

Thunder Ridge Elementary Final Report 2013-2014

Financial Proposal and Report - This report is automatically generated from the School Plan entered in the spring of 2013 and from the District Business Administrator's data entry of the School LAND Trust expenditures in 2013-2014.

Available Funds	Planned Expenditures (entered by the school)	Actual Expenditures (entered by the District Business Administrator)
Carry-Over from 2012 - 2013	\$2,107	\$6,438
Distribution for 2013 - 2014	\$34,770	\$44,920
Total Available for Expenditure in 2013 - 2014	\$36,877	\$51,358
Salaries and Employee Benefits (100 and 200)	\$23,966	\$15,094
Professional and Technical Services (300)	\$1,800	\$5,233
Repairs and Maintenance (400)	\$0	\$0
Other Purchased Services (Admission and Printing) (500)	\$0	\$0
Travel (580)	\$0	\$0
General Supplies (610)	\$1,550	\$8,027
Textbooks (641)	\$0	\$0
Library Books (644)	\$3,100	\$0
Periodicals, AV Materials (650-660)	\$0	\$0
Software (670)	\$2,174	\$0
Equipment (Computer Hardware, Instruments, Furniture) (730)	\$2,180	\$10,656
Total Expenditures	\$34,770	\$39,010
Remaining Funds (Carry-Over to 2014 - 2015)	\$2,107	\$12,348

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 2013. 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 2014.

Identified academic area(s).

Reading

This was the action plan.

1. DRA Substitutes: Provide 35 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. Double-Dosing Aides: Provide 695 hours of aide time throughout the year dedicated to preteaching/reteaching 1st-6th grade students who need extra support. (Alpine School District will provide a grant for another 493 hours.) In total, this will amount to 2 hours of aide time each Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday throughout the year for each grade level, 1st-6th.
5. Spring Reading Program: Provide funds to purchase supporting materials for the annual Spring Reading Program.
6. Guided Reading Library: Provide funds to purchase books that offer differentiated texts for teachers to use with small reading groups.
7. Resource Lending Library: Provide funds to purchase books that students receiving Special Education services can check out that are uniquely selected for their reading readiness level.
8. 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.

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. Monies were used to hire several "Double Dose" aides that worked with 1st-6th grade 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. 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.

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. We will also use SGP scores for our 4th-6th grade students who take the Language Arts CRT in May 2014 to provide an additional measure of progress towards our goal. We will use an SGP score of 45 as our benchmark to demonstrate approximately one year of growth.

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	Read Growth
K	Glover	L	1.5
K	Glover	M	1.2
K	Glover	H	1
K	McPherson	L	1.6
K	McPherson	M	1.2
K	McPherson	H	1
K	Willson	L	1.25
K	Willson	M	1
K	Willson	H	1
1	Beck	L	1
1	Beck	M	1
1	Beck	H	1
1	Eliason	L	1.35
1	Eliason	M	1
1	Eliason	H	0.7
1	Meade	L	1
1	Meade	M	1
1	Meade	H	1
1	Sasser	L	1.1
1	Sasser	M	1
1	Sasser	H	1
1	Schiess	L	1.1

1	Schiess	M	1
1	Schiess	H	1
1	Schmidt	L	1.1
1	Schmidt	M	1.1
1	Schmidt	H	1
2	Gatto	L	0.8
2	Gatto	M	1.2
2	Gatto	H	1
2	Howell	L	1.5
2	Howell	M	1.1
2	Howell	H	1.1
2	Hutchings	L	1
2	Hutchings	M	1.1
2	Hutchings	H	1
2	Layne	L	1
2	Layne	M	1
2	Layne	H	0.8
2	Young	L	1.1
2	Young	M	1
2	Young	H	1
3	Biggs	L	1.1
3	Biggs	M	1.1
3	Biggs	H	1
3	Casper	L	1
3	Casper	M	1.1
3	Casper	H	1
3	Smith, Colleen	L	2
3	Smith, Colleen	M	1.2
3	Smith, Colleen	H	1
3	Welch	L	1
3	Welch	M	1.1
3	Welch	H	1
4	Bowman	L	2
4	Bowman	M	2
4	Bowman	H	2
4	Cannon	L	3
4	Cannon	M	2.2
4	Cannon	H	2

4	Mickelsen	L	3
4	Mickelsen	M	1.4
4	Mickelsen	H	1
4	Rogers	L	1
4	Rogers	M	1
4	Rogers	H	1
5	Cochrane	L	1
5	Cochrane	M	1
5	Cochrane	H	1.5
5	Decker	L	1.5
5	Decker	M	1
5	Decker	H	1
5	Hutchinson	L	1.8
5	Hutchinson	M	0.5
5	Hutchinson	H	0.8
5	Smith, Bob	L	1.5
5	Smith, Bob	M	1
5	Smith, Bob	H	1.5
6	Allred	L	2
6	Allred	M	1
6	Allred	H	1
6	McCord	L	1
6	McCord	M	1
6	McCord	H	1
6	Hodson-Smith	L	3
6	Hodson-Smith	M	1
6	Hodson-Smith	H	1

Read Growth

Total	1.22
Low	1.46
Middle	1.12
High	1.08

The data above indicates that we were able to achieve a little more than one year of growth in Reading overall (1.22), with some variation among the 3 subgroups and the low students making the most progress (1.46). At this time, SGP has not been not calculated by the state for the May 2014 tests, so I cannot include that data in this report. 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
13356	Salaries and Employee Benefits (100 and 200)	Substitutes for DRA (\$2,835), substitutes for Professional Development (\$1,215), and Double Dosing Aides (\$9,306.35).
1800	Professional and Technical Services (300)	Professional Development workshop and conference fees.
800	General Supplies (610)	Supporting materials for the Spring Reading program.
3100	Library Books (644)	Texts for our Guided Reading Library (\$3,000) and our Resource Lending Library (\$100).
2174	Software (670)	Subscriptions for each classroom to Raz-kids, and online level-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
\$3,786.75	Salaries and Employee Benefits	DRA & Prof Development Substitutes
\$7,412.60	Salaries and Employee Benefits	Double Dose (DD) Aides
\$1,700.00	Salaries and Employee Benefits	Benefits (approx. 22%) for DD
\$1,446.00	Professional and Technical Services	Conference Fees
\$974.55	General Supplies	Spring Reading materials
\$5,523.55	Library Books	Guided Reading and Resource books
\$899.95	Software	Raz-kids subscriptions

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 2013. 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 2014.

Identified academic area(s).

Mathematics

This was the action plan.

1. Summer Collaboration Grant: Provide funding for teachers to meet in teams over the summer to develop common assessments, prepare scoring rubrics, and plan interventions/extensions for crucial math and literacy objectives.
2. 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).
3. 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. Training, modeling, and materials will be provided for each family. The welcoming "carnival" atmosphere of the workshops encourages the whole family to come and helps the students feel they are fortunate to be invited.
4. 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.

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.

Summer Collaboration grants money was set aside in our School LAND Trust so teachers could meet several times during the summer to identify core concepts, create targeted assessments, and plan interventions and enrichment opportunities. Alpine School District provides similar grants for several teams at every school; these funds are set aside

so those teams that don't receive the district grant can still meet together and do the same work. Two teams (8 teachers total) used the money set aside by the SCC.

School LAND Trust funds were 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.

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.

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 2013 scores will sort students for various tiers of instruction and assistance, common assessments will redirect efforts as necessary throughout the year, and the May 2014 scores will measure our overall success. We will also use SGP scores for our 4th-6th grade students who take the Math CRT in May 2014 to provide an additional measure of progress towards our goal. We will use an SGP score of 45 as our benchmark to demonstrate approximately one year of growth.

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
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
K	Willson	H	1
1	Beck	L	1
1	Beck	M	1
1	Beck	H	1
1	Eliason	L	0.67
1	Eliason	M	1
1	Eliason	H	1
1	Meade	L	1
1	Meade	M	1
1	Meade	H	1

1	Sasser	L	1
1	Sasser	M	1
1	Sasser	H	1
1	Schiess	L	0.75
1	Schiess	M	1
1	Schiess	H	1
1	Schmidt	L	moved
1	Schmidt	M	1.1
1	Schmidt	H	1
2	Gatto	L	1.1
2	Gatto	M	1
2	Gatto	H	1
2	Howell	L	1.1
2	Howell	M	1
2	Howell	H	1
2	Hutchings	L	1.1
2	Hutchings	M	1
2	Hutchings	H	1
2	Layne	L	1
2	Layne	M	0.8
2	Layne	H	0.8
2	Young	L	1
2	Young	M	moved
2	Young	H	0.9
3	Biggs	L	1
3	Biggs	M	1
3	Biggs	H	1
3	Casper	L	1.1
3	Casper	M	1
3	Casper	H	1
3	Smith, Colleen	L	1.2
3	Smith, Colleen	M	1
3	Smith, Colleen	H	1
3	Welch	L	1
3	Welch	M	moved
3	Welch	H	1
4	Bowman	L	1
4	Bowman	M	1

4	Bowman	H	1
4	Cannon	L	1.5
4	Cannon	M	1.2
4	Cannon	H	1
4	Mickelsen	L	1
4	Mickelsen	M	1
4	Mickelsen	H	1
4	Rogers	L	1
4	Rogers	M	1
4	Rogers	H	1
5	Cochrane	L	0.8
5	Cochrane	M	1.25
5	Cochrane	H	1
5	Decker	L	1
5	Decker	M	1
5	Decker	H	1
5	Hutchinson	L	2
5	Hutchinson	M	1
5	Hutchinson	H	1
5	Smith, Bob	L	1.5
5	Smith, Bob	M	1
5	Smith, Bob	H	1
6	Allred	L	1
6	Allred	M	1
6	Allred	H	1.5
6	McCord	L	1
6	McCord	M	1
6	McCord	H	1
6	Hodson-Smith	L	1
6	Hodson-Smith	M	0.5
6	Hodson-Smith	H	0.5

Math Growth

Total 1.03

Low 1.12

Middle 0.99

High 0.99

The data above indicates that we were able to achieve one year of growth in math overall (1.03), with only minor variation among the 3 subgroups. At this time, SGP has not been calculated by the state for the May 2014 tests, so I

cannot include that data in this report. 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. At the time of this report, we do not have access to Core Tests at the student level, so we cannot share the core test data of those students who participated in Family Math Nights.

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

Amount	Category	Description
10610	Salaries and Employee Benefits (100 and 200)	Reteach & Enrich Aide (\$3,238.56), Family Math Night instructors (\$546), and Summer Collaboration Grant teachers (\$6,825).
750	General Supplies (610)	Materials needed for Family Math Night (\$500) and supplies needed for the Reteach & Enrich program (\$250).
2180	Equipment (Computer Hardware, Instruments, Furniture) (730)	Classroom instructional technology (document cameras, interactive white boards, etc.).

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

Amount	Category	Description
\$2,503.28	Salaries and Employee Benefits	Reteach & Enrich (R&E) aide salary
\$341.25	Salaries and Employee Benefits	Family Math Night (FMN) instructors salary
\$2,100.00	Salaries and Employee Benefits	Summer Collaboration (SC) grants salary
\$1,128.00	Salaries and Employee Benefits	Benefits (approx. 22%) for R&E, FMN, and SC salaries
\$475.65	General Supplies	Family Math Night (FMN) materials
\$63.29	General Supplies	Reteach & Enrich (R&E) materials
\$10,655.44	Equipment	Classroom instructional technology

ITEM B - In the Financial Proposal and Report, there is a carry-over of \$12348 to the 2014-2015 school year. This is 27% of the distribution received in 2013-2014. 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 the Raz-kids program for all lower-grade students and so we only had to purchase the program for two grade levels. We recouped money when many teachers were able to use half-day substitutes to complete the DRA testing instead of full-day substitutes. We recouped a significant amount of money because five of our seven grade level teams were given the district Summer Collaboration Grant so we only had to fund the summer grants of two teams (instead of the four we anticipated). We also recouped significant amounts of money anytime the hourly aides being paid for out of Trust Lands did not come to work (sick, vacation, etc.). Finally, 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.

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 used for instructional technology upgrades. We are a growing school and we add several new classrooms each year. Additional School LAND Trust funds will help equip the new classrooms with similar instructional technology that can already be found in the existing grade-level classrooms.

The distribution was about 14% more that 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 and books than we originally planned—both of which are in the plan. 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

Brian Halladay
JoDee Sundberg
John Burton
Scott Carlson
Debbie Taylor
Wendy K. Hart
Paula Hill

State School Board

ITEM G - A summary of this Final Report must be provided to parents and posted on the school website by October 20th of the 2014. When was this task completed?

Not required for Charter Schools.

11/06/2014