

Teacher Name: Ms. Smart	Contract Level: <input type="checkbox"/> Induction <input type="checkbox"/> Annual <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Continuing	
School Name: SC Middle School	ADEPT Process: <input type="checkbox"/> Induction I <input type="checkbox"/> Induction II <input type="checkbox"/> Formal/Summative <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Renewal <input type="checkbox"/> SLO	
Principal/Evaluator: Ms. Support		
Grade Level(s)/Subject: 6th ELA	Collaborative SLO Team Members (if applicable): Click or tap here to enter text.	
Content Area for SLO (APS 6): 6th ELA - Reading Literary Text	SLO Type: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Individual <input type="checkbox"/> Collaborative (APS 10)	SLO Approach: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Class <input type="checkbox"/> Course
Choose the one that applies:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> This SLO serves as the Professional Growth and Development Plan	<input type="checkbox"/> This SLO serves as <i>one</i> of multiple goals of the Professional Growth and Development Plan
SLO Objective Statement: By the end of the Reading and Analyzing Literary Text Unit students will be able to determine the theme of literary text by analyzing the literary elements present in the text and how the elements interact with one another in order to develop the theme. This SLO was chosen based on teacher observation during the introductory unit setting up Reading and Writing Workshop, student individual summer reading conferences, and Fall MAP data which indicated an overall weak area of literary text specifically, leaving the most room for growth in the strand of Literary Text: meaning and content. After reviewing the DesCartes skill breakdown for students, I was able to determine that many of the students could grow in this area and would benefit from intense focused instruction at their level.		
Assessment Window Dates: (APS 3) September, 2016 - November, 2016 Click or tap here to enter text.	Pre-Assessment Date: 9/26	Post-Assessment Date: 11/21/2016 According to the district curriculum map, Block 1 may need to be extended
SLO Interval of Instruction (APS 5): <input type="checkbox"/> Year <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Semester <input type="checkbox"/> Quarter	Beginning Instruction Date: 9/26/2016	Ending Instruction Date: 11/17/2016 According to the district curriculum map Block 1 may need to be extended
Conferences	Dates	Teacher and Administrator Signatures
Preliminary Conference	9/22	Teacher: <i>Ms. Smart</i> Administrator: <i>Ms. Support</i>
Mid-course Conference	11/9	Teacher: <i>Ms. Smart</i> Administrator: <i>Ms. Support</i>
Summative Conference	12/12	Teacher: <i>Ms. Smart</i> Administrator: <i>Ms. Support</i>
SLO Rating	Percentage of Attainment (*SC School District Scoring Rubric)	
Exemplary	86% - 100% of students met or exceeded their growth goal	
Proficient <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	70% - 85% of students met or exceeded their growth goal 74% Met or Exceeded Goal	
Needs Improvement	40% - 69% of students met or exceeded their growth goal	
Unsatisfactory	Fewer than 40% of students met or exceeded their growth goal	

<p>Reflection on SLO Data: (APSs 5, 4, 10)</p>	<p>How does the data inform your instructional ‘practice, goal setting, or your professional development for next school year?</p> <p>This year confirmed that text complexity truly affects a student’s ability to showcase mastery of a skill. This was seen through the need for a reteach, relearn, and reassess with a different text for about 8 students. Once we practiced more in small group, worked with a variety of textual levels, and then reassessed, students clearly showed mastery and ability to trace and find the theme of a text. Next school year, I will continue with this method for teaching theme but will try to include more variety in genre and complex texts. I also feel that those students that struggled the most with literary text elements and analyzing the impact of literary elements in turn struggled with finding the theme, comprehension skills and taking notes.</p>
---	---

<p>I. Student Population: Provide a detailed description of the student population. Information should include, but not be limited to, the following: the number of students in the class, a description of students with exceptionalities (e.g. learning disability, gifted, English Language Learner (ELL) status, etc.) and a description of academic supports provided to students (e.g. extended time, resource with EC teacher, any classroom supports that students receive to help them access the core curriculum). (APS 1)</p>	<p>19 students in the class 18 are regular 6th grade English 1 is advanced English no students are identified as GT 2 ESOL 1 504 plan that required repeat directions and extended time 2 students are Tier 3 in the RTI process coming from elementary school</p> <p>6 students are provided reading support during Gryphon Time with Ms. Hussey</p>
<p>II. Historical and Trend Data: Describe the applicable past data for the students. In your description include the students’ level of knowledge prior to instruction, including the source(s) of data (e.g. formative and summative assessments, anecdotal data gathered from collaboration with other educators) and its relation to the overall course objectives. (APS 2)</p>	<p>Statement about MAP grouping by strand. Referencing the Descartes student Breakdown as well Summer Reading Conference Data After holding student individual summer reading conferences (formative assessment), and Fall MAP data which indicated an overall weak area of literary text specifically leaving the most room for growth in the strand of Literary Text: meaning and content. After reviewing the DesCartes skill breakdown for students, I was able to determine that many of the students could grow in this area and would benefit from intense focused instruction at their level.</p>

III. Baseline Data:

Describe which pre-assessment(s) will be used to measure student learning and why the assessment is appropriate for measuring the objective(s). Provide baseline assessment results for the student population. Attach assessment and grading scale and/or rubric used to score the assessment(s). (APS 3)

Pre-assessment used was a merge of text from USA test prep and multiple choices questions that aligned to that standard vetted by the teacher and a teacher created assessment designed by the teacher and a team of assessment professionals (district personnel, Mr. English, etc.)

The assessment was adjusted for 6th grade level for that standard for students who are not currently working at this level (below grade level), and there is a similarly designed assessment with a higher Lexile text for those students already showing mastery or near mastery at the sixth-grade level for this text (advanced level).

This is appropriate because it combines a multitude of question types, multiple choice, matching, short answer, and a short essay response using textual evidence.

The Lexiles of the text are either at sixth grade level or above which is appropriate as shown by Lexile scores and historical and trend data as well as teacher generated data from reading conferences.

Pre-assessment Data: Out of 40 possible points

10/40 = 25%

20/40 = 50%

30/40 = 75%

40/40 = 100%

Mason	15
Athena	11
Emily	31
Brock	19
Walker	10
Braydon	14
Faith	12
Ruthann	21
Jacob	27
Isabella	18
Kaneda	10
Lela'au	5
Harley	12

IV. Post Assessments:

Indicate what assessment will be used as a post assessment and how it is aligned to the baseline assessment. (APS 3)

The post assessment will be almost identical to the pre- assessment as far as questions types and creation style, but the text is what will change in order to make them have a cold read and their analysis be authentic.

V. Progress Monitoring:

How frequently will you progress monitor students' master of the content? Indicate what ongoing sources of evidence you

Progress monitored weekly as skills continue to develop with literary elements.

Students will be measured using teacher created formative assessments, teacher resources (Collections, Jacob's Ladder, Interactive Read Aloud, etc).

- Data will be collected using methods such as ClassFlow formative response

<p>will collect in order to monitor student progress. (Other evidence of student growth can include student work samples, portfolios, etc.) (APS 7)</p>	<p>data, Socratic short answer, classwork using graphic organizers, and Google Classroom response questions.</p> <p>Students that are not showing adequate progress will be placed in small groups and during their RTI Time they will receive small group and individualized instruction. -- Skills navigator probes at their Literary Text RIT Level will also be administered after specific mini lessons are taught to see if growth is occurring -- Mastery checks on skills navigator will also support progress monitoring</p>
<p>VI. Standards: Identify the content standard(s) and indicators that align to the SLO learning goal (objective). (APS 6)</p>	<p>6.RL.8.1 Describe how a plot in a narrative or drama unfolds and how characters respond or change as the plot moves toward a resolution; determine the impact of contextual influences on setting, plot and characters. 6.RL.6.1 Determine a theme of a text and how it is conveyed through particular details Skills: Determines theme in literary text Analyzes how setting affects characters Analyzes how setting affects tone Analyzes how setting contributes to plot Analyzes conflict in literary text Analyzes the effect of characterization</p>
<p>VII. Growth Targets</p> <p>A. Considering all available data, identify the targets the students are expected to reach by the end of the SLO interval. Provide the growth target information or on an attached spreadsheet.</p> <p>B. Provide a rationale for the selected growth targets. Rationale may reflect typical vs pretest performance, may include reasoning for using individualized targets for some but not all students, or any other influencing information used to determine anticipated growth. (APS 4)</p>	<p>(Choose 1)</p> <p>A. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Tiered B. <input type="checkbox"/> Individual C. <input type="checkbox"/> Targeted (Sub population(s) of students are the focus of the SLO goal. Appropriate for the course approach as a second SLO when the first includes all students) D. Growth Targets: Students will increase by one proficiency level. low, medium, high, low, medium, and high will be using text at the 6th grade level High students, students who have already shown to master the skill on a 6th grade level text, will be given an advanced grade level text for their post-assessment to determine growth.</p> <p>Group 1: Will move to scoring above 60% on the assessment. Group 2: Will to scoring above 80% on the assessment Group 3: Will move to scoring above 80% on the assessment that is at or above 6th grade level.</p> <p>Group Members: See Below</p> <p>E. Growth target rationale: of 19 students in this class, 5 have shown to be reading above grade level already. On the pre-assessment, they used an advanced level text and placed at the 3rd higher level tier. Other students are approaching the 6th grade reading Lexile and are given a grade level text. My goal for them is that they advanced their proficiency level by using the skills taught and reading a grade level text.</p>
<p>VIII. Instructional Strategies Describe the best instructional practices you will use to teach this content to students. Include how instruction will be differentiated based on data. What interventions will be used if more assistance is needed during the learning process? (APS 5)</p>	<p>Instructional Strategies: Mini Lessons Schedule: Literary Elements (2 weeks): review setting characterization (direct/indirect) Character types (flat/round, static/dynamic) plot (plot stages) conflict types (types of conflict) Analyzing Literary Elements and Interactions</p>

	<p>Themes Determining how themes are developed by literary elements in the story Determining Theme</p> <p>Grouping Strategies: Students will be in whole group instruction for a grade level mini lesson, flexible small groups based on MAP for specific skill mini lessons and practice, as well as teacher created groups for each strategy taught and practiced.</p> <p>Students vary from below grade level--- to significantly above grade level. Students possess SOME skills for analyzing literary text but may not be able to use all of those or cannot combine the skill in order to adequately explain how the literary elements interact with one another to develop the theme of the text. For example, they can usually pick out the setting or the character but cannot explain how the character's changes lead us to the theme of the text, nor can they explain how a different conflict would have a different effect on character dynamics.</p> <p>Strategies will be differentiated by the content (Lexiled text) and delivery method (whole group, small group, individual). Interventions will contain extended practice in small groups, varying text levels, and individual instruction.</p> <p>Remediation will include teacher-led small group with resources from online programs such as Khan Academy, Flocabulary, BrainPop, and USA Test Prep.</p>		
<p>IX. Professional Growth and Development Plan and Action Research (S.C. Code Ann. Section 59-26-40): Describe the learning that you will engage in to successfully complete the plan. How will this learning occur? Will this be compiled as action research to add to the profession? What reading and reflection will be done during the SLO process? What teaching skills and techniques will be improved through the project? (APS 10)</p>	<p>The teacher will review specific resources such as Scholastic Differentiated Reading Instruction, Laura Robb, Jacob's Ladder, and other Middle Level Reading Workshop Fountas and Pinnell</p> <p>-- Teacher will independently read and skim and scan resources as well watch videos and attend a tech training about Class Flow to strengthen formative assessment opportunities</p> <p>-- Teacher will also reference materials related to Curriculum Map Resources and suggested links and resources</p> <p>-Skills will become stronger at using flexible small groups, think-alouds and learning guides for the students in order to access a variety of strategies..</p> <p>I will measure my professional growth by student work as well as asking for specific feedback related to these areas from administrators during walk-throughs and formal observations.</p>		
Exemplary	Proficient	Needs Improvement	Unsatisfactory
The teacher attains a high level of student achievement with all populations of learners.	The work of the teacher results in acceptable, measurable progress based on established standards for a significant number of students.	The work of the teacher results in student growth but does not meet the established standard and/or is not achieved with all populations taught by the teacher.	The work of the teacher does not achieve acceptable student growth.
Almost all students meet their targeted growth, and many exceed their targets.	A significant number of students meet or exceed their targets.	A less than significant number of students meet or exceed their targets.	A small number of students meet or exceed their targets.

Group 1: Kaneda, Faith, Walker, Athena, Christian, Le'lalua, Mason C (7 students)

Group 2: Jack L, Mason A., Braydon (not sure this is the right spot, may adjust), Harley, Angel, Kiara (6)

Group 3: Millie, Ruthann, Jacob, Brock, Leah, Bella (6)

(toying with idea of fourth group...not quite sure if that's manageable so I went with 3, fourth group would be medium-high, students that have the skills and are almost mastery at the 6th grade level already (Braydon, Harley, Ruthann, Bella) but that would my high group smaller... going with 3 because of this)

Progress Monitoring: *Daily and weekly Progress Monitoring can be found in my professional reflection journal.

Midpoint Thoughts:

Ruthann may need to move to group 2. She seems to struggle when she isn't guided with her comprehension while reading a complex text, Braydon is in the right spot - not ready for advanced when it deals with WRITING about his reading but can easily analyze and break items into pieces

Walker is progressing beautifully, may move him to small group #2 to encourage even more growth.

Midpoint Data using literary elements teacher created assessment:

First Name	Midpoint Check	Original Tiered Group Level
Mason	On Target - med	2
Athena	On Target Medium understanding is definitely being built upon here working on adding textual evidence to support answer instead of abstract thoughts and connections	1
Emily	ABOVE Target Already HIGH gave advanced level	3
Brock	on target med/high	3
Walker	on target med	1 (? possibly moving?)
Braydon	on target ? (text level?) excessive absences – sending work home isn't teaching him how. Will request after-school time at parent conference this week.	2
Faith	on target	1
Ruthann	Not meeting target (low) needs reinforcement and comprehension closer monitoring	3 (possibly really needs 2?)
Jacob	on target/slightly above HIGH	3
Isabella	on target/slightly above move to high group?	3
Kaneda	not meeting target needs reinforcement with comprehension in small group...attempts to summarize for all pieces of writing as opposed to analyzing and determining theme	1
Lela'au	not meeting target	1

	needs reinforcements with small group possibly need to assess alternatives meet w/ESOL?	
Harley	on target med/high	2
Mason	below target low (needs intervention)	1
Angel	on target med	2
Christian	on target low/medium	1
Kiara	on target medium *growing exponentially, work on stronger reader comprehension and she will exceed goal, the skills are evident*	2
Leah	on target high	3
Jack	not meeting target for advanced level (slated for advanced ELA) concerned about comprehension of text at that complexity... perplexed about what to do with this one... according to SLO he needs slightly below 6th grade level text, but he is the only one out of this group slated for advanced ELA so district benchmarks and my assessment are assessing him at advanced level...so he isn't meeting that target for an advanced student but I placed him in group 3 where PowerSchool or his current status would've placed him in group 2...	2 (I've been putting him in 3 too so bump him up...obviously, it's not all transferring when his comprehension isn't teacher or group supported as evidenced by the midpoint exam)

Principal/Ms. Support's Notes from Midpoint conference:

Mid-year Conference Notes - 11/9/16

Students were given text at their level to demonstrate their knowledge and skill (mastery)

Discussed individual students and their progress

11 students On Target = 58%

5 students NOT on Target = 26%

3 students Exceeding Target = 16%

14 students (74%) meeting or exceeding target at the mid-course - Teacher Proficient Level for Percentage of Attainment

Mrs. Smart's instructional learning has been in the area of students' metacognition as students think through their responses to informational text so that they are responding with thought and evidence rather than just responding to follow a formula or defined structured. She is organizing her other unit in writing with this in mind.

Progress Monitoring:

ELA Assessment on theme showed that several students did not meet their goal.

Small Group was provided for those 6 students (K.S., C.D. R. H., J.L., A.B., M.A and F.F.) students then did small group practice, independent practice, and were reassessed with a different teacher made assessment on the same standards. Improvements were made and several saw Mastery.

Final Results:

First	Midpoint Check	Original Tiered Group Level	% on Assessment	Met Goal?
Mason	On Target - med	2	81%	Yes (with extra remediation)
Athena	On Target med *cutest answer EVER for written assessment about how setting interacts with the plot... understanding is definitely being built upon here working on adding textual evidence to support answer instead of abstract thoughts and connections	1	100%	Yes (with extra remediation) -- ESOL needed writing accommodations (verbally talk to teacher about theme instead of writing theme statement paragraph)
Emily	ABOVE Target Already HIGH gave advanced level	3	96%	YES (needs to be moved to Advanced ELA)
Brock	on target med/high	3	81%	Yes
Walker	on target med	1 (? possibly moving?)	72%	Yes
Braydon	on target ? (text level?)	2	82%	Yes
Faith	on target	1	44% test 1 88% test 2	YES - had remediation - referred further for extra support
Ruthann	Not meeting target (low) needs reinforcement and comprehension closer monitoring	3 (possibly really needs 2?)	88%	YES - needed retest - -had remediation
Jacob	on target/slightly above HIGH	3	77% advanced level 82% 6th grade level	YES (gave harder text first to see, then he did better with regular 6th grade text)
Isabella	on target/slightly above move to high group?	3	82%	Yes
Ka'Nadia	not meeting target needs reinforcement with comprehension in small group...attempts to summarize for all pieces of writing as	1	65%	Yes - had remediation -showed improvements -needed writing accommodations (verbally talk to teacher about

	opposed to analyzing and determining theme			theme instead of writing theme statement paragraph)
Lela'au	not meeting target needs reinforcements with small group possibly needs to assess alternatives meet w/ESOL?	1	54%	No -- had remediation --still needs more --given accommodations -referred for ESOL support did show improvements, but not enough - accepted into ESOL program and receives support on A days
Harley	on target med/high	2	77%	No VERY CLOSE!!!
Mason	below target low (needs intervention)	1	85%	Yes...if scoring with textual accommodations counts (story was read aloud)
Angel	on target med	2	89%	Yes
Christian	on target low/medium	1	56%	No -given remediation - still needs more remediation
Kiara	on target medium *growing exponentially, work on stronger reader comprehension and she will exceed goal, the skills are evident*	2	56%	No -- needs retest!
Leyah	on target high	3	70%	No (may have done better with a different text?)
Jack	not meeting target for advanced level (slated for advanced ELA) concerned about comprehension of text at that complexity... perplexed about what to do with this one... according to SLO he needs slightly below 6th grade level text, but he is the only one out of this group slated for advanced ELA so district benchmarks and my assessment are	2 (i've been putting him in 3 too so bump him up...obviously it's not all transferring when his	88% (on regular 6th grade assessment NOT the advanced assessment like he should be slated take per PowerSchool as suspected)	Yes on regular 6th grade text standard not the advanced assessment

	assessing him at advanced level...so he isn't meeting that target for an advanced students but I placed him in group 3 where PowerSchool or his current status would've placed him in group 2...	comprehension isn't teacher or group supported as evidenced by the mid point exam)		
--	--	--	--	--