

Thunder Ridge Elementary Final Report 2012-2013

Financial Proposal and Report - This report is automatically generated from the School Plan entered in the spring of 2012 and from the District Business Administrator's data entry of the School LAND Trust expenditures in 2012-2013.

Available Funds	Planned Expenditures (entered by the school)	Actual Expenditures (entered by the District Business Administrator)
Carry-Over from 2011 - 2012	\$2,571	\$2,617
Distribution for 2012 - 2013	\$28,600	\$32,490
Total Available for Expenditure in 2012 - 2013	\$31,171	\$35,107
Salaries and Employee Benefits (100 and 200)	\$16,385	\$5,898
Professional and Technical Services (300)	\$0	\$4,530
Repairs and Maintenance (400)	\$0	\$0
Other Purchased Services (Admission and Printing) (500)	\$1,500	\$0
Travel (580)	\$0	\$0
General Supplies (610)	\$1,550	\$8,740
Textbooks (641)	\$0	\$0
Library Books (644)	\$4,216	\$0
Periodicals, AV Materials (650-660)	\$0	\$0
Software (670)	\$1,949	\$0
Equipment (Computer Hardware, Instruments, Furniture) (730)	\$3,000	\$9,501
Total Expenditures	\$28,600	\$28,669
Remaining Funds (Carry-Over to 2013 - 2014)	\$2,571	\$6,438

ITEM A - Report on Goals

Goal #1

READING: Three students in each class (one scoring below average, one scoring average, and one scoring above average) will be identified as a result of their performance on the Fall DRA, given in August/September of 2012. The goal is for each of these students to demonstrate at least one year of progress on the Spring DRA, given in April/May of 2013.

Identified academic area(s).

Reading

This was the action plan.

For Reading in 2012-2013, we will use the DRA (Direct Reading Assessment) to monitor and adjust curriculum delivery and to track literacy needs. One of the major parts of our School LAND Trust will be centered on securing accurate DRA assessments and providing programs targeted to improve student literacy skills for students of all skill levels.

1. DRA Substitutes: Provide 61 days of substitutes throughout the year so K-6 teachers can thoroughly administer and score DRA tests three times a year.
2. Professional Development Substitutes: Provide 15 substitute days to cover teachers who are attending literacy/math professional development workshops for which the district does not provide substitutes.
3. Outside Professional Development: Provide money that helps teachers attend professional development opportunities directly related to literacy and math (in particular the Literacy Promise conference in SLC in March).
4. Spring Reading Program: Provide funds to purchase student incentives and other supporting materials for the annual Spring Reading Program.
5. Guided Reading Library: Provide funds to purchase books that offer differentiated texts for teachers to use with small reading groups.
6. Raz-Kids Program: Provide funds to purchase access for all students to Raz-Kids, an online leveled-reading practice program, which provides students a chance to practice literacy skills at home.
7. Reteach & Enrich Block: This program provides small group, differentiated instruction for 30 minutes a day, Tuesday-Friday. We will use School LAND Trust funds to hire an R&E Aide dedicated to tracking students, data collection, correlation between teachers, preparing activities, and supervising students (8 hours of aide time each week for 36 weeks).

Please explain how the action plan was implemented to reach this goal.

Our overarching goal was to promote one year's growth for all students at Thunder Ridge. While the specific data given below will demonstrate to what extent we met our goal, it is fair to say that we planned for and organized activities that would benefit our low, middle, and high learners.

Monies were used to hire substitutes to free teachers to complete the DRA (Developmental Reading Assessment) several times this year. The substitutes allowed teachers to perform thorough assessments in a location away from the bustle of the classroom. All three groups benefited from the DRA assistance because it allows teachers to accurately assess literacy competence without feeling pressured to end a test too soon or estimate ability in order to save time. Funds were used to provide scholarships to teachers to attend literacy professional development opportunities and the

substitutes needed in order to attend. Teachers were very appreciative of the chance for additional literacy training. We also used some School LAND Trust monies to support our annual Spring Reading program that tracks student reading and motivates them to finish the year on a strong literacy note. The Spring Reading Program is based on time reading (not reading level) so this allows students to participate on an equal playing field regardless of their academic proficiency.

All three groups benefited from the purchase of leveled books in the Guided Reading Library and the Take-home Reading Library. These libraries are especially well suited to supporting students because the books are leveled by reading ability and assigned to the students. Similarly, we used funds to purchase Raz-Kids subscriptions for our upper-grade classrooms so students could easily access leveled books and comprehension assessments at home via the internet. However research suggests that struggling learners have the highest relative benefit from having access to "just-right" books and from the added engagement that comes from instructional technology. Finally, School LAND Trust funds were also used to hire an aide that coordinated our daily Reteach and Enrich program and Z.A.P. Program. These blocks of time give our 1st-6th grade students the chance to receive additional instruction or to extend learning of basic concepts already mastered. Our struggling learners specifically benefited from the "reteach" portion of the Reteach & Enrich program as we all as the Z.A.P. program. Both are designed to provide extra support to struggling students in a smaller-group setting. Our advanced learners specifically benefited from the "enrich" portion of the Reteach & Enrich program that allows them to receive extension activities several times a week. Our typically-developing students benefited from the "fluency" components of the Reteach & Enrich block in which some teachers works with the students on grade level to develop fluency and automaticity with the skills the students are beginning to master.

This is the measurement identified in the plan to determine if the goal was reached.

For Reading, DRA scores will be used to measure academic improvement: Fall DRA data will sort students for various tiers of instruction and assistance, Winter DRA will help redirect efforts as necessary, and the Spring DRA will measure our overall success.

Please show the before and after measurements and how academic performance was improved.

The graph below shows the measured growth a low-, a middle-, and a high-achieving student made in each K-6 core classroom in Reading. The year's growth was calculated by comparing scores on an assessment given in August/September and again in April/May.

Grade	Teacher	L/M/H	Reading Growth
K	Glover	L	1.5
K	Glover	M	1.75
K	Glover	H	1
K	McPherson	L	1.5
K	McPherson	M	1
K	McPherson	H	1
K	Willson	L	1.5
K	Willson	M	1.25
K	Willson	H	1
1	Beck	L	0.5
1	Beck	M	1
1	Beck	H	1.5
1	Burgon	L	1.25
1	Burgon	M	1.25
1	Burgon	H	1
1	Eliason	L	1.5
1	Eliason	M	1.25
1	Eliason	H	1
1	Schiess	L	1
1	Schiess	M	1.25
1	Schiess	H	1.25

1	Schmidt	L	1.25
1	Schmidt	M	1.25
1	Schmidt	H	1
2	Gatto	L	1.25
2	Gatto	M	1
2	Gatto	H	1
2	Howell	L	1.25
2	Howell	M	1
2	Howell	H	1
2	Hutchings	L	1
2	Hutchings	M	1
2	Hutchings	H	1
2	Layne	L	1
2	Layne	M	1
2	Layne	H	1
3	Biggs	L	1
3	Biggs	M	1
3	Biggs	H	1
3	Rogers	L	1
3	Rogers	M	1
3	Rogers	H	1
3	Sands	L	1
3	Sands	M	1
3	Sands	H	1
3	Smith, Colleen L		1.75
3	Smith, Colleen M		1.5
3	Smith, Colleen H		1
4	Cannon	L	1.5
4	Cannon	M	1.5
4	Cannon	H	1
4	Larson	L	1.25
4	Larson	M	1.5
4	Larson	H	1.25
4	Smith, Bailey	L	0.5
4	Smith, Bailey	M	1
4	Smith, Bailey	H	2
5	Cochrane	L	2
5	Cochrane	M	1

5	Cochrane	H	1
5	Decker	L	1
5	Decker	M	1
5	Decker	H	1
5	Smith, Bob	L	2
5	Smith, Bob	M	2
5	Smith, Bob	H	1
6	Allred	L	1
6	Allred	M	1
6	Allred	H	1
6	Jensen	L	1.5
6	Jensen	M	1
6	Jensen	H	1.5

Reading Growth

Total	1.18
Low	1.25
Middle	1.19
High	1.10

The data above indicates that we were able to achieve a little more than one year of growth in Reading overall (1.18), with very little variation among the 3 subgroups. The Student Growth Percentile (SGP) score, gleaned from the State CRTs for our 4th-6th grade students, was 53 for Language Arts. While SGP is a metric based upon a cohort of students, anything above 45 suggests approximately one year of growth, so we feel the SGP score supports the assertion that we were able to meet our goal. (Additionally, it should be noted that Reading is only a portion of the content and skills assessed on the Language Arts CRT. Nevertheless, the tests are associated and can be used to make general judgments regarding student achievement.) While there is no way to directly attribute student scores to the efforts made through the programs supported by Trust Lands funds, feedback received from teachers, parents, and students suggest the programs were appreciated, effective, and successful.

The amounts, categories and descriptions of expenditures planned to implement this goal are listed here:

Amount	Category	Description
9295	Salaries and Employee Benefits (100 and 200)	Substitutes for DRA (\$4,941), for Professional Development (\$1,215), and for a Reteach & Enrich Aide (\$3,139).
1050	General Supplies (610)	Supplies for the Reteach & Enrich program (\$250) and for our Spring Reading Program (\$800).
4216	Library Books (644)	Texts for our Guided Reading Library.
1949	Software (670)	Subscription for each classroom to Raz-Kids, an online leveled-reading practice program.

Please describe the expenditures made to implement this goal as identified in the Financial Proposal and Report displayed above.

Amount	Category	Description
\$2,122.85	Pro/Tech Services	Subs for DRA and Professional Development
\$3,408.81	Salaries/Benefits	Salary for Reteach & Enrich aide (+ 23.6% benefits)

\$378.09 General Supplies Supplies for Reteach & Enrich and for Spring Reading

\$579.50 Pro/Tech Services Spring Reading reward

\$6702.58 General Supplies Guided Reading Library books and supplies

\$734.51 General Supplies Learning A-Z online subscription

The significant differences in the category totals between the proposed and the actual expenditures are due to two main factors: first, the district has different category nomenclature than Trust Lands and this means the purchases we make don't always neatly fit into the categories specified by both organizations; secondly, the school's financial secretary will occasionally log expenditures under a similar, but different category than that intended by the SCC (such as logging substitutes we get through Kelly Services under Professional and Technical Services instead of Salaries and Employee Benefits).

Goal #2

MATH: Three students in each class (one scoring below average, one scoring average, and one scoring above average) will be identified as a result of their performance on a Fall Benchmark Math Assessment, given in August/September 2012. The goal is for each of these students to demonstrate at least one year of progress on a comparable Spring Benchmark Math Assessment, given in April/May of 2013.

Identified academic area(s).

Mathematics

This was the action plan.

For Mathematics in 2012-2013, we will use Fall Benchmark Math Assessment scores to determine how to differentiate curriculum delivery. One of the major parts of our School LAND Trust will be centered on providing programs targeted to improve student confidence and ability in numeracy.

1. Family Math Workshop: A team of 3 teachers will conduct 4 workshops, each lasting approximately 1.5 hours (with an additional .5 hour of prep time). Students identified by their teachers as needing additional mathematical support will be invited, along with their families, to participate in these workshops. Dinner, training, modeling, and materials will be provided for each family. The inexpensive dinners will create a welcoming atmosphere that encourages the whole family to come and helps the students feel they are fortunate to be invited.
2. Instructional Technology Upgrades: Provide funds to purchase classroom instructional technology (document cameras, interactive whiteboards, etc.) that assists in the teaching and learning of mathematical reasoning, problem solving, and justification of answers.
3. Double-Dosing Aides: Provide 7.5 hours of aide time each day (for 68 days) dedicated to preteaching/reteaching 1st-6thgrade students who need extra support. (Alpine School District will provide a matching grant for another 68 days.)
4. Professional Development Substitutes: Provide 15 substitute days to cover teachers who are attending literacy/math professional development workshops for which the district does not provide substitutes.
5. Outside Professional Development: Provide money that helps teachers attend professional development opportunities directly related to literacy and math (in particular the Literacy Promise conference in SLC in March).
6. Reteach & Enrich Block: This program provides small group, differentiated instruction for 30 minutes a day, Tuesday-Friday. We will use School LAND Trust funds to hire an R&E Aide dedicated to tracking students, data collection, correlation between teachers, preparing activities, and supervising students (8 hours of aide time each week for 36 weeks).

Please explain how the action plan was implemented to reach this goal.

Our overarching goal was to promote one year's growth for all students at Thunder Ridge. While the specific data given below will demonstrate to what extent we met our goal, it is fair to say that we planned for and organized activities that would benefit our low, middle, and high learners.

We allocated some of our School LAND Trust funds to sponsor Family Math Nights. These nights provided parents with resources and modeling meant to increase math support and awareness at home. Our middle learners specifically benefited from the Family Math Workshops that are designed to support those students who could use a little extra support to maintain adequate math achievement. Neither students that are really low nor students that are really high are invited to participate in the workshops. It is targeted to those who are on the verge of making good strides in math achievement.

We used a significant portion of funds to purchase instructional technology for the several new classrooms we added (we grew by over 100 students last year). All three groups benefited from the acquisition of instructional technology. However research suggests that struggling learners have the highest relative benefit from having access to the added engagement that comes from instructional technology.

Monies were also used to hire several "Double Dose" aides that worked with 1st-6thgrade teachers to provide extra reteaching, preteaching, and small-group tutoring to students who were below grade level. This intervention was obviously targeted to our low learners. Teachers used formative assessment to determine which content was the focus on Double Dosing and which students would be invited to receive the extra support.

Funds were used to provide scholarships to teachers to attend math professional development opportunities and the substitutes needed in order to attend. Teachers were very appreciative of the chance for additional mathematics training.

This is the measurement identified in the plan to determine if the goal was reached.

For Mathematics, Benchmark Math Assessment scores will be used to measure academic improvement. August 2012 scores will sort students for various tiers of instruction and assistance, common assessments will redirect efforts as necessary throughout the year, and the May 2013 scores will measure our overall success.

Please show the before and after measurements and how academic performance was improved.

The graph below shows the measured growth a low-, a middle-, and a high-achieving student made in each K-6 core classroom in Mathematics. The year's growth was calculated by comparing scores on an assessment given in August/September and again in April/May.

Grade	Teacher	L/M/H	Math Growth
K	Glover	L	1.5
K	Glover	M	1.25
K	Glover	H	1
K	McPherson	L	1.5
K	McPherson	M	1.5
K	McPherson	H	1
K	Willson	L	1
K	Willson	M	1
K	Willson	H	1
1	Beck	L	1
1	Beck	M	1
1	Beck	H	1
1	Burgon	L	0.75
1	Burgon	M	0.75
1	Burgon	H	1
1	Eliason	L	1
1	Eliason	M	0.75
1	Eliason	H	0.5
1	Schiess	L	0.75
1	Schiess	M	1
1	Schiess	H	1
1	Schmidt	L	1
1	Schmidt	M	1
1	Schmidt	H	1
2	Gatto	L	1
2	Gatto	M	1
2	Gatto	H	1
2	Howell	L	1
2	Howell	M	1
2	Howell	H	1
2	Hutchings	L	1
2	Hutchings	M	1

2	Hutchings	H	1
2	Layne	L	1
2	Layne	M	1
2	Layne	H	1
3	Biggs	L	1.25
3	Biggs	M	1.25
3	Biggs	H	1
3	Rogers	L	1
3	Rogers	M	1
3	Rogers	H	1
3	Sands	L	1
3	Sands	M	1
3	Sands	H	1
3	Smith, Colleen	L	1
3	Smith, Colleen	M	1
3	Smith, Colleen	H	1
4	Cannon	L	1
4	Cannon	M	1
4	Cannon	H	1
4	Larson	L	moved
4	Larson	M	1.25
4	Larson	H	1
4	Smith, Bailey	L	0.5
4	Smith, Bailey	M	1
4	Smith, Bailey	H	1
5	Cochrane	L	1
5	Cochrane	M	1
5	Cochrane	H	1
5	Decker	L	1
5	Decker	M	1
5	Decker	H	1
5	Smith, Bob	L	1
5	Smith, Bob	M	1
5	Smith, Bob	H	1
6	Allred	L	0.5
6	Allred	M	1
6	Allred	H	1
6	Jensen	L	1

6	Jensen	M	1
6	Jensen	H	1

Math Growth

Total	1.00
Low	0.99
Middle	1.03
High	0.98

The data above indicates that we were able to achieve one year of growth in math overall (1.00), with very little variation among the 3 subgroups. The Student Growth Percentile (SGP) score, gleaned from the State CRTs for our 4th-6thgrade students, was 58 for Math. While SGP is a metric based upon a cohort of students, anything above 45 suggests approximately one year of growth, so we feel the SGP score supports the assertion that we were able to meet our goal. While there is no way to directly attribute student scores to the efforts made through the programs supported by Trust Lands funds, feedback received from teachers, parents, and students suggest the programs were appreciated, effective, and successful.

Additionally, we gave a survey to all of the parents whose children participated in the Family Math Nights. We received feedback from several dozen parents and, without exception, they were very complimentary of the workshops and urged us to continue them in the future. Below you can also find the Math CRT scores for 11 of the students who attended the Family Math Night Workshops. There were 22 students that actually attended the workshops, but the other 11 students didn't take the CRTs for some reason (they were 2ndgraders, moved, etc.).

Student Grade Math CRT

AB	4	1
AK	4	3
NM	4	3
CB	4	3
LR	5	4
SR	5	4
ER	5	2
LR	5	3
MR	5	4
JD	5	3
KS	5	4

This data indicates that 9 of the 11 students that participated in Family Math Nights and also took the Math CRT passed the test (or 82%). Again, it is not reasonable to make a direct correlation between the two, but it is gratifying to know that these students who at one time were evaluated by their teachers as being "at-risk" of struggling in math, were able to perform well on the Math CRT test.

The amounts, categories and descriptions of expenditures planned to implement this goal are listed here:

Amount	Category	Description
7090	Salaries and Employee Benefits (100 and 200)	Double Dosing aides (\$6,561) and Family Math instructors (\$529).
1500	Other Purchased Services (Admission and Printing) (500)	Professional development workshop and conference fees.
500	General Supplies (610)	Materials, copying, and supplies needed for Family Math Night.
3000	Equipment (Computer Hardware, Instruments, Furniture) (730)	Classroom instructional technology (document cameras, interactive whiteboards, etc.).

Please describe the expenditures made to implement this goal as identified in the Financial Proposal and

Report displayed above.

Amount	Category	Description
\$2,057.64	Salaries/Benefits	Salary for Double Dosing aides (+ 23.6% benefits)
\$432.60	Salaries/Benefits	Salary for Family Math Night Teachers (+ 23.6% benefits)
\$1,810.00	Pro/Tech Services	Registration fees for Professional Development
\$140.71	General Supplies	Materials and supplies for Family Math Night
\$9,501.28	Equipment	6 SmartBoards
\$784.00	General Supplies	Document camera and technology installation

The significant differences in the category totals between the proposed and the actual expenditures are due to two main factors: first, the district has different category nomenclature than Trust Lands and this means the purchases we make don't always neatly fit into the categories specified by both organizations; secondly, the school's financial secretary will occasionally log expenditures under a similar, but different category than that intended by the SCC (such as logging the purchase of a USB connector for a document camera under General Supplies instead of Equipment).

ITEM B - In the Financial Proposal and Report, there is a carry-over of \$6438 to the 2013-2014 school year. This is 20% of the distribution received in 2012-2013. Please describe the reason for a carry-over of more than 10% of the distribution.

Most of the carry-over came from recouping funds in a variety of ways. We recouped money when the district decided to fund a software program we had already used Trust Land monies to purchase and we were reimbursed. We recouped money when many teachers were able to use half-day substitutes to complete the DRA testing instead of full-day substitutes. We also recouped money anytime the hourly aides being paid for out of Trust Lands did not come to work (sick, vacation, etc.). We also recouped money because the district requires us to calculate aide salary and benefits at the highest possible compensation rate, but most of the aides do not make that rate. Unfortunately, we are not able to calculate the actual amount we are recouping from these payroll sources until the school year is over and books are closed.

ITEM C - The school plan describes how additional funds exceeding the estimated distribution would be spent. This is the description.

Should we be fortunate to receive more School LAND Trust funds, they will be for technology upgrades and to increase professional development opportunities.

The distribution was about 14% more than the estimate in the school plan. Please explain how the additional money was spent, if it was spent for items other than expenditures described in the approved goals above. If all expenditures were spent for items in the goals, please enter "Not applicable."

Not applicable. (The extra allocation we received allowed us to spend more money on technology than we originally planned--\$3,000 projected, but \$9,501 actual. However, because we recouped quite a bit of money at the end of the year as explained in Item B above, our final balance would seem to indicate that the extra allocation wasn't spent.

ITEM D - The school plan was advertised to the community in the following way(s):

- Letters to policy makers and/or administrators of trust lands and trust funds
- School newsletter
- School website

ITEM E - Please select from the pull down menus the names of policymakers the council has communicated with about the School LAND Trust Program. To choose more than one name on a list, use CTRL while selecting. To unhighlight a selected name, choose another name or use CTRL and select it.

State Leaders

Governor: Gary R. Herbert.

U.S. Senators

Mike Lee
Orrin Hatch

State Senators

Dist. 13 Mark B. Madsen

U.S. Representatives

Jim Matheson

State Representatives

Dist. 2 Lifferth, David E.

District School Board

State School Board

ITEM F - The State Board Rule requires reporting of the dates when local boards approved the other plans school community councils are responsible for. Please enter the most recent approval date for each plan listed. These approval dates are for plans being implemented in the 2013-2014 school year and require a 2013 approval date.

2013 - 2014 School Plans

School Improvement Plan
(required for all schools) 06/18/2013

Professional Development Plan
(required for all schools) 06/18/2013

Reading Achievement Plan
(required for all schools with K-3 grades) 06/18/2013

Note for Charter Schools: Charter Schools are only required to have a Reading Achievement Plan, if they receive funding for the program. The other plans are not required.

ITEM G - A summary of this Final Report must be provided to parents and posted on the school website by November 15th of the 2013. When was this task completed?

Not required for Charter Schools.

11/15/2013