

Shorewood School District

Appendix

R-2.1 (Grades K5-12 Math)

Multi-Age Classroom and Single Grade Classroom Data:

- ✓ 1-6 Grade End of Year Math Assessment
 - Percent of students that are “Secure”/”Meeting Expectations” or above on the End of Year Math Assessment (2017-18)

Shorewood	% Secure
MAC	64.7%
Single Grade	58.3%

Lake Bluff	% Secure
MAC	63.6%
Single Grade	57.5%

Atwater	% Secure
MAC	67.0%
Single Grade	59.0%

- ✓ 3-4th Grade (Atwater) and 3-6th Grade (Lake Bluff) Forward Assessment
 - Percent of students that are Proficient or Advanced on Forward Math

Shorewood	N Sample Size	% of students Prof/Adv on Math
MAC	173	80.9%
Single Grade	263	71.1%

Lake Bluff (3rd through 6th)	N Sample Size	% of students Prof/Adv on Math
MAC	131	78.6%
Single Grade	178	74.1%

Atwater (3rd and 4th)	N Sample Size	% of students Prof/Adv on Math
MAC	42	88.0%
Single Grade	85	64.7%

Provided here is the Multi-Age classroom data side by side with Single Age classroom data. As we can see according to our End of Year Math Assessment data, there is little difference between the two programs. Looking at the Forward Assessment, we see an overall gap of about 10%. It is important then to look at the two schools. Lake Bluff shows a negligible difference of about 4% between the two programs that could be explained through a multitude of reasons. Atwater however shows a larger difference between the two programs. It is important to note the small sample size in Atwater MAC meaning that there is the possibility of some “selection bias” occurring, and an examination into number of students in math intervention at Atwater would support the idea of selection bias

occurring. Further data analysis reveals that the gap in Forward Assessment ELA scores this past year is inconsistent with the much smaller gaps and inverse relationships (i.e. Single Grade outperforming MAC) shown in previous years. I would posit that the similarity in scores from End of Year Math Assessments and Lake Bluff's Forward assessment, and the similarity in gaps in the ELA Next Steps report, that the variety of class structure is not the reason for differences in performance, but rather something else. I would like to meet with Atwater's 3rd and 4th single grade teachers, share the data and identify reasons, next steps and resources necessary to hopefully decrease this gap.

Target Setting:

The targets were set by first identifying some of the largest gaps within each area. Two focuses then guided the target setting: all students should grow *and* subgroups with lower performance need to grow at a faster rate. This is in line with federal ESSA requirements to close gaps over 6 years while maintaining growth for all students.

Analysis/Next Steps on the whole report:

Much of the growth and or consistent performance can be attributed to growing familiarity with the new Common Core Aligned curriculum that Shorewood adopted 3 years ago. Last year would have been the 2nd year, so fidelity to the program is growing. Largely we see either continued growth, or a steadying of results from year to year that we would expect as the new curriculum becomes more familiar. There are some academic gaps to focus on specifically the ACT performance of Black students.

Suggested Changes to R-2 Math Report

- Similar to the suggestion for the ELA report, it may be time to consider a "Students with Disabilities" and "Students without Disabilities" comparison for the math report as well.
- I would recommend that we remove the K5 Kindergarten Math Checklist indicator from our monitoring report for two reasons. The first is because it monitors only one grade, our subgroup sample sizes become very small and make it difficult to make comparisons. Also, because it is only a single grade indicator, the cohort of students consistently changes, so setting targets for an entirely new population of students is difficult.
- I would recommend that we pull the 6th Grade End of Year Big Ideas Assessment into the Grades 1 through 5 End of Year Everyday Math Assessment indicator. For the same reasons noted above, it would make sense to pull them into a larger sample size in order to maintain another year of cohort students and increase the sample size.