The intervention plan.

- Consistent, districtwide math advancement plan
- Fully redesigned Carnegie curriculum; increased focus on key standards and cohesive topic sequencing in grades 6-8
- Alignment of grading/expectations across all RLS math classes
- Student goal-setting meetings based on MAP results
- All grades beginning the year with a Week of Inspirational Math and a growth mindset focus
- Common block collaboration period for all math teachers
- New intervention structure
Purpose of strategies implemented:

❖ Math would be more focused and better aligned as students matriculated through the grades
❖ Math teachers would be able to support each other and teach with an understanding of the full math continuum
❖ Students would receive “just in time” flexible intervention based on data
❖ Students would not be assigned to a math support class indefinitely
❖ Students needing support would not feel singled out or embarrassed
❖ Students would display a more positive mindset towards mathematics
The outcomes...


... exceeded our expectations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Proportional Relationships</th>
<th>Graph Proportional Relationships</th>
<th>Derive the equation of a line (Bonus)</th>
<th>This test average</th>
<th>1st Trimester Assessment Average</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A*</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>-5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>87.50%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>33.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F*</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>-4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>78.30%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>21.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I*</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = Special Education Resource Student
Grades vs CAASPP

All three math teachers collaboratively agreed to adopt grading policies that emphasize mastery (with support) instead of completion. This has provided data-driven grades that are better aligned with student understanding.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Math CAASPP: Percent exceeded or met</th>
<th>16-17 Grades: Percent of students with A or B</th>
<th>17-18 Grades: Percent of students with A or B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sixth</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seventh</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eighth</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Multiple Student Groups Are Positively Affected

- AVID students from all grades, backgrounds, abilities, parent education levels and incomes are reached through tutorials.
- Resource students are given additional, targeted math support weekly during Learning Center.
- Students in general math classes at all grade levels receive the quiet support of an additional math teacher.
- Throughout the year, ANY student at ANY level can be included in brief, strategic math support sessions as determined by data, teacher formative assessment, or student request.
…students have commented on how they like the course and like the flexibility to be there for a short period of time before returning to the other electives.

I get a lot from going to Margie’s advanced. She and I can collaborate on the spot about the problems offered in the lesson, and I get a chance to see how her advanced kids approach the same concepts that my grade-level kids are working on.

It [is] beneficial for me … to be able to work one-on-one with this group [Learning Center], as well as frontload upcoming concepts.

Being in Avid tutorials has helped me to see where students are getting stuck, as well as how they work together to grasp the concept.

Having Deb in my class twice a week helps me because she sometimes finds a different way to explain a concept if they are struggling.
Key Success Factors

- The teacher who pushes in is a MATH teacher
- Allows relationship building: students are with their current math teacher, plus either a prior or future math teacher
- Increases both the amount of students on task and time on task
- Students are selected for targeted intervention based on data
- Provides a taste of success for students to build on – growth mindset – I can do this!!
Challenges

After seeing the success of the SHHS intervention trial last year, we attempted to create a similar program for RLS to serve students flexibly and immediately. We succeeded in this endeavor without being afforded an additional FTE, but that has created some challenges:

➢ The math teacher is pulled out of the enrichment/intervention rotation, which causes the remaining classes to be significantly larger than is optimal.

➢ There are now two teachers to teach three classes, which creates a challenge in the third trimester and requires teachers to develop additional curriculum mid-year.

➢ Teachers agreed to pilot the math intervention system this year, but its sustainability is in question due to the increased class sizes and teacher shortage it creates.
Additional Challenges

➢ Increasing English Learner population and needs

➢ Ensuring optimum utilization and consistent maintenance of the new Makerspace

➢ Providing increased access to creative technology through the enrichment rotation

➢ Need for a consistent intervention program

➢ Continued need for sections to support math, EL, and reading intervention

➢ Difficulty in sharing 0.8 band teacher with SHES due to conflicting schedules
Recommendations for Next Steps

Increase staffing to allow for the following:

1) Continuation of the math intervention program
2) Increased support for English Language Learners
3) A cohesive reading intervention program
4) The addition of Makerspace to the enrichment program
5) Appropriate and consistent maintenance of Makerspace and supplies
6) Decrease in enrichment class sizes
7) Three discrete enrichment classes to fully support the rotation
8) More effective use of the shared band teacher
Questions?