

# Manson Northwest Webster



## A Look at Student Learning 2010-2011

### PreK Vision for Teaching and Learning

Manson Northwest Webster staff will actively engage all students in real-world, relevant, and academically challenging experiences in a safe and positive environment. Staff will share accountability for the learning of all students through professional collaboration, innovative thinking, and the use of technology and research-based strategies.

**Manson Northwest Webster Community School District**  
**“A Look at Student Learning”**  
**2010-2011**

Learning is very complex and difficult to measure with a single assessment. We believe, in order to get a comprehensive picture of student learning at MNW, we must consider information from a variety of assessment tools in a given school year as well as across time. This report includes student learning results from a several assessments and surveys that were administered to MNW students and staff during the 2010-2011 school year. In addition, the report contains a summary of the year’s professional development. MNW believes the staffs’ professional learning is a key component in increasing student achievement. For further explanation of any information contained in this report, contact Laura Horan, Curriculum and Assessment Coordinator.

**Table of Contents**

**District Wide Assessments:**

ITBS/ITED Percent Proficient	Pages 2-5
Measures of Academic Progress (MAP)	Page 6
Basic Reading Inventory (BRI)	Page 7
Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS)	Page 8

**More Evidence of Learning:**

ACT	Page 9
Student Achievement Goals	Page 9
PreK12 Vision for Teaching and Learning	Page 10-12
Technology Literacy	Page 13

**Professional Development – Connections to Learning:**

District Professional Development Plan	Page 13-16
Elementary, Grades K-6	Page 16
Jr/Hs, Grades 7-12	Page 17

**MNW Elementary  
2010-2011 ITBS Results  
Tested November 2010, Fall Norms  
Percent Proficient - 41<sup>st</sup> Percentile and Above (National Percentile Rank)  
Grades 3-6**

**All Students**

Grade	Reading	Math	Science
3 N= 42	85.6	78.6	78.6
4 N=42	81.0	78.6	78.5
5 N=46	69.6	84.8	71.7
6 N=39	79.5	89.8	84.6

**Trend \*  
2006/2007 – 2010/2011**

Grade	Reading					Math					Science				
	06-07	07-08	08-09	09-10	10-11	06-07	07-08	08-09	09-10	10-11	06-07	07-08	08-09	09-10	10-11
3	79.5	81.3	80.5	74.3	85.5	85.7	78.2	78.1	74.2	78.6	79.5	87.7	70.7	77.2	78.6
4	77.2	88.2	87.5	74.0	81.0	74.3	92.2	90.0	80.5	78.6	88.6	92.1	85.0	76.1	78.5
5	76.4	71.0	81.2	83.8	69.6	85.7	77.5	91.8	86.4	84.4	92.0	71.0	91.8	94.5	71.7
6	83.3	71.9	65.6	75.4	79.5	78.8	86.1	77.2	85.0	89.8	78.6	76.6	77.2	84.9	84.6

\*Trend data looks at grade levels across time.

**Cohort\*  
2007/2008 – 2010/2011**

Class of	Reading				Math				Science			
	07-08	08-09	09-10	10-11	07-08	08-09	09-10	10-11	07-08	08-09	09-10	10-11
2019 (3 <sup>rd</sup> in 2010)	NA	NA	NA	85.5	NA	NA	NA	78.6	NA	NA	NA	78.6
2018 (4 <sup>th</sup> in 2010)	NA	NA	74.3	81.0	NA	NA	74.2	78.6	NA	NA	77.2	78.5
2017 (5 <sup>th</sup> in 2010)	NA	80.5	74.0	69.6	NA	78.1	80.5	84.4	NA	70.7	76.1	71.7
2016 (6 <sup>th</sup> in 2010)	81.3	87.5	83.8	79.5	78.2	90.0	86.4	89.8	87.7	85.0	94.5	84.6

\*Cohort data follows the same class year after year as they travel through the grades.

**Low SES Students\***

Grade Level	Number of Low SES	Reading	Math	Science
3 Total N=42	20	80.0	75.0	70.0
4 Total N=42	18	77.8	61.2	83.4
5 Total N=46	13	69.3	84.7	61.6
6 Total N=39	13	69.3	77.0	69.3

\*These students receive free/reduced lunch

**All Students and FAY (Full Academic Year)\***

Grade	Reading		Math		Science	
	All students	FAY	All Students	FAY	All Students	FAY
3 All N= 42 FAY N=40	85.6	85.0	78.6	77.5	78.6	77.5
4 N=42 FAY N=36	81.0	80.6	78.6	75.0	78.5	75.0
5 N=46 FAY N=44	69.6	68.2	84.8	84.1	71.7	72.6
6 N=39 FAY N=36	79.5	83.2	89.8	94.4	84.6	89.0

\*FAY – All students who have been in the district from test date of 2008/2009 to the test date of 2009/2010

**MNW Jr/High School**  
**2010-2011 ITBS/ITED Results**  
**November 2010 Testing, Fall Norms**  
**Percent Proficient - 41<sup>st</sup> Percentile and Above (National Percentile Rank)**  
**Grades 7 and 8 – ITBS**  
**Grades 9, 10 and 11 - ITED**

**All Students**

Grade	Reading	Math	Science
7 N=55	72.7	92.7	90.9
8 N=41	63.4	73.1	80.5

Grade	Reading	Math	Science
9 N= 67	73.0	91.0	89.5
10 N=57	78.9	80.7	80.7
11 N=55	89.1	85.4	96.4

**Trend\***  
**06/07 – 09/10**

Grade	Reading					Math					Science				
	06-07	07-08	08-09	09-10	10-11	06-07	07-08	08-09	09-10	10-11	06-07	07-08	08-09	09-10	10-11
7	75.6	73.9	78.1	64.1	72.7	92.4	71.7	82.9	74.4	92.7	86.8	76.1	81.2	69.3	90.9
8	83.9	84.6	84.0	90.5	63.4	79.0	88.3	86.8	88.9	73.1	85.6	76.8	88.8	85.7	80.5

Grade	Reading					Math					Science				
	06-07	07-08	08-09	09-10	10-11	06-07	07-08	08-09	09-10	10-11	06-07	07-08	08-09	09-10	10-11
9	84.2	60.3	84.6	68.0	73.0	84.2	80.9	90.3	80.0	91.0	NA	82.5	92.3	89.7	89.5
10	74.6	88.6	75.0	83.0	78.9	80.2	88.6	80	85.0	80.7	NA	90.5	83.3	83.0	80.7
11	84.7	76.4	90.0	78.8	89.1	72	76.4	92.0	80.3	85.4	84.7	88.3	92.0	85.2	96.4

\*Trend data looks at grade levels across time.

**Cohort\***  
**06/07 – 07/08**

Class of	Reading				Math				Science			
	07-08	08-09	09-10	10-11	07-08	08-09	09-10	10-11	07-08	08-09	09-10	10-11
2016 (7 <sup>th</sup> in 2011)	88.2	81.2	75.4	72.7	92.2	91.5	85.0	92.7	92.1	91.8	84.9	90.9
2015 (8 <sup>th</sup> in 2011)	71.0	65.6	64.1	63.4	77.5	77.2	74.4	73.1	71.0	77.2	69.3	80.5

Class of	Reading				Math				Science			
	07-08	08-09	09-10	10-11	07-08	08-09	09-10	10-11	07-08	08-09	09-10	10-11
2014 (9 <sup>th</sup> in 2011)	71.9	78.1	90.5	73.0	86.1	82.9	88.9	91.0	76.6	81.2	85.7	89.5
2013 (10 <sup>th</sup> in 2011)	73.9	84.0	68.0	78.9	71.7	86.8	80.0	80.7	76.1	88.8	89.7	80.7
2012 (11 <sup>th</sup> in 2011)	84.6	84.6	83.0	89.1	88.3	90.3	85.0	85.4	76.8	92.3	83.0	96.4

\*Cohort data follows the same class year after year as they travel through the grades.

**All Students and FAY (Full Academic Year)\***

Grade	Reading		Math		Science	
	All students	FAY	All Students	FAY	All Students	FAY
7 All N= 55 FAY N=51	72.7	72.5	92.7	92.2	90.9	92.2
8 N=41 FAY N=39	63.4	61.5	73.1	61.5	80.5	82.1
11 N=55 FAY N=50	89.1	90.0	85.4	86.0	96.4	96.0

\*FAY – Students who have been in the district from test date of 2008/2009 to the test date of 2009/2010  
 Note: FAY data is not available for grades 9 and 10.

**Low SES Students\***

Grade Level	Number of Low SES	Reading	Math	Science
7 Total N=55	18	44.4	88.9	94.5
8 Total N=41	17	47.1	70.6	70.6
11 Total N=55	9	66.7	44.4	88.9

\*These students receive free/reduced lunch

## Another Look at Student Learning – Measures of Academic Progress (MAP)

The MAP test is a computer adaptive test which adjusts to the student's performance. Upon completion of the test, students immediately receive a RIT score. This score is not an achievement score, but instead measures where a student is instructionally. The RIT score has the same meaning regardless of whether a student is at the top, bottom, or middle of the RIT scale and it has the same meaning regardless of grade level. In this way the RIT scale measures how "tall" a student is on the curriculum scale.

The National Norms come from a 2008 norming study and include data from over 2.8 million students from over 6,900 schools in 1,123 districts located in 42 states.

The following charts show growth from fall of 2010 to spring of 2011, and compares MNW's growth to the other students in the nation.

<b>General Science Topics: Life, Earth and Space, Physical</b>				
	Fall 10		Spring 11	
Grade	National	MNW	National	MNW
3	191.0	189.8	196.3	194.7
4	196.6	196.1	200.9	198.2
5	201.1	199.4	204.9	204.4
6	204.4	207.8	207.0	211.3
7	207.7	213.7	209.6	218.2
8	210.5	212.2	212.6	211.1
9	212.4	216.0	213.3	216.7
10	214.9	218.1	216.8	218.6
11		220.0		221.8

<b>Reading: Letters/Words/Vocabulary, Literature, Informational Text</b>				
	Fall 10		Spring 11	
Grade	National	MNW	National	MNW
2	179.7	NA	189.6	187.5
3	191.6	190.3	199.0	200.7
4	200.1	199.7	205.8	203.2
5	206.7	204.1	211.1	210.2
6	211.6	210.4	214.8	217.6
7	215.4	218.3	217.9	223.4
8	219.0	216.7	221.2	212.3
9	220.9	220.6	222.6	222.0
10	223.9	227.3	225.4	225.0
11	225.2	228.0	225.6	228.2

<b>Science Concepts and Processes: Scientific Inquiry and Analysis</b>				
	Fall 10		Spring 11	
Grade	National	MNW	National	MNW
3	189.2	189.2	194.6	197.7
4	195.2	196.3	199.6	198.4
5	200.0	199.6	203.7	203.3
6	203.7	204.9	205.7	207.7
7	206.9	212.6	208.6	216.2
8	209.6	209.9	211.2	209.9
9	211.4	212.4	212.1	215.3
10	213.3	213.3	214.8	214.7
11		218.6		219.6

<b>General Mathematics: Numbers and Operations, Algebra, Geometry and Measurement, Data Analysis and Probability</b>				
	Fall 10		Spring 11	
Grade	National	MNW	National	MNW
2	179.5	NA	190.8	195.5
3	192.1	194.0	202.4	206.1
4	203.0	202.0	211.4	211.1
5	211.7	209.9	219.2	221.1
6	218.3	221.0	223.8	227.3
7	224.1	232.2	228.3	239.3
8	229.3	228.1	232.7	231.0
9	231.6	236.5	234.0	238.1
10	235.2	240.9	237.1	240.0
11	237.1	243.1	239.8	244.2

## BRI Results 2010-2011

(Basic Reading Inventory)

The Basic Reading Inventory is an individually administered informal reading assessment. It is given 3 times a year by the MNW assessment team. It is composed of graded passages and assesses the areas of Word Recognition (Accuracy), Fluency, and Comprehension. Teachers use the results for instructional decision making. They use the information from the assessment to aid them in forming small, flexible, reading groups, and to identify students for additional interventions or reading services through Title I Reading. It is not uncommon for fluency (measured as students read out loud) scores to go down as the students travel through the grades. It's important to note that comprehension remain high.

\*\*Proficient indicates students are working at or above grade level and includes:

1. Independent Level
2. Independent Instructional Level
3. Instructional Level

Note: Students read the same fiction passage for the fall and spring assessments.

### Percent Proficient

Grade 1 N=	Fall	Spring
Word Recognition	NA	89
Fluency	NA	NA
Comprehension	NA	81

Grade 2 N=48	Fall	Spring
Word Recognition	68	100
Fluency	90	88
Comprehension	50	92

Grade 3 N=43	Fall	Spring
Word Recognition	95	100
Fluency	79	86
Comprehension	81	93

Grade 4 N=41	Fall	Spring
Word Recognition	93	100
Fluency	78	83
Comprehension	90	98

Grade 5 N=46	Fall	Spring
Word Recognition	91	98
Fluency	41	51
Comprehension	92	89

Grade 6 N=39	Fall	Spring
Word Recognition	97	97
Fluency	67	59
Comprehension	77	92

## DIBELS

### (Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills)

What are Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills? The Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS) are a set of standardized, individually administered measures of early literacy development. They are designed to be short (one minute) fluency measures used to regularly monitor the development of pre-reading and early reading skills. Manson Northwest Webster gives the DIBELS assessment in grades K - 2.

The measures were developed upon the essential early literacy components discussed in both the National Reading Panel (2000) and National Research Council (1998) reports. These components include: 1) phonological awareness, 2) alphabetic understanding, and 3) automaticity and fluency. Each measure has been thoroughly researched and demonstrated to be reliable and valid indicators of early literacy development and predictive of later reading proficiency to aid in the early identification of students who are not progressing as expected. When used as recommended, the results can be used to evaluate individual student development as well as provide grade-level feedback toward validated instructional objectives. The following table shows the fall, winter and spring comparisons of the 2010-2011 school year.

**Dibels Results 2009-2010  
(Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy)  
Percent of Students Benchmarking**

Grade Level	Fall	Winter	Spring
Kindergarten	N=100  N=43	98  N=42	85  95 (includes "in the instructional zone") N=41
Grade 1	98  N=46	93  N=46	85  98 (includes "in the instructional zone") N=47
Grade 2	90  N=48	87  N=47	50  83 (includes "in the instructional zone") N=48

**N = number of students tested**

Notes in comparing DIBELS and BRI:

- Fluency is the only component of DIBELS measured on the Spring testing in grade 2
- The fluency criteria for BRI and DIBELS is different. For example, proficiency/benchmarking in 2<sup>nd</sup> grade for DIBELS is 90 wpm and BRI is 66 wpm.

**Manson Northwest Webster ACT Results  
2009-2010**

Year	Number Taking Test	Local	National
2007-2008	29	23.4	21.2
2008-2009	47	22.0	NA
2009-2010	33	22.5	NA
2010-2011	34	22.4	NA

\*Students who are going to college take the ACT test . The Iowa Postsecondary Success Indicator as identified by the Iowa Department of Education is a score of 20.

**Annual Student Achievement Goals**

**Grades 7-12**

Reading:

10<sup>th</sup> grade reading –

Following the Class of 2013, (9<sup>th</sup> grade in 09-10) the percent proficient in reading comprehension will increase from 68% in 2009-2010.

**Met goal: 78.9% proficient**

Science:

8<sup>th</sup> grade science-

Following the class of 2015, (7<sup>th</sup> grade in 09-10) the percent in science will increase from 69.3% in 2009-2010.

**Met goal: 80.5% proficient**

Math:

10<sup>th</sup> grade math -

Following the class of 2013, the percent proficient in math will increase from 80% in 2009-2010.

**Met goal: 80.7% proficient**

**Grades K-6**

Math:

4<sup>th</sup> grade Math -

Following the class of 2019 (3<sup>rd</sup> grade in 09-10) the percent proficient in Math will increase from 74.2% in 2009-2010. **Met goal:**

**78.6% proficient**

Reading:

Grades K-1

All classes in grades K-1 will increase the percent of students benchmarking from fall to spring on the DIBELs assessment.

**The benchmarking goal was not met. The results show Kdg decreased from 100% in the fall of 2010 to 95% in the spring of 2011, with 2 students not benchmarking. The 1<sup>st</sup> grade results remained at 98% with fall 2010 and spring 2011 assessment**

Grades 2-6

All classes, grades 2-6 will improve reading comprehension from fall to spring on the BRI assessment. (Move students out of the frustration level into the instructional or independent level).

**The reading goal of improving the comprehension component of BRI was met in 4 out of 5 grade levels.**

## Tracking our PreK12 Vision for Teaching and Learning 2010-2011

### *PreK12 Vision for Teaching and Learning*

*Manson Northwest Webster staff will actively engage all students in real-world, relevant, and academically challenging experiences in a safe and positive environment. Staff will share accountability for the learning of all students through professional collaboration, innovative thinking, and **the use of technology and research-based strategies.***

The PreK12 Vision for Teaching and Learning was created during the 2008-2009 school year with input from all staff members. The District Leadership Team feels strongly about the importance of this vision, and want to continue to monitor the progress of it as it impacts teaching and learning. The highlighted portion was the area of focus for the 10-11 school year. The district professional development was aligned by including inservices in technology and the research-based teaching practices identified in the Iowa Core called Characteristics of Effective Instruction. The following tables and descriptions show results of these 2 focus areas.

1) Technology –

- Survey results from staff, students, and parents
- Professional development details

2) Research-based Strategies –

- Professional development details

### PreK-12 Instructional Technology Integration Survey

The PreK-12 staff took an online technology integration survey in the Spring of 2011. There were 48/54 teachers who participated in the survey. Results in the first section can be compared to those of 2009-2010. Results are shown as percent of teachers responding.

**Technology Integration – PreK12 Staff  
Percent of Teachers Responding**

Questions	Rarely		Sometimes		Almost Always/Always	
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2009-2010	2010-2011	2009-2010	2010-2011
Each question included the starter, “In regards to technology in my classroom...”						
My classroom instruction includes student-centered, performance-focused learning.	18.7	4	44.3	42	37.2	54
My classroom includes flexible progression with multi-path options for student learning.	23.2	15	39.5	50	37.2	35
My classroom instruction includes media-rich, multi-sensory stimulation.	18.3	4	44.3	50	37.2	46
My classroom instruction includes learner-constructed knowledge from multiple information sources and experiences.	23.2	4	39.5	40	37.2	56
My classroom instruction includes student engagement in definition, design, and management of projects.	25.6	13	44.3	50	30.3	38
My classroom instruction includes collaborative work on authentic, real-world projects.	25.6	10	39.5	48	35.0	42
My classroom instruction includes creative thinking for innovation and original solutions.	18.3	15	51.2	48	30.3	38
My classroom instruction includes global expertise, information, and learning experiences.	30.3	10	41.9	77	28.0	13

Summary Notes:

The teachers’ responses to the questions above indicate there has been an increase in instructional technology integration. The results in 09-10 showed that an average of 25% of the PreK12 staff “rarely” used technology in the classroom. In 10-11, the same category of “rarely” used dropped to an average of 9%. Additionally, the “Sometimes” responses increased an average of 7.8% and the “Almost Always/Always” responses increased an average of 6.5%.

### Using Web 2.0 Tools and Social Networks - PreK-12 Staff

Developing a Personal Learning Network	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Almost Always/Always
I use social network connections professionally, such as Twitter to gather and share resources.	13	17	50	21

I use the following technology tools professionally. Check all that apply.	
Twitter	67
Online bookmarking tools such a Diigo or Delicious	44
Facebook	27
Blogs, Wikis	75
Information Feeds, such as RSS	33
Other	8
Not applicable – Don't use any	2

Summary Notes: A focus on Developing a Personal Learning Network (PLN) was a PreK-12 initiative. This initiative was suggested as a supplement to professional development and encouraged but not required. Responses from the survey indicate over 70% of teachers used social media to develop a PLN. While there are many social networking tools, those listed above were the ones that were suggested as possibilities for helping to develop a PLN. The most common social networking tools were Twitter, blogs and wikis.

### Student Instructional Technology Integration Survey

#### Technology Integration – Students Grades 7-12 N=258

Question	Daily	2-3 times per week	Once a week	1-2 times per month	Never
1. How often do you use technology at school (smartboard, computers, flipcams, etc)?	89	10	1	0	1
2. I use technology to learn skills in math.	16	24	26	15	19
3. I use technology to learn skills in language arts.	63	26	5	2	3
4. I use technology to learn skills in science.	21	29	24	14	12
5. I use technology to learn skills in social studies.	50	36	4	2	5
6. I use technology to learn skills in my elective courses.	38	35	11	4	12
7. I communicate and collaborate with others using technology (skype, email, twiducate, blogs, wikis, twitter, etc).	64	24	6	2	5
8. I use technology to find the information I need at school (google, internet search).	76	21	2	0	2
9. I use technology to create work and show what I've learned.	30	46	17	4	3

Question	A lot	Sometimes	A little	Never
10. I use technology within classrooms to help me connect to the world outside my classroom.	26	45	22	7
11. When you are at home, do you use the technology you've learned at school?	13	47	29	10

Question	I can use it without assistance	I need a little help	I need a lot of help	I cannot use it without help
12. How would you rate your overall ability to use technology?	56	41	2	1

Summary Notes: 2010-2011 was the first year students were surveyed about the use of technology in the classroom. The responses of students in grades 7-12 indicate technology was integrated more in Language Arts, Social Studies, and elective courses than in Math and Science. 71% of the students said they use technology 2-3 times per week or more to connect to the world outside the classroom and 68% said they use technology 2-3 times per week or more to communicate and collaborate.

**Technology Integration – Students Grades 3-6 N=156**

Question	Daily	2-3 times per week	Once a week	1-2 times per month	Never
1. How often do you use technology at school (smartboard, computers, flipcams, etc)?	82	12	4	1	0
2. I use technology to learn skills in math.	47	34	8	4	6
3. I use technology to learn skills in language arts.	33	42	17	4	4
4. I use technology to learn skills in science.	22	39	28	8	4
5. I use technology to learn skills in social studies.	44	35	16	4	2
6. I communicate and collaborate with others using technology (skype, email, twiducate, blogs, wikis, twitter, etc).	35	30	21	6	8
7. I use technology to find the information I need at school (google, internet search).	40	39	17	2	2
8. I use technology to create work and show what I've learned.	16	36	32	9	3

Question	A lot	Sometimes	A little	Never
9. I use technology within classrooms to help me connect to the world outside my classroom.	63	22	2	10
10. When you are at home, do you use the technology you've learned at school?	19	49	27	6

Question	I can use it without assistance	I need a little help	I need a lot of help	I cannot use it without help
11. How would you rate your overall ability to use technology?	53	40	6	1

Summary Notes: Students surveyed in grades 3-6 indicated technology was integrated the least in science. 85% of the students said they use technology 2-3 times per week or more to connect to the world outside the classroom and 65% said they use technology 2-3 times per week or more to communicate and collaborate.

NOTE: A low scoring area for all respondents in grades 3-12 was, "I use technology to create work and show what I've learned".

**Technology Integration – Parents N=50**

Question	Rarely	Sometimes	A great deal	Unsure
1. According to the overall feedback I receive from my child, I feel technology is integrated into most of my child's classes.	2	26	68	2
2. According to the comments my child makes and the discussions we have I feel most teachers, most of the time, use technology as tools for instruction.	4	34	56	4
3. According to the comments my child makes and the discussions we have, I feel the students themselves use technology for learning in most classes, most of the time.	8	38	46	6

Summary Notes: Most of the responses were from parents who had students in elementary. Parents feel that most teachers are using technology as a teaching tool more than students using it themselves for learning.

## Technology Literacy

2009-2010

All Iowa districts are required by the Iowa Code to report on the technology literacy of 8<sup>th</sup> grade students.

Manson Northwest Webster's Definition of Technology Literacy:

Technology literacy is the ability of individuals to responsibly use appropriate technology to: access, manage, integrate and evaluate information; construct new knowledge; and communicate with others to improve learning and acquire lifelong knowledge and skills.

Source: Iowa's Committee for Technology Literacy

The 2010-2011 8<sup>th</sup> Grade Technology Literacy results indicate that 93% of our 8<sup>th</sup> grade students are technologically literate. The assessments used to determine proficiency were, 1) an online survey written and distributed by Prairie Lakes AEA and 2) the district Technology Integration Survey. The results are based on data in the following areas:

- Basic computer use
- File management
- Word processing
- Email
- Computer devices
- Presentation and design
- Research and information searching
- Digital Citizenship – Responsible use
- 21<sup>st</sup> Century Skills use – communicating, collaborating, creating, connecting
- Overall ability to use technology

MNW continues to prepare students for life beyond our K-12 doors by focusing on using technology as a tool for 21<sup>st</sup> century learning. By aligning our classroom curriculum, instruction and assessment with the Iowa Core Curriculum, the scope of our assessment will broaden and the results will give a more comprehensive picture of what is happening in the classroom.

## Professional Development 2010-2011

The purpose of professional development at Manson Northwest Webster is to improve student learning by increasing teachers' knowledge and skills. As is stated in MNW's PreK Vision for Teaching and Learning, all staff are responsible for student learning. Therefore, the expectation is that 100% of the staff implement the professional development initiatives with fidelity to the research base. The long term comprehensive school improvement goals provide a guide for the professional learning.

- 1) All students K-12 will achieve at high levels in reading, math, and science and be prepared for success beyond high school.
- 2) All students K-12 will use technology in developing proficiency in reading, mathematics, and science.

The district's professional development plan is directly aligned with district priorities and school improvement goals, along with the PreK12 Vision, and the Iowa Core Implementation Plan. In addition, each building had a plan that is designed to specifically address building level needs as staff and administrators work to improve student achievement.

MNW follows the tenets of the Iowa Professional Development Model that is grounded in the learning community and operates under these four principles:

- 1) A clear focus on and alignment of curriculum, instruction, and assessment.
- 2) Collaboration and participation by all teachers in the planning and implementation increases the likelihood of success.
- 3) Strong leadership facilitates the engagement of all staff and supports the effort as a priority.
- 4) Simultaneity ensures that the focus remains on the major initiative while integrating content, context, and process.

**Manson Northwest Webster  
District Professional Development Plan 2010-2011**

Elementary, Grades K-6	Jr High/High School, Grades 7-12
<p>Data Summary: ITBS Reading, Math and Science scores are flat to slightly declining. Low SES continues to remain high in comparison. Average Dibels prof – 94%, Ave BRI prof – 94% MAP scores show adequate growth for the district as well as being above the National Norms Met AYP in all areas Additional data found in the Iowa Core Implementation Plan</p>	<p>Data Summary: ITBS/ITED ITBS Reading, Math and Science scores are flat to slightly declining. Low SES continues to remain high in comparison. The average ACT- 22.5. 8<sup>th</sup> grade Technology Literacy Assessment – 90% prof. All students enrolled in Reading Enrichment improved. Met AYP in all areas. Additional data found in the Iowa Core Implementation Plan</p>
<p>PD Target: 1. Increase student achievement in all areas by implementing the Characteristics of Effective Instruction of the Iowa Core Curriculum. The content will come from the Iowa Core sessions. 2. Integrate 21<sup>st</sup> Century Skills, including technology, into all classrooms and content areas. Skills include problem solving, creativity, innovation, communication, and collaboration. 3. Analyze and improve the implementation of the guided reading program and best practice strategies within to meet the needs of all students including those who struggle. The content will be delivered and supported by MNW’s elementary reading teacher.</p>	<p>PD Target: 1. Increase student achievement in all areas by implementing the Characteristics of Effective Instruction of the Iowa Core Curriculum. The content will come from the Iowa Core sessions and be delivered through an online Moodle class. 2. Integrate 21<sup>st</sup> Century Skills, including technology, into all classrooms and content areas. Skills include problem solving, creativity, innovation, communication, and collaboration. 3. Continue to develop and implement an RtI framework at the secondary level for the purpose of intervening with struggling learners.</p>
<p>Supplemental PD: Teachers will begin to develop Professional Learning Networks (PLNs) for the purpose of learning, sharing tools and strategies with educators across the globe. Tools include: Social Networks such as Twitter Bookmarking and sharing tools such as Diigo, Delicious Information Feeds such as RSS Web 2.0 Tools such as Blogs, Wikis, Podcasts, Screencasts And others</p>	<p>Supplemental PD: Teachers will begin to develop Professional Learning Networks (PLNs) for the purpose of learning, sharing tools and strategies with educators across the globe. Tools include: Social Networks such as Twitter Bookmarking and sharing tools such as Diigo, Delicious Information Feeds such as RSS Web 2.0 Tools such as Blogs, Wikis, Podcasts, Screencasts And others</p>
<p>Evaluation of PD: Teacher- 1. Principal walk-throughs 2. Teacher survey Students- 1. ITBS 2. MAP 3. Dibles 4. BRI 5. RtI data 6. Student survey</p> <p>In addition, the overall evaluation will be in part the continuation of the monitoring of our PreK12 Vision for Teaching and Learning. Data will be gathered in the form of walk-throughs and surveys. Portion of vision to be monitored:</p>	<p>Evaluation of PD: Teacher- 1. Principal walk-throughs 2. Teacher survey Students- 1. ITBS 2. MAP 3. Struggling students data (IRIS) 4. Student survey</p> <p>In addition, the overall evaluation will be in part the continuation of the monitoring of our PreK12 Vision for Teaching and Learning. Data will be gathered in the form of walk-throughs and surveys.</p>

<p><b>K-12 Vision for Effective Teaching and Learning</b>  <b>Manson Northwest Webster staff will actively engage all students in real-world, relevant, and academically challenging experiences in a safe and positive environment. Staff will share accountability for the learning of all students through professional collaboration, innovative thinking, and <u>the use of technology and research-based strategies.</u></b></p>	<p><b>K-12 Vision for Effective Teaching and Learning</b>  <b>Manson Northwest Webster staff will actively engage all students in real-world, relevant, and academically challenging experiences in a safe and positive environment. Staff will share accountability for the learning of all students through professional collaboration, innovative thinking, and <u>the use of technology and research-based strategies.</u></b></p>
<p>Inservice Timeline</p>	
<p>August: Review of Data, Iowa Core, Overview of CEI, PD Plan for 10-11          Sept: Technology, Student Centered Classrooms          Oct: All day, Alan November Conference          Nov: Technology, Student Centered Classrooms, EM Observations          Dec: Student Centered Classrooms          Jan: All day, Teaching for Understanding, ½ day wk day          Feb: Struggling Readers, Teaching for Understanding          Mar: Technology, Teaching for Understanding          Apr: Teaching for Understanding          May: Analyze data</p> <p>PD Support:          PLAEA for Iowa Core and Characteristics of Effective Instruction, Everyday Math Consultants</p> <p>Learning team structure will be used for collaboration, new learning and analyzing student results</p>	<p>August: Review of Data, Iowa Core, Overview of CEI, PD Plan for 2010-2011          Sept: Technology/21<sup>st</sup> Century Skills-Web 2.0 Tools in the Classroom          Oct: All day, 1:1 Conference          Nov: Technology/21<sup>st</sup> Century Skills-Web 2.0 Tools in the Classroom          Dec: Technology/21<sup>st</sup> Century Skills-Web 2.0 Tools in the Classroom          Jan: All day, Begin Moodle Class on CEI, ½ day wk day          Feb; Moodle Class on CEI          Mar: Moodle Class on CEI          Apr: Moodle Class on CEI          May: Analyze data</p> <p>PD Support:          PLAEA for Iowa Core and Characteristics of Effective Instruction, IRIS – Support for Struggling Learners</p> <p>Learning team structure will be used for collaboration, new learning, and analyzing student results. The Moodle course will take place in LTs as well as inservice</p>

**K-12 Professional Development Initiatives for 2010-2011**

1. Increase student achievement in all areas by implementing the Characteristics of Effective Instruction of the Iowa Core Curriculum. The content will come from the Iowa Core sessions.
2. Integrate 21<sup>st</sup> Century Skills, including technology, into all classrooms and content areas to improve student learning. Skills include problem solving, creativity, innovation, communication, and collaboration.
3. Teachers will begin to develop Professional Learning Networks (PLNs) for the purpose of learning, sharing tools and strategies with educators across the globe to improve teaching and learning.

Data analyzed to establish the need of these professional development initiatives include:

- ✓ ITBS/ITED
- ✓ Other district-wide assessments including Dibles, BRI, Reading Enrichment results, Tech Literacy results
- ✓ Iowa Core Implementation Plan
- ✓ Research and literature concerning 21<sup>st</sup> Century Learning
- ✓ PreK12 Vision for Teaching and Learning

This summary is organized and reported according to the data collected at each of the two buildings at Manson Northwest Webster as the staff studied and implemented the district initiatives.

- Elementary
- Junior High/High school

## **Elementary Professional Development**

The four areas of emphasis in professional development during the 2010-2011 school year were 1) Characteristics of Effective Instruction, 2) Technology Integration, and 3) Personal Learning Networks (PLNs). Specific to the elementary building also included 4) analysis of the K-6 reading program

### **1) Characteristics of Effective Instruction**

All five Characteristics were reviewed in August and then throughout the 10-11 school year, inservices focused on learning and implementing two of the Characteristics:

- Student Centered Classrooms
- Teaching for Understanding

**Content:** The content and resources for inservices came primarily from Iowa Core resources through Prairie Lakes AEA, Heartland AEA and the Iowa Core hashtag on Twitter.

**Implementation:** Approximately 125 walkthroughs/observations were conducted by administrators and teachers observing each other. The walkthrough tool was developed by the principal and focused on observable benchmarks under each of the Characteristics.

**Learning Teams:** Teams met monthly to review and discuss the teachers' observations, thus furthering their understanding of the Student Centered Classrooms and Teaching for Understanding.

### **2) Technology Integration**

One inservice was dedicated to Smart Board training to support the usage of the Smartboard technology in the classroom. The focus was on exploration, planning and implementation of this technology as a tool for learning and a resource to actively engage students. In addition, the expectation for implementing technology aligned with creating a Student Centered Classroom and Teaching for Understanding. Smartboards were installed in 100% of core classrooms, the vocal room and the preschool. The rest of the elementary rooms will have boards installed during the summer of 2011.

### **3) Personal Learning Networks (PLNs)**

Many teachers began exploring and learning about the benefits of professional social networking. Several developed connections with other educators around the state, country and the world for the purpose of learning and sharing resources. 100% of the elementary staff established Twitter accounts.

### **4) Analysis of the K-6 Reading Program**

The Building Leadership Team created a survey to analyze the Guided Reading Program. It was administered to all reading teachers in grades K- 6 and the results were analyzed by the reading teacher. It was determined that there was a need for a change in the K-6 reading program because: 1) ITBS scores were consistently low to flat, 2) all components of skill instruction within reading which includes comprehension, vocabulary, fluency, phonics and phonemic awareness (where appropriate) weren't consistent and articulated K-6 as well as within each grade level , 3) Guided Reading lacked a consistent framework for teachers to follow, and 4) very little writing was being done. As a result, the Daily 5 as an organizational reading framework was studied during inservices and staff meetings. Many teachers visited Daily 5 classrooms in Pocahontas and Jefferson, and participated in a book study on Daily 5. In addition MNW 5<sup>th</sup> grade teachers were trained in Daily 5 during the summer of 2010 and piloted the program during the 10-11 school year.

## **Jr/Hs Professional Development**

The four areas of emphasis in professional development during the 2010-2011 school year were 1) Characteristics of Effective Instruction 2), Technology Integration, and 3) Personal Learning Networks (PLNs). Specific to the jr/hs building also included, 4) struggling learners.

### **1) Characteristics of Effective (CEI) Instruction/Implementation**

All five Characteristics were reviewed in August and then during the spring of 2011, the 7-12 building spring professional development centered around the Characteristics of Effective Instruction. Teachers chose one of the three areas to emphasize in their classrooms: 1) Student centered Classrooms, Formative Assessment, or Teaching for Understanding. Teachers researched and learned about their chosen characteristic by reading the Iowa Core brief and supporting educational articles, and watching videos related to the topic. Teachers then implemented Quadrant D lesson plans that focused on their CEI trait. Their implementation also included technology integration.

### **2) Technology integration**

The first half of the school year was dedicated to technology integration. Inservice time was spent on learning, sharing, and implementing Web 2.0 tools. In addition, staff members in grades 7-12 attended and presented at two technology conferences. During the fall, the entire staff attended a regional technology conference at Newell Fonda. In May of 2011, a group of seven staff members attended the state wide 1:1 Conference in Des Moines. MNW staff members presented at both conferences sharing how they implemented technology as a learning tool within their classrooms.

### **3) Personal Learning Networks**

Many teachers began exploring and learning about the benefits of professional social networking. Several developed connections with other educators around the state, country and the world for the purpose of learning and sharing resources.

### **4) Struggling Learners**

A portion of each inservice was spent on the needs of struggling learners. A framework was established, implemented, and analyzed through the year to identify, support, monitor, and report the needs and successes of these students. The work was led by the IRIS team carried out by the whole staff in learning teams.

**Content:** The content and resources for inservices came primarily from Iowa Core resources through Prairie Lakes AEA, Heartland AEA and the Iowa Core hashtag on Twitter. In addition, support for struggling learners came through the grant from Iowa's Rapidly Improving Schools (IRIS).

**Implementation:** First and second trimester implementation data is available for Technology Integration and Characteristics of Effective Instruction in the form of walk-throughs, formal observations, and implementation logs/unit or lesson plans.

**Learning Teams:** During the 2010-2011 school year the learning team emphasis was on struggling learners and creating a system to support struggling learners. The goal as a 7-12 building was to create a system that would be in place for the 2011-2012 school which will allow staff to be more proactive in identifying and meeting the needs of struggling learners. The goal was met and the framework is ready to implement beginning the 2011-2012 school year. Work within The Iowa Rapidly Improving Schools (IRIS) Grant helped and supported this work.