

District Data – Local Assessments



Summary - What do the Local Assessment data tell you about student performance in your district?. If appropriate, the district will consider grade-level and subgroup performance.

Local Assessment Data:

The local assessment data used in this plan consist of the Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS), and the ThinkLink (TL) online assessment in reading and math from Discovery Education Assessment, a locally developed Technology Survey for Students, Teachers and Administrators, and a *Facilities Community Survey* that went to all parents. The DIBELS are given to every student in grades K-5, and use AIMSWeb prompts as a curriculum-based measure for progress monitoring targeted students in grades 6-8. In grades K-5 the DIBELS are given to all students three times a year as universal screeners in literacy. The TL assessment is given to all students in reading and math in grades 3-10. It is also administered three times per year. (Grades 9 and 10 of TL are considered alignment pilot tests by the company.) Beginning with the 08-09 school year, the high school administers the Explore to 9th graders and the Plan to 10th graders. The technology survey data is collected periodically to inform information/instructional technology and professional development plans and purchases.

At the elementary and middle school level, RtI problem solving teams use DIBELS and TL assessment data to help make instructional decisions and determine specific interventions at the Tier II and Tier III levels. At the high school level, department and leadership teams use Plan, Explore, and TL data to make curricular decisions as well as placement decisions.



Analysis - What areas of strength are indicated? What areas of weakness, if any, are indicated by these data? What factors are likely to have contributed to these results? Consider both external and internal factors to the school that can be influenced or improved by the district.

DIBELS.

The local DIBELS assessment data for the Fall 2008 benchmark shows that students' Oral Reading Fluency in grades 2-5 is either emerging or established for between 70 % to 75% of students district wide.

ThinkLink Reading. In grades 3-5, the TL scores for reading were between 62% and 77% of the students overall meeting or exceeding benchmarks. In grades 6-8, the TL scores for reading were between 58% (6th grade) and 81% (8th grade) of students overall meeting or exceeding benchmarks.

ThinkLink Math. In grades 3-5, the TL scores for math were between 80% and 90% of the students across the district meeting or exceeding benchmarks. In grades 6-8, the TL scores for math were between 83% and 90% meeting and exceeding benchmarks.

Teacher Technology Survey:

In the area of teachers usage of technology 68.0% stated that they are able to move files from one machine to another using various storage devices. 80.1% use a computer to perform tasks such as emailing and word processing and understand how to control the location of files. 55.6% are able to search the web and locate resources as well as design classroom or homework activities for students that require them to use the Internet as a reference resource. 53.1% use productivity tools, such as word processing and spreadsheets, to develop lesson plans. 92.3% Communicating with

staff members and other colleagues (e.g. via email, text messages or discussion areas). 75.7 Maintaining attendance and/or grades via an electronic resource (Skyward).

Weaknesses

40.5% of Teachers that responded indicated that they were unable distinguish between hardware or software errors. 26.1% know how to backup files. 50.7% are not able to design an activity that requires students to publish to the web. 39.6% can't help students use instructional software (like Type-to- Learn Inspiration or Geometers Sketchpad). 36.7% will need support to develop and deliver technology-infused lesson plans. When asked How often do your students use technology, 38.7 responded that their students never use technology to Manipulate/analyze/interpret information or data to discover relationships, generate questions, and/or reach conclusions (e.g. sorting spreadsheet data or using electronic graphic organizers). 46.5% never accommodate for a disability or limitation using assistive technology devices or software (iPads, Kurzweil, BoardMaker). 34.0% responded that their students never communicate/report information, conclusions, or results of investigations , interact with others in the classroom/school/outside of school (e.g. in word processing documents, e-mail, online discussion areas, multimedia presentations, social networks, or online discussion areas). For teacher use, 51.4% never generate or administering tests in an electronic format. 65.6% never utilize virtual field trips (e.g. Smithsonian, NASA) and 50% never Use a course management system or collaboration tool to support the delivery of instruction and facilitate communication with students (e.g. Moodle, WIKIs, blogs) Utilizing instructional aids (e.g. Interactive Whiteboards, clickers/student response systems).

Administrative Survey:

All district administrators that participated in the survey felt that the use of technology (computers, iPads, clickers, etc.) in the classroom increases student engagement and interest in the subject matter. **94% agreed that there should be ongoing professional development that focuses on instructional technology for administrators. 72.2% indicated students should be able to bring laptop, smart phones, and other personal electronic devices to Urbana High School to complete.** 100% of administrators communicate with staff members and other colleagues (e.g. via email or online discussion areas) daily, 77.8% communicate with parents daily. 44.4% of administrators are accessing curriculum school improvement material from the Internet or school system Intranet. 38.9 indicated that they work closely with the Tech Committee on all technology decisions for the building.

When asked what has been the biggest improvement in informational and instructional technology for USD 116, administrators responded: Supplying teachers with up to date hardware and software (or web-based access) and classroom presentation boards (preferably Promethean Boards), Having various departmental and school info, forms, etc. available on the District's Intranet. I know some of our teachers use Moodle, and many access i-Pathways (an on-line GED prep site developed here in Illinois) and newsletters and district news updates have also been nice, the addition of a computer lab has been the most important improvement over recent years, adding wireless capability and putting computers in each classroom is the most needed improvement, likewise, Smart Boards are needed in each classroom to enable the delivery of 21st Century instruction, Creating and following through with a district plan to provide newer computers and systems for teachers- in order to improve instructional practice and increase all students' competence with current technology, Moving toward wireless high speed connections in all environments.

When asked how would allowing access to social networks sites (Twitter, Facebook, etc.) benefit our students and teachers, administrators responded: Many teachers would like to use You Tube to show students examples of things that come up for discussion or that relate to what they are teaching in the classroom. I don't think access to Facebook, twitter is necessary, I do not think access to social networks will benefit our students at all. Administrators and counselors spend a great deal of time investigating threats and other inappropriate comments that are made on social networks outside of school time; because, they affect the school day, I do not think it would be beneficial; in fact, I think it could open the school to more discipline issues related to that median, Our society has many forms of social networks for communication and we fight to keep these out of the learning environment. We need to find a way to embrace the changes that occurs with technology. Our guidance office currently uses Twitter as a form to communicate with our students. I believe it's working well for those who use it. If nothing else, these sites can be used to inform our

students/guardians.



Conclusions - What do these factors imply for next steps in continuous improvement planning? Address these improvement priorities in Assess Indicators (Step 2), Create Plan (Step 3) and Monitor Plan (Step 4).

External Factors:

- There are several population shifts that may have an impact on the results:
 - The percent of low socioeconomic students increased from 47.4% (2004) to 65.9% (2011).
 - The percent of LEP students increased from 5.5% (2004) to 8.4% (2011).
 - The district enrollment dropped from 4424 (2002) to 3974 (2011).
 - **The mobility rate for the district has been between 21.1% and 28.3% between 2004 and 2011.**

Other external factors:

- The reauthorization of IDEA (2004) that provided support for Response to Intervention (RtI).

Internal Factors:

- Adoption of new reading and math series at the elementary level.

- Ongoing professional development for math, literacy, and technology instruction.
- Restructuring of English and reading courses at the high school level.
- Restructured reading courses at the middle school.
- Implemented Discovery Education Assessments for reading and math grades 3-11.
- Implementation of RtI at K-5 during the 06-07 and 07-08 school years.
- District lacks a central database for student achievement data that can be used to correlate state mandated assessments to local data points (e.g. Discovery Education Assessments, DIBELS, attendance, discipline, grades). However, the District is working towards a resource that will allow all databases to communicate and be SIF compliant.
- Extended learning opportunities (after school, Saturday school, Summer school), academic programs in reading and math (funded by grants and local funds).
 - Implementation of co-taught special education classes at the secondary level.
 - Students with disabilities IEP goals may not be aligned to the state assessments.
 - Insufficient monitoring of progress toward curriculum goals in both core curriculum and support services for SpEd students.
 - In some buildings the service delivery model is based on resource for regular classroom work rather than providing interventions that will help SpEd students become independently successful.
 - The Board of Education recently sold working cash bonds to improve technology hardware, software and infrastructure.