## **Student Achievement Update**

August 8, 2016

# **District 64 Assessment** Portfolio



#### **MAP Performance: Four Key Questions**

- 1. Did we improve our performance in Reading and Math as measured by MAP and PARCC?
- 2. Did we outperform the Virtual Comparison Group on the MAP assessment?
- 3. How did we cause these results?
- 4. What are our next steps?

### **Status & Growth**



#### Status

How does our students' average score compare to the average score of students in other schools?

#### Growth

Are our students growing more or less than students in other schools?

### **Key Points**

- 2015 Norm Study
- 8th grade included in data
- **Growth**: >50th percentile = *above average*
- 2nd grade included beginning in 2016-17

STATUS Percentile Rank for Mean Score		
2015	2016	
91	93	
GROWTH Percentile Rank for Growth		
2015	2016	
39	55	

## **MAP Reading**

- Slight increase in status to 93rd percentile
- Significant increase in growth from below average (39) to above average (55)
- Focus on differentiation

STATUS Percentile Rank for Mean Score		
2015	2016	
86	88	
GROWTH Percentile Rank for Growth		
2015	2016	
66	68	

## **MAP Math**

- Slight increase in status to 88th percentile
- Slight increase in growth (already well above average)
- Focus Area: Increase in 4th grade growth from *below average* to *average*
- Focus on differentiation- Guided Math
- Data Review Data Leadership Teams
- Increased Tier III math interventions
- Title I Funded Math Tutoring Program in some schools

#### **Typical Performance Profile**



#### **District Performance Profile**



#### Virtual Comparison Group







**Growth Comparison (effect size)** 

# **District 64 Assessment** Portfolio



## **PARCC Assessment Topics**

#### Reading

- Literary Text
- Informational Text
- Vocabulary

#### Writing

- Expression
- Conventions

#### Math

- Major content
- Supporting content
- Reasoning
- Modeling/Application

## **PARCC Structure**

#### Spring 2015

- Two Testing Windows, One Test Score: Performance-Based Assessment (March) & End-of-Year Assessment (May)
- 8-9 test sessions per student

#### Spring 2016

- One Testing Window, One Test Score (April)
- 6-7 test sessions per student (reduced testing time for most students by 90 minutes)

## How is the data reported?

- ELA/Math
- Percentage of Students Achieving at Five Performance Levels
  - 5- Exceeded Expectations
  - 4 Met Expectations
  - 3- Approached Expectations
  - 2 Partially Met Expectations
  - 1 Did Not Meet Expectations

## **ELA:** What does our **DISTRICT** data look like?

	2015	2016
5- Exceeded Expectations	9%	9%
4 - Met Expectations	48%	50%
3- Approached Expectations	28%	26%
2 - Partially Met Expectations	12%	10%
1 - Did Not Meet Expectations	4%	5%
MEETS/EXCEEDS	57%	59%

## Math: What does our DISTRICT data look like?

	2015	2016
5- Exceeded Expectations	7%	8%
4 - Met Expectations	43%	50%
3- Approached Expectations	32%	28%
2 - Partially Met Expectations	15%	11%
1 - Did Not Meet Expectations	4%	4%
MEETS/EXCEEDS	50%	58%

## Next Steps for 2016-17

- Continue to focus on high-impact instruction to outperform the Virtual Comparison Group by .5 in 2020
- Design common assessments in each subject area
  - Provide information about student learning that is directly related to our District 64 curriculum and instruction
  - Measure student progress by unit
  - Guide differentiated instruction

## Questions/Comments?

llopez@d64.org