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**Part I: Executive Summary**

A lesson learned in the SIG I process was the importance of partners. In addition, it is important to provide an infrastructure of support within the district. With that in mind, the district decided to use the restart model with a partner which would provide support around leadership support, academic supports, protocols for planning and teaching and family engagement. In addition, the district expanded the role of the Turnaround Office with more subject content support and family engagement support.

Mosaica was selected as the partner. The first six months of the partnership was a process of aligning expectations and deliverables. The relationship was not in the tradition vein of an Educational Management Organization takeover, to more of a partnership. The leadership support started slowly as it took time to build trust. Eventually, the Mosaica staff was changed to create a stronger relationship with the principals. The academic support came in the form of a computerized program called Mercury on-line. This process required an alignment of the technology and an upload of student information. While currently in place, there that been some issues in the full implementation of the program. The district and Mosaica continue to work through the challenges. The protocols for collaborative planning, student support planning and teacher planning were implemented early in the process and continue. Family engagement continues to evolve.

The Turnaround Office has been able to provide subject content support and family engagement support. In addition, the Turnaround Office has maintained critical and continued communication with Mosaica. This has served to clarify expectations and deliverables. The relationship continues to evolve in a positive direction.

Challenges to the turnaround effort continue to be staffing with highly effective teachers. The district continues to examine hiring and placement practices to find the most highly effective teachers for the turnaround effort. Additional challenges include the release of SIG funds to hire additional positions. The turnaround content specialists were not in place until the end of the first marking period due to the grant loading and approval process. The district continues to work through procedural challenges.

The leadership in the SIG II schools is well positioned to oversee instructional improvement and academic performance. Gains in performance are noted in the appropriate section.

**I A. Strengths:**

SIG II provided a unique opportunity for Prince George’s County Public Schools to reflect upon lessons learned in “Turnaround” to add two additional schools using the restart model. Many question why the district selected this model over turnaround. First, with the decrease in school funding and reduction in force, the turnaround model as written is counterproductive to our efforts to accelerating school achievement. Replacing fifty (50) percent of staff would not have been an effective strategy in light of the difficulty of securing highly effective staff for the original SIG I schools, and the pool of candidates was not as vast as we would have preferred.

SIG II was different form SIG I in that it allowed the district to work closely with the restart partner to conduct funded pre-implementation activities to support the work. Prince George’s County was successful at developing an RFP, hosting a meeting for potential partners, reviewing proposals, and collaborating to select the best company to partner with our two new SIG II schools: Oxon Hill Middle and Thomas Johnson Middle.

Needs Assessments were conducted at each school during the month of June. Within two weeks of the needs assessment, Mosaica, our restart partner provided a narrative of their findings to support their work. The needs assessment for each school is attached.

Staff meetings were held in June for two purposes. First, the Turnaround Director provided the vision of PGCPS Turnaround while discussing the unique aspects of the SIG II application to include the purpose for funding, staffing allocations, and an introduction to Mosaica. Secondly, the president of Mosaica Education Turnarounds provided an overview of the company and a summary of the work that would be conducted in each of the schools to include intense professional development, professional development plans for each staff member, individual plans for students, role of additional staff, etc… Parent meetings followed reiterating the same message.

**First Quarter**

The needs assessment conducted in June of 2011 was helpful in planning an initial course of action for both schools and the list of deliverables was clear in its terms and derived directly from the grant application.

School staff was well informed as to the restart efforts and the anticipated changes that would occur. Processes and procedures existed in each school and in the county itself to support restart efforts. Collaborative planning meetings occurred regularly as did school-wide meetings around school culture and student achievement.

MTP offered 2 full-time staff members to work with both schools.

**Second Quarter**

The on boarding of experienced coaches and specialists accelerated the speed of implementation which has resulted in observable growth and proficiency in each school as was evidenced in the January 2012 SIG II Year 1 Monitoring Team’s Second Onsite Visit. While schools are showing some documented growth in school culture and academic achievement, the beginning phases of implementation are now becoming habit and a way of life at both schools.

Mosaica gained better access to PGCPS data systems.

A change in Mosaica personnel has led to more effective communication between MTP and PGCPS.

**Third Quarter**

The bi-weekly meetings with Principals, PGCPS Turnaround Director and Mosaica Turnaround Partners have strengthened the communication between all stakeholders. These meetings have given us a clear focus on the expectations as it relates to the implementation of the deliverables. We now have a clear focus on what the work should manifest and have a reasonable timeline for successful completion of each of the deliverables.

Additionally, the weekly meetings between Principals and Project Manager have proven to be productive. These meeting have improved the relationship and collaboration between both parties. Furthermore, the faculty and staff at both schools are becoming aware of the partnership and are becoming comfortable with the Mosaica team as many staff have reached out for professional assistance and guidance on several occasions.

**I B. Areas for Improvement:**

**First Quarter**

As with any newly formed partnership, the collaboration between PGCPS and Mosaica has been slow to develop. According to Mosaica, the transition to a new school system and individual personnel in each school lasted longer than expected and access to school-wide data systems was difficult to initiate.

Selection of the additional positions was delayed due to the Notice of Grant Award. As a result, the work of the school level coaches, math, reading, and data, did not begin until the end of October. The same holds true for behavior specialist and parent intervention specialist.

**Second Quarter**

PGCPS and Mosaica worked collaboratively to restructure the implementation of deliverables. Furthermore, vice president Dr. John Q. Porter, Chief Academic Officer, Dr. Duane Arbogast, and the Turnaround Director met November 22, 2012 to discuss PGCPS’ ongoing concerns with the implementation of deliverables as stipulated in the contract for services. During this meeting, both parties agreed a replacement for the current leadership coach was in order.

According to Mosaica, the challenge in the second quarter mainly revolved around gaining ground on implementation and defining further the relationship between PGCPS and MTP. Both parties have agreed to an implementation timeline and regular meetings have been scheduled to monitor activities.

**Third Quarter**

Consistent with SIG I schools, staffing is an area of concern. Great strides were made in the area of financial and non-financial incentives for teachers. Several meetings were held with PGCEA and PGCPS to discuss this area which culminated in administering the PGCPS-PGCEA Teacher Satisfaction and Motivation Questionnaire (Results of the survey are attached). Additionally, staff from Human Capital, Dr. Arbogast, TA Director, and PGCEA President, Kenneth Haines participated in a one-day trip to Chicago Public Schools to build the District’s and Association’s capacity around school Turnaround.

Mosaica will create a professional development calendar for the upcoming school year for both schools based on the results from the surveys and the individualized professional development plans for teachers. It will be our goal to provide highly effective professional development that will engage the participants. Mosaica will allow participants to provide feedback after each professional development session to rate its effectiveness. If needed, Mosaica will modify its presentations to meet the needs of the staff at both schools. Additionally, this feedback will be shared with the Principals and Director of Turnaround in a disaggregated format.

**Part II. Monitoring**

**II A. Turnaround Director’s Monitoring of SIG Restart Partner**

The Turnaround Director meets, at a minimum, once a month with the restart partner to be provided status updates on the deliverables provided in the agreement. Most meetings have been held in person. There have been a few occasions in which conference calls were conducted in lieu of face-to-face meetings.

Listed below is a brief synopsis of each meeting:

**August 31, 2011**

Collaborative meeting between MOSAICA, principals, and TA Director to chart the course of the year based on the school’s vision and performance data (professional development plan for leadership and professional staff, goal setting, PBIS, etc.

**September 14, 2011**

This was a collaborative meeting between MOSAICA, principals, and TA Director to finalize the applicant screening and selection process. Team reviewed resumes (behavior specialist and parent engagement specialist), made recommendations for interviews, developed interview questions and scoring rubric, and scheduled interviews.

**September 27, 2011**

Collaborative meeting between MOSAICA, both principals, and TA Director to discuss ELO and Mercury Online implementation: technical requirements for and management of Mercury Online.

**October 10, 2011**

Collaborative meeting between MOSAICA, both principals, and TA Director to share ELO updates for each school. Implementation status of Mercury Online (a major of component of the ELO) was also discussed and MOSAICA was asked to submit a Mercury Online Implementation Plan by Monday, October 17.

**November 22, 2011**

Collaborative meeting between MOSAICA and PGCPS to discuss the status of deliverables as stipulated in the agreement. During this meeting, both parties agreed to replace the existing leadership coach for the remainder of the school year.

**December 5, 2011**

Collaborative meeting between MOSAICA, both principals, and TA Director to discuss the following: Mercury Online implementation status; MOSAICA’s PD Plan for each school; upcoming 0.5 PD days (1/18; 2/13, 4/18); school-based workshops for teachers (money is available); MOSAICA-Principal partnership meeting schedule; parent-community meetings. A discussion was also held concerning the need to realign some funds for classroom libraries across content areas and for RELA and math supplies.

**January 9, 2012**

Collaborative meeting between MOSAICA, both principals, and TA Director to discuss the MSDE SIG feedback from the first onsite visit, expectations around documentation for the second MSDE visits scheduled for February, and the monitoring tool developed by PGCPS to monitor MOSAICA. The new MOSAICA Executive Coach (Dr. Robinson who replaced Mr. Gibson) attended this meeting.

**February 27, 2012**

Collaborative meeting between Mosaica and TA Director. The crux of the meeting focused on Mercury Online. Both schools have experienced difficulty with implementing this initiative. Further discussions were held with the administrator from Mercury Online, Dr. Robinson, Mosaica, and Dr. Arbogast. The remainder of the meeting focused on parent-community meetings, teacher professional development plans, student learning plans, planning for teacher professional development, and coaches meetings.

**March 8, 2012**

The Mosaica team and TA Director met to discuss the following items:

1. Partnership Relations
2. Planning Meetings
3. Individual Teacher Professional Development Plans
4. Data Warehouse/Individual Student Plans

**March 19, 2012**

Collaborative meeting between Mosaica and TA Director to discuss the following items:

1. Mosaica – PGCPS Monitoring Tool Review
	1. Individual Teacher Professional Development Plans
	2. Parent Engagement
	3. Scheduling
	4. Staffing
	5. Extended Learning
	6. Collaborative Planning
	7. Leadership Coaching
	8. Professional Development
2. Individual Professional Development Plans
3. New Teacher Support
4. Professional Development Day – April 18
5. Mosaica Turnaround Institute – Planning
6. Mercury Online – updates

**March 26, 2012**

Collaborative meeting between Mosaica, TA Director, and the principals to discuss the following items:

1. Introduction of 100-Day Planning packet
2. Individual PD plans for teachers
3. Instructional Needs Assessment
4. Student Plans – PSAP
5. April 18th – Professional Development
6. Mosaica Summer Institute
7. Mosaica Turnaround Leadership Institute
8. Summer Staffing Collaboration
9. Scheduling
10. Reallocation of SIG II, Year 1 Funds

**II B. Chief Academic Officer Monitoring of SIG Restart Partner**

**This table shows the dates and number of occurrences for each monitoring activity by the Chief Academic Officer of the Turnaround Director.** Additionally, the Chief Academic Officer and Turnaround Director frequently discuss the status of the schools and implementation of deliverables.

**First Quarter**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Schools** | **Quarterly Evaluation of test data by school** | **Quarterly Evaluation of Participation Data** **(Attendance, suspension, etc.)** | **Quarterly Meetings with Restart Partner Executive Leadership to discuss progress.** |
| **Oxon Hill Middle** | November 9, 2011 | November 9, 2011 | November 9, 2011 |
| **Thomas Johnson** | November 9, 2011 | November 9, 2011 | November 9, 2011 |

**Second Quarter**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Schools** | **Quarterly Evaluation of test data by school** | **Quarterly Evaluation of Participation Data** **(Attendance, suspension, etc.)** | **Quarterly Meetings with Restart Partner Executive Leadership to discuss progress.** |
| **Oxon Hill Middle** | January 26, 2012 | January 26, 2012 | January 26, 2012 |
| **Thomas Johnson** | January 26, 2012 | January 26, 2012 | January 26, 2012 |

**Third Quarter**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Schools** | **Quarterly Evaluation of test data by school** | **Quarterly Evaluation of Participation Data** **(Attendance, suspension, etc.)** | **Quarterly Meetings with Restart Partner Executive Leadership to discuss progress.** |
| **Oxon Hill Middle** | FAST is not administered Third Quarter. | April 10, 2012 | March 8, 2012 and March 19, 2012 |
| **Thomas Johnson** | FAST is not administered Third Quarter | April 10, 2012 | March 8, 2012 and March 19, 2012 |

**II C. SIG Restart Partner Implementation of Deliverables**

**First Quarter**

During the Pre-Implementation phase, MTP conducted observations of the teaching staff at both schools in June 2011 and made recommendations as to teacher and leadership staffing. MTP President and other staff participated in 2 parent meetings and 2 staff meetings (one at each school) to provide an overview of the work that would occur at each school. MTP staff also participated in Back-To-School Night at OHMS on September 6, 2011. Position descriptions were provided for two content specialists, a data coach, Behavior Intervention Specialist and Parent Engagement Specialist. MTP also conducted 4 days of professional development on Culture & Climate (Positive Behavioral Interventions and Support or PBIS) and Building Cultural Capital, the data cycle (Classroom-Focused Improvement Process) or CFIP) and Effective Teaching Strategies. MTP staff did a preliminary analysis of school-wide MSA data.

MTP exceeded the expectation of access to a leadership coach on a bi-monthly basis by providing a Leadership Coach/Project Manager and Curriculum/Staff Development Coach in schools approximately 4 days a week.

Due to the late start of the content specialists and other required personnel, PGCPS and MTP revised the deliverables on September 12, 2011. MTP participated in Collaborative Planning Meetings, when possible, to assist content area teachers in implementing the CFIP protocol. MTP also participated in the interview process for content specialists and other personnel. MTP conducted professional development on the Framework for Teaching and Data Analysis for School Leaders (OHMS). MYP also re-delivered a professional development session on CFIP, upon the request of PGCPS.

In general, MTP staff offered support and technical assistance to school principals on each school’s particular area of focus. Because Thomas Johnson Middle School retained its principal from the 2010-2011 school year many reform programs were already in existence. PBIS had been formally introduced as well as significant work on planning within collaborative planning meetings. TJMS choose to deepen its work on the data cycle and planning for instruction while Oxon Hill Middle School choose to focus its initial efforts on Culture and Climate and student engagement. Both schools worked to refine the PBIS programs implemented in previous years and spent a significant amount of time deciding upon what incentives would work best with their respective populations.

**Second Quarter**

The speed of implementation was accelerated with the arrival of two content specialists, a Data Coach, a Behavior Intervention Specialist and Parent Engagement Specialist. During the week of November 15, 2011, MTP conducted a 3-day Orientation for Coaches and Specialists with sessions on making staff familiar with the SIG grants and the relationship between PGCPS and MTP, the coaching relationship and adult learners, and leading the CFIP protocol. The Orientation also included significant time for action planning with each school team.

Leadership Staff at both schools began to implement new programs and revise existing protocols for higher efficiency in supporting student achievement. Content specialists delivered professional development sessions of various lengths on observed areas of need. These sessions continue to give teachers explicit instruction in writing SMART objectives and planning for instruction. Each school also instituted ½-day data analysis and planning sessions after FAS testing for content area teachers.

As previously stated, each school has a different area of focus. TJMS is offering additional professional development in Classroom Management and Differentiated Instruction while OHMS is developing its PEACE Initiative (Positive Energy Activates Constant Elevation), a comprehensive program aimed at school culture, climate and empowerment. Both schools continue to review processes and procedures for operations and documentation.

MTP and PGCPS staffs began the implementation of Mercury Online in both schools and continue to work on procedures to ensure that this program will be successful for all students who participate.

In January of 2012 upon an agreement between MTP and PGCPS, MTP brought in a new Leadership Coach/Project manager who has formalized and refined the Executive Coaching sessions and increased the amount of communication between MTP and the PGCPS Turnaround Director.

**Third Quarter**

Provided below is a summary of work completed during the third quarter for both SIG II schools:

Parent Meetings

* Participated in Parent Teacher Meeting – March 13, 2012 @ TJMS
* Participated in Parent Teacher Meeting – March 27, 2012 @ OHMS

Collaborative Planning/Coaching

* Weekly meetings with MTP staff and coaching staff (Literacy Coach, Math Coach, Data Coach) at each campus to guide collaborative planning/data analysis protocol;
* Attend content-specific collaborative planning meetings when possible;
* Assist in the planning and participate in ½-day content-specific professional development sessions.

Personal Student Achievement Plans (PSAP)

* Designed a PSAP form specific to PGCPS students and beginning data collection process. Forms anticipated completion – June 30, 2012

Mercury On-Line

* MTP staff monitoring Mercury On-Line during after-school hours;
* Re-registered OHMS students for assessment and enrollment in Mercury courses;
* Direct training of TJMS teachers assigned to work with Mercury On-Line (training for OHMS teacher to be scheduled);

Leadership Coaching

* MTP Leadership Coach/Project Manager meeting weekly with school principals and leadership teams

Professional Development

* February ½ day PD – Depth of Knowledge
* April ½ day PD – Individual Professional Development Plans

Individual Professional Development Plans (IPDP)

* Designed an IPDP form specific to PGCPS teachers and beginning data collection process. Forms anticipated completion – Week of June 4, 2012

MSDE

* Assisted TJMS on document organization for MSDE SIG II Audit;
* Lead OHMS on document organization for MSDE SIG II Audit

Looking ahead to Quarter 4

* Mosaica Turnaround Partners to host a parent/student event at each school during the fourth quarter. We anticipate that it will be held in conjunction with a welcoming event for incoming students for the 2012-13 school year. Date to be announced.
* Student schedules – MTP staff working with school staff to create 2012-13 master schedule to ensure that students are placed according to their academic needs
* MTP staff will begin a regular meeting schedule with the Behavior Intervention Specialists and Community Engagement Specialists
* Personal Student Achievement Plans – Anticipated completion for returning students - July 1/ New students to be completed during the summer 2012 and ongoing as enrolled
* Individual Professional Development Plans – Anticipated completion week of June 4, 2012
* Planning for 2012 -13 school year including year-long PD plan based on IPDP and PSAP data

**Part III. Progress**

**III A. Benchmark Data**

**IIIA1: Reading Benchmark Data**

**This chart shows the *Quarter 1* Reading Benchmark Results By School and Grade Level.**

**County FAST I Reading Average**

6th Grade – 71 7th Grade – 75 8th Grade – 79

Both Thomas Johnson and Oxon Hill Middle began the school year with solid RELA teams and student achievement data is reflective of the teams’ efforts. Students in the 6th and 7th grade were a percentage point under the County average; however, students enrolled in the 8th grade exceeded the County average.

Students at Oxon Hill Middle exceeded the County average at both grade levels.

**This chart shows the *Quarter 2* Reading Benchmark Results by School and Grade Level.**

**County FAST II Reading Average**

6th Grade – 72.9 7th Grade – 73.2 8th Grade – 77.9

Reading data at Thomas Johnson suggests students are increasingly working towards and/or meeting the standard. Although there was a decline in student performance from 1st quarter in the 6th grade, the team has worked closely with the reading coach and instructional specialist to adjust instruction to meet the needs of students. 7th grade students exceeded the County average in achievement. 8th grade students were slightly under the County average.

Students at Oxon Hill Middle exceeded the County average for grade 7 and were slightly under the County average for grade 8.

**This chart shows the *FAST I and FAST II* Reading Benchmark Results by School and Grade Level.**

**Reading Third Quarter Analysis**

FAST is not given during the third quarter; therefore, an analysis of the work performed during this period to include activities, and how those activities supported teacher growth and student achievement.

**SIG 2 Schools**

**(Oxon Hill Middle School & Thomas Johnson Middle School)**

| **Activities** | **How Activities Supported Teacher Growth** | **How Activities Supported Student Achievement** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| * Mosaica (leadership and instructional coaching partner)
 | Professional development and support during collaborative planning across content areas has extended teacher thinking around pedagogy and thinking toward common core shifts | Students are engaged in more cross-curricular learning activities as teachers approach instruction using similar strategies (Webb’s Depth of Knowledge) |
| * Extended Learning Opportunities
 | Teachers have the opportunity to work with small groups of students and engage in further practice with the best practices and strategies discussed in collaborative planning (partner and school-based) | Students were targeted for inclusion in the ELO programs and through exposure to re-teaching and extended practice opportunities they have gained greater task persistence |
| * School-Based Collaborative Planning
 | Through the consistent efforts of the instructional lead teacher, the teachers have reflected upon specific practices that are recognized as valuable to their professional development. The school-based collaborative planning has served as an extension of the planning sessions with the partner | Students are exposed to more focused and aligned instruction that follows the MSDE model for planning and implementation. The result of focused instruction is increased time on task and student work that reflects improves teaching and learning as reflected in student work samples |
| * Lesson Implementation Walk-Through (school-based team)
 | The debrief from the instructional walk guides the teachers reflection upon collaborative planning processes and the effectiveness of the practices that are highlighted. | Students are asked questions during instructional walks that show their thoughts around what they are learning is valued and important to what the teachers are learning in the process of improving teaching and learning |
| * MSA Practice Assessment (Instructional Focus Task for Teacher Model & Student Practice)
* Test Sophistication
 | The MSDE education specialist and Turnaround Office Instructional Specialist for RELA produced a practice assessment with two reading samples for each genre type and select responses and a BCR for each selection. The assessment was aligned in Edusoft for ease of administration and data collection. | Time spent in modeling how to respond to test items and the instruction provided as a model lead to purposeful student engagement with the practice material in preparation for the MSA. Student qualitative response to how they felt about taking the MSA revealed that they felt prepared and possessed the skill to read the passages and respond to the test items. |
| * Project 50 Professional Learning Community (select cohort)
 | The FFT frame focused teacher attention upon the domains utilized in evaluation. Teachers have shown greater reflection in their practice and the cohorts have engaged in discussion that supports deepening of teaching and learning | One aspect of Project 50 has been teacher use of specific techniques (discussion techniques, questioning, classroom environment) that have been evaluated by the lead teachers/coaches in relation to student data. Data collected shows that student engagement is increasing and the learning environment has begun to shift to more student centered practices |

**Oxon Hill Middle School**:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Activities** | **How Activities Supported Teacher Growth** | **How Activities Supported Student Achievement** |
| * Enrichment & Remediation Modified Schedule for Response to Intervention (Planning and Logistics)
 | The leadership devised a plan for incorporating RTI that forced teachers to engage with a variety of students to meet student needs in several subject areas. Teachers are forced to consider alternative strategies and expand their repertoire | Through strengthening teacher skill, students are provided with instruction that shifts teacher centered methods to student centered outcomes |
| * Development and Execution of Common Assessments
 | RELA teachers creation of standards based test items improves their ability to back map instruction | Students experienced greater success as teachers were able to focus instruction with a clear understanding of the outcome |
| Next Steps:* Continue the efforts the RTI. This is not being tried systematically in any other building. The efforts will translate to meeting the demands of common core.
* Maintain and extend use of common assessments to drive the instruction and focus for pacing and what objectives should be taught for a longer period of time or shortened period of time
 |

**Thomas Johnson Middle School:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Activities** | **How Activities Supported Teacher Growth** | **How Activities Supported Student Achievement** |
| * Curriculum Extension Projects
 | RELA teams collaborated and researched ways to extend student learning, thus stretching their thinking around objectives that would be tested on MSA. Each teacher crafted their version of a similar enrichment project across multiple indicators | Student engagement in planning and executing the project completion was very high and the end product demonstrated student proficiency that was exemplary in most cases (performance based learning; artifacts displayed that met and exceeded the standard) |
| * Student Advisories (after first mod)
 | Entire staff engages in morning meetings about academic and social issues that impact student learning and personal growth. Adult -student rapport is built and staff are better able to relate to students which translates to growth in teacher knowledge of the adolescent learner | Student engagement has increased given the time spent sustaining climate and culture. As students work in small groups their potential is increased for growth in learning |
| Next Steps:* Develop and refine aligned work between the coach and the RELA staff so planning and instruction is focused and communication supports the efforts of the classroom teacher
* Work toward greater infusion of information shared during Mosaica trainings (Webb’s Depth of Knowledge; questioning; preparation for the common core)
 |

**IIIA2. Math Benchmark Data**

**This chart shows the *Quarter 1* Math Benchmark Results by School and Grade Level.**

**County FAST I Mathematics Average**

6th Grade – 59 7th Grade – 44 8th Grade – 52

The County average for achievement in 6th Grade was 59 percent. According to the chart, Thomas Johnson was 13 percent below the County average. 7th grade students achieved at a rate of 53 percent which is 11 percent above the County average. On the other hand, 8th grade students achieved at a rate of 43 percent which is 9 percent below the County Average.

Oxon Hill Middle School was significantly lower than the County average for 7th grade. Student achievement for 7th grade was 29 percent. Students in the 8th grade met the County average. To assist with improving student achievement in Mathematics, the newly selected coaches and the instructional specialist will provide intensive support to teachers and students.

**This chart shows the *Quarter 2* Math Benchmark Results by School and Grade Level.**

**County FAST II Mathematics Average**

6th Grade – 61.8 7th Grade – 62 8th Grade – 56.3

The County average for achievement in 6th Grade was 61.8 percent. According to the chart, Thomas Johnson was 26 percent below the County average. Student achievement in the 7th and 8th grade was significantly better than students currently enrolled in the 6th grade. 7th grade students achieved at a rate of 55 percent which is 7 percent below the County average. Furthermore, 8th grade students achieved at a rate of 50 percent which is 6 percent below the County Average.

Oxon Hill Middle School, while under the County Average, showed growth for students enrolled in Math 7. Student achievement for 7th grade was 39.35 percent. Students in the 8th grade met the County average of 56 percent which represents a 15 percent increase in student achievement.

**This chart shows the *FAST I and FAST II* Mathematics Benchmark Results by School and Grade Level.**

 **Mathematics Third Quarter Analysis**

Consistent with Reading, FAST is not given during the third quarter; therefore, an analysis of the work performed during this period to include activities, and how those activities supported teacher growth and student achievement.

**SIG II MIDDLE Schools**

**(Oxon Hill and Thomas Johnson)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Activities** | **How Activities Supported Teacher Growth** | **How Activities Supported Student Achievement** |
| * School Based Collaborative Planning
 | The coach develops lesson plans with the mathematics teachers that have the same focus as the sessions planned with the partner.  | Students are exposed to more instruction that allows them to use appropriate mathematical language, models and manipulatives that support their deep understanding of mathematics, and aligned to state curriculum objectives that results in increased student learning of mathematics. |
| * School Based Lesson Implementation Walkthrough
 | The walkthroughs provide teachers with feedback on their implemented lesson plans. The feedback given to the teachers inform their instructional practice.  | Students are asked questions during instructional walks that show their thoughts around what they are learning is valued and important to what the teachers are learning in the process of improving teaching and learning |
| * Mosaica Partnership (Professional development, leadership and coaching support)
 | Professional development and support during collaborative planning across content areas has extended teacher thinking around pedagogy and thinking toward common core shifts | Students are engaged in more cross-curricular learning activities as teachers approach instruction using similar strategies (Webb’s Depth of Knowledge) |
| * Extended Learning Opportunities
 | Teachers have the opportunity to work with small groups of students and engage in further practice with the best practices and strategies discussed in collaborative planning (partner and school-based) | Students were targeted for inclusion in the ELO programs and through exposure to re-teaching and extended practice opportunities they have gained greater task persistence |
| * Project 50 Professional Learning Community (select cohort of teachers)
 | The FFT frame focused teacher attention upon the domains utilized in evaluation. Teachers have shown greater reflection in their practice and the cohorts have engaged in discussion that supports deepening of teaching and learning | One aspect of Project 50 has been teacher use of specific techniques (discussion techniques, questioning, classroom environment) that have been evaluated by the lead teachers/coaches in relation to student data. Data collected shows that student engagement is increasing and the learning environment has begun to shift to more student centered practices |
| Next Steps:Professional Development opportunities that include:* Develop lessons that incorporate the use of the Standards of Mathematical Practices
* Writing and analyzing rich mathematical tasks
* Analyzing student work
 |

Oxon Hill Middle School

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Activities** | **How Activities Supported Teacher Growth** | **How Activities Supported Student Achievement** |
| * Enrichment & Remediation Modified Schedule for Response to Intervention (Planning and Logistics)
 | The leadership devised a plan for incorporating RTI that forced teachers to engage with a variety of students to meet student needs in several subject areas. Teachers are forced to consider alternative strategies and expand their repertoire | Through strengthening teacher skill, students are provided with instruction that shifts teacher centered methods to student centered outcomes |
| * Unpacking Mathematics State Curriculum Objectives
 | The coach and the Turnaround Instructional Specialist supported the teachers in their understanding of the state curriculum objectives through scaffolding the requisite and prerequisite skills needed to address the demands of the state objectives | The teachers’ understanding of the state objectives assist the students deep understanding of the mathematics content |
| * Development and Execution of Common Assessments
 | Mathematics teachers creation of standards based test items improves their ability to back map instruction | Students experienced greater success as teachers were able to focus instruction with a clear understanding of the outcome |
| * Writing rich mathematical tasks
 | The coach and the Turnaround Instructional Specialist supported the teachers in writing tasks that different opportunities to meet the different needs of learners at different times | Rich tasks allow students to construct their own knowledge of math concepts and assist in their deep understanding of mathematics. |
| Next Steps:* Provide professional development which includes the support and questioning that is used by the teacher and the roles that learners are encouraged to adopt while engaging in a rich task, analyzing and adjusting mathematical tasks
* Continue the efforts the RTI. This is not being tried systematically in any other building. The efforts will translate to meeting the demands of common core.
* Maintain and extend use of common assessments to drive the instruction and focus for pacing and what objectives should be taught for a longer period of time or shortened period of time
* Analyze the data gleaned from the common assessments and use the data to inform the teachers’ instructional practice
 |

Thomas Johnson Middle School

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Activities** | **How Activities Supported Teacher Growth** | **How Activities Supported Student Achievement** |
| * Examining student work
 | Teachers become more reflective about their practice as they look for progress in student work and are able to adjust and differentiate instruction | The result of focused instruction is increased time on task and student work that reflects improves teaching and learning as reflected in student work samples |
| * Analyzing Mathematical Tasks
 |

|  |
| --- |
| Teachers analyze tasks to determine if the students attention while engaged in the task is focused on the use of a procedure or requires students to explore and understand the nature of math concepts, processes, or relationships  |

 | Students engagement in tasks that require exploration of math concepts leads to conceptual and deep understanding of mathematics |
| Next Steps:* Professional development sessions for the teachers that explore nature of mathematical concepts, processes or relationships through the use of models, manipulatives, and representations
* Utilize texts and articles that support the teachers’ deep understanding of the content
* Development and utilize common assessments that inform instruction and student learning
* Developing rich mathematical tasks that allow teachers to meet the needs of different learners at different times (open and parallel tasks)
 |

**III B. Attendance**

**This table shows the Overall Attendance Percentages from the 2009 School Year to Date for the 2011-2012 School Year.**

*Source:* [*www.mdreportcard.org*](http://www.mdreportcard.org) *and PGCPS’ Data Warehouse*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **School** | **2009** | **2010** | **2011** | **2011-2012****1st Quarter** | **2011-2012****2nd Quarter** | **2011-2012****3rd Quarter** |
| **%** | **%** | **%** | **%** | **%** | **%** |
| **Oxon Hill Middle** | 94.5 | 94 | 93.7 | 95.68 | 94.26 | 94.41 |
| **Thomas Johnson Middle** | 95 | 95 | 95 | 96.74 | 96.07 | 96.42 |

**III C. Suspensions**

**This table shows the number of Suspensions by School for the current School Year 2010-11.**

 *Source: PGCPS’ Data Warehouse*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **School** | **2010-2011 1st Quarter** | **2011-2012****1st Quarter** |  | **2010-2011****2nd Quarter** | **2011-2012** **2nd Quarter** |  | **2010-2011****3rd****Quarter \*** | **2011-2012****3rd** **Quarter** |
| **Oxon Hill Middle** | 29 | 27 |  | 41 | 40 |  | 61 | 59 |
| **Thomas Johnson** | 3 | 33 |  | 32 | 32 |  | 19 | 46 |