

ATTACHMENT A – DATA ANALYSIS

Data analysis driving the development of the 2015-16 PDP include findings from an analysis of the district’s accountability data ranging from 2010-11 through 2013-14, the spring 2015 DTSDE IIT reviews of Franklin Academy and Malone Central School District, and the annual PD Needs Assessment Survey results.

Malone District Accountability Data Summary (2011-12 school year through 2013-14 school year)

2013-2014	Elem & Middle ELA					Elem & Middle Math					Elem & Middle Science				
	Made AYP	No				Made AYP	No				Made AYP	No			
	Subgroup	All	White	SWD	ED	Subgroup	All	White	SWD	ED	Subgroup	All	White	SWD	ED
	Tested 95%	93%	93%	93%	95%	Tested 95%	90%	90%	89%	91%	Tested 80%	88%	88%	86%	92%
	PI	71	71	12+	53	PI	77	77	18+	56	PI	170	171	126+	160
	EAMO	85	105	39	70	EAMO	82	101	40	67	EAMO	176	185	149	166
	Safe Harbor	85	90	35	70	Safe Harbor	82	82	37	67	Safe Harbor	174	174	129	166

+ Includes former students with disabilities because the number of students with disabilities in the current year is equal to or greater than 30

2013-2014	Secondary ELA					Secondary Math				
	Made AYP	No				Made AYP	No			
	Subgroup	All	White	SWD	ED	Subgroup	All	White	SWD	ED
	Tested 95%	99%	99%	--	96%	Tested 95%	98%	98%	--	96%
	PI	153	151	62+	120	PI	123	125	53+	94
	EAMO	158	170	99	140	EAMO	140	154	87	119
	Safe Harbor	126	130	20	121	Safe Harbor	133	136	20	116

+ Includes former students with disabilities because the number of students with disabilities in the current year is equal to or greater than 30

2012-2013	Elem & Middle ELA					Elem & Middle Math					Elem & Middle Science				
	Made AYP	No				Made AYP	No				Made AYP	Yes			
	Subgroup	All	White	SWD	ED	Subgroup	All	White	SWD	ED	Subgroup	All	White	SWD	ED
	Tested 95%	99%	99%	99%	100%	Tested 95%	98%	98%	97%	99%	Tested 80%	98%	97%	95%	98%
	PI	78	78	17+	58	PI	70	69	19+	53	PI	173	173	128+	165
	EAMO	78	101	27	61	EAMO	75	95	29	57	EAMO	175	186	146	163
Safe Harbor	78	90	26	61	Safe Harbor	74	73	24	57	Safe Harbor	168	169	105	156	

+ Includes former students with disabilities because the number of students with disabilities in the current year is equal to or greater than 30

2012-2013	ELA					Math				
	Made AYP	No				Made AYP	No			
	Subgroup	All	White	SWD	ED	Subgroup	All	White	SWD	ED
	Tested 95%	92%	92%	--	95%	Tested 95%	98%	98%	--	97%
	PI	118	122	--	112	PI	126	129	--	107
	EAMO	155	168	--	134	EAMO	134	150	--	111
Safe Harbor	155	160	--	124	Safe Harbor	133	133	--	108	

2011-2012	Elem & Middle ELA					Elem & Middle Math					Elem & Middle Science				
	Made AYP	No				Made AYP	No				Made AYP	No			
	Subgroup	All	White	SWD	ED	Subgroup	All	White	SWD	ED	Subgroup	All	White	SWD	ED
	Tested 95%	98%	98%	95%	97%	Tested 95%	99%	99%	97%	98%	Tested 80%	97%	97%	88%	94%
	PI	138	138	67+	120	PI	141	140	78+	125	PI	167	168	104+	155
	EAMO	146	160	93	129	EAMO	160	170	114	146	EAMO	173	184	141	159
Safe Harbor	137	137	75	119	Safe Harbor	149	148	103	134	Safe Harbor	173	183	141	159	

+ Includes former students with disabilities because the number of students with disabilities in the current year is equal to or greater than 30

2011-2012	Secondary ELA					Secondary Math				
	Made AYP	No				Made AYP	No			
	Subgroup	All	White	SWD	ED	Subgroup	All	White	SWD	ED
	Tested 95%	99%	99%	--	99%	Tested 95%	99%	99%	--	99%
	PI	154	155	89+	116	PI	125	125	70+	98
	EAMO	151	166	83	130	EAMO	128	146	68	104
	Safe Harbor	151	158	57	130	Safe Harbor	128	133	68	104

+ Includes former students with disabilities because the number of students with disabilities in the current year is equal to or greater than 30

2010-2011	Elem & Middle ELA					Elem & Middle Math					Elem & Middle Science				
	Made AYP	No				Made AYP	Yes				Made AYP	Yes			
	Subgroup	All	White	SWD	ED	Subgroup	All	White	SWD	ED	Subgroup	All	White	SWD	ED
	Tested 95%	99%	99%	96%	99%	Tested 95%	99%	99%	97%	98%	Tested 80%	98%	98%	96%	97%
	PI	127	127	57	105	PI	138	138	86	121	PI	182	182	153	173
	EAMO	118	118	114	117	EAMO	133	133	129	132	EAMO	100	100	100	100
	Safe Harbor			76	117	Safe Harbor			82	119	Safe Harbor				

2010-2011	Secondary ELA					Secondary Math				
	Made AYP	No				Made AYP	No			
	Subgroup	All	White	SWD	ED	Subgroup	All	White	SWD	ED
	Tested 95%	99%	99%	--	99%	Tested 95%	99%	99%	--	98%
	PI	177	178	108	162	PI	185	186	138	178
	EAMO	175	175	167	172	EAMO	172	172	164	169
	Safe Harbor			126*	151*	Safe Harbor			126*	

*Did not qualify for safe harbor

2013-2014	Graduation Rate					
	Made AYP - No					
	Subgroup		All	White	SWD	ED
	4 year	Grad Rate	77%	79%	43% +	67%
		State Standard	80%	80%	80%	80%
		Progress Target	80%	80%	55%	65%
	5 year	Grad Rate	80%	79%	54%+	64%
		State standard	80%	80%	80%	80%
		Progress Target	76%	76%	62%	67%

+ Includes former students with disabilities because the number of students with disabilities in the current year is equal to or greater than 30

2012-2013	Graduation Rate					
	Made AYP - Yes					
	Subgroup		All	White	SWD	ED
	4 year	Grad Rate	79%	79%	52%+	63%
		State Standard	80%	80%	80%	80%
		Progress Target	74%	74%	54%	62%
	5 year	Grad Rate	75%	75%	57%+	64%
		State standard	80%	80%	80%	80%
		Progress Target	72%	72%	46%	57%

+ Includes former students with disabilities because the number of students with disabilities in the current year is equal to or greater than 30

2011-2012	Graduation Rate					
	Made AYP - Yes					
	Subgroup		All	White	SWD	ED
	4 year	Grad Rate	73%	73%	51%+	60%
		State Standard	80%	80%	80%	80%
		Progress Target	70%	70%	41%	52%
	5 year	Grad Rate	70%	70%	38%	51%
		State standard	80%	80%	80%	80%
		Progress Target	80%	80%	61%	75%

+ Includes former students with disabilities because the number of students with disabilities in the current year is equal to or greater than 30

2010-2011	Graduation Rate					
	Made AYP - No					
	Subgroup		All	White	SWD	ED
	4 year	Grad Rate	69%	69%	37%	49%
		State Standard	80%	80%	80%	80%
		Progress Target	80%	80%	61%	71%
	5 year	Grad Rate	Data not available	Data not available	Data not available	Data not available
		Progress Target	Data not available	Data not available	Data not available	Data not available

ACCOUNTABILITY DATA ANALYSIS:

Math Elem/Middle

- White gap consistent from year to year
- SWD gap erratic
- ED gap consistent from year to year

Math – HS

- Gap increased in 2013-14 for all subgroups

ELA Elem/MS

- Increasing trend of not making AYP from 11-12 through 13-14

ELA HS

- ED improving

Focus School accountability identification is at the HS, but issues start earlier. HS shows some improvement in ELA.

Graduation Rate

- SWD have not met targets the past two years.
- White did not make it as well.
- ED data has improved since the first year of identification

After discussing the findings, the group determined that improving literacy/higher-order thinking should be the district's focus. This dovetails with the work a subgroup of FA's Leadership Team has conducted, as FA's priority is literacy/higher-order thinking, as well, with particular attention on the economically disadvantaged subgroup.

DTSDE IIT MALONE CSD REVIEW FINDINGS:

SOP 1.1 The district has a comprehensive approach for recruiting, evaluating, and sustaining high-quality personnel that affords schools the ability to ensure success by addressing the needs of their community.

Finding: The school district does not ensure that feedback provided to teachers through the observation process is regular and actionable and leads to improvements in teacher practices.

SOP 1.2 The district leadership has a comprehensive and explicit theory of action about school culture that communicates high expectations for addressing the needs of all constituents.

Finding: The school district is currently developing a theory of action, as well as a means to communicate it to all constituents.

SOP 1.3 The district is organized and allocates resources (financial, staff support, materials, etc.) in a way that aligns appropriate levels of support for schools based on the needs of the school community.

Finding: Though the school district seeks to allocate resources based on school need, there are no systems in place to evaluate if resource and spending decisions lead to school improvement and increased levels of student achievement.

SOP 1.4 The district has a comprehensive plan to create, deliver and monitor professional development in all pertinent areas that is adaptive and tailored to the needs of individual schools.

Finding: The school district does not have formalized systems or established goals to determine if the current PD plan is positively influencing student achievement.

SOP 1.5 The district promotes a data-driven culture by providing strategies connected to best practices that all staff members and school communities are expected to be held accountable for implementing.

Finding: Though the school district is currently developing common expectations concerning the use of data to make pedagogical decisions, it does not yet have systems in place that ensure the consistent implementation of data-driven instruction.

SOP 2.1 School Leader Practices and Decisions: The district works collaboratively with the school to provide opportunities and supports for the school leader to create, develop and nurture a school environment that is responsive to the needs of the entire school community.

Finding: Although the district provides schools with some direction and resources, there are areas in which schools do not receive the support and guidance necessary to fully support district goals and the needs of all learners.

SOP 3.1 Curriculum Development and Support: The district works collaboratively with the school(s) to ensure CCLS curriculum that provide 21st Century and College and Career Readiness skills in all content areas and provides fiscal and human resources for implementation.

Finding: Schools do not have fully developed curricula and instructional levels do not meet the criteria of the Common Core Learning Standards (CCLS) or the needs of all learners.

SOP 4.1 Teacher Practices and Decisions: The district works collaboratively with the school to provide opportunities and supports for teachers to develop strategies and practices and addresses effective planning and account for student data, needs, goals, and levels of engagement.

Finding: The school district does not effectively support schools in ensuring that instructional strategies advance the use of rigor, differentiation, and data to meet the needs of all learners.

SOP 5.1 Student Social and Emotional Developmental Health: The district creates policy and works collaboratively with the school to provide opportunities and resources that positively support students' social and emotional developmental health.

Finding: The school district does not provide school staff with written policies, guidelines, or training to ensure that the social-emotional developmental health needs of its students are met.

SOP 6.1 Family and Community Engagement: The district has a comprehensive family and community engagement strategic plan that states the expectations around creating and sustaining a welcoming environment for families, reciprocal communication, and establishing partnerships with community organizations and families.

Finding: The school district and schools do not have a formal family or community plan used to communicate school or district visions and engage all stakeholders in areas related to the support of students' social, emotional, or academic needs.

DTSDE IIT FRANKLIN ACADEMY REVIEW FINDINGS:

Tenet 2: Efforts to achieve school goals are not monitored or evaluated, which limits opportunities for the school to make adjustments that lead to improvements in academic standards and progress.

Tenet 3: There are few examples of teacher lesson plans that support effective implementation of the CCLS, including higher-order thinking skills.

Tenet 4: Rigor, including higher-order thinking and questions, is not consistently implemented across all content areas and classrooms.

Tenet 5: The school does not yet have formalized systems in place to ensure the social-emotional needs of all students are consistently met.

Tenet 6: The school has not set expectations surrounding the type and frequency of communication between teachers and families nor has the school provided families with information, tips, or training in the CCLS or ways parents can support their child's academic success at home.

PROFESSIONAL NEEDS ASSESSMENT SURVEY:

Following is a summary of the top PD needs identified by Malone CSD instructional staff:

- I need training in research-based strategies that best meet the instructional needs of students who are economically disadvantaged (67% strongly agree/agree)
- I need training in creating developmentally appropriate lessons that address student learning differences and needs. (51% strongly agree/agree)
- I need training in research/evidence-based strategies for varying and modifying instruction to meet the diverse learning needs of each student. (59% strongly agree/agree)
- I need training in strategies for motivating and engaging students. (67% strongly agree/agree)
- I need training in effective questioning techniques that elicit higher levels of thinking/critical thinking. (62% strongly agree/agree)