

Student Growth Objective Form

(DISTRICT-DEVELOPED SAMPLE SGO for ALGEBRA I-Agile Mind; 2 of 2)

Name	School	Grade	Course/Subject	Number of Students	Interval of Instruction
		9	Algebra I – Agile Mind		Sept. 2015 – March. 2016

Standards, Rationale, and Assessment Method

Focused Area: Mathematical Reasoning

Rationale: High school students should understand and use stated assumptions, definitions, and previously established results in constructing arguments. They make conjectures and build a logical progression of statements to explore the truth of their conjectures. They are able to analyze situations by breaking them into cases, and can recognize and use counterexamples. They justify their conclusions, communicate them to others, and respond to the arguments of others. They reason inductively about data, making plausible arguments that take into account the context from which the data arose. High school students are also able to compare the effectiveness of two plausible arguments, distinguish correct logic or reasoning from that which is flawed, and—if there is a flaw in an argument—explain what it is. High school students learn to determine domains to which an argument applies, listen or read the arguments of others, decide whether they make sense, and ask useful questions to clarify or improve the arguments.

Agile mind is an intervention program and spends time reviewing prerequisite material, particularly 7th grade standards. In 7th grade, Students extend addition, subtraction, multiplication, and division to all rational numbers, maintaining the properties of operations and the relationships between addition and subtraction, and multiplication and division. By applying these properties, and by viewing negative numbers in terms of everyday contexts (e.g., amounts owed or temperatures below zero), students explain and interpret the rules for adding, subtracting, multiplying, and dividing with negative numbers. They use the arithmetic of rational numbers as they formulate expressions and equations in one variable and use these equations to solve problems.

Standards:

- HS.C.5.5, HS.C.5.6, HS.C. 5.10-1: Given an equation or system of equations, reason about the number or nature of the solutions. Possible content connections: A.REI.5, A.REI.11
- HS.C.6.1: Base explanations/reasoning on the principle that the graph of all its solutions plotted in the coordinate plane. Possible content connections: A-REI-10
- HS.C.9.1: Express reasoning about transformation of functions. Possible content connections: F.BF.3
- HS.C.10.1: Express reasoning about linear and exponential growth. Possible content connections: F-LE.1
- HS.C.12.1: Construct, autonomously, chains of reasoning that will justify or refute propositions or conjectures about functions. Possible content connections: F-IF.8a
- HS.C.16.2: Given an equation or system of equations, present the solution steps as a logical argument that concludes with the set of solutions. Possible content connections: A.REI.1
- HS.C.18.1: Construct, autonomously, chains of reasoning that will justify or refute propositions or conjectures about linear equations in one or two variables. Possible content connections: A.REI.1, A.REI.3

Focused Mathematical Practice Standards:

MP 1: Make sense of the problems and persevere in solving them

MP 2: Reason abstractly and quantitatively

MP 3: Construct viable arguments and critique the reasoning of others

MP 6: Attend to precision

Assessment Method: Authentic Assessments (Assessment Portfolio) will be used as a tool to measure students' growth. The assessment portfolio incorporates carefully selected practice-forward tasks that reflect higher levels of cognitive complexity. All tasks included in the portfolio will be "practice forward" and rubric-scored.

Starting Points and Preparedness Groupings

Student tiers will be determined using a multiple data point system to develop a baseline index. Each tier will be assigned a target command level.

Data Measures used to Establish Baselines

- 2014-15 Average of unit assessments (40%)
- 2014-15 Average of SGO performance assessment (10%)
- 2014-15 Final Grade (10%)
- 2014-15 current year diagnostic assessment (40%)
- 2015-16 (September 8 – October 10) class attendance (see Rubric)

Preparedness Group	Baseline Score
Tier 1	< 0.35
Tier 2	0.35 – 0.55
Tier 3	0.55 – 0.75
Tier 4	> 0.75

Student Growth Objective

By March 2016, 70% of students in each preparedness group will meet their assigned target command level for full attainment of the objective as shown in the scoring plan.

Preparedness Group (e.g. 1,2,3)	Number of Students in Each Group	Target Command Level on SGO Assessment Portfolio
Tier 1		2
Tier 2		3
Tier 3		4
Tier 4		4 or 5 ¹

¹ It is expected that students in Tier 4 maintain a level of strong command or grow to distinguished command.

Scoring Plan

State the projected scores for each group and what percentage/number of students will meet this target at each attainment level. Modify the table as needed.

Preparedness Group	Student Target Command Level	Teacher SGO Score Based on Percent of Students Achieving Target Score			
		Exceptional (4) >80%	Full (3) 70-80%	Partial (2) 50-69%	Insufficient (1) <50%
Tier 1	2				
Tier 2	3				
Tier 3	4				
Tier 4	4 or 5				

Approval of Student Growth Objective

Administrator approves scoring plan and assessment used to measure student learning.

Teacher _____ Signature _____

Date Submitted _____

Evaluator _____ Signature _____

Date Approved _____

Results of Student Growth Objective

Summarize results using weighted average as appropriate. Delete and add columns and rows as needed.

Preparedness Group	Students at Target Score	Teacher SGO Score	Weight (based on students per group)	Weighted Score	Total Teacher SGO Score
Tier 1					
Tier 2					
Tier 3					
Tier 4					

Notes

Describe any changes made to SGO after initial approval, e.g. because of changes in student population, other unforeseen circumstances, etc.

Review SGO at Annual Conference

Describe successes and challenges, lessons learned from SGO about teaching and student learning, and steps to improve SGOs for next year.

Teacher _____ Signature _____ Date _____

Evaluator _____ Signature _____ Date _____

Class Attendance Baseline Rubric

Attendance Rate (September 8 - October 10)	Scores
≥ 94%	No points deducted from the student's original baseline score
< 94%	6% of baseline score will be deducted from the student's original baseline score

Note:

The attendance percentage of 94% was used as good average attendance for public schools, while 93-85 percent was used as needing improvement and 84 percent or below was used as poor attendance as defined by the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) 2001.

Reference:

1. Jones, J., (2006, April 7). The impact of student attendance, socio-economic status and mobility on student achievement of third grade students in Title I schools. Retrieved from: <http://scholar.lib.vt.edu/theses/available/etd04202006154606/unrestricted/jonesapproveddisse rtationsapr7.pdf>
2. Applegate, K. (2003). The relationship of attendance, socio-economic status, and mobility and the achievement of seventh graders (Unpublished doctoral dissertation), Saint Louie University, St. Louis, MO.
3. Ziegler, C. W. (1972). School attendance as a factor in school progress (Rev. ed.). New York, NY: AMS Press, Inc.