DATA AND INFORMATION THAT SUPPORTS PROGRESS

Montessori Day Public Schools Chartered (MDPSC) currently has two operating campuses: Mountainside in Sunnyslope and Lakeshore/Tempe in Chandler. Its district and schools have met AYP every year, and met all SPED and other ADE requirements every year. In 09, 42% of its ELL students tested Proficient according to AZELLA test results – well over the state's required 15%.

MDPSC's **Mountainside** campus has served a **Title I** population for almost 15 years, as determined by review of poverty data from income guidelines completed by its parents. With a challenging population, and a large ELL component, the school has **met AYP every year** and has never been in school improvement. The decision to move from a Title I Targeted Assistance program to a Schoolwide program was a conscious choice on the part of the School's Administrative Team. It was made because Schoolwide - with a goal of serving *all* students according to need, and in a multi-age, inclusion environment - made a better match with the LEA's and school's Montessori program model. Within the last five years, it has twice been given a **"Performing Plus"** label, most recently in 08-09 as a preliminary label. In that year, 38% of its ELL students achieved Proficiency, well over ADE's required 15%.

In April 09, MDPSC's smaller **Lakeshore** campus was designated as **2nd out of 1,250 schools in the state for students' progress in reading**, based on longitudinal research done by Rebecca Gau of the Arizona Charter Schools Association and published in the Arizona Republic ("New Tests for Arizona's Charter Schools", 4/26/09). Its ELL proficiency achievement in 09 was 60%. In 09 its subgroups were smaller than needed to furnish comparison data. It has had an increasingly high percentage of Title I category students, such that it is looking ahead at a Schoolwide plan for the future – perhaps for the coming year.

Outside of data provided by AIMS, LEA progress is supported by other measures, such as awards won by students in diverse areas. These range from performance awards in the Phoenix Light Parade (combined-campus drum and flute group) to League championships in Basketball to 2nd place in the Governor's Chess competition to consistent top 10 state placement in the state's Stock Market Game. Two of the LEA's former students have won Flinn Foundation scholarships in the past 10 years. Additionally, there is an average 80% or better return on the annual Parent Satisfaction Survey, with less than a handful each year rating the schools as less than Excellent. Parents know their children are getting an "education for life", that builds to show excellent long-term results. In February of this year, Lillie Sly, ADE's Associate Superintendent of Educational Services and Resource Division, personally delivered a commendation plaque for consistency in meeting AYP, commitment to development of

the whole child, and partnering with parents. These measures are in keeping with future directions in education, and Education Secretary Arne Duncan's emphasis on the importance of going beyond math and reading scores and providing a well-rounded education.

Looking strictly at AIMS results, we see the following, by subgroup:
District: 97 students tested in 09, with **49 students in the 'economically disadvantaged' subgroup.** There was an **'all student' gain of 4% in math** from 08 to 09, exceeding the state gain by 2%; and an **'all student' gain in reading of 7%,** exceeding the state gain by 4%. The highest percentage gains in math were in the economically disadvantaged (7% vs AZ 3%), ELL (8% vs AZ 0%) and Hispanic (11% vs AZ 3%) subgroups. In reading, the highest percentage gains were with the economically disadvantaged (15% vs AZ 5%), ELL (18% vs AZ 2%), and Hispanic (15% vs AZ 4%) subgroups. In math there was a 4% gain for both males and females (vs AZ 2% for females and 1% for males). In reading there was a 5% gain for females (vs AZ 3%) and a 7% gain for males (vs AZ 2%). There was a 6% drop in math scores of white elementary students, and a 4% drop in their reading scores. No comparison data showed for the Asian/Pacific Islander, Native American, and Special Education subgroups.

School: MT: 85 tested in 09, with **45 in the 'economically disadvantaged' subgroup**. There was an **'all student' gain of 3% in math**, exceeding the state gain by 1%; and an **'all student' gain in reading of 5%**, exceeding the state gain by 2%. The highest percentage gains in math were in the economically disadvantaged (7% vs AZ 3%), ELL (8% vs AZ 0%), and Hispanic (13% vs AZ 3%) subgroups. In reading, the highest percentage gains were in the economically disadvantaged (13% vs AZ 5%), ELL (18% vs AZ 2%), and Hispanic (16% vs AZ 4%) subgroups. In math there was a 3% gain for females (vs AZ 2%) and a 5% gain for males (vs. AZ 1%). In reading there was a 4% gain for females (vs AZ 3%) and a 3% gain for males (vs AZ 2%). There was a 6% drop in both math and reading scores of white students. No comparison data showed for the Asian/Pacific Islander, Native American, and Special Education subgroups.

School: LK: 12 students tested, with no subgroup comparison data showing. There was an **'all student' gain of 16% in reading**, exceeding the state's 3% gain by 13%; and an 'all student' loss of 25% in math.

The data clearly indicated LEA percentage gains exceeding those of the state in both reading and math. It also pointed out the LEA's 09 achievement of subgroup goals with ELLs and the economically disadvantaged – apparently to the detriment of white students, and particularly in math, and particularly at its Tempe/Lakeshore campus, where its ELL and reading gains were highest. In fairness to the Tempe/Lakeshore campus and staff, it should be stated that the teacher of its students who tested was new to the campus and the students, was unfamiliar with some of the lower level math manipulatives which would have helped the group's very challenged students, and lost the group's 3 continuing gifted students (whose scores would have significantly changed the data) to moves before the 100th day. Regardless, in 09-10 the LEA's Consolidated Plan and application for funds placed a clear emphasis on improving student academic

gains in math, and anticipates gains in this area along with continued gains in other categories and subgroups.

Regarding instruction and assessments used: central to the LEA's Montessori program model is the Montessori training of its instructional staff, and implementation of the LEA's Montessori curriculum, aligned to the Arizona Education Standards. The work of HQ paraprofessionals and the mentoring of new team members is vital to this process. Each classroom has a copy of the aligned Montessori curriculum, as well as a copy of the Arizona Education Standards. Lesson plans are created and instruction given with this curriculum as the driver, factoring in group and individual student needs (e.g., IEPs, ILLPs, other student needs). Learning Lists at the younger levels (K-3rd gr) and Goals Books at the older levels (4th-8th gr) are among the planning instruments created to differentiate and individualize instruction as well as track student progress toward achieving goals, with the curriculum as the driver and the materials as the vehicle to make a match with student need.

The LEA's Montessori classroom environments K-6 are furnished with extensive hands-on **Montessori materials**, which are **designed for instruction and assessment**. Environments become progressively more research-oriented and less materials-oriented as students approach and enter Middle School. Because student learning – particularly at the K-3rd level - is largely through independent engagement with these materials, **scientific observation and extensive record-keeping/data collection** is required of the instructional staff in order to **assess student progress and inform instruction**, supporting students to progress at their own pace. Student performance data is collected on a daily basis, and summarized on standardized Montessori student report/record forms (Montessori Made Manageable). These forms are organized to show student progress in the standards-aligned curriculum and are shared with parents at parent-teacher conferences. **Progress is assessed** through daily informal observation and formal observation and recording; review of work samples; student demonstration of mastery with materials (e.g., successful completion of the Trinomial Cube material); teacher-made and other classroom assessments (e.g., Test-Pro material from Montessori Made Manageable); and specialized tests (e.g., given by special education teacher, psychologist, ELL specialist, speech therapist).

The LEA's teaching and admin staff determined in 08 that the school still needed traditional, RB, uniform programs in reading and math to support self-paced learning, assessment and instruction. SRA reading labs with a technology interface component were determined appropriate for classrooms 1st -8th, and the Otter Creek math timings material for gr. 1-4. These were purchased and implemented in the 08-09 academic year. Vocabulary Workshop and Saxon Math were already in use at gr. 4-8. Further needed was a no-cost (given underfunding plus budget cuts) math assessment, which could be used, K-8, to assess performance at the beginning of the year, mid-year, and end-of-year to track student progress and help gauge program effectiveness. Staff research discovered the national math standards-based CAIU Benchmark Assessment (www.caiu.org/resources/schools/curriculum/math-benchmark.aspx), which some LEA and school classrooms administered mid-year 09-10 and will also administer the end-of-

year assessment. All LEA classrooms plan to administer this assessment at the beginning, middle and end of year in the 10-11 academic year. Results will be used to track and monitor student progress and help gauge program effectiveness.