level  
Percentile Rank Scores Corresponding to Mean NCE Scores

<u>Level/School</u>	<u>Sub-Test</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Spring 1996</u>	<u>Spring 1998</u>	<u>Gain</u>
District	Reading	5,370	68	65	-3
Grades	Language Arts	5,631	62	61	-1
9 - 11	Mathematics	5,622	70	70	0
	Composite	5,238	69	69	0
West	Reading	612	62	59	-3
	Language Arts	607	59	58	-1
	Mathematics	629	70	67	-3
	Composite	601	66	64	-2

"Gain Scores" for Students in Continuing Feeder Pattern  
1995-96 to 1996-97 -- Analysis Based on 1997 Grade Level  
Percentile Rank Scores Corresponding to Mean NCE Scores

<u>Level/School</u>	<u>Sub-Test</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Spring 1996</u>	<u>Spring 1997</u>	<u>Gain</u>
District	Reading	6,103	66	63	-3
Grades	Language Arts	6,714	59	58	-1
9 - 11	Mathematics	6,697	68	68	0
	Composite	5,994	67	66	-1
West	Reading	775	60	56	-4
	Language Arts	777	54	54	0
	Mathematics	780	67	62	-5
	Composite	762	63	60	-3

"Gain Scores" for Students in Continuing Feeder Pattern  
1996-97 to 1997-98 -- Analysis Based on 1998 Grade Level  
Percentile Rank Scores Corresponding to Mean NCE Scores

<u>Level/School</u>	<u>Sub-Test</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Spring 1997</u>	<u>Spring 1998</u>	<u>Gain</u>
District	Reading	6,592	66	64	-2
Grades	Language Arts	6,599	61	59	-2
9 - 11	Mathematics	6,628	69	69	0
	Composite	6,497	69	67	-2
West	Reading	731	60	56	-4
	Language Arts	719	60	56	-4
	Mathematics	748	66	65	-1
	Composite	716	65	62	-3

West High School's two year feeder pattern scores indicated a relative decline in performance compared to the national norm group. The Reading and Math scores declined slightly and the Language Arts scores were essentially stable. The pattern for Reading and Language Arts exactly matched the pattern for the district. The district's Math scores at the high school level remained stable over the two year period.

"Gain Scores" for Students Targeted for Specific Services  
1996-97 to 1997-98 -- Analysis Based on 1998 Grade Level  
Percentile Rank Scores Corresponding to Mean NCE Scores

<u>Level/School</u>	<u>Sub-Test</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Spring 1997</u>	<u>Spring 1998</u>	<u>Gain</u>
West	Reading	202	62	57	-5
	Language Arts	201	63	58	-5
	Mathematics	210	67	68	1
	Composite	201	67	64	-3

The gain scores for "targeted" students are not markedly different from the gain scores for the entire student population.

### **Overall Program Success and Ongoing Affects on Academic Achievement:**

*The Special Ed. Department has decided, because of students' needs in reading, to form two new intervention reading classes next year. The **S.T.A.R.** testing helped shed light on and reinforce the need for such classes.*

Bob Kalow, Special Ed.

*We are looking forward to implementing an **Integrated Core Studies** program for incoming freshmen. Students will qualify for this program who are two or more grade levels below in reading and have been recommended by their 8th grade English teacher and/or counselor. Two class sections will have the opportunity to flow, with a smaller grouping of students, in a circuit for core requirements in Math, Science and English. Three team teachers will mesh literacy-based curriculum and strategies for the two targeted groups. Already immersed in the planning, "Big Joe" Alvord (Math), "Little Joe" Alward (Science), and I (Reading/English) will continue during the summer months to prepare for this literacy-based approach to team teaching.*

Leslie Wiederholt, Reading Specialist

The **Anchored In Reading** Program, which we think of as "reading to learn and learning to read," has had a positive impact on students and staff at West High. It has allowed a school-wide emphasis on a skill critical to today's learning and to life-long learning. The message has clearly been, "Reading is important!" It's important to schedule time for it, to develop better skills in doing it, to talk about it, to enjoy it, and to do it. Change is a very slow process, but between the conception of the **AIR** Program and now, reading has become a more valued and recognized skill. Our current students cannot help but get the message that the quality of their lives will be improved if their reading skills are improved.

That's a good basis for continual positive change down the road.

### **Dependence of Program Results on Continued Funding:**

Because change is such a slow process, it takes a substantial period of time for a new program emphasis to become an inherent part of a school. With the **AIR** grant monies, when there's a reading-related need, there are some resources to draw upon and the need can be met. That's healthy! If the financial support for **AIR** stopped today, it would be very difficult to sustain the current emphasis on reading; we fear we would quickly slip backwards. The additional funding we've used for staffing, training, special projects, reading materials, assessment, celebration, etc. has provided the

"boost" to keep a momentum going. If funding were withdrawn, there would be a handful of staff members trying to "keep **AIR** alive," but with all the other demands on educators' time, I'm afraid the focus on reading would fade; there would be no "special program" to rally around and no additional resources to help sustain a high level of effort and enthusiasm for reading.

### **Recommendation for Program Continuation or Change:**

As principal of WHS, I support the reading program totally and without reservation. The program has been in place for the past two years and while it has not been our underlying goal to show major immediate cognitive improvements, it has been our long term goal--as a school--to demonstrate both schoolwide affective and cognitive improvements throughout. We began the reading program somewhat naively believing there were numbers of high school reading programs available to learn from throughout the nation. We found that this was not true--there is only a handful of high schools providing schoolwide programs designed to improve reading.

The first year of the program, we trained staff members in reading procedures and strategies. This year we continued to train teachers. We introduced a **Reading Period** to the entire school which emphasizes the importance of reading for all. My long range goal is to have a specified time each day when the entire school and staff will be reading. While we are not there yet, we are well on the road to making this happen.

We continue to need assistance from the ASD as we struggle to find the appropriate assessment instrument, and to provide the needed evaluative materials. The **CAT** test does not accurately calculate growth of students who are reading in the lower ranges. Our **STAR** assessment program does not show appropriate results for those who have demonstrated the highest (13) scores in the initial pretest. We will continue to address these concerns.

The English department is proposing to broaden our targeted group of students through incorporating reading strategies within a Core Studies literacy-based curriculum for lower-reading ninth graders.

Again I endorse the reading program at WHS; we are only beginning to touch the surface of attaining our goal of improving school achievement through reading. I urge you to continue your support of the WHS reading program. We believe it is making a difference for students who come to us with eight years of limited reading.

### ***The Last Word...***

After having the opportunity to work with teachers at West High School as part of their Anchored In Reading program, I take pleasure in adding my words to the summary report. My involvement with the AIR goals began when three members of the AIR team came to Orange County to visit classrooms where the Literacy Project was being initiated. That visit was followed by my coming to Anchorage to work with teachers in all content areas at West High. This year, I had the opportunity to spend an additional follow-up day with the AIR team and teachers at West High and was impressed that the focus on literacy was still alive and well.

West has much in which they can take pride; few high schools have been able to institute and maintain a literacy focus. In fact, in spite of the significant studies that have highlighted the importance of independent reading, I have yet to speak in any other secondary school that has a schoolwide sustained silent reading program.

I have met and worked with teachers in all content areas at West High who have actively incorporated more reading and specific reading strategies in their teaching. Most teachers on the faculty acknowledge the importance of reading and recognize that it will take more than the work of one or two teachers or departments to improve literacy for all students. These are major accomplishments and ones that are not common in most high schools.

Oscar Wilde said, "Success is a science; if you have the conditions, you get the results." West High has established conditions that are conducive to success. The challenge will be in maintaining that success and continuing to take the next difficult steps.

Janet Allen  
Ed.D., University of Maine  
Associate Professor of Education at the University of Central Florida  
Director of the Central Florida Writing Project

## S.T.A.R. Pre- and Post Test Scores 1997-98

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
1	Student Name	1	Student Num.	Fitzgerald-1	12.9	13.0	0.1	
2	Student Name	2	Student Num.	Fitzgerald-1	7.6	8.5	0.9	
3	Student Name	3	Student Num.	Fitzgerald-1	9.5	13.0	3.5	
4	Student Name	4	Student Num.	Fitzgerald-1	10.6	13.0	2.4	
5	Student Name	5	Student Num.	Fitzgerald-1	11.5	13.0	1.5	1.68
6	Student Name	6	Student Num.	Fitzgerald-2	6.6	8.3	1.7	
7	Student Name	7	Student Num.	Fitzgerald-2	11.9	13.0	1.1	
8	Student Name	8	Student Num.	Fitzgerald-2	9.8	7.9	-1.9	
9	Student Name	9	Student Num.	Fitzgerald-2	4.5	5.8	1.3	
10	Student Name	10	Student Num.	Fitzgerald-2	9.2	7.7	-1.5	
11	Student Name	11	Student Num.	Fitzgerald-2	11.6	13.0	1.4	
12	Student Name	12	Student Num.	Fitzgerald-2	6.4	8.6	2.2	
13	Student Name	13	Student Num.	Fitzgerald-2	12.9	13.0	0.1	
14	Student Name	14	Student Num.	Fitzgerald-2	8.7	8.7	0.0	
15	Student Name	15	Student Num.	Fitzgerald-2	10.0	12.1	2.1	
16	Student Name	16	Student Num.	Fitzgerald-2	7.9	9.6	1.7	0.75
17	Student Name	17	Student Num.	Westlake-2	7.1	7.6	0.5	
18	Student Name	18	Student Num.	Westlake-2	9.7	10.9	1.2	
19	Student Name	19	Student Num.	Westlake-2	8.9	9.2	0.3	
20	Student Name	20	Student Num.	Westlake-2	10.4	13.0	2.6	
21	Student Name	21	Student Num.	Westlake-2	7.0	6.7	-0.3	
22	Student Name	22	Student Num.	Westlake-2	12.8	12.9	0.1	
23	Student Name	23	Student Num.	Westlake-2	7.6	7.6	0.0	
24	Student Name	24	Student Num.	Westlake-2	7.0	8.9	1.9	
25	Student Name	25	Student Num.	Westlake-2	7.7	9.4	1.7	
26	Student Name	26	Student Num.	Westlake-2	6.5	9.6	3.1	
27	Student Name	27	Student Num.	Westlake-2	10.0	9.4	-0.6	
28	Student Name	28	Student Num.	Westlake-2	8.9	11.1	2.2	1.06
29	Student Name	29	Student Num.	Wiederholt-3	8.2	7.7	-0.5	
30	Student Name	30	Student Num.	Wiederholt-3	5.4	3.3	-2.1	
31	Student Name	31	Student Num.	Wiederholt-3	3.2	3.9	0.7	
32	Student Name	32	Student Num.	Wiederholt-3	9.5	9.7	0.2	
33	Student Name	33	Student Num.	Wiederholt-3	8.3	9.2	0.9	
34	Student Name	34	Student Num.	Wiederholt-3	8.0	7.5	-0.5	
35	Student Name	35	Student Num.	Wiederholt-3	8.9	7.5	-1.4	
36	Student Name	36	Student Num.	Wiederholt-3	6.2	5.4	-0.8	
37	Student Name	37	Student Num.	Wiederholt-3	5.3	5.8	0.5	
38	Student Name	38	Student Num.	Wiederholt-3	5.9	8.6	2.7	
39	Student Name	39	Student Num.	Wiederholt-3	5.0	7.6	2.6	
40	Student Name	40	Student Num.	Wiederholt-3	7.5	7.5	0.0	
41	Student Name	41	Student Num.	Wiederholt-3	6.3	6.4	0.1	
42	Student Name	42	Student Num.	Wiederholt-3	6.7	7.2	0.5	
43	Student Name	43	Student Num.	Wiederholt-3	5.3	5.5	0.2	
44	Student Name	44	Student Num.	Wiederholt-3	7.1	7.6	0.5	
45	Student Name	45	Student Num.	Wiederholt-3	10.8	12.9	2.1	

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
46	Student Name	46	Student Num.	Wiederholt-3	5.6	8.6	3.0	
47	Student Name	47	Student Num.	Wiederholt-3	6.4	6.5	0.1	
48	Student Name	48	Student Num.	Wiederholt-3	5.7	5.2	-0.5	
49	Student Name	49	Student Num.	Wiederholt-3	1.9	5.5	3.6	
50	Student Name	50	Student Num.	Wiederholt-3	6.9	8.4	1.5	
51	Student Name	51	Student Num.	Wiederholt-3	7.8	10.7	2.9	
52	Student Name	52	Student Num.	Wiederholt-3	8.1	9.2	1.1	
53	Student Name	53	Student Num.	Wiederholt-3	5.5	6.6	1.1	
54	Student Name	54	Student Num.	Wiederholt-3	5.8	8.9	3.1	
55	Student Name	55	Student Num.	Wiederholt-3	6.4	5.6	-0.8	
56	Student Name	56	Student Num.	Wiederholt-3	7.6	9.8	2.2	0.82
57	Student Name	57	Student Num.	Wiederholt-5	2.3	2.4	0.1	
58	Student Name	58	Student Num.	Wiederholt-5	9.5	9.4	-0.1	
59	Student Name	59	Student Num.	Wiederholt-5	4.5	4.7	0.2	
60	Student Name	60	Student Num.	Wiederholt-5	12.9	9.2	-3.7	
61	Student Name	61	Student Num.	Wiederholt-5	4.3	4.8	0.5	
62	Student Name	62	Student Num.	Wiederholt-5	0.6	7.5	6.9	
63	Student Name	63	Student Num.	Wiederholt-5	5.2	6.5	1.3	
64	Student Name	64	Student Num.	Wiederholt-5	7.3	5.6	-1.7	
65	Student Name	65	Student Num.	Wiederholt-5	9.7	13.0	3.3	
66	Student Name	66	Student Num.	Wiederholt-5	12.5	13.0	0.5	
67	Student Name	67	Student Num.	Wiederholt-5	6.3	8.1	1.8	
68	Student Name	68	Student Num.	Wiederholt-5	6.7	6.4	-0.3	0.73
69	Student Name	69	Student Num.	Fitzgerald-2	7.6	9.6	2.0	
70	Student Name	70	Student Num.	Fitzgerald-2	10.0	13.0	3.0	
71	Student Name	71	Student Num.	Fitzgerald-2	9.7	9.7	0.0	
72	Student Name	72	Student Num.	Fitzgerald-2	8.5	8.7	0.2	
73	Student Name	73	Student Num.	Fitzgerald-2	11.6	13.0	1.4	1.32
74	Student Name	74	Student Num.	Steele-3	4.6	4.9	0.3	
75	Student Name	75	Student Num.	Steele-3	6.0	7.1	1.1	
76	Student Name	76	Student Num.	Steele-3	5.6	6.2	0.6	
77	Student Name	77	Student Num.	Steele-3	11.6	13.0	1.4	
78	Student Name	78	Student Num.	Steele-3	6.3	6.8	0.5	
79	Student Name	79	Student Num.	Steele-3	6.0	6.5	0.5	
80	Student Name	80	Student Num.	Steele-3	7.7	8.1	0.4	
81	Student Name	81	Student Num.	Steele-3	6.7	6.1	-0.6	
82	Student Name	82	Student Num.	Steele-3	7.8	7.7	-0.1	
83	Student Name	83	Student Num.	Steele-3	8.2	6.5	-1.7	
84	Student Name	84	Student Num.	Steele-3	9.2	13.0	3.8	0.56
85	Student Name	85	Student Num.	Westlake-3	7.3	13.0	5.7	
86	Student Name	86	Student Num.	Westlake-3	10.2	13.0	2.8	
87	Student Name	87	Student Num.	Westlake-3	7.2	7.4	0.2	
88	Student Name	88	Student Num.	Westlake-3	6.8	7.1	0.3	
89	Student Name	89	Student Num.	Westlake-3	10.8	10.6	-0.2	
90	Student Name	90	Student Num.	Westlake-3	5.9	6.5	0.6	

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
91	Student Name	91	Student Num.	Westlake-3	7.6	10.0	2.4	
92	Student Name	92	Student Num.	Westlake-3	2.7	2.9	0.2	
93	Student Name	93	Student Num.	Westlake-3	11.8	13.0	1.2	
94	Student Name	94	Student Num.	Westlake-3	9.9	12.8	2.9	
95	Student Name	95	Student Num.	Westlake-3	8.1	8.2	0.1	
96	Student Name	96	Student Num.	Westlake-3	9.8	13.0	3.2	
97	Student Name	97	Student Num.	Westlake-3	10.0	13.0	3.0	1.72
98	Student Name	98	Student Num.	Hanak-5	11.5	13.0	1.5	
99	Student Name	99	Student Num.	Hanak-5	9.7	12.0	2.3	
100	Student Name	100	Student Num.	Hanak-5	7.6	8.0	0.4	
101	Student Name	101	Student Num.	Hanak-5	7.0	7.1	0.1	1.08
102	Student Name	102	Student Num.	Steele-5-IR1	4.4	5.2	0.8	
103	Student Name	103	Student Num.	Steele-5-IR1	3.8	7.3	3.5	
104	Student Name	104	Student Num.	Steele-5-IR1	10.2	9.8	-0.4	
105	Student Name	105	Student Num.	Steele-5-IR1	12.0	10.2	-1.8	
106	Student Name	106	Student Num.	Steele-5-IR1	6.8	12.0	5.2	
107	Student Name	107	Student Num.	Steele-5-IR1	6.3	6.3	0.0	
108	Student Name	108	Student Num.	Steele-5-IR1	10.0	12.9	2.9	
109	Student Name	109	Student Num.	Steele-5-IR1	6.5	12.7	6.2	2.05
110	Student Name	110	Student Num.	Steele-5-IR2	7.2	8.1	0.9	
111	Student Name	111	Student Num.	Steele-5-IR2	2.4	6.0	3.6	
112	Student Name	112	Student Num.	Steele-5-IR2	3.4	4.1	0.7	
113	Student Name	113	Student Num.	Steele-5-IR2	9.6	13.0	3.4	
114	Student Name	114	Student Num.	Steele-5-IR2	7.1	7.5	0.4	
115	Student Name	115	Student Num.	Steele-5-IR2	6.9	7.8	0.9	
116	Student Name	116	Student Num.	Steele-5-IR2	7.8	8.5	0.7	
117	Student Name	117	Student Num.	Steele-5-IR2	8.5	7.5	-1.0	
118	Student Name	118	Student Num.	Steele-5-IR2	7.2	8.1	0.9	
119	Student Name	119	Student Num.	Steele-5-IR2	6.3	5.6	-0.7	
120	Student Name	120	Student Num.	Steele-5-IR2	10.5	13.0	2.5	1.12
121	Student Name	121	Student Num.	Sessions	9.3	9.7	0.4	
122	Student Name	122	Student Num.	Sessions	10.4	13.0	2.6	
123	Student Name	123	Student Num.	Sessions	7.0	6.8	-0.2	
124	Student Name	124	Student Num.	Sessions	7.8	9.5	1.7	
125	Student Name	125	Student Num.	Sessions	8.7	8.0	-0.7	
126	Student Name	126	Student Num.	Sessions	9.1	10.8	1.7	
127	Student Name	127	Student Num.	Sessions	10.3	10.8	0.5	
128	Student Name	128	Student Num.	Sessions	6.3	6.6	0.3	
129	Student Name	129	Student Num.	Sessions	12.5	12.3	-0.2	
130	Student Name	130	Student Num.	Sessions	9.5	13.0	3.5	
131	Student Name	131	Student Num.	Sessions	7.1	8.3	1.2	
132	Student Name	132	Student Num.	Sessions	7.3	7.9	0.6	
133	Student Name	133	Student Num.	Sessions	8.0	11.1	3.1	
134	Student Name	134	Student Num.	Sessions	12.0	13.0	1.0	
135	Student Name	135	Student Num.	Sessions	10.5	13.0	2.5	

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
136	Student Name	136	Student Num.	Sessions	7.7	7.8	0.1	
137	Student Name	137	Student Num.	Sessions	9.7	13.0	3.3	1.26
138	Student Name	138	Student Num.	Steele-6-IR1	9.9	11.0	1.1	
139	Student Name	139	Student Num.	Steele-6-IR1	9.4	12.5	3.1	
140	Student Name	140	Student Num.	Steele-6-IR1	9.3	6.1	-3.2	
141	Student Name	141	Student Num.	Steele-6-IR1	12.9	13.0	0.1	
142	Student Name	142	Student Num.	Steele-6-IR1	3.5	4.3	0.8	
143	Student Name	143	Student Num.	Steele-6-IR1	12.8	13.0	0.2	
144	Student Name	144	Student Num.	Steele-6-IR1	10.5	10.2	-0.3	
145	Student Name	145	Student Num.	Steele-6-IR1	8.8	8.9	0.1	
146	Student Name	146	Student Num.	Steele-6-IR1	7.5	8.9	1.4	
147	Student Name	147	Student Num.	Steele-6-IR1	5.0	6.2	1.2	0.45
148	Student Name	148	Student Num.	Steele-6-IR2	3.3	4.8	1.5	
149	Student Name	149	Student Num.	Steele-6-IR2	2.1	4.0	1.9	
150	Student Name	150	Student Num.	Steele-6-IR2	10.9	13.0	2.1	
151	Student Name	151	Student Num.	Steele-6-IR2	6.0	5.1	-0.9	1.15
152	Student Name	152	Student Num.	Westlake-6	9.6	9.5	-0.1	
153	Student Name	153	Student Num.	Westlake-6	10.4	13.0	2.6	
154	Student Name	154	Student Num.	Westlake-6	8.8	11.5	2.7	
155	Student Name	155	Student Num.	Westlake-6	12.7	13.0	0.3	
156	Student Name	156	Student Num.	Westlake-6	9.3	9.5	0.2	
157	Student Name	157	Student Num.	Westlake-6	8.6	13.0	4.4	
158	Student Name	158	Student Num.	Westlake-6	10.0	13.0	3.0	
159	Student Name	159	Student Num.	Westlake-6	8.9	12.9	4.0	
160	Student Name	160	Student Num.	Westlake-6	9.6	8.5	-1.1	
161	Student Name	161	Student Num.	Westlake-6	8.6	7.1	-1.5	1.45
162	Student Name	162	Student Num.	Easley	9.3	13.0	3.7	
163	Student Name	163	Student Num.	Easley	9.1	10.3	1.2	
164	Student Name	164	Student Num.	Easley	6.2	6.4	0.2	
165	Student Name	165	Student Num.	Easley	9.0	8.1	-0.9	
166	Student Name	166	Student Num.	Easley	11.8	13.0	1.2	
167	Student Name	167	Student Num.	Easley	5.7	5.7	0.0	
168	Student Name	168	Student Num.	Easley	8.1	10.6	2.5	
169	Student Name	169	Student Num.	Easley	8.3	8.6	0.3	
170	Student Name	170	Student Num.	Easley	3.6	3.9	0.3	0.94
171	Student Name	171	Student Num.	Block	5.0	5.9	0.9	
172	Student Name	172	Student Num.	Block	11.0	13.0	2.0	
173	Student Name	173	Student Num.	Block	11.0	11.6	0.6	
174	Student Name	174	Student Num.	Block	11.6	13.0	1.4	
175	Student Name	175	Student Num.	Block	9.9	13.0	3.1	
176	Student Name	176	Student Num.	Block	12.3	13.0	0.7	
177	Student Name	177	Student Num.	Block	12.7	12.8	0.1	
178	Student Name	178	Student Num.	Block	7.5	11.0	3.5	
179	Student Name	179	Student Num.	Block	10.6	13.0	2.4	
180	Student Name	180	Student Num.	Block	7.6	5.2	-2.4	

	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>E</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>G</b>	<b>H</b>
181	Student Name	181	Student Num.	Block	12.9	13.0	0.1	
182	Student Name	182	Student Num.	Block	9.0	7.9	-1.1	
183	Student Name	183	Student Num.	Block	8.5	13.0	4.5	
184	Student Name	184	Student Num.	Block	6.5	8.4	1.9	1.26
185								
186				Overall Average Gain				1.15
187				Intervention Gain				0.95
188				Individual Reading Gain				2.25
189				Other than Intervention Gain				1.19

**"Snapshot" Analysis**

Table 1

Anchorage School District  
Average Scores on California Achievement Tests (CATs)  
Percentile Rank Scores Corresponding to Mean NCE Scores  
All Students Tested

<u>Level/School</u>	<u>Year</u>	<u>Total Reading</u>		<u>Total Lang. Arts</u>		<u>Total Math</u>		<u>Battery Composite</u>	
		<u>Num.</u>	<u>%ile</u>	<u>Num.</u>	<u>%ile</u>	<u>Num.</u>	<u>%ile</u>	<u>Num.</u>	<u>%ile</u>
District	1998	14,424	61	14,375	63	14,411	65	14,243	64
Grades 3-6	1997	14,325	62	14,311	63	14,318	66	14,185	65
	1996	14,013	63	14,028	59	14,047	63	13,839	63
District	1998	6,776	64	6,753	60	6,761	64	6,621	64
Grades 7-8	1997	6,384	63	6,387	59	6,400	64	6,277	64
	1996	6,379	64	6,385	56	6,353	63	6,248	62
District	1998	8,288	61	8,232	57	8,310	66	8,138	64
Grades 9-11	1997	8,256	61	8,276	55	8,266	66	8,197	63
	1996	6,866	61	7,949	55	7,976	65	6,792	62
Ptarmigan	1998	206	40	207	40	210	42	205	40
	1997	167	44	168	43	168	44	165	44
	1996	196	41	196	34	199	40	195	37
Taku	1998	179	55	181	56	181	62	178	58
	1997	208	53	208	54	212	61	208	57
	1996	187	55	185	52	185	55	182	54
Willow Crest	1998	238	49	238	54	240	58	237	54
	1997	233	52	232	56	234	53	231	54
	1996	243	55	243	50	249	48	242	51
Central	1998	724	66	724	62	719	62	716	65
	1997	652	68	645	66	647	66	639	69
	1996	613	69	616	54	613	65	608	68
Romig	1998	614	57	608	58	615	63	606	61
	1997	493	57	491	56	500	61	490	59
	1996	500	56	504	50	506	60	499	56
West	1998	964	50	944	51	974	60	936	56
	1997	994	52	998	50	1,000	59	989	55
	1996	975	53	969	47	956	61	923	56

## Interpretation --

District Elementary performances show stability in the Composite. However, this masks a possible decline in Reading and an improvement from two years ago in Language Arts and Mathematics.

District Middle Schools have increased performances in Language Arts leading to an improvement in the Composite over the past two years. Reading and Math are essentially unchanged.

District High Schools are similar to Middle Schools, with an increase in the Composite attributable to the increase in Language Arts and stability in Reading and Math.

Ptarmigan's scores are lower than the district averages, but the pattern is very similar. Reading scores fluctuated, but did not change greatly over the three testing periods. Language Arts and Math scores both increased. It appears that Ptarmigan's high year, of the three shown, was 1996-97.

Taku's scores are slightly lower than those for the district. Taku had the pattern of increased scores over time in Language Arts and Mathematics. Taku's Reading scores were essentially stable over the period while those for the district may have declined slightly.

Willow Crest's Reading scores have declined over the three testing periods displayed in Table 1. Language Arts and Math scores at Willow Crest have improved over the same time frame. The pattern is similar to that for the district, but at a slightly lower absolute performance level.

Central Middle School of Science had a pattern of decline in Reading scores over the period while the district's overall middle school pattern was one of stability in this area. The Math scores also declined slightly at Central while the Language Arts scores increased over time. The district level Math scores were stable and the Language Arts scores increased, though slightly less than the increase at Central.

West High School tests at the national average in Reading and Language Arts and above the national average in Math. Its scores are slightly lower than those for the district as a whole. The district showed stable scores in Reading and Math over the three testing period and slightly improved scores in Language Arts. West demonstrated similar patterns in Math and Language Arts but had a slight decline in Reading scores over the period.

The scores in Table 1 reflect all students tested. As populations and school boundaries change, the impact on the scores at any given school can be substantial. The data in Table 1 reflects standings at three points in time without examining issues such as demographics and boundary changes on the schools. The next section of the analysis will examine "gain scores" for students continuing in a single "feeder pattern". That is, over the three testing periods, the students were either in the same school or matriculated to a school at the next higher level that is the assigned school for students in the school from which the student moved.

**Gain Score Analysis**

Table 2

Anchorage School District  
 "Gain Scores" for Students in Continuing Feeder Pattern  
 1995-96 to 1997-98 -- Analysis Based on 1998 Grade Level  
 Percentile Rank Scores Corresponding to Mean NCE Scores

<u>Level/School</u>	<u>Sub-Test</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Spring 1996</u>	<u>Spring 1998</u>	<u>Gain</u>
District	Reading	3,970	69	68	-1
Grades 3 - 6	Language Arts	3,956	61	74	+13
	Mathematics	3,967	69	72	+3
	Composite	3,870	67	74	+7
District	Reading	3,845	66	69	+3
Grades 7 - 8	Language Arts	3,850	68	65	-3
	Mathematics	3,846	69	68	-1
	Composite	3,705	70	70	0
District	Reading	5,370	68	65	-3
Grades 9 - 11	Language Arts	5,631	62	61	-1
	Mathematics	5,622	70	70	0
	Composite	5,238	69	69	0
Ptarmigan	Reading	43	39	38	-1
	Language Arts	43	27	45	+18
	Mathematics	43	43	41	-2
	Composite	43	33	43	+7
Taku	Reading	39	46	53	+7
	Language Arts	39	37	60	+23
	Mathematics	39	47	61	+14
	Composite	38	42	59	+17
Willow Crest	Reading	49	57	56	-1
	Language Arts	49	50	70	+20
	Mathematics	50	51	67	+16
	Composite	48	52	65	+13
Central	Reading	305	61	66	+5
	Language Arts	304	67	64	-3
	Mathematics	301	68	63	-5
	Composite	296	67	66	-1
Romig	Reading	297	65	68	+3
	Language Arts	295	69	70	+1
	Mathematics	302	65	72	+7
	Composite	291	69	73	+4
West	Reading	612	62	59	-3
	Language Arts	607	59	58	-1
	Mathematics	629	70	67	-3
	Composite	601	66	64	-2

Table 3

Anchorage School District  
 "Gain Scores" for Students in Continuing Feeder Pattern  
 1995-96 to 1996-97 -- Analysis Based on 1997 Grade Level  
 Percentile Rank Scores Corresponding to Mean NCE Scores

<u>Level/School</u>	<u>Sub-Test</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Spring 1996</u>	<u>Spring 1997</u>	<u>Gain</u>
District	Reading	7,371	67	66	-1
Grades 3 - 6	Language Arts	7,384	62	69	+7
	Mathematics	7,387	66	71	+5
	Composite	7,251	67	70	+3
District	Reading	4,857	65	66	+1
Grades 7 - 8	Language Arts	4,872	63	62	-1
	Mathematics	4,872	68	67	-1
	Composite	4,727	67	67	0
District	Reading	6,103	66	63	-3
Grades	Language Arts	6,714	59	58	-1
9 - 11	Mathematics	6,697	68	68	0
	Composite	5,994	67	66	-1
Ptarmigan	Reading	85	44	46	+2
	Language Arts	85	37	45	+8
	Mathematics	85	47	50	+3
	Composite	85	41	47	+6
Taku	Reading	83	58	52	-6
	Language Arts	79	48	56	+8
	Mathematics	81	54	63	+9
	Composite	78	52	57	+4
Willow Crest	Reading	119	55	57	+2
	Language Arts	119	53	65	+12
	Mathematics	121	50	57	+7
	Composite	118	52	61	+9
Central	Reading	448	64	66	+2
	Language Arts	441	64	66	+2
	Mathematics	444	68	65	-3
	Composite	438	67	67	0
Romig	Reading	363	60	61	+1
	Language Arts	365	61	61	0
	Mathematics	370	64	65	+1
	Composite	358	63	64	+1
West	Reading	775	60	56	-4
	Language Arts	777	54	54	0
	Mathematics	780	67	62	-5
	Composite	762	63	60	-3

Table 4

Anchorage School District  
 "Gain Scores" for Students in Continuing Feeder Pattern  
 1996-97 to 1997-98 -- Analysis Based on 1998 Grade Level  
 Percentile Rank Scores Corresponding to Mean NCE Scores

<u>Level/School</u>	<u>Sub-Test</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Spring 1997</u>	<u>Spring 1998</u>	<u>Gain</u>
District	Reading	7,976	66	65	-1
Grades 3 - 6	Language Arts	7,939	65	69	+4
	Mathematics	7,934	69	70	+1
	Composite	7,828	68	70	+2
District	Reading	5,103	65	66	+1
Grades 7 - 8	Language Arts	5,093	66	63	-3
	Mathematics	5,113	70	66	-4
	Composite	4,960	68	67	-1
District	Reading	6,592	66	64	-2
Grades	Language Arts	6,599	61	59	-2
9 - 11	Mathematics	6,628	69	69	0
	Composite	6,497	69	67	-2
Ptarmigan	Reading	84	41	36	-6
	Language Arts	85	41	42	+1
	Mathematics	86	40	40	0
	Composite	82	42	39	-3
Taku	Reading	93	58	56	-2
	Language Arts	93	56	56	0
	Mathematics	93	66	64	-2
	Composite	92	61	59	-2
Willow Crest	Reading	114	53	50	-3
	Language Arts	113	55	60	+5
	Mathematics	113	53	61	+8
	Composite	112	54	57	+3
Central	Reading	491	66	67	+1
	Language Arts	490	67	64	-3
	Mathematics	486	70	64	-6
	Composite	481	69	66	-3
Romig	Reading	439	61	61	0
	Language Arts	437	66	64	-2
	Mathematics	448	67	68	+1
	Composite	435	66	66	0
West	Reading	731	60	56	-4
	Language Arts	719	60	56	-4
	Mathematics	748	66	65	-1
	Composite	716	65	62	-3

Interpretation --

### *District Level Patterns*

Elementary performances in Table 2 reflect students moving from third grade to fifth grade and students moving from fourth grade to sixth grade from 1995-96 to 1997-98. Tables 3 and 4 reflect gains for students moving from grade 3 to grade 4, grade 4 to grade 5, and grade 5 to grade 6 in the periods from 1995-96 to 1996-97 and from 1996-97 to 1997-98, respectively. These tables reflect only students moving up a grade level within the elementary level.

Middle Schools performances in Table 2 reflect students moving from fifth grade to seventh grade and students moving from sixth grade to eighth grade from 1995-96 to 1997-98. Tables 3 and 4 reflect gains for students moving from grade 6 to grade 7 and grade 7 to grade 8 in the periods from 1995-96 to 1996-97 and from 1996-97 to 1997-98, respectively. These tables reflect both students moving within the middle school level and students moving from the elementary level to the middle school level.

High Schools performances in Table 2 reflect students moving from seventh grade to ninth grade, students moving from eighth grade to tenth grade, and students moving from ninth grade to eleventh grade from 1995-96 to 1997-98. Tables 3 and 4 reflect gains for students moving from grade 8 to grade 9, grade 9 to grade 10, and grade 10 to grade 11 in the periods from 1995-96 to 1996-97 and from 1996-97 to 1997-98, respectively. These tables reflect both students moving within the high school level and students moving from the middle school level to the high school level.

Both the two year (Table 2) growth pattern and the two one year growth patterns (Tables 3 and 4) for the district are similar. Students seem to show substantial growth in language arts and some growth in mathematics in the elementary grades. Their reading performances relative to the national norm group on the CAT remains fairly stable over their elementary careers.

As students move into and within the middle school years, their standings in language arts and mathematics seem to drop compared to the norm group, while their reading performance seems to rise slightly. As they move into the high school years, their reading and language arts performances drop back slightly compared to the national norm group, and their mathematics scores remain relatively the same.

Most of the year to year fluctuations are small, and the overall performance levels are high for students who continue within their normal feeder patterns from year to year.

### *Underachieving Schools' Patterns*

Ptarmigan Elementary School has a pattern of change for students continuing for two years that shows substantial growth in Language Arts, stability in Reading, and, perhaps, a slight decline in Math. The district's pattern is similar for Language Arts and Reading. The district had an increase in the elementary years in Math. The 1996 to 1997 year had a more positive change pattern for Ptarmigan than did the 1997 to 1998 year.

Taku Elementary School's two year change pattern was positive for all grade levels and substantially above that for the district. The year to year patterns for Taku are not as positive, but the patterns indicates that students who stay in the school over time are successful.

Willow Crest Elementary School has a pattern similar to, though slightly better than, the pattern for the district. The two year change in Reading at Willow Crest was essentially nil, similar to the district in this area. Language Arts and Math scores increased for students in the school for the two years at a pace greater than that demonstrated by the district as a whole.

Central Middle School of Science had a two year change pattern very like the district's overall middle school pattern. Reading scores increased for the continuing Central students over the two year, while Language Arts and Math scores declined. The Reading increase at Central was slightly larger than that for the district; the Math decrease was also slightly larger. Overall, Central was similar to the district as a whole in terms of changes in scores over the two year.

Romig Middle School had slightly positive to positive gains in all areas for students in the feeder pattern over the past two years. The Reading gain matched that for the district, and the Language Arts and Math gains were positive whereas the district's overall pattern was negative in those areas.

West High School's two year feeder pattern scores indicated a relative decline in performance compared to the national norm group. The Reading and Math scores declined slightly and the Language Arts scores were essentially stable. The pattern for Reading and Language Arts exactly matched the pattern for the district. The district's Math scores at the high school level remained stable over the two year period.

Overall, it seems that the movement from 1995-96 to 1996-97 was more positive than the movement from 1996-97 to 1997-98. The two year change scores for Taku, Romig and Willow Crest seem the strongest when compared to national and local norms. Ptarmigan's two year Composite gain matches that of the district's elementary grades as a whole, while the Composite gains for Central and West are slightly below the corresponding gains for the district as a whole.