## DISTRICT 64 <br> ANALYSIS OF STUDENT ACH EVEMENT \& PREVIEW OF STATE REPORT CARD



## Assessment Landscape

## ISAT

MAP

Educational Ends Assessments

Quizzes or Tests
that Contribute to
a Grade
End of Unit/Term
Tests or Projects
Report Card
Grades

## Summative

- Measure student learning relative to content standards
- Occur after instruction
- Tools to evaluate program effectiveness, school improvement goals, and curriculum alignment


## Assessment Landscape

Diagnostic
Admit Slips or
Exit Slips
Progress-
Monitoring Tools

Checkpoints
Learning Logs
SMART
Response

## Formative

- Occur during instruction
- Provide information to adjust teaching and learning while they are happening
- Students have the opportunity to respond to feedback


## Student Achievement Update - 2013

■Educational Ends
$\square$ MAP (Measures of Academic Progress)

םISAT (Illinois Standards Achievement Test)

## Educational Ends

Critical Thinking /
Problem-Solving
Foreign Language
General Music
Health
Instrumental Music
Language Arts
Math
Physical Education
Science
Social Emotional
Social Studies
Visual Arts
$\square$ Broadly defined learning goals in each area of a child's development

Reflect the value District 64 places on the "whole child"

## Assessing the Educational Ends

$\square$ Standardized Tests
$\square$ Report Card DataLocally Developed Assessments
87 indicators were reviewed in 2012-13

| ENDS STATEMENT | ASSESSMENT TOOL | Evidence | TARGEIED OUTCOME | WHEN | bastine | target | Current status |
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## What Can We Learn from the Educational Ends Assessments?

Of the 87 assessments administered during the 2012-13 school year:

- 84\% reflect on-target performance

ㅁ 16\% reflect performance within 10\% of the target - $0 \%$ reflect performance outside of the target range
$\square$ The percentage of assessments in the "on-target" scoring range has increased from $62 \%$ in 2007-08 to its current level of $84 \%$.

Measures of Academic Progress (MAP)
$\square$ Aligned to Illinois State StandardsComputerized "adaptive" testRIT scaleDistrict 64 mean has increased over time and is consistently higher than the national mean

- Reading: high 60s to mid 70s national percentile rank
-Math: high 60s to low 70s national percentile rank


## MAP Reading Results

$\square$ In general, about a quarter of students perform above the $75^{\text {th }}$ percentile ( $=86^{\text {th }}-90^{\text {th }}$ percentile nationally)
$\square$ Over the past five years: Decrease in percentage scoring in lower quartile (District 64 norms)


## MAP Math Results

$\square$ In general, about a quarter of students perform above the $75^{\text {th }}$ percentile ( $=85^{\text {th }}-88^{\text {th }}$ percentile nationally)
$\square$ Over the past five years: Increase in percentage of students performing above the $75^{\text {th }}$ percentile $2^{\text {nd }}$ grade, $3^{\text {rd }}$ grade, and $8^{\text {th }}$ grade


## MAP: Looking Ahead to Spring 2014

## D64 has implemented the CCSS-aligned version of MAP Reading \& Math.

## English Language Arts

## Math

- Increasing complexity of texts
- Reduced number of topics at
- Balance of informational and each grade level narrative text
- Content area literacy
- Writing to argue or explain
- Academic discussion and vocabulary
- Integration of research and media skills
- Focus on deep conceptual understanding, speed and accuracy in calculation, application of math in realworld contexts


## Student Growth Targets

$\square$ Calculated based on:
typical growth of students at specific RIT scores

■student's grade level
$\square$ Important measure for ALL students

## Student Growth Targets

$\square$ If $70 \%$ of students are meeting/exceeding growth targets, district is at $90^{\text {th }}-95^{\text {th }}$ percentile for growth

■Average growth - 50\%
■"Ambitious" growth - 63\%
■"Aggressive" growth - 70\%

| Student Growth Targets |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2008-09 | 2009-10 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 5-Year Avg |
| Reading | 59.0 | 54.1 | 56.4 | 56.9 | 55.2 | 56.3 |
| Math | 58.9 | 55.9 | 59.8 | 62.6 | 62.8 | 60.0 |
| Reading: "Above average" growth Math: "Ambitious" growth |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Changes to ISAT Performance Levels

Seeking waiver from U.S. Department of Education

Commitment to aligning ISAT results with PSAE
Anticipated that only half of all students in Illinois will "Meet Standards"
$11 \%-14 \%$ decrease in percentage of students demonstrating proficiency on the ISAT

## ISAT Results

$\square$ Overall District performance in Reading and Math remains competitive

■"Meets \& Exceeds" in Reading: 83\% (94\%)
■"Meets \& Exceeds" in Math: 82\% (96\%)

Performance continues to be strong in Science




## AYP (Adequate Yearly Progress) Status

Calculated based on percentage of total students and subgroups who meet/exceed standards, testing participation rates, and attendance rates
Only one of our elementary schools - Franklin achieved AYP

Pending approval, growth model may be adopted

|  | Reading | Math |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| District 64 | 107.4 | 106.9 |
| State | 102.1 | 101.4 |



## 5Essentials Survey Results

## Strengths

Opportunities for Growth

- External relationships
- Parent input and participation
- Students' sense of safety
- Teacher responsiveness
- Students value hard work
- High expectations for academic performance
- Teachers' influence on school practices
- Collective sense of responsibility
- Quality instruction and rigorous professional development
- Principals' capacity as instructional leaders
- Program coherence


## PARCC Assessment

Fully implemented in 2014-15 Administered at $3^{\text {rd }}-8^{\text {th }}$ grade
Computer-based assessment that includes a range of item types

Includes optional diagnostic and mid-year assessments

Speaking and Listening Component

## Performance-Based Assessments (PBAs)

ELA
$\square$ Research simulation task
$\square$ Task focused on analyzing literature
$\square$ Read multiple texts and write several pieces

Math
$\square$ Solve problems using key grade-level content/skills

Problems presented in a real-world context

## End-of-Year Assessments

## ELA: Focus on reading and comprehending

 complex texts
## Math: Focus on demonstrating deep

 understanding of grade-level content
## Implications for Our Work Together:

## Curriculum \& Assessment Influences

| SPRINC 2013 | FALL 2013 | SPRINC 2014 | FALL 2014 | SPRING 2015 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Administer <br> ISAT (20\% <br> Common <br> Core; new <br> cut scores) |  | Administer <br> 2014 ISAT <br> (100\% <br> Common <br> core; new <br> cut scores) | ISAT <br> discontinued | Administer <br> summative <br> PARCC <br> Assessments |
|  | Administer <br> Common <br> Core- <br> aligned <br> MAP |  |  |  |

## Recommendations for Our Work Together

Maintain our focus on individual student growth and the high-yield instructional strategies that support student growth.
$\checkmark$ Continue to support teachers with the use of data to inform instruction.

## Recommendations for Our Work Together

$\checkmark$ Continue to evaluate the Educational Ends and determine their alignment to the District 64 Priority Standards and the Common Core State Standards. Refine the Educational Ends assessments so that they provide information that most accurately reflects our learning priorities.
$\checkmark$ Through collaboration with the Instructional Technology Coaches, Curriculum Specialists, and Department Chairpersons, continue to provide support for teachers with the implementation of the Common Core State Standards.

## Recommendations for Our Work Together

$\checkmark$ Continue to explore tools that enable us to progress-monitor students with more precision on essential skills like reading comprehension and math problem-solving, particularly at the kindergarten and $1^{\text {st }}$ grade levels.

## Impacting Student Learning

Our fundamental task is to evaluate our effect on student learning

Seek out and implement high-leverage teaching practices
Recognize and celebrate the professionalism of educators

Enjoy the challenge

