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 Modeling

Rationale:
Students will apply the mathematics they know to solve problems arising in everyday life, society and the workplace. They are able to identify important quantities in a practical situation and map their relationships using mathematical tools. They can analyze those relationships mathematically to draw conclusions. They routinely interpret their mathematical results in the context of the situation and reflect on whether the results make sense, possibly improving the model if it has not served its purpose.
Students also will notice if calculations are repeated, and look both for general methods and for shortcuts. They maintain oversight of the process, while attending to the details. They continually evaluate the reasonableness of their intermediate results. In high school PARCC assessment, at least 30% of total score points are items assessing application.

Standards:

- HS.D.2-5 Solve multi-step contextual word problems with degree of difficulty appropriate to the course, requiring application of course-level knowledge and skills. Possible content connections: A-CED.1, 2, 3, N-Q.1, 2, A-SSE.3, A-REI.6, A-REI.12, A-REI.11-2, limited to linear equations and exponential equations with integer exponents
- HS.D.2-6 Solve multi-step contextual word problems with degree of difficulty appropriate to the course, requiring application of course-level knowledge and skills. Possible content connections: A-CED.1, 2, 3, N-Q.1, 2, A-SSE.3, A-REI.6, A-REI.12, A-REI.11-2, limited to linear and quadratic functions.
- HS.D.2-8 Solve multi-step contextual word problems with degree of difficulty appropriate to the course, requiring application of course-level knowledge and skills. Possible content connections: F-BF.1a, F-BF.3, A-CED.1, A-SSE.3, F-IF.4, 5, 6, F-IF.7, limited to linear functions and exponential functions with domains in the integers.
- HS.D.2-9 Solve multi-step contextual word problems with degree of difficulty appropriate to the course, requiring application of course-level knowledge and skills. Possible content connections: F-BF.1a, F-BF.3, A-CED.1, A-SSE.3, F-IF.4, 5, 6, F-IF.7, limited to linear and quadratic functions.
- HS.D.3-3 Reasoned estimates: Use reasonable estimates of known quantities in a chain of reasoning that yields an estimate of an unknown quantity.

Focused Mathematical Practice Standards:
MP 1: Make sense of the problems and persevere in solving them
MP 2: Reason abstractly and quantitatively
MP 4: Model with mathematics

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/jonesapproveddissertationsapr7.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.