



COOLIDGE INTERMEDIATE SCHOOL 2008-2009 ANNUAL REPORT

SEPTEMBER 2009

GAIL SNODDY, PRINCIPAL

FERNDALE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

An Introduction to Coolidge Intermediate School

Coolidge Intermediate School services fourth, fifth, and sixth grade students. The school atmosphere is positive and nurturing. The instructional model is active participation, including many hands-on learning projects. Students at Coolidge receive instruction in the self-contained classroom format. They receive special classes; vocal music, instrumental music, Spanish, physical education, and art, in addition to the core curriculum. Their assignment to the classroom is based on the student's learning style and individual needs.

Academic programs are focused learning through problem-solving and inquiry-based acquisition of knowledge. All students are taught to use higher-level thinking skills. Teachers use the researched-based, effective instructional practices as the foundation for instruction in their classrooms.

School Mission Statement

Our mission is to create a positive learning environment where everyone is treated with respect: staff, students, parents, and guests. Each person in the environment has clear, high expectations for students' achievement. The goal is to provide academic relevance, positive learning relationships, content rigor, and lifelong learning skills.

School Vision Statement

All students will meet or exceed the State Performance Standards in the core content areas at Grades 4, 5, and 6.

Points of Pride

Coolidge School met the State Standards and Benchmarks for the 4th, 5th, and 6th grades. This is the fourth year of the restructure configuration of grade levels; however, the re-organization was very successful. Students continue to make academic gains in the core curriculum.

Coolidge offers a full range of learning opportunities for the students:

1. Peer Mediation
2. Character Education Activities
3. Huntington Banking Program
4. After-School Activities/ Tutoring
5. Comprehensive Computer Instruction
6. Daily Spanish - Grades 5 and 6
7. Band and Orchestra
8. Hands-On Science Instruction
9. Math Academic Game
10. Emphasis on thinking skills
11. Honors Choir for Grades 4, 5 & 6

Parents

Parents participated in three workshops about the curriculum at each grade level that were designed to support them in helping their children with homework, understanding a different approach to teach mathematics, internet safety and the impact of bullying on children.

Parent Teacher Conference Attendance

During the Parent Conferences in November 2008, 315 parents attended the conferences, or 97% of Coolidge Parents. The Spring Conferences attendance rate was 72% (only certain parents were requested to attend).

School Programs

Coolidge Intermediate School's average daily attendance rate is 93.3%.

Student retention rate for Coolidge School for the 2008-09 school year is .02%

Accreditation status- Coolidge Intermediate School met the requirements of the NCLB – Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) for the 2008-09 school year, and received an EdYes grade of B.

School Improvement Plan to Improve Student Achievement

The School Improvement Committee reviews data and information from the Coolidge Intermediate School Screening Committee. The Screening Team reviews all of the test data and information that is provided from the Standardize Test. The DRA2 data is combined with the year of quarterly assessments from each grade level, plus the unit test from the Harcourt Trophies Series for grades 4, 5, and 6. Also, the Student Academic Support Team provides specific information about the most at-risk students. The data is carefully reviewed by the school improvement planning team. They report their findings to the staff. Recommendations are made for specific interventions to support the instructional plan. Coolidge Intermediate School adopted the Response to

Intervention Model for improvement.

The focus of the data review is to identify the areas of instructional improvements, as well as individual student needs. Once the needs have been determined, planning for the instructional improvements is developed.

The Coolidge School Improvement Team held bi-monthly meetings to review the data from the MEAP and quarterly assessments. The team was divided into grade levels to look at specific instructional content expectations. The teams determined the goals.

Language Arts Goals

1. To improve students comprehension skills by developing strategies to determine genre, compare/contrast, summarize, make predictions.
2. To improve students writing skills by teaching grammar and paragraph development.

Mathematics Goals

1. To strengthen student's ability to identify the correct operation to solve a given problem.
2. To be able solve multi-step math problems.
3. To be able to use measurement as a problem solving tool.

Three Year Improvement Plan

Each year begins with a Summer School Program that provides an intensive review and re-teaching specific areas of math and reading that were below the State Standards. The students that participate in the Summer Program attend four days a week, for a total of ten days. The purpose of the program is to prepare students to begin the school year with learning routines and self-confidence. Our past experiences indicated that the students who attend Summer School were able to

sustain the improvement well into the new school year. It is the positive reinforcement of learning success that is developed in the small instructional setting. This approach works extremely well with the reluctant learner.

Summer School mathematics is focused on playing the math games that reinforce the concepts that are taught during the previous year. Students have enjoyed the opportunity to play the games. They view playing the math games as fun. Usually, students can easily see the relationships between the concepts of math and using them in everyday experiences.

The second year of the School Improvement Plan (SIP) is focused on improving the students' writing skills. Students are weak in writing mechanics. The District has revised the writing curriculum to align across grade levels. The team developed instructional strategies that were used in all the content areas to address the deficiencies in writing. All staff worked to reinforce the skill development of grammar.

In addition to the focus on the writing mechanics, the team identified summarizing narrative and information text. The team made recommendations for strategies that all staff would implement across content areas. Students were given tasks that require thinking and writing.

The second year of the SIP will continue to focus on the mechanics of writing and the comprehension skill of summarization, identification of genre, vocabulary, and making inferences.

The School Improvement Plan for the 2008-09 school year was successful in improving the writing skill and math skills that were identified from the data. The improvement occurred in small increments, yet there were improvements.

The improvement plan was developed to increase academic achievement for all students. Our goal is to instruct the individual student at their appropriate instructional level. Some students need challenges and some need remedial support.

The evaluation process includes the use of the Response to Intervention Model (RTI), progress monitoring bi-weekly, monthly common assessments, and quarterly grade level evaluations of the students. The formal assessments include the MEAP Test, Iowa Test of Basic Skills, and the Stanford Test.

The School Improvement Committee meets approximately three times per year. The schedule is as follows:

Fall Meeting – School Improvement Plan implementation

Mid-Year (January) - Assessment of the progress of the Plan

June Meeting – The Plan effectiveness is determined by using data from testing and other indexes.

The review process uses formative and summative assessment data collected from the previous/end of school year, MEAP results, quarterly assessments, weekly content assessments, unit test, and teacher observations from the current year to monitor the progress of all students.

The teams identify areas of instructional weakness and plan staff development strategies to address deficiencies.

The Coolidge staff administers the DRA Assessment to develop individual students' instructional plans.

This year's school improvement process was an improvement compared to last year because we used a response to intervention model, which provided an on-going process for improving academic achievement. The staff was responsible for developing

the action plan and had ownership of the implementation. The focus of the instructional team was on monitoring the plan and making adjustments to the process on a quarterly basis. The staff was better prepared for instruction by using the information from the SIP.

Overall Curricular Implementation

The District Curriculum is monitored during the school year in several different ways. The staff is provided a Pacing Chart, which identifies the essential learning expectations in each content area given a specific time period. The chart was developed to ensure that teachers focus on targeted content and monitor for student understanding as they deliver instruction, so as to monitor the effectiveness of the lesson.

Each grade level has at least one meeting per month. The purpose of the grade level meeting is to monitor the progress of the students and the effectiveness of the instruction. It is an opportunity for the administrator to have professional discussions about teaching and learning with the staff. We often discuss the best practices for teaching specific content. The meetings are extremely revealing of anyone that is not teaching the curriculum. This is an opportune time to provide the staff support for instructional improvements.

The staff is required to complete weekly lesson plans. The administrator reviews the plans to monitor all teachers' progress based on the pacing chart. If there is a considerable difference in classroom lesson and the timeline of the pacing chart, a teacher-administrator conference is held to determine the reason for the lack of progress. Teachers are held accountable for instructing the curriculum.

The building administrator conducts bi-weekly walk-through observations and debriefs with the instructional staff.

At the end of the school year, each classroom highlights their academic accomplishments for the community during the Coolidge Learning Fair where English/Language Arts, Math, Science, and Social Studies are showcased.

Staff Data

The Coolidge Intermediate School Staff is dedicated to providing the highest quality of classroom instruction for the students. There were 10 of the 15 staff members that complete the training of the Mathematics Education Resource Center (MERC) Project. This project is an aggressive approach to changing the teacher pedagogy of mathematics. Coolidge Students are benefactors of the specialized training of the staff.

In addition, the Coolidge Staff is willing to learn and share the best instructional practices. They are comfortable in the role of a learner, as well as a teacher.

100% of classes are taught by highly qualified teachers, according to the No Child Left Behind Act.

Title I School

Coolidge Intermediate School has been a Title 1 school for 17 years during which time it has made Adequate Yearly Progress every year.

MEAP Scores

The Michigan Educational Assessment Program is a criterion referenced test that shows how students in grades 3-6 score in reading, writing, language arts, math and social studies (5th grade) and science (6th grade). Individual student scores show how well each student has learned the state curriculum. While students are not really compared to other students in this type of test, the state "cut score" determines proficiency after all of the tests in the state have been scored.

The numbers below indicate the percentage of students who achieved in reading, language arts, math, science and social studies on the 2008 MEAP tests. All students in grades 3-8 take the reading and language arts' tests. Fifth grade takes the science test and sixth grade takes the social studies test.

MEAP Analysis

There were two significant changes in the MEAP subgroups: Economically Disadvantaged and African-American Students. The two subgroups show a decline in the raw MEAP data for reading and mathematics. However, once the data was refined for the federal government, this was not true. For additional information, contact Gail Snoddy, Principal (248/547-1700).

MEAP Reading | Fourth Grade

Summary Statement: Building level 66% proficient

Student Group	School Year	School Percent of Students Proficient		School Percent of Students Not Proficient		Percent of Students Tested
		Advanced	Proficient	Partially Proficient	Not Proficient	
Fourth Grade						100%
All Students	2008-09	24	49	21	6	
	2008-09	14	52	26	8	
African American	2008-09	6	53	30	11	
	2008-09	7	50	33	11	
White	2008-09	47	41	13	0	
	2008-09	29	50	16	5	
Econ. Disadvantaged	2008-09	8	56	25	10	
	2008-09	10	53	26	10	
Males	2008-09	28	45	20	8	
	2008-09	14	47	30	9	
Females	2008-09	59	34	7	0	
	2008-09	20	52	23	5	

MEAP Reading | Fifth Grade

Summary Statement: Building level 60% proficient

Student Group	School Year	School Percent of Students Proficient		School Percent of Students Not Proficient		Percent of Students Tested
		Advanced	Proficient	Partially Proficient	Not Proficient	
Fifth Grade						100%
All Students	2008-09	20	43	24	13	
	2008-09	16	44	26	13	
African American	2008-09	17	29	43	11	
	2008-09	3	40	37	20	
White	2008-09	30	45	18	8	
	2008-09	38	53	6	3	
Econ. Disadvantaged	2008-09	15	63	18	5	
	2008-09	5	48	29	18	
Males	2008-09	19	66	8	7	
	2008-09	17	42	33	8	
Females	2008-09	17	57	25	2	
	2008-09	16	47	20	18	

MEAP Reading | Sixth Grade

Summary Statement: Building level 69% proficient

Student Group	School Year	School Percent of Students Proficient		School Percent of Students Not Proficient		Percent of Students Tested
		Advanced	Proficient	Partially Proficient	Not Proficient	
Sixth Grade						100%
All Students	2008-09	18	61	17	4	
	2008-09	20	49	24	7	
African American	2008-09	15	59	20	5	
	2008-09	17	43	29	10	
White	2008-09	23	67	10	0	
	2008-09	28	56	14	2	
Econ. Disadvantaged	2008-09	42	42	16	0	
	2008-09	12	50	30	9	
Males	2008-09	52	42	6	0	
	2008-09	18	45	29	8	
Females	2008-09	59	34	7	0	
	2008-09	NA	NA	NA	NA	

MEAP Language Arts | Fourth Grade

Summary Statement: Building level 57% proficient

Student Group	School Year	School Percent of Students Proficient		School Percent of Students Not Proficient		Percent of Students Tested
		Advanced	Proficient	Partially Proficient	Not Proficient	
Fourth Grade						100%
All Students	2008-09	6	58	30	6	
	2008-09	1	56	40	3	
African American	2008-09	0	47	43	11	
	2008-09	0	49	49	3	
White	2008-09	16	69	16	0	
	2008-09	3	68	24	5	
Econ. Disadvantaged	2008-09	2	54	33	10	
	2008-09	1	53	41	5	
Males	2008-09	5	60	30	5	
	2008-09	0	49	46	5	
Females	2008-09	7	57	30	7	
	2008-09	2	62	34	2	

MEAP Language Arts | Fifth Grade

Summary Statement: Building level 55% proficient

Student Group	School Year	School Percent of Students Proficient		School Percent of Students Not Proficient		Percent of Students Tested
		Advanced	Proficient	Partially Proficient	Not Proficient	
Fifth Grade						100%
All Students	2008-09	4	71	24	1	
	2008-09	9	46	38	7	
African American	2008-09	5	64	30	1	
	2008-09	2	37	49	12	
White	2008-09	3	85	13	0	
	2008-09	22	59	19	0	
Econ. Disadvantaged	2008-09	3	67	28	1	
	2008-09	2	44	45	9	
Males	2008-09	3	78	17	2	
	2008-09	9	43	45	4	
Females	2008-09	5	63	32	0	
	2008-09	10	49	31	10	

MEAP Language Arts | Sixth Grade

Summary Statement: Building level 70% proficient

Student Group	School Year	School Percent of Students Proficient		School Percent of Students Not Proficient		Percent of Students Tested
		Advanced	Proficient	Partially Proficient	Not Proficient	
Sixth Grade						100%
All Students	2008-09	4	71	24	1	
	2008-09	6	64	30	0	
African American	2008-09	5	64	30	1	
	2008-09	5	56	40	0	
White	2008-09	3	85	13	0	
	2008-09	9	77	14	0	
Econ. Disadvantaged	2008-09	3	67	28	1	
	2008-09	1	62	37	0	
Males	2008-09	3	78	17	2	
	2008-09	5	59	36	0	
Females	2008-09	5	63	32	0	
	2008-09	7	68	25	0	

MEAP Mathematics | Fourth Grade

Summary Statement: Building level 68% proficient

Student Group	School Year	School Percent of Students Proficient		School Percent of Students Not Proficient		Percent of Students Tested
		Advanced	Proficient	Partially Proficient	Not Proficient	
Fourth Grade						100%
All Students	2007-08	25	51	18	6	
	2008-09	18	50	30	3	
African American	2007-08	11	55	23	11	
	2008-09	12	50	36	3	
White	2007-08	41	47	13	0	
	2008-09	3	21	47	29	
Econ. Disadvantaged	2007-08	15	56	21	8	
	2008-09	18	49	30	2	
Males	2007-08	30	50	15	5	
	2008-09	14	47	35	4	
Females	2007-08	20	52	20	7	
	2008-09	21	52	25	2	

MEAP Mathematics | Fifth Grade

Summary Statement: Building level 59% proficient

Student Group	School Year	School Percent of Students Proficient		School Percent of Students Not Proficient		Percent of Students Tested
		Advanced	Proficient	Partially Proficient	Not Proficient	
Fifth Grade						100%
All Students	2007-08	20	40	32	8	
	2008-09	26	28	38	7	
African American	2007-08	8	44	40	8	
	2008-09	10	32	47	12	
White	2007-08	36	33	21	10	
	2008-09	53	25	22	0	
Econ. Disadvantaged	2007-08	13	39	39	9	
	2008-09	14	29	49	8	
Males	2007-08	17	43	28	13	
	2008-09	29	27	38	6	
Females	2007-08	22	37	36	5	
	2008-09	24	29	39	8	

MEAP Mathematics | Sixth Grade

Summary Statement: Building level 73% proficient

Student Group	School Year	School Percent of Students Proficient		School Percent of Students Not Proficient		Percent of Students Tested
		Advanced	Proficient	Partially Proficient	Not Proficient	
Sixth Grade						100%
All Students	2007-08	39	35	21	4	
	2008-09	36	37	21	6	
African American	2007-08	31	41	21	7	
	2008-09	29	40	27	5	
White	2007-08	53	30	18	0	
	2008-09	47	37	12	5	
Econ. Disadvantaged	2007-08	38	33	23	6	
	2008-09	29	45	20	6	
Males	2007-08	36	39	22	3	
	2008-09	32	39	23	6	
Females	2007-08	43	31	21	5	
	2008-09	40	35	19	6	