## New York State Student Learning Objective: Algebra 2

| All SLOS MUST include the following basic components: |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Population | These are the students assigned to the course section(s) in this SLO - all students who are assigned to the course section(s) must be included in the SLO. (Full class rosters of all students must be provided for all included course sections.) <br> Two sections of Honors Algebra II (60 students total) |
| Learning Content | What is being taught over the instructional period covered? Common Core/National/State standards? Will this goal apply to all standards applicable to a course or just to specific priority standards? <br> The following are based upon Common Core Standards. <br> Students will use their knowledge of functions (linear, quadratic, exponential, polynomial, rational, and radical) algebraically, to solve problems, and to model real-world situations. <br> Students will use their knowledge of trigonometry to model periodic phenomena. <br> Students will build upon their prior knowledge of probability and statistics to draw inferences and conclusions from data. |
| Interval of Instructional Time | What is the instructional period covered (if not a year, rationale for semester/quarter/etc)? <br> 2012-2013 school year |
| Evidence | What specific assessment(s) will be used to measure this goal? The assessment must align to the learning content of the course. <br> Baseline Assessment: NYS Algebra I and Geometry Regents Examination results. Also, in September of each year, students will take a locally developed assessment based on critical Algebra I and Geometry skills needed for Algebra II. <br> Summative Assessment: NYS Regents Examination in Algebra II and Trigonometry. |
| Baseline | What is the starting level of students' knowledge of the learning content at the beginning of the instructional period? <br> On the Geometry Regents from last year: $55(92 \%)$ students were at mastery and $5(8 \%)$ students were below mastery (but passed the exam). <br> On the Algebra I Regents from 2 years ago: 55 (92\%) students were at mastery and 5 ( $8 \%$ ) students were below mastery (but passed the |


|  | exam). <br> On the school-developed assessment of critical Algebra I and Geometry skills: $48(80 \%)$ students were at mastery and $12(20 \%)$ students were below mastery (but passed the exam). |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Target(s) | What is the expected outcome (target) of students' level of knowledge of the learning content at the end of the instructional period? $80 \%$ of all students will score $65 \%$ or higher on the NYS Algebra II and Trigonometry Regents Examination. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HEDI Scoring | How will evaluators determine what range of student performance "meets" the goal (effective) versus "well-below" (ineffective), "below" (developing), and "well-above" (highly effective)? <br> See ranges as specified (scores on the two scales will be averaged for the overall points out of 20 ): |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | HIGHLY EFFECTIVE |  |  | EFFECTIVE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | DEVELOPING |  |  |  |  |  | INEFFECTIVE |  |  |
|  | 20 | 19 | 18 | 17 | 16 | 15 | 14 | 13 | 12 | 11 | 10 | 9 | 8 | 7 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
|  | 98 <br> 90\% | 94- $97 \%$ | 90- $93 \%$ | $\begin{array}{\|c} 88- \\ 89 \% \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 86- \\ 87 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 84- \\ 85 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 82- \\ 83 \% \\ 8 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 79- \\ 81 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 76- \\ 78 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 73- \\ & 75 \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 70- \\ & 72 \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 67- \\ 69 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 62- \\ 66 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 58- \\ 62 \% \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 54- \\ 57 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 50- \\ 53 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 45- \\ 49 \% \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 40- \\ 44 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 35- \\ 39 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 30- \\ 34 \% \end{gathered}$ | $<30$ $\%$ |
| Rationale | Describe the reasoning behind the choices regarding learning content, evidence, and target and how they will be used together to prepare students for future growth and development in subsequent grades/courses, as well as college and career readiness. <br> The Learning Content is based upon the CCLS anchor standards. The baseline evidence combines NYS Regents Examination results with a school-developed assessment of skills from Algebra I and Geometry that are crucial for success in Algebra II and are based on CCLS standards in Appendix A. The summative assessment score is calculated by averaging the results from the NYS Algebra II Regents Examination with the results from the locally developed summative assessment which is developed based on CCLS standard in Appendix A. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

