School Board Meeting:	June 13, 2011
Subject:	Spring MAP Results
Presenter:	Pam Miller

SUGGESTED SCHOOL BOARD ACTION:
Report only.

DESCRIPTION:

<u>**Background**</u>

Our district has now completed the sixth year of NWEA's *Measures of Academic Progress* (MAP) testing. Students in Grades 2-8 are tested in reading and math during fall and spring testing windows. In addition, select students at BHS and PLC are tested for remediation identification. MAP test results are just one piece of standardized assessment data to determine the amount of student growth in reading and math on an annual basis, as well as over time.

MAP results provide us with a large amount of data to consume and analyze to aide in making programmatic decisions in reading and math. District analysis is considered through the following comparisons:
- BHM Schools vs. NWEA Norm Group
- Percentage of students meeting growth targets
- RIT Scores Spring 2011 vs. RIT Scores Spring 2010
- Average Growth Target Index
- Average Growth Target Rates for Subgroups

District personnel and site principals will analyze all district and site MAP data, along with other assessment data, to determine appropriate improvement strategies for 2011-12 and beyond.

The BHM spring MAP results are once again very positive results when comparing to the NWEA norm group.

<u>**District MAP Analysis Summary**</u>

<u>**BHM Schools vs. NWEA Norm Group**</u>

In math, the spring results of all seven grade levels tested (Grades 2-8) show BHM students scoring significantly above the national norm. According to NWEA, a score that is statistically significant is one that is ± 3 RIT points as compared to the NWEA normative group.

In reading, the spring results show BHM students scoring significantly above the national norm at six grade levels tested (Grades 3-8), and above the national norm at all seven grade levels tested (Grades 2-8).

Percentage of Students Meeting Growth Targets

In reading, the percent of students meeting or exceeding their growth targets at four of seven grade levels is at or above 60%, which NWEA considers to be "high-performing."

In math, the percent of students meeting or exceeding their growth targets at six of seven grade levels is at or above 60%, which NWEA considers to be "high-performing."

RIT Scores Spring 2011 vs. RIT Scores Spring 2010

In reading, four of the seven grade levels tested attained a higher RIT score than the previous year's students at that grade level, but none of the increases are statistically significant. None of the decreases are considered statistically significant.

In math, all seven grade levels tested attained a higher RIT score than the previous year's students at that grade level. Only grade 5 was a statistically significant increase.

Average Growth Target Index

A more accurate reflection of academic growth in reading and math is to examine the mean growth by RIT scores, as well as the growth index at each grade level. The mean growth is the average number of RIT points gained by students at any given grade level. The growth index compares the average growth of the norm group with that of our district's students. For example, the mean growth of Grade 5 math students in the norm group is 7.0 RIT points. This year, the BHM Grade 5 math students grew 15.5 RIT points. This gives us a growth index of +8.5 (15.5-7.0). When comparing that growth index to the NWEA research of schools nationwide, this places us above the 99th percentile.

As we examined the mean growth and the growth index for each grade level in both reading and math for Spring 2011, we can celebrate the following results:

> Reading
> - Growth indices at grades 4, 5, and 8 place us at or above the 90th percentile as compared to other schools nationwide.
> - All grade levels tested show growth above the 50th percentile.

Math
- Grades 4, 5, and 8 all indicate our performance above the 90th percentile as compared to other schools nationwide.
- All grade levels tested show positive growth above the 60th percentile.

All positive growth target index rates indicate a growth rate higher than that of peers nationwide. As we examine the BHM data, we recognize positive growth at all grade levels and all sites in reading with the exceptions of Hanover 2nd grade and Montrose 3rd grade. Looking at math, we see we have only celebrations to report, as every grade level and every site show positive growth index rates.

Average Growth Target Rates for Subgroups
An additional strategy we use to analyze our MAP data is to examine our subgroup populations' performance, much the same as is done with MCA assessment data. In particular, we examine the special programming for English Learners (EL), Free/Reduced Lunch (FRL) students, Special Education, and Title I. As you will note in reviewing the disaggregated data for each of these subgroups, there is much to celebrate in terms of success for BHM students – particularly in Title I. However, there are areas for improvement in each of the subgroups and specifically within the middle school years.

Next Steps
The administrative team has not yet had an opportunity to discuss the spring results, but will have the opportunity to do so this summer. In August at the district's data retreat, building teams will further analyze the results along with MCA assessment data.

Attachments:
    MAP Reading & Math Strand Report 2010-2011
    MAP Reading & Math Percent Meeting Growth Targets/Proficiency
    MAP Reading & Math Comparing Spring 2010 and Spring 2011
    MAP Reading & Math Growth Target Index
    MAP Reading & Math Growth Target Index Rates – Disaggregated