**Team Final Report on Teacher and Student Learning**

**Teacher(s)/School:** Sheridan Preparatory Academy – Kindergarten Team

**SUNY Oswego faculty member:** Dr. Barbara Beyerbach

**Teacher Participant Names:** Emily Goodreau, Charlotte Miecznikowki, Tara Allen

**Course Name & Academic Year:** EDU 505-Formative Assessment to meet CCLS 2013-2014

Please answer the following questions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please update us on any changes you made to your team action plan:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We primarily assessed writing numbers 0-20. We did this as a pre-assessment and then decided upon ways to best teach the numbers that were difficult for our students. We did two assessments (a pre and a post) assessing all numbers at one time and it was given whole group.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Analysis of Data on Teacher Learning:** We examined our reflections on the 6 shifts, and CCLS and found the following: (Support each claim with examples/evidence)

- We need to have more adequately looked at the modules to see that numbers 11-20 were not taught consecutively with numbers 0-10. This skewed our data because most students were able to write numbers 0-10 at the pre-assessment because they were taught those but were unable to write numbers 11-20 because they were not being taught until a later module.
- Numbers 0-10 need to be and will be taught in the unit directly before numbers 11-20.
- More weekly/daily number writing needs to be done.
- Hundreds charts need to be used more.
- Collaboration to plan lessons based on the curriculum map that will be used next year.

**Analysis of Data on Student Learning:** We examined the Post- assessment results and found the following: (Give examples/evidence for each claim).

- Most students were able to write 0-20 with less than five mistakes and reversals. (We did not count reversals(backwards numbers) wrong, but did count 71 instead of 17 wrong, for example.
- Most students were able to get to 20. If there were mistakes, it was either numbers out of order(ex: 18, 17 or the whole number reversal, as mentioned above)
Please answer the following questions:

Please update us on any changes you made to your team action plan:

Our action plan remained the same. We are tracking the progress of our students as they work through math application problems. The students are asked to complete a read, draw, and write activity with multistep math questions. To see if students become more adept at solving the problems with familiarity and practice with the format and expectations.

Analysis of Data on Teacher Learning: We examined our reflections on the 6 shifts, and CCLS and found the following: (Support each claim with examples/evidence)
The dual intensity and applications remain challenging shifts for our students. Even when the math is basic assimilating words (reading and/or listening) multi steps, and math concepts combined together is very challenging.
One of our more recent application problems, based on measurement, asked students to put in order 3 different sized objects and then to make comparison statements about the objects. The challenge for the students wasn’t comparing the objects (the focus skill) it was drawing the objects appropriately. (see attached). The students need the directions broken down into segmented step by step directions.

Analysis of Data on Student Learning: We examined _Math Application Problems_ and found the following: (Give examples/evidence for each claim).
-Multi step problems are challenging for our students.
-Students have difficulty verbalizing their thinking about how they solve problems.

Careful, frequent modeling of thinking strategies and explaining different approaches to problem solving are necessary for students to explain their thinking. Breaking down multistep problems before building them back up, is necessary for developing the ability to grasp multistep directions.

Our hypothesis is that children of poverty may be less inclined to succeed at this type of problem as their life skills have taught them to react immediately (fight or flight) so instead of listening to the entire situation and breaking it down into segments, they react to the first statement and loose the ability to focus on subsequent directions.
**Teacher(s)/School:** Sheridian Prep. Academy – 2nd Grade Team  
  
**SUNY Oswego faculty member:** Barbara Beyerbach  
  
**Teacher Participant Names:** Lakesia Chalmers, Melissa Maioriello, Amanda Anderson  
  
**Course Name & Academic Year:** Math Standards 2013 – 2014  

Please answer the following questions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please update us on any changes you made to your team action plan:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We focused on:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RL 2.1 (Narrative Elements of a story – who, what, when, where, why and how)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RL 2.3 (How characters respond to major events—Character Traits)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RI 2.9 (Compare and Contrast)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Analysis of Data on Teacher Learning:** We examined our reflections on the 6 shifts, and CCLS and found the following: (Support each claim with examples/evidence)

We examined our reflections on the 6 shifts, and the CCLS and found that shift 5-writing from sources really impacted the students’ learning with CCLS RI 2.9. The students had to compare and contrast two similar texts (*Sit in: How Four Friends Stood Up, and Freedom on the Menu*) and use evidence from the texts to support their answers. This pushed student learning to a higher level.

As we reflected we also noticed that shift 4 - text based answers was prevalent in our teaching. Students engaged in rich, rigorous evidence based conversations about the texts such as *Julius, Baby of the World, Lilly’s Purple Plastic Purse, and Chirsanthum*. The students were able to identify character traits of the characters, and discuss evidence to support their thinking.

**Analysis of Data on Student Learning:**

Please see the attached power point.
Please answer the following questions:

Please update us on any changes you made to your team action plan:

No changes were made to our team action plan.

Analysis of Data on Teacher Learning: We examined our reflections on the 6 shifts, and CCLS and found the following: (Support each claim with examples/evidence)

- We need to use more nonfiction texts to address the CCLS during instruction based on the data.
- We need to provide more opportunities for the students to generalize the skill throughout the day.
- We need to provide a different, modified instructional plan for the students who were far to go but not likely/intervention group based on the whole year’s data trend.
- We need to continue this process next year based on the positive results for students.
- We need to build more team planning time to address the needs of the students and the CCLS.

Analysis of Data on Student Learning: We examined the formative assessment results and found the following: (Give examples/evidence for each claim).

- Most students were able to learn using direct, explicit instruction.
- Students need more opportunities to complete graphic organizers based on the error analysis.
- Students’ progress and motivation to learn improved once goal setting was introduced.
- Students who fell in the far to go but not likely/intervention group did not make much progress in the targeted skill.
Teacher(s)/School: Sheridan Preparatory Academy – 4th & 5th Grade Team

SUNY Oswego faculty member: Barbara Beyerbach

Teacher Participant Names: Carol Villeneuve, Caryn Dwyer, Mary Williams, Krista Rinaldo

Course Name & Academic Year: EDU 50S Formative Assessment to meet CCLS

Please answer the following questions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please update us on any changes you made to your team action plan:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There were no changes made.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analysis of Data on Teacher Learning: We examined our reflections on the 6 shifts, and CCLS and found the following: (Support each claim with examples/evidence)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We use the book <em>Classroom Discussions</em> to teach, model and guide our students to engage in meaningful math discussions. We developed anchor charts that reinforced math talk with specific “Math Talk Moves” as described in the text. We researched various strategies to implement “Math Talk” during our instruction. Students were given a weekly “Math Talk” checklist in order to monitor and self-assess their use of “Math Talk Moves”. We found that students that engaged in math talk, using the math talk moves were more engaged, motivated and generally demonstrated higher levels of success than those who did not.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analysis of Data on Student Learning: We examined exit tickets, written statements, math posters, Math Talk Checklists and observations during lessons, and found the following: (Give examples/evidence for each claim).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As the use of Math Talk became a part of the culture of our classrooms students soon carried this accountable talk over to other academic areas as well as during their time with other teachers including reading and math interventionists. Several of our students made measureable gains on their NWEA math assessment from fall to spring. Students who regularly demonstrated the use of math talk generally demonstrated higher levels of growth on the assessment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>