Student Growth Objective Form



(DISTRICT-DEVELOPED SAMPLE SGO for Geometry; 1 of 2)

Name	School	Grade	Course/Subject	Number of Students	Interval of Instruction
		10-12	Geometry		Sept. 2015 –Mar. 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.

Standards:

- Apply geometric reasoning in a coordinate setting, and/or use coordinates to draw geometric conclusions. Possible content connections: G.GPE.4, G.GPE.5, G.GPE.6, G.GPE.7
- Construct, autonomously, chains of reasoning that will justify or refute geometric propositions or conjectures. Possible content connections: G.SRT.1, G.SRT.2, G.SRT.3, G.SRT.4, G.SRT.5, G.CO.1, G.CO.2, G.CO.3, G.CO.4, G.CO.5, G.CO.6, G.CO.7, G.CO.8, G.CO.9, G.CO.10, G.CO.11, G.CO.12, G.CO.13
- Present solutions to multi-step problems in the form of valid chains of reasoning, using symbols such as equal signs, or identify or describe errors in solutions to multi-step problems and present corrected solutions.
 Possible content connections: G.SRT.6, G.SRT.7, G.SRT.8

Focused Mathematical Practice Standards:

MP 1: Make sense of 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	Number of Students in Each	Target Command Level on SGO
(e.g. 1,2,3)	Group	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	Teacher SGO Score Based on Percent of Students Achieving Target Score			
	Command Level	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 C Administrator approves	Growth Objective scoring plan and a	e ssessment used to	measure student le	arning.	
Teacher	Signature			Date Submitted	
Evaluator	Signature			Date Approved	
Results of Student Gr	owth Objective				
Summarize results using	weighted average	as appropriate. De	elete and add colum	nns and rows as nee	eded.
Preparedness Group	Score	Score	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	

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:

- 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: <u>http://scholar.lib.vt.edu/theses/available/etd04202006154606/unrestricted/jonesapproveddisse</u> <u>rtationsapr7.pdf</u>
- 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.