**Team Goal Setting: Moving from School-Wide Focus Area to Team Student Learning Goal**

After your school team has identified a focus area and set a school-wide student learning goal, teams are ready to dig into data to find evidence for a specific student learning challenge within identified focus areas. The student learning challenge should be:

* **Evidence-Based:** Supported by multiple sources of data
* **Standards-Driven:** Focused on the knowledge and skills students need to acquire in order to master the CCSS and/or WIDA
* **Gap-Closing:** If you solve this challenge, you will make progress towards closing a persistent achievement gap
* **Urgent and High-Leverage:** If you solve this challenge, it will help you meet your larger goals for students

**Examples**

Below are two examples which demonstrate how to move from an identified focus area to a team student learning challenge.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Evidence for School-Wide Focus Area** | | |
| Majority of SWD are Resource:   * 53 of 67 SWD receive Resource support * 53 of 67 are 0.1 level of need | SWD Achievement Gap (Math): | |
| * Mean CPI of 50.6 for SWD * Mean CPI of 74.0 for nondisabled students * 39.0 SGP for SWD | * 55.0 Median SGP for nondisabled * 17% of SWD Proficient or Advanced * 54% nondisabled students Prof or Adv |
| **School-Wide Focus Area** | | |
| Math performance of students receiving resource room support | | |
| **School-Wide Student Learning Goal** | | |
| Based on recent MCAS trends of low growth and low performance in Math for students receiving Resource support, our goal is that the 2014 Math median SGP for Resource students will increase 12 points from 39.0 to 51.0. | | |
| **Evidence for Team Student Learning Challenge** | | |
| * Largest school-state gap for SWD by question type was OR items (28%/1.1 for Gr 5) * Gap for SWD on MC was 16% for Grade 5 * SWD performance on OR items ranged from 1.56 to 0.6 pts.; school-state gaps on OR items ranged from 1.2 to 0.5 pts. * Cluster had the largest school-state gap for SWD in Grade 5 (27%). This cluster also has 7 test items. * Resource students also struggled on Number and operations in base ten on Predictive #2 (15% “Meeting Standard” in Grade 5) * Students receiving Resource support struggled the most with items requiring understanding of place value, including adding, subtracting, and dividing multi-digit whole numbers. | | |
| **Team Student Learning Challenge** | | |
| Students receiving Resource support are struggling to understand place value, impacting their ability to add, subtract, and divide multi-digit whole numbers. *(Based on item analysis and distractor analysis)* | | |
| **Team Student Learning Goal** | | |
| Based on the fact that students receiving Resource support did not demonstrate understanding of place value on the pre-assessment, scoring an average of 30% on questions in this strand, our goal is that by January, these students will apply understanding of place value to with score an average of at least 60% on a similar assessment in January and at least 80% on a similar assessment in May. We will monitor progress over the course of the year through classwork and informal assessments. | | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Evidence for School-Wide Focus Area** | | |
| Large ELL Population:   * 150 out of 347 students are ELL:   No ELD Level 1, 25 ELD Level 2, 85 ELD Level 3, 30 ELD Level 4, and 10 ELD Level 5 | ELL Achievement Gap (ELA): | |
| * Mean CPI of 40.5 for ELL * Mean CPI of 67.8 for non-ELL * 31.5 SGP for ELL | * 51.0 SGP for non-ELL * 9% of ELLs Prof. or Adv. * 51% of non-ELLs Prof .or Adv. |
| **School-Wide Focus Area** | | |
| Writing skills of ELL students | | |
| **School-Wide Student Learning Goal** | | |
| Based on recent trends of low performance for ELL students on the ELA MCAS, and the fact that students currently score the lowest on open response questions, our goal is that by May 2014, our ELL students will demonstrate increased written communication skills using the Claim, Evidence, Argument format. We will measure progress every semester, using grade level rubrics designed to build toward college readiness. | | |
| **Evidence for Team Student Learning Challenge** | | |
| * Largest school-state gap for ELL by question type was on open response items (15% school-state gap) * ELL performance on OR items ranged from 1.6 to 0.5; school-state gaps on OR items ranged from 1.4 to 0.30 points * On average, 4th grade ELL students earned a 7/20 on the long comp. (23% school-state gap), which is 5 points below the non-ELL average (13) * 70% of ELD 1-3 students scored “Needs Attention” or “Critical Area for Improvement” on the majority of CWA rubric criteria | | |
| **Team Student Learning Challenge** | | |
| ELL students struggle to state and support a claim – The writer clearly states an opinion, supports the opinion with evidence, and provides reasons that support the opinion. *(Based on analyzing open response, long composition, and CWA responses)* | | |
| **Team Student Learning Goal** | | |
| Based on the fact that 78% of our ELL students currently score “Needs Attention” or below on the CWA rubric, our goal is to improve written performance on grade level writing assessments as measured by the CWA rubric. By January, 70% of our students will score Proficient on CWA-style writing assessment. By May, 85% of our students will score Proficient, and no students will score below “Needs Attention.” | | |