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1. **Discover** how fostering school leadership, supports, and systems help ensure growth of all learners.

2. Analyze equity data to ensure all students receive core, rigorous, quality instruction.

3. Learn practical action steps and resources aligned to the Ohio Improvement Process (OIP) that can be used to assist in ensuring rigorous instruction for all.

4. Learn how professional development is planned and implemented to support necessary outcomes for the adults.
Questions to ask your team...  
...in terms of our learning targets

1. How could we foster school leadership, supports, and systems to help ensure growth of all learners?

2. How is the school ensuring all students are receiving core, rigorous, quality instruction?

3. What information can we use for proactive, collaborative instruction for all learners aligned to Ohio’s Learning Standards?

4. Where do we start?
Questions during the presentation?

Join us at TodaysMeet

https://todaysmeet.com/progress
Hello
my name is

Your Role Matters!
A little about us:

Massillon Intermediate School

Massillon Junior High School
Our Schools’ Demographics

**MIS:**
- 900+ students
  - 10.7% African-American, non-Hispanic
  - 10.2% Multiracial
  - 16.9% SWD
  - 99.8% Econ. Disadv.
- 11% Chronic Absenteeism
- High Poverty Status
- 66+ teachers
- 8 Title 1 tutors
- 1 principal
- 1 assistant principal

**MJHS:**
- 600+ students
  - 9.6% African-American, non-Hispanic
  - 10.4% Multiracial
  - 21.4% SWD
  - 99.8% Econ. Disadv.
- 16.8% Chronic Absenteeism
- High Poverty Status
- 42+ teachers
- 1 principal
- 1 assistant principal
Our History

○ 2011-2013- transition to the OLS from OSS.
○ 2014-15- Systems and structures aligned to new standards; “co-labor”
  ■ 5 step process
  ■ Establish a vision
  ■ Establish building plan
○ 2015-16- Institute a focus on instructional practices for ALL learners in alignment to standards, assessment & instruction:
  ■ Implement the vision
  ■ Review and implement the building plan
  ■ Implement 5 step-focusing on implementation
  ■ Study and implement High Yield strategies
  ■ Recommit to PBIS
○ 2016-2017- Deeply implement and sustain systems, structures, and practices for all learners in alignment to school’s vision.
• Discover how fostering school leadership, supports, and systems help ensure growth of all learners.
• Discover how to foster school leadership and supports.
Who owns the progress of the school?

What is the leadership model of our schools?
DISCUSSION ITEM

How do schools get better?

Who owns the progress of the school?

What is the leadership model of our schools?
HOW DO SCHOOLS GET BETTER?
What does the research say?

• Establishing goals and expectations
• Resourcing strategically
• Ensuring quality teaching
• Leading teacher learning and development
• Ensuring an orderly and safe environment

--Student Centered Leadership, 2011
HOW DO SCHOOLS GET BETTER?

What does the research say?

- Establishing goals and expectations (0.42)
- Resourcing strategically (0.31)
- Ensuring quality teaching (0.42)
- **Leading teacher learning and development (0.84)**
- Ensuring an orderly and safe environment (0.27)

--*Student Centered Leadership, 2011*
LEADING TEACHER LEARNING AND DEVELOPMENT E.S.= 0.84

The impact of this leadership practice is 2X the effect of any other leadership practice!

This finding refers to the direct involvement of the principal in the professional learning of their staff.
INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP INCLUDES TWO COMPLEMENTARY APPROACHES AND BOTH ARE NECESSARY:

- A focus on classroom practice
- Shared leadership to create learning organizations

Leithwood and Seashore Louis, 2012
2 OVERALL FINDINGS

1. Collective leadership (collective capacity) has a stronger influence on student learning than any individual source of leadership.

2. Higher-performing schools award greater influence to teacher teams/TBTs.
School Leadership

Leadership

- Appreciation
- Strategy
- Humility
- Commitment
- Responsibility
- Listening
- Integrity
- Honest
- Communication
- Values
- Purpose
- Determination
- Passion
- Principles

TEAM
The Ohio Improvement Process
Teacher Based Teams:
• Use of data to assess the IMPACT of strategy(ies) on student learning.
• Action-research teams!
• Proactive planning
• Know thy impact?
• Changes for teaching?

Building Leadership Teams:
• Monitors
• Feedback
• Support
• Owns the progress/continual improvement of the school!

DLT-BLT-TBT
GROUPS OF TEACHERS, WORKING TOGETHER IN PURPOSEFUL WAYS OVER PERIODS OF TIME, WILL PRODUCE GREATER LEARNING IN MORE STUDENTS.
• Discover the system to help ensure growth of all learners (7).
The Process for **ALL** students!

1. Collaborative Inquiry System

![Diagram showing the Ohio 5-Step Process: A Cycle of Inquiry]

- **Step 1:** Collect and chart data
- **Step 2:** Analyze student work specific to the data
- **Step 3:** Establish shared expectations for implementing specific effective changes in the classroom
- **Step 4:** Implement changes consistently across all classrooms
- **Step 5:** Collect, chart and analyze post data
“Collaborative teams at the classroom instructional level that implement procedures for the effective use of data...
### Data System - What is your data system?

#### (RI 5.5 Structure)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>1(Above 100-99%)</th>
<th>2(Near 90-99%)</th>
<th>3(At 89-80%)</th>
<th>4(Below 89-79%)</th>
<th>1(Above 100-99%)</th>
<th>2(Near 90-99%)</th>
<th>3(At 89-80%)</th>
<th>4(Below 89-79%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dennis/All (39)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6 (15%)</td>
<td>15 (37.5%)</td>
<td>19 (47.5%)</td>
<td>20 (51%)</td>
<td>12 (31%)</td>
<td>7 (18%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis/SWD (6)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5 (100%)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houze/All (48)</td>
<td>8 (13%)</td>
<td>7 (15%)</td>
<td>12 (26%)</td>
<td>21 (47%)</td>
<td>24 (53%)</td>
<td>19 (42%)</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houze/SWD (8)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6 (100%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin/All (48)</td>
<td>5 (10%)</td>
<td>5 (10%)</td>
<td>11 (23%)</td>
<td>27 (56%)</td>
<td>25 (52%)</td>
<td>15 (31%)</td>
<td>7 (15%)</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin/SWD (15)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (7%)</td>
<td>2 (13%)</td>
<td>12 (60%)</td>
<td>7 (47%)</td>
<td>5 (33%)</td>
<td>2 (13%)</td>
<td>1 (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicholas/All (45)</td>
<td>4 (8%)</td>
<td>8 (17%)</td>
<td>20 (44%)</td>
<td>13 (28%)</td>
<td>28 (62%)</td>
<td>14 (31%)</td>
<td>3 (6%)</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicholas/SWD (5)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (20%)</td>
<td>4 (80%)</td>
<td>1 (20%)</td>
<td>2 (40)</td>
<td>1 (20%)</td>
<td>1 (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stitzel/All (45)</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
<td>3 (7%)</td>
<td>18 (40%)</td>
<td>23 (51%)</td>
<td>23 (51%)</td>
<td>12 (27%)</td>
<td>8 (18%)</td>
<td>2 (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stitzel/SWD (9)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 (22%)</td>
<td>7 (78%)</td>
<td>2 (22%)</td>
<td>5 (56%)</td>
<td>2 (22%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watkins/All (52)</td>
<td>19 (37%)</td>
<td>20 (38%)</td>
<td>9 (17%)</td>
<td>4 (8%)</td>
<td>20 (37%)</td>
<td>32 (60%)</td>
<td>2 (3%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watkins/Gifted (24)</td>
<td>12 (50%)</td>
<td>8 (34%)</td>
<td>2 (8%)</td>
<td>2 (8%)</td>
<td>18 (75%)</td>
<td>4 (17%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watkins/SWD (1)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals (278), (275)</strong></td>
<td><strong>37(13%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>49(18%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>85(31%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>107(38%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>140(51%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>103(37%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>28(10%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>5(2%)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Pre-Data**

**Post-Data**

ALL means ALL- Equity of Rigorous Instruction
## 2. Data System - What is your data system?

## 5.5 Text Structure

### Step 1: Collect and chart formative assessment data aligned to the standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Group</th>
<th># of students who took the assessment</th>
<th>Number of students who are above mastery 90-100%</th>
<th>Percent of students who are above mastery 90-100%</th>
<th>Number of students who are mastering and above mastery 80-89%</th>
<th>Percent of students who are mastering and above mastery 80-89%</th>
<th>Number of students who are near mastery 65-79%</th>
<th>Percent of students who are near mastery 65-79%</th>
<th>Number of students who are below mastery 0-64%</th>
<th>Percent of students who are below mastery 0-64%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All students</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students with disabilities</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifed</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 2. Data System - What is your data system?

### 5.5 Text Structure

**Step 5: Collect, chart, & analyze post data aligned to the standards.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Group</th>
<th># of students who took the assessment</th>
<th>Number of students who are above mastery 90-100%</th>
<th>Percent of students who are above mastery 90-100%</th>
<th>Number of students who are mastering and above mastery 80-89%</th>
<th>Percent of students who are mastering and above mastery 80-89%</th>
<th>Number of students who are near mastery 65-79%</th>
<th>Percent of students who are near mastery 65-79%</th>
<th>Number of students who are below mastery 0-64%</th>
<th>Percent of students who are below mastery 0-64%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All students</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students with disabilities</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifted</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Optional
3. Team Structure and Expectations - Disciplined Collaboration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monday</th>
<th>Tuesday</th>
<th>Wednesday</th>
<th>Thursday</th>
<th>Friday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Content (Steps 1-5)</td>
<td>Content (Steps 1-5)</td>
<td>Content (Steps 1-5)</td>
<td>SW initiatives</td>
<td>TBT/Principal Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Celebrations/successes &amp; OhioMeansJobs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Working on the Work**
4. Adult Metacognition for Improvement

TBT Self Reflections  TBT Walkthroughs  BLT Member Walkthrough

This process is for feedback and support!
4. Adult Metacognition for Improvement

Feedback Step 1: Collect and chart data to identify how students are performing/progressing *

Your answer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 1. Collect and chart data to identify how students are performing/progressing</th>
<th>Data is not assembled. A common pre-test/-formative assessment is not used. No rubric scoring guides exist.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Some teachers bring data to meetings. A common pre-test/ formative assessment is used inconsistently. There are rubric scoring guides with defined benchmarks, but not agreed to by all team members.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most teachers organize data prior to meeting using forms and protocols. Common assessments aligned to standards are given to ALL students at that level at least quarterly (e.g., SWD, EL, Title I). There are rubric scoring guides with defined benchmarks and agreed to by all team members.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All teachers organize data prior to meeting using forms and protocols. Common assessments aligned to standards are regularly given to ALL students at that level (e.g., SWD, EL, Title I). There are rubric scoring guides with defined benchmarks and used by all team members.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Step 2: Analyze student work specific to the data. *

Choose ↓

Feedback Step 2: Analyze student work specific to the data. *

Your answer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 2. Analyze student work specific to the data</th>
<th>Student work is not analyzed to identify learning needs. No process is in place to select the representative samples of student work. TBT makes little or no connection between data being analyzed and its connection to the building district strategies/ actions.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student work is analyzed for only an individual, student-by-student basis. No process is in place to select the representative samples of student work. TBT makes some connections between data being analyzed and its connection to the building district strategies/ actions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student work is analyzed for most groups of students. There is a process in place to select the representative samples of student work that is representative of most students. TBT makes many connections between data being analyzed and its connection to the building district strategies/ actions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student work is analyzed for all groups of students. There is a process in place to select the representative samples of student work that is representative of all students. TBT makes consistent connections between data being analyzed and its connection to the building district strategies/ actions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Massillon Intermediate School TBT Protocol

**Dates:** November 29 - December 1, 2016  
**Team:** 4th Grade Math  
**Facilitator:** Tricia Dempsey  
**Time Keeper:** Megan Williams  
**Recorder:** Tracy Jenkins, Kelly Giese  
**Participants:** Jen Wolgamott, Jenny Gotschall, Megan Williams, Tricia Dempsey, Kelly Giese, Tracy Jenkins, Josh Quinn, Tiffany Spaniak  
**Process Observers:** Jenny Gotschall and Jen Wolgamott  
**Norms:**  
1. Focused Agenda  
2. Show Up Prepared  
3. Positive Attitude  
4. Professional Respect  
5. Collaboration  

| Topic/Focus | Math pre-assessments aligned to the grade level CCSS standards, Grade 4  
| --- | ---  
| **Standard/Indicator/Skill:** | Math- 4th Grade Number Base Ten, 4.NBT.1-3  
| **CCSS.Math.Content.4.NBT.1** | Recognize that in a multi-digit whole number, a digit in one place represents ten times what it represents in the place to its right. For example, recognize that 700 ÷ 70 = 10 by applying concepts of place value and division.  
| **CCSS.Math.Content.4.NBT.2** | Read and write multi-digit whole numbers using base-ten numerals, number names, and expanded form. Compare two multi-digit numbers based on meanings of the digits in each place, using >, =, and < symbols to record the results of comparisons.  
| **CCSS.Math.Content.4.NBT.3** | Use place value understanding to round multi-digit whole numbers to any place.  
| **Unpacked Learning Target:** |  

5. Studying of Strategies for Impact
6. BLT Monitoring, Support, & Feedback

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monitored TBT: 5th Grade ELA</th>
<th>Communication to the TBTs/Reflection: BLT to TBT Feedback Protocol</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The purpose of the BLT is to support the teacher teams’ 5-step process implementation by:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Monitoring</td>
<td>- Providing support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Providing feedback</td>
<td>- Communicating</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Reflective Questions for BLT to consider:**
1. Did the team identify a priority standard or group of standards for its focus? Yes
2. Do the unpacked learning targets and sub-targets match the rigor of the standard? Yes
3. Are all parts of the standard represented in the sub-targets? Yes
4. Did the team implement a rigorous pre-assessment that aligned to the rigor of the standard/sub-targets? Yes
5. Did the team create a rigorous post-assessment that aligned to the rigor of the standard/sub-targets? Yes
6. Did the team identify students’ strengths and weaknesses and identify prioritized needs from the pre-assessment? Yes
7. Do the instructional strategies and activities support differentiated instruction and align to the expected level of rigor? Yes
8. Does the implementation describe specifically what will be done and who will be doing it? Yes
9. Did the team reflect on student growth? Yes
10. Did the TBT analyze the overall effect of the implemented strategies towards students with disabilities and other targeted students? Yes
11. Did the TBT examine the post-assessment to determine if it was aligned to the performance level descriptors/rigor of the standard(s)? Yes
12. Did the team reflectively communicate to the BLT? Yes

**Date:** 3/29/16
**TBT: 5th ELA**

**Strengths of TBT:**
Great job on step 4 “fidelity of the strategies,” use of work samples!
Nice job aligning each question on the assessment to standard and DOK.
Very nice job reflecting upon the strategies and then discussing next steps.

**Challenges of TBT:**
How do students use universal accessibility tools throughout the classrooms?

• How does your school provide grade-level feedback & support, regularly?
• How does your school measure its impact?
**Two-Way Communication**

6th ELA: Communication to the TBT/Reflection: BLT to TBT Feedback Protocol

The purpose of the BLT is to support the teacher teams' 5-step process implementation by:
- Monitoring
- Providing support
- Providing feedback
- Communicating

**Reflective Questions for BLT to consider:**
- Did the team identify a priority standard or group of standards for its focus? **YES**
- Do the unpacked learning targets and sub-targets match the rigor of the standard? **NO**
- Are all parts of the standard represented in the sub-targets? **We don't know.**
- Did the team identify students' strengths and weaknesses and identify prioritized needs? **YES**
- Do the instructional strategies and activities support differentiated instruction and align to the expected level of rigor? **No clear. See inquiries to TBT.**
- Does the implementation describe specifically what will be done and who will be doing it? **YES; step four was read to BLT.**
- Did the team reflect on student growth? **NA**
- Did the TBT analyze the overall effect of the implemented strategies towards students with disabilities and other targeted students? **NA**
- Did the team reflectively communicate to the BLT? **NO. This is an important step. Please complete during TBT time.**

**Date:** 10/27/15  
**TBT:** 6th grade ELA

**Strengths of TBT:**
- The preassessment data included 5th grade standard considerations.
- The standards were clearly indicated.
- Some of the preassessment data was high-knowledge.

**Inquiries of TBT:**
- What was the purpose of the graphic organizer chosen as a team?
- Have you considered choosing a single focus literacy or informational in one 5-step process?
- Would a shorter more focused assessment help with the student stamina?
- How do the levels levels correspond to AIR?
- Do students ever have choice in their graphic organizer? Do all students have to use a graphic organizer?
- How is the graphic organizer being taught by all teachers?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communication to the BLT/Reflection</th>
<th>Obstacles/Challenges</th>
<th>Support/Needed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strengths/Successes:</strong> The BLT had good instructional discussion for the 6th grade ELA TBT</td>
<td>Time-use only had 20 minutes to provide feedback. Some BLT members had to leave without reflection the BLT.</td>
<td>(Didn't discuss)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. Inclusive Practices Building Level Professional Development Plan

We believe in having our staff identify and discuss research and theory that supports the academic needs of all students.

Exit tickets and two-way communication will help plan our second semester after school Professional Development.

---

**MIS/MHIS DRAFT**

**2016-17**

**Inclusive Practices Professional Development**

**Description:** Below is a tentative plan for the year focusing on support and professional development to help grow all learners. Please contact administration if you have any question(s). For this school year, the focus will be to deeply implement and sustain systems, structures, and practices that have been created on for all learners in alignment to school’s vision.

- **June 1 and June 2, 2016:** Reading for all learners: Tier II support for Reading: Just Words (Orton-Gillingham/Just Words representatives)
  - Attendees: 4th and 5th grade teachers
  - Where: A.O.
  - Topic: Just Words
  - Time: 8:30-3:30 PM each day
  - Funds: Title 2A, $15/hour.

- **August 19, 2016 DISTRICT WIDE PD DATE**
  - Attendees: All MIS/MHIS staff
  - Where: WHS
  - Topic: TBD
  - Time: 8:00-3:00 PM.
  - Funds: N/A

- **September 21, 2016 (after school workshop)** - 2016-2017 Inclusive Practices Professional Development Plan-Instructional Shifts of Learning Standards and Plan Review (administration)
  - Attendees: All MIS/MHIS staff
  - Where: Library; class workrooms
  - Topic: Review the Professional Development Plan to support BLT plan
  - Time: After-school workshop
  - Funds: N/A
Celebrating Growth!
Instructional Leaders
Know Thy Impact!
“What is needed to ensure 90% implementation of effective Teacher Based Teams?”
Support the work!
• Analyze equity data to ensuring all students receive core, rigorous, quality instruction.
Equity of Education:

Where is your school?
DISCUSSION ITEM

1. **What data tells you about your kids?**
2. **What is equity data?**
3. **What does today’s quality instruction look like?**
Equity Data Sources to Review

- Equity Audit Data
- Value Added Data
- AMO Data (Safe Account)
- Discipline Data
- Attendance Data
What did our data say?

**Race – Achievement Data**

18. Reading and math achievement data comparing students of color with white students and report for each race:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ELA</th>
<th>Math</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>37.3%</td>
<td>56.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIS</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>51.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>47.5%</td>
<td>63.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Equity Data**

**AMO Data**
### School Progress/Value Added Data

#### MIS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Overall Value-Add Ed Grade</th>
<th>Gifted Value-Add Ed Grade</th>
<th>Lowest 20% Value-Add Ed Grade</th>
<th>SWD Value-Add Ed Grade</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>OAA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>OAA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>PARCC/AIR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-16</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>AIR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1516-Highest in History

#### MJHS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Overall Value-Add Ed Grade</th>
<th>Gifted Value-Add Ed Grade</th>
<th>Lowest 20% Value-Add Ed Grade</th>
<th>SWD Value-Add Ed Grade</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>OAA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>OAA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>PARCC/AIR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-16</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>AIR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How to close this gap?

1. Close the Implementation Gap (strategies)

2. What does the research support?
   a. TBTs
   b. Strategies
   c. Standards Aligned work, material, assessments

   • What we know:
   1. Varied achievement within student groupings positively impacts student achievement.
   2. The students who are isolated the most in ability groupings often are the furthest behind.


3. OLAC modules

4. Elise Frattura

5. Jon Saphier
• Learn practical action steps and resources aligned to the Ohio Improvement Process (OIP) that can be used to assist in ensuring rigorous instruction for all.
What does our Data tell us?

Using data protocols

Focus on Standards!

Focus on Performance Level Descriptors in connection to Step 2 to plan instruction!

Focus on strategy!

Are the Formative aligned to the rigor of the standard in which you expect for the summative?
• Learn how *professional development* is planned and implemented to *support* necessary outcomes for the adults.
1. Yearlong PD plan
   • Aligned to our schoolwide focuses

2. Embedded Support
   • Weekly TBT meetings

3. Outside Support
   • SST-9, OLAC, Battelle For Kids, Edcite, Achieve the Core, Readworks, NewsELA, Edmodo.
Resources to get you started:

Ohio Leadership Advisory Council (OLAC)

OLAC:
Meeting the Needs of Diverse Learners

OLAC:
Learning Supports

OLAC:
The Instructional Process

OLAC:
Teacher-Based Teams (TBTs):
What Districts need to Know
Leadership (TBTs/BLTs) created and fostered a: *School Wide Growth Mindset*

Centered on Rigorous instruction for ALL
THANKS

ANY QUESTIONS?

You can find us at:
@jarredzapolnik
@tmarti24

Jzapolnik@massillonschools.org
vlindsey@massillonschools.org
tfichter@massillonschools.org
sruss@massillonschools.org
ceturley@massillonschools.org
How did the changes impact student learning?

Trend data for School Progress (Value Added)
### Progress-Value Added

#### MIS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>OVERALL VALUE-ADDED GRADE</th>
<th>GIFTED VALUE-ADDED GRADE</th>
<th>LOWEST 20% VALUE-ADDED GRADE</th>
<th>SWD VALUE-ADDED GRADE</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>OAA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>OAA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>PARCC/AIR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-16</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>AIR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### MJHS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>OVERALL VALUE-ADDED GRADE</th>
<th>GIFTED VALUE-ADDED GRADE</th>
<th>LOWEST 20% VALUE-ADDED GRADE</th>
<th>SWD VALUE-ADDED GRADE</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>OAA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>OAA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>PARCC/AIR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-16</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>AIR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How are we performing in the County?

2015-16 Comparison
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>Gifted</th>
<th>Lowest 20</th>
<th>SPED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Louisville Middle</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Canton-Orchard Hill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Canton</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwest</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Canton-Greentown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermed.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canton Local</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Canton-Middle School</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandy Valley</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canton City-Arts Academy</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canton City-Lehman</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIS</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MJHS</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canton City-Hartford</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuslaw</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canton City-Crenshaw</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alliance Middle</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown (Malvern)</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairless Middle</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How are we performing vs. comparable schools in Ohio?

2015-16 Comparison
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>ELA Comparison Schools Ranking</th>
<th>Math Comparison Schools Ranking</th>
<th>Composite Schools Ranking (Math/ELA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MIS</td>
<td>#14 of 23 schools! (-4.7 Ave. Growth Index)</td>
<td>#2 of 23 schools! (6.6 Ave. Growth Index)</td>
<td>#8 of 23 schools! (0.6 Ave. Growth Index)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MJHS</td>
<td>#4 of 25 schools! (2.5 Ave. Growth Index)!</td>
<td>#13 of 25 schools! (-1.5 Ave. Growth Index)!</td>
<td>#10 of 25 schools! (1.0 Ave Growth Index)!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: [https://ohiova.sas.com/](https://ohiova.sas.com/)

See attached Composite (ELA/Math) rankings, ELA rankings, and Math rankings for both MIS and MJHS!
1. **Discover** how fostering school leadership, supports, and systems help ensure **growth of all learners**.

2. Analyze equity data to ensuring all students receive core, **rigorous, quality instruction**.

3. Learn practical action **steps and resources aligned** to the Ohio Improvement Process (OIP) that can be used to assist in ensuring rigorous instruction for all.

4. Learn how **professional development** is planned and implemented to support necessary outcomes for the adults.
Special thanks to all the people who made and released these awesome resources for free:

- MIS Staff
- MJHS Staff
- OLAC (http://www.ohioleadership.org/)
- Battelle for Kids:
  - Value Added
  - Formative Instructional Practices