# DODGE CITY MIDDLE SCHOOL DATA DRIVEN DECISION MAKING <br> 2009-2010 

## SUBGROUP DATA ANALYSIS

Analyzing subgroup information on at-risk students will allow Dodge City Middle School to answer questions such as, "What can our school do that will support students who are at risk?" The answer to the question would be to develop school improvement goals that provide academic support for atrisk students. Data analysis and tracking the school's progress in at-risk categories is one way our school can gage its progress on the effects it has on improving at-risk behaviors.


Number of Students by Grade SCORING BELOW AN OVERALL AVERAGE OF 2.0

| Grade | $\mathbf{2 0 0 7}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 8}$ | Dif | $\mathbf{2 0 0 8}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 9}$ | Dif | $\mathbf{2 0 0 9}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}$ | Dif |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Seventh | $(40) 9.6 \%$ | $(64) 15.50 \%$ | $-5.9 \%$ | $(64) 15.50 \%$ | $(88) 22.92 \%$ | $-7.42 \%$ |  |  |  |
| Eighth | $(55) 13.8 \%$ | $(88) 22.17 \%$ | $-8.37 \%$ | $(88) 22.17 \%$ | $(75) 19.04 \%$ | $+3.13 \%$ |  |  |  |
| Total | $23.4 \%$ | $37.67 \%$ | $-14.27 \%$ | $37.67 \%$ | $41.96 \%$ | -4.29 |  |  |  |

Number of Students ABSENT MORE THAN EIGHTEEN DAYS

| Grade | $\mathbf{2 0 0 7}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 8}$ | Dif | $\mathbf{2 0 0 8}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 9}$ | Dif | $\mathbf{2 0 0 9}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}$ | Dif |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Seventh | 20 | 119 | 99 | 119 | 26 | 93 |  |  |  |
| Eighth | 14 | 108 | 94 | 108 | 27 | 81 |  |  |  |
| Total | 34 | 227 | 193 | 227 | 53 | 174 |  |  |  |

Number of Students SCORING APPROACHING STANDARDS/ACADEMIC WARNING

| Subject | $\mathbf{2 0 0 7}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 8}$ | $\mathbf{D i f}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 8}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 9}$ | $\mathbf{D i f}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 9}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}$ | Dif |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Math 7 | $43 \%(173)$ | $54 \%(224)$ | $-11 \%$ | $54 \%(224)$ | $44 \%(160)$ | $+10 \%$ |  |  |  |
| Reading 7 | $24 \%(96)$ | $27 \%(112)$ | $-3 \%$ | $27 \%(112)$ | $24 \%(87)$ | $+3 \%$ |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Subject | $\mathbf{2 0 0 7}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 8}$ | $\mathbf{D i f}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 8}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 9}$ | Dif | $\mathbf{2 0 0 9}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}$ | Dif |
| Math 8 | $49 \%(190)$ | $53 \%(207)$ | $-4 \%$ | $53 \%(207)$ | $42 \%(163)$ | $+11 \%$ |  |  |  |
| Reading 8 | $36 \%(135)$ | $42 \%(163)$ | $-6 \%$ | $42 \%(163$ | $23 \%(86)$ | $+19 \%$ |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## CONTENT ANALYSIS (SEE CHART 2)

This type information would be valuable as baseline data to measure the effects of the school improvement plan as it is tracked from one year to the next. For example, if one of the goals for school improvement was to focus on learning achievement in low performance students, then a shift in the percentage of students scoring limited and unsatisfactory would be reduced.

A second type of data analysis tool is one that reports overall student performances in specific content areas. This type of chart reports test analysis on specific content areas as they are broken out under units of learning. The content analysis chart in Reading and Math Assessment Content Analysis Charts displays student proficiency percentages within specific reading or math content areas tested. The content analysis chart is helpful in identifying specific content areas that are consistently showing over time weakness in student performances within specific content areas of the curriculum. The benchmark for proficiency should be set at $70 \%$ for each content area.


## IDENTIFYING STUDENT PERFORMANCES IN KEY CONTENT AREAS

The identification and understanding of curriculum standards in terms of key content areas is an important process in the improvement of student learning. Developing technology tools to track how students are performing in specific content areas is one method in helping teacher's identity strengths and weaknesses in delivery choices. Such tools will allow teachers and principals to get answers about trends in content weakness and determine gaps in learning across specific subjects. One data analysis tool for tracking performance information would be to design a chart that specifies the percentage of students scoring in four quadrant ranges of specified abilities. Math and reading Standardized Achievement Range shows the percentage of students who are performing in a four quadrant range from advance to unsatisfactory on a standardized math assessment.

## MATH ( $\left.7^{\text {th }}\right)$ Seventh Grade: STANDARDIZED ACHIEVEMENT RANGE

| Year | Exemplary | Exceeds <br> Expectations | Meets Standards | Approaching <br> Standards | Academic <br> Warning |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2006 | $3 \%(10)$ | $12 \%(46)$ | $33 \%(124)$ | $26 \%(96)$ | $26 \%(96)$ |
| 2007 | $12 \%(46)$ | $16 \%(65)$ | $29 \%(116)$ | $26 \%(105)$ | $17 \%(68)$ |
| 2008 | $4 \%(17)$ | $14 \%(55)$ | $28 \%(114)$ | $24 \%(98)$ | $30 \%(123)$ |
| 2009 | $8 \%(29)$ | $18 \%(67)$ | $30 \%(108)$ | $20 \%(72)$ | $24 \%(88)$ |

MATH ( $8^{\text {th }}$ ) Eighth Grade : STANDARDIZED ACHIEVEMENT RANGE

| Year | Exemplary | Exceeds <br> Expectations | Meets Standards | Approaching <br> Standards | Academic <br> Warning |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2006 | $5 \%(19)$ | $13 \%(51)$ | $26 \%(100)$ | $26 \%(101)$ | $30 \%(115)$ |
| 2007 | $6 \%(25)$ | $17 \%(67)$ | $27 \%(103)$ | $24 \%(92)$ | $25 \%(98)$ |
| 2008 | $8 \%(33)$ | $14 \%(56)$ | $24 \%(93)$ | $21 \%(83)$ | $32 \%(124)$ |
| 2009 | $12 \%(46)$ | $19 \%(72)$ | $27 \%(104)$ | $18 \%(70)$ | $24 \%(93)$ |

MATH AYP: PROGRESS REPORT (2003-2009)

| YEAR | $\mathbf{2 0 0 3}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 4}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 5}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 6}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 7}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 8}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 9}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| TARGET | $\mathbf{4 6 . 8 \%}$ | $\mathbf{5 3 . 5 \%}$ | $\mathbf{6 0 . 1 \%}$ | $\mathbf{6 0 . 1 \%}$ | $\mathbf{6 6 . 8 \%}$ | $\mathbf{7 3 . 4 \%}$ | $\mathbf{7 7 . 8 \%}$ |
| All Students | $34.1 \%$ | $31.2 \%$ | $51.2 \%$ | $47.1 \%$ | $55.1 \%$ | $46.2 \%$ | $59.5 \%$ |
| Free Reduced | $24.7 \%$ | $22.0 \%$ | $42.5 \%$ | $40.3 \%$ | $47.2 \%$ | $39.7 \%$ | $54.6 \%$ |
| w/Disabilities |  | $13.5 \%$ | $59.1 \%$ | $23.2 \%$ | $28.3 \%$ | $17.6 \%$ | $22.3 \%$ |
| Ell | $25.8 \%$ | $10.8 \%$ | $30.2 \%$ | $40.5 \%$ | $41.1 \%$ | $42.6 \%$ | $47.0 \%$ |
| Hispanic | $25.6 \%$ | $19.9 \%$ | $45.0 \%$ | $40.2 \%$ | $48.8 \%$ | $42.5 \%$ | $55.4 \%$ |
| Whites | $50.4 \%$ | $51.8 \%$ | $62.2 \%$ | $63.0 \%$ | $73.0 \%$ | $59.7 \%$ | $78.3 \%$ |

* AYP Math Goal $2010=82.3 \%$ (All Students and Sub Groups Must Meet Minimum Standards of $70 \%$ )


## READING $\left(7^{\text {th }}\right)$ Seventh Grade: STANDARDIZED ACHIEVEMENT RANGE

| Year | Exemplary | Exceeds <br> Expectations | Meets Standards | Approaching <br> Standards | Academic <br> Warning |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2006 | $11 \%(42)$ | $19 \%(73)$ | $30 \%(111)$ | $16 \%(59)$ | $24 \%(90)$ |
| 2007 | $18 \%(71)$ | $26 \%(104)$ | $32 \%(129)$ | $14 \%(54)$ | $11 \%(42)$ |
| 2008 | $13 \%(52)$ | $29 \%(120)$ | $31 \%(129)$ | $13 \%(54)$ | $14 \%(58)$ |
| 2009 | $18 \%(67)$ | $28 \%(102)$ | $29 \%(107)$ | $15 \%(56)$ | $9 \%(31)$ |

## READING ( $\mathbf{8}^{\text {th }}$ ) Eighth Grade: standardized achievement range

| Year | Exemplary | Exceeds <br> Expectations | Meets Standards | Approaching <br> Standards | Academic <br> Warning |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2006 | $9 \%(34)$ | $21 \%(81)$ | $26 \%(101)$ | $19 \%(74)$ | $24 \%(93)$ |
| 2007 | $15 \%(56)$ | $18 \%(70)$ | $31 \%(118)$ | $20 \%(75)$ | $16 \%(60)$ |
| 2008 | $13 \%(50)$ | $23 \%(89)$ | $22 \%(87)$ | $19 \%(74)$ | $23 \%(89)$ |
| 2009 | $20 \%(76)$ | $27 \%(101)$ | $30 \%(111)$ | $14 \%(51)$ | $9 \%(35)$ |

READING AYP PROGRESS REPORT (2003-2009)

| YEAR | $\mathbf{2 0 0 3}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 4}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 5}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 6}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 7}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 8}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 9}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| TARGET | $\mathbf{5 1 . 2 \%}$ | $\mathbf{5 7 . 3 \%}$ | $\mathbf{6 3 . 4 \%}$ | $\mathbf{6 3 . 4 \%}$ | $\mathbf{6 9 . 5 \%}$ | $\mathbf{7 5 . 6 \%}$ | $\mathbf{7 9 . 8 \%}$ |
| All Students | $70.2 \%$ | $60.6 \%$ | $61.3 \%$ | $58.6 \%$ | $64.7 \%$ | $65.4 \%$ | $78.6 \%$ |
| Free Reduced | $67.3 \%$ | $52.7 \%$ | $53.9 \%$ | $51.9 \%$ | $57.6 \%$ | $60.1 \%$ | $75.7 \%$ |
| w/Disabilities |  | $48.9 \%$ | $72.4 \%$ | $25.5 \%$ | $9.4 \%$ | $27 \%$ | $44.2 \%$ |
| Ell | $74.5 \%$ | $42 \%$ | $34.8 \%$ | $51.2 \%$ | $50.1 \%$ | $60.2 \%$ | $66.7 \%$ |
| Hispanic | $66.3 \%$ | $51.7 \%$ | $51 \%$ | $52.3 \%$ | $59.0 \%$ | $61.9 \%$ | $75.1 \%$ |
| Whites | $76.5 \%$ | $74.8 \%$ | $81.7 \%$ | $73.7 \%$ | $77.9 \%$ | $76.9 \%$ | $90.2 \%$ |

[^0]
[^0]:    * AYP Reading Goal $2010=83.7 \%$ (All Students and Sub Groups Must Meet Minimum Standards of 70 \%)

