Penfield Montessori Academy

Annual School Growth Plan & Report

Year: 2017-2018

PREPARED FOR

Office of Charter Schools
University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee

School Profile

- **School Name:** Penfield Montessori Academy
- **School Address:** 1441 N. 24th Street, Milwaukee, WI 53205
- **Grades Served:** K3, K4, K5, 1st
- **Board President:** Christine P. Holmes
- **School Leader:** Kathleen Ronco

- **Describe the major emphasis of the school:** Penfield Montessori Academy is a fully-inclusive public Montessori charter school for students of all abilities. The school provides a rich and challenging environment, which allows students to realize their full potential – academically, emotionally, and socially – in a safe, supportive, and culturally diverse setting. The school serves students who are typically developing, those with high-needs, those living in poverty, those with current or past trauma experiences, and members of many different ethnic and economic groups.

  Penfield Montessori uses a comprehensive model to ensure students benefit from the culture, support services, partnerships, and family and community engagement offered at the school. The school leadership team will partner with academic institutions to create an educational model that will serve as a teaching, training, and research facility. Along with serving the educational needs of students, Penfield Montessori strives to meet the health and wellness needs of typically developing students, as well as those with significant medical and/or developmental needs through the school's association with Penfield Children's Center. Currently, Penfield Montessori partners with Penfield Children's Center to provide physical therapy, behavior therapy, nursing and administrative support.

- **Describe the school's educational program:** Penfield Montessori Academy's educational program is guided by the work of Dr. Maria Montessori. Each multi-age classroom is led by a Montessori-trained teacher and includes a full set of Montessori materials. Through hands-on and concrete experiences in the Montessori classroom, students acquire an independent sense of self, the ability to communicate accurately and precisely, in-depth experience with math and all its operations, and the ability to read and write. Students also learn to work and function both independently and collaboratively in a diverse community while developing social and emotional skills, responsibility, and compassion for one's self and others.

At-a-Glance School Performance Framework Data

Priority Area(s) of Growth: (Check the priority area(s) in need of greatest growth)
___ Student Achievement - Performance on State Assessment in reading and/or math
X   Student RIT Growth Targets - Improvement over time on MAP Assessment in reading and/or math
___ Student RIT Growth for Significant Sub-groups – Student subgroups closing gaps in reading and/or math
___ Student Post-Secondary Readiness – Performance in attendance and graduation

1.0 Annual School Growth Goals

Annual school growth goals flow from the strategic goals, as well as, analysis of academic performance framework results and identify improvement efforts to be undertaken during the fiscal year. The school should have **three to five** measurable goals including at least one reading goal and one math goal.

1.1 (required)

Annual Growth Goal: Increase the number of students at or above expected grade level in Reading from 18% to 25% by spring 2018.				
Background Data Analysis:				
SPRING 2017 MAPS READING SCORES		**Entire K5**	**Special Education**	**Regular Education**
Significantly below expected grade level		47% (8 students)	75% (6 students)	22% (2 students)
Slightly below expected grade level		35% (6 students)	12.5% (1 student)	56% (5 students)
At or above expected grade level		18% (3 students)	12.5% (1 students)	22% (2 students)
	Total:	100% (17 students)		

Approaches/Strategies (What will you do to achieve the goal?):

Approach/Strategy #1: Provide students with more direct instruction in reading.

Strategy #2: Investigate and implement a successful research-based approach to reading designed for students who do not learn phonetically.

Strategy #3: Provide additional faculty training and support for our tier two and tier three students, including training on the needs of students with specific disabilities.

Strategy #4: Identify and record student progress using measurements and means appropriate to our school population, as well as, the traditional standardized test scores.

Success Indicator (How will you know that you are making progress toward achieving the goal?):

- Increase in MAP performance (Fall, Spring)
- Increase in PALS performance (Fall, Spring)
- Learning strategists will be trained and will implement a successful research-based approach to reading designed for students who do not learn phonetically.
- Documentation of currently used formative and summative classroom assessments.
- Growth in performance on classroom assessments.

Growth Goal Monitoring and Data Analysis (When are goals monitored? What data will be used? What does the data indicate about your current efforts?):

When are goals monitored?

- Daily (classroom observations, student learning portfolios, formative assessments)
- Monthly (Professional development meetings)
- Fall and Spring standardized tests (MAPS/PALS)

What data will be used?

- Data on specific subgroups (i.e. typically developing students, special education students, English/Language Learners)
- Individual Learning Portfolios
- MAP assessment (Fall, Spring)
- PALS assessment (Fall, Spring)
- Progress monitoring data (i.e. measure of growth and progress within the intervention)

What does the data indicate about your current efforts?

First we examined how reading instruction is presented. The Montessori curriculum uses a distinct set of practices that nurture a positive, natural learning experience to teach reading and writing. The Montessori curriculum is built around teaching children the many elements of reading and writing one by one, in a way accessible to all children.

To ensure a continuity of our reading curriculum throughout the school, PMA is using the Waseca Reading Program. These materials provide a solid structured to provide a systematic and sequential presentation of the phonetic elements used in the English language.

The Montessori sequence is consistent with that of the Orton-Gillingham Method in its application for children with dyslexia.

Children in the 1st grade who required extra support in learning to decode and encode received daily Orton-Gillingham tutoring sessions.

What was noted:

Throughout the year the team discussed when reading interventions should start for students in K5. The Montessori Method centers on following the child. The materials in the classroom are hands-on/minds-on, multisensory, and sequential. Through monitoring growth it was noted that some of the K5 students required additional time with the writing/reading lessons. It was also noted that some students required a different approach to reading instruction.

As the year progressed, we also noted that we have several students who need a more gestalt approach to reading instruction. During the 17/18 school year Montessori Guides and Learning Strategist implemented teacher created whole word lessons. For the 18/19 school year these students will receive reading instruction using Edmark Reading Program.

There is a need for additional professional development for staff in reading instruction to support the wide range of our students' abilities.

The group of 1st grade students who received Orton-Gillingham tutoring daily for 45 minutes. made significant progress in their decoding and encoding skills. More staff will be trained in Orton-Gillingham for the 18/19 school year.

End of Year Annual Growth Goal Results and Data Analysis (Based on your school's approaches, success indicator and monitoring data, what are the overall results of your annual growth goal? What are your next steps?):

SPRING 2018 MAPS READING SCORES	Entire K5	Special Education	Regular Education
Significantly below expected grade level	53% (8 students)	40% (1 student)	80% (4 students)
Slightly below expected grade level	7% (1 student)	0 (0 students)	1% (1 student)
At or above expected grade level	40% (6 students)	20% (1 students)	50% (5 students)
Total:	100% (15 students)		
SPRING 2018 MAPS READING SCORES	Entire 1st Grade	Special Education	Regular Education
Significantly below expected grade level	64% (7 students)	75 (3 students)	57% (4 students)
Slightly below expected grade level	18% (2 students)	25% (1 student)	14% (1 student)
At or above expected grade level	18% (2 students)	0% (0 students)	29% (2 students)
Total:	100% (11 students)		

1.2 (required)

Annual Growth Goal: Increase the number of students at or above expected grade level in Math from 35% to 50% by Spring of 2018.			
Background Data Analysis:			
SPRING 2017 MAPS MATH	Entire K5	Special Education	Regular Education
Significantly below expected grade level	59% (10 students)	70% (7 students)	30% (3 students)
Slightly below expected grade level	6% (1 student)	0%	100% (1 student)
At or above expected grade level	35% (6 students)	33% (1 student)	67% (5 students)

Approaches/Strategies (What will you do to achieve the goal?):   Approach/Strategy #1: Determine and provide the best interventions to use universally with new non-Montessori students.   Strategy #2: Provide more opportunities for students to develop a deep number sense.   Strategy #3: Increase time on task.   Strategy #: Continue to deliver a high quality Montessori math curriculum and monitor results with second year Montessori students (K4 students).

Success Indicator (How will you know that you are making progress toward achieving the goal?):
   ▪ Increase in MAP performance (Fall, Spring)
   ▪ Documentation of currently used formative and summative classroom assessments results.
   ▪ Growth in performance on classroom assessments.

When are goals monitored?
   ▪ Daily (classroom observations, student learning portfolios, formative assessments), Monthly (Professional development meetings,
 	
 What data will be used?
   ▪ Data on specific subgroups (i.e. typically developing students, special education students, English/Language Learners)
   ▪ Report out findings monthly to clusters
   ▪ Individual Learning Portfolios
   ▪ MAP assessment (Fall, Winter, Spring)
   ▪ Data from Student Support Team Meetings (weekly)
   ▪ RTI Documentation
   ▪ Classroom observations and teacher effectiveness evaluation process
   ▪ Formative and summative assessments
   ▪ Progress monitoring data (i.e. measure of growth and progress within the intervention)

What does the data indicate about your current efforts?

In the Montessori program math concepts are introduced in 6 sections in a deliberate and progressive manner. At age 4 students are introduced to the first 3 sections

- Numbers 1-10
- The Decimal System (taking students up to the 10,000th place) addition, subtraction, multiplication, division
- Tens and Teens - linear counting up to 1,000 and skip counting are included in this section

At age 5 students are introduced to the last 3 sections

- Memorization of basic math facts of all four operations
- Abstract math (mental math, up to the millionth place in all four operations)
- Fractions (in all 4 operations)

When administering the MAP test the staff noted a disconnect between how our students learn and demonstrate their knowledge of math as compared to the MAP test. The Montessori method has very deliberate language and materials that are not reflected in the MAPS test an example being that Montessori method introduces the impression of mathematical operations and quantities with large numbers and hands on materials before introducing basic math facts.

The staff records and tracks each individual child's progress through the math curriculum in our interactive web base program, Transparent Classroom. While the teams have information on each individual child, the data was not compiled based on our two levels – Children's House (ages 3-5) and Lower Elementary (1st – 3rd grades). At the end of the year it was noted that we need to explore and implement a means to interpret math scores and progress based on the two levels and on a school wide bases.

End of Year Annual Growth Goal Results and Data Analysis (Based on your school's approaches, success indicator and monitoring data, what are the overall results of your annual growth goal? What are your next steps?):

SPRING 2018 MAPS MATH SCORES	Entire K5	Special Education	Regular Education
Significantly below expected grade level	53% (8 students)	80% (4 student)	40% (4 students)
Slightly below expected grade level	14% (2 students)	0 (0 students)	20% (2 students)
At or above expected grade level	33% (8 students)	20% (1 student)	40% (4 students)
Total:	100% (15 students)		

SPRING 2018 MAPS MATH SCORES	Entire 1st Grade	Special Education	Regular Education
Significantly below expected grade level	85% (2 students)	0% (0 students)	71% (5 students)
Slightly below expected grade level	0% (0 students)	0% (0 students)	0% (0 students)
At or above expected grade level	15% (11 students)	100% (6 students)	29% (2 students)
	Total: 100% (13 students)		

1.3 (required)

Annual Growth Goal: Situations requiring the use restraint or seclusion will decrease by 30%.
Background Data Analysis: Data was not kept in a constructive manner last year. Observations and anecdotal evidence is what we are planning from at this time.
Approaches/Strategies (What will you do to achieve the goal?): ▪ Imbed a mental health clinic in the school utilizing the Penfield Children's Center Behavior Clinic model. ▪ Isolate disruptive behaviors and complete behavior plans that can be shared with the entire school. ▪ Become a trauma informed school by developing appropriate policies and procedures and providing training for the entire staff on trauma informed care. ▪ Establish clear school wide expectations for all students and staff.
Success Indicator (How will you know that you are making progress toward achieving the goal?): ▪ Reduction in incident reports ▪ Reduction in the need for crisis team intervention ▪ Number of families enrolled in the behavior clinic ▪ Students and parents level of comfort around safety
Growth Goal Monitoring and Data Analysis (When are goals monitored? What data will be used? What does the data indicate about your current efforts?): When are goals monitored? (Daily, Weekly, Monthly) ▪ Teacher observation - Daily

- ▪ Weekly classroom team meetings
- ▪ Special education meetings
- ▪ Weekly behavior clinic meetings

What data will be used?

- ▪ Incident reports
- ▪ Teacher referrals
- ▪ Parent survey

What does the data indicate about your current efforts? There is a need to develop social and emotional competency/self-regulation skills in students and create a school where the children feel safe.

End of Year Annual Growth Goal Results and Data Analysis (Based on your school's approaches, success indicator and monitoring data, what are the overall results of your annual growth goal? What are your next steps?):

Several of our students struggled due to trauma and mental health concerns. To support students, families, and staff a behavior clinic housed in the school started in the 17-18 school year.

Throughout the school year PMA worked on systems, supports, and means of monitoring progress.

At the end of the school year the team reviewed what worked and what systems and procedures were needed for the 18-19 school year.

During the summer the team created a system with strong universal supports for all children in the classroom and throughout the school, a problem solving and child study program for children that need additional supports, and means to work proactively with students and families that require outside services and treatment.

Seclusion and Restraint Report 17-18

Number of times a Special Education Students was Secluded	Number of times a General Education Students was Secluded	Number of times a Special Education Students was Restrained	Number of times a General Education Students was Restrained
12	2	16	7

2.0 Mobility Rates

2.1 Student Mobility

Year	Total Students Enrolled at ANY Point in the Year	Number of Students who Transferred In After 3rd Friday	Number of Students who Transferred Out After 3rd Friday	Within-Year Mobility Rate (In+Out)/Total
17-18	110	0	11	10%

Year	Number of Students Enrolled at the End of the Previous Year who COULD Return this Year (Not Graduated)	Number of Students from Previous Year who DID Return and Stayed Through the End of the Current Year	Between-Year Stability Rate Number who DID Return/Number who COULD Return
17-18	47	36	76.6%

2.2 Faculty and Staff Mobility

NOTE: Include all instructional/academic staff and faculty in the counts below, including administrators.

Year	Total Faculty at ANY Point in the Year	Number of New Faculty After 3rd Friday	Number of Faculty who Left After 3rd Friday	Within-Year Mobility Rate (In+Out)/Total
16-17	16	8	1	56%

Year	Number of Faculty Employed at the End of the Previous Year who COULD Return this Year (Not Let Go)	Number of Faculty from Previous Year who DID Return and Stayed Through the End of the Current Year	Between-Year Stability Rate Number who DID Return/Number who COULD Return
17-18	10	10	100%