

## English Language Arts I, 9-10<sup>th</sup> Grade

### Overview

The author of this Student Growth Objective teaches 9<sup>th</sup> and 10<sup>th</sup> grade English Language Arts in a traditional public school.

**Strengths:** a) The standards, assessment method, and scoring rubrics are explicitly stated and clear. b) A variety of measures are used to determine student starting points. This information allows the teacher to group students by preparedness level and create a set of targets that are ambitious and achievable for each group.

**Improvement:** The teacher might want to consider using percentages of students that will attain a particular target in the scoring plan. This will simplify calculations for an SGO score if students enter or leave the class throughout the year.

Name	School	Grade	Course/Subject	Number of Students	Interval of Instruction
		9-10	ELA 1	78/78	September 6 - April 30

The teacher's intent to capture a significant portion of the course instructional period in this SGO is specific and clear. All students are included in this SGO.

### Standards, Rationale and Assessment Method

Name the content standards covered, state the rationale for how these standards are critical for the next level of the subject, other academic disciplines, and/or life/college/career. Name and briefly describe the format of the assessment method.

The writing process is developed over time. This SGO will measure student growth by having students compile an electronic, multi-genre "showcase portfolio" of selected writing tasks drafted, revised, and published during the academic year.

As students complete final, "published" writing tasks, they will upload the artifacts to their designated wiki page on the class wiki (<http://litsource.pbworks.com/>). Once posted, artifacts will be committee scored by colleagues in my department during designated Professional Learning Committee sessions using Common Core Writing Rubrics: Explanatory/Narrative/Persuasive (<http://i.mp/ccssrubrics>), Response to Literature, and Research Writing (these rubrics will be collaboratively developed using <http://www.essaytagger.com/commoncore>). Except for the literary analysis and research writing tasks, each genre will be assessed twice during the SGO window (see attached "ELA 9 Writing Assessment Calendar"). Students will have the opportunity to make as many revisions to each task up until the publishing deadlines. Students will select their strongest task for inclusion in the electronic writing portfolio. Once published, the score given by the evaluator will be final. All writing tasks will be scored equally and the average score for the portfolio will be used to determine if students meet their target score. The following proficiency scale will be used:

### Portfolio Scoring Scale

Inadequate	Developing	Proficient	Skilled	Exceptional
0-1.49	1.50-2.49	2.50-3.49	3.50-4.24	4.25-5.00

### Standards Assessed

The majority of the writing CCSS standards are represented in the portfolio project. They include the following standards.

### Range of Writing:

CCSS.ELA-LITERACY.W.9-10.10

Write routinely over extended time frames (time for research, reflection, and revision) and shorter time frames (a single sitting or a day or two) for a range of tasks, purposes, and audiences.

Each portfolio will contain the following items:

**Persuasive**

CCSS.ELA-LITERACY.W.9-10.1

Write arguments to support claims in an analysis of substantive topics or texts, using valid reasoning and relevant and sufficient evidence.

**Informative/Explanatory**

CCSS.ELA-LITERACY.W.9-10.2

Write informative/explanatory texts to examine and convey complex ideas, concepts, and information clearly and accurately through the effective selection, organization, and analysis of content.

**Narrative**

CCSS.ELA-LITERACY.W.9-10.3

Write narratives to develop real or imagined experiences or events using effective technique, well-chosen details, and well-structured event sequences.

**Literary Analysis**

CCSS.ELA-LITERACY.W.9-10.9

Draw evidence from literary or informational texts to support analysis, reflection, and research.

**Research**

CCSS.ELA-LITERACY.W.9-10.7

Conduct short as well as more sustained research projects to answer a question (including a self-generated question) or solve a problem; narrow or broaden the inquiry when appropriate; synthesize multiple sources on the subject, demonstrating understanding of the subject under investigation.

**Publishing**

CCSS.ELA-LITERACY.W.9-10.6

Use technology, including the Internet, to produce, publish, and update individual or shared writing products, taking advantage of technology's capacity to link to other information and to display information flexibly and dynamically.

***Standards:** The standards that will be taught and assessed in the course are clearly stated. The course captures a significant portion writing CCSS for the grade levels included in the SGO.*

***Assessment:** The teacher clearly states the assessment method that will be used at the end of the SGO period. The portfolio assessment is grounded in standards and multiple rigorous rubrics are used to provide meaningful feedback. The approach of having multiple educators weigh into the scoring process will help the students get more robust feedback and enable stronger score validity, given the inherent subjective nature of scoring writing tasks. Rubrics and the assessment schedule are linked to this form which will assist in conversations with the administrator.*

**Starting Points and Preparedness Groupings**

State the type of information being used to determine starting points and summarize scores for each type by group. Add or subtract columns and rows as needed to match number of preparedness groups and types of Information used.

Preparedness Group	Information #1	Information #2	Information #3
	NJASK 8 Writing (out of 18 points possible)	Baseline writing assessments	Indicators of Future Success
High	≥15	4/5	2-3
Medium	9-14	3/5	1-2
Low	≥8	2/5	0-1

*Using multiple data points including NJASK 8 scores, current grades and future markers of success provides a detailed picture of how well prepared students are for learning in terms of content knowledge and skills.*

***Suggestion:** a) The teacher may want to describe how a student who falls into multiple categories will be grouped. For example, where students could be placed in two or more preparedness groups, baseline writing assessment average has most weight. b) The teacher might consider attaching a rubric to indicate what is included in the indicators of future success information, e.g. [sample rubric](#).*

**Student Growth Objective**

State simply what percentage of students in each preparedness group will meet what target in the space below, e.g. "75% of students in each group will meet the target score." Describe how the targets reflect ambitious and achievable scores for these students. Use the table to provide more detail for each group. Add or delete group rows as needed.

75% of students in each preparedness group will meet the average target portfolio score.

Preparedness Group (e.g. Low, Medium, High)	Number of Students in Each Group	Target Score on SGO Assessment
High	8/78	Exceptional (Average score: >4.24)
Medium	22/78	Skilled (Average score: >3.49)
Low	48/78	Proficient (Average score: >2.49)

*It is very clear how many students will accomplish what by when. Recognizing that students start the year at different levels, a set of ambitious and achievable targets have been established for all students using a differentiated approach.*

**Scoring Plan**

State the projected scores for each group and what percentage of students will meet this target at each attainment level.

Preparedness Group	Student Target Score	Teacher SGO Score Based on Percent of Students Achieving Target Score			
		Exceptional (4)	Full (3)	Partial (2)	Insufficient (1)
High	Exceptional	7-8	5-6	3-4	<3
Medium	Skilled	20-22	15-19	11-14	<14
Low	Proficient	41-48	32-40	24-31	<24

*The scoring plan is clear, logical, and aligns with the SGO statement and other information on this form.*

**Approval of Student Growth Objective**

Administrator approves scoring plan and assessment used to measure student learning.

Teacher \_\_\_\_\_ Signature \_\_\_\_\_

Date Submitted:

Evaluator \_\_\_\_\_ Signature \_\_\_\_\_

Date Approved:

**Results of Student Growth Objective**

Summarize results using weighted average as appropriate. Delete and add columns and rows as needed.

Preparedness Group	# Students at Target Score	Teacher SGO Score	Weight (based on students per group)	Weighted Score	Total Teacher SGO Score
High	3	2	.10	0.4	3.38
Medium	20	4	.28	1.12	
Low	35	3	.62	1.86	

**Notes**

Describe any changes made to SGO after initial approval, e.g. because of changes in student population, other unforeseen circumstances, etc.

**Review SGO at Annual Conference**

Describe successes and challenges, lessons learned from SGO about teaching and student learning, and steps to improve SGOs for next year.

Teacher \_\_\_\_\_ Signature \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_  
 Evaluator \_\_\_\_\_ Signature \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

## SGO Addendum Items

### *Writing Assessment Calendar*

Assessment Name	Writing Type	Date Administered	Final Draft
Baseline Writing Assessment 1	Narrative	September 12, 2014	September 26, 2014
Baseline Writing Assessment 2	Informative/Explanatory	September 19, 2014	October 3, 2014
EUA #1	Narrative	October 10, 2014	October 24, 2014
ELA Module 2 Project	Persuasive	November 14, 2014	December 1, 2014
EUA #2	Informative/Explanatory	December 8, 2014	December 22, 2014
ELA Module 3 Project	Literary analysis	January 16, 2015	January 30, 2015
EUA #3	Persuasive	February 13, 2015	February 27, 2015
Research Writing Project	Research Writing	March 13, 2015	April 3, 2015
UA #4	Narrative	April 10, 2015	April 24, 2015

### Electronic Portfolio Submission Dates

Task	Final Submission Date for Committee Scoring
Informative/Explanatory	January 15, 2015
Literary Analysis	February 12, 2015
Persuasive	March 12, 2015
Research Writing	April 9, 2015
Narrative	April 28, 2015