SOUTH SAN ANTONIO INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT

Agenda Item Summary

Meeting Date: November 14, 2018

Purpose: ☒ Presentation/Report ☐ Recognition ☐ Discussion/ Possible Action

☐ Closed/Executive Session ☐ Work Session ☐ Discussion Only ☐ Consent

From: Amy Shields, Director of Teaching and Learning

Item Title: Report on Goal 2 and Goal Progress Measures 2.1, 2.2, 2.3: Percent of students performing at Masters Level in Math

Description:

The percent of students who perform at the Masters Grade Level standard for all grades in state mathematics exams will increase 2.2 percentage points each year from 9% to 20% by 2022 (using Measures of Academic Progress beginning of year data for Grades 3-8).
11.2% 2018
13.4% 2019
15.6% 2020
17.8% 2021
20% by 2020

Recommendation:

Report only.

District Goal/Strategy:

Goal 2 The percent of students who perform at the Masters Grade Level standard for all grades in state mathematics exams will increase from 8% to 20% by 2022.

Funding Budget Code and Amount:	CFO Approval

APPROVED BY:	SIGNATURE	DATE
Chief Officer:		10-29-18
Superintendent:	Dr.	10/31/18

Form Revised: September 2018

Goal 2 and GPM 2.1, 2.2, 2.3 Mathematics

Amy Shields
Director of Teaching and Learning
Division of Academics

Goal 2

The percent of students who perform at the Masters Grade Level standard for all grades in state mathematics exams will increase 2.2 percentage points each year from 9% to 20% by 2022.

13.4% 2019
15.6% 2020
17.8% 2021
20% by 2022

GPM 2.1

The percent of 3rd grade students who perform at Masters Grade Level standard for math will increase yearly by 2.75 percentage points from 9% to meet the goal of 20% by 2022.

11.75% by 2019
14.5% by 2020
17.25% by 2021
20% by 2022

GPM 2.2

The percent of 5th grade students who perform at Masters Grade Level standard for math will increase yearly by .75 percentage points from 17% to meet the goal of 20% by 2022.

17.75% by 2019

18.5% by 2020

19.25% by 2021

20% by 2022

GPM 2.3

The percent of 8th grade students who perform at Meets Grade Level standard for math will increase yearly by 12 percentage points from 12% to meet the goal of 60% by 2022.

24% by 2019
36% by 2020
48% by 2021
60% by 2022

MAP Testing

After the first 4 weeks of instruction, 3rd-8th grade students' current math abilities were assessed using Measures of Academic Progress (MAP).

The test finds where students are performing on level, below level, or above level in four areas.

Measures of Academic Progress (MAP)

The grades below are assessed in the following areas:

Grades 3-5

- Numerical Representations and Relationships
- Geometry and Measurement
- Data Analysis and Monetary Transactions
- Computations and Algebraic Relationships

Grades 6-8

- Geometry and Measurement
- Data Analysis
- Numerical Representations and Probability
- Computations and Algebraic Relationships

Measures of Academic Progress (MAP)

- Online diagnostic assessment which identifies skills and learning standards that require targeted intervention to close learning gaps and also areas where students are excelling
- Reports for each classroom teacher to classify students into five groups
  - Lo, Lo-Avg, Avg, Hi-Avg, Hi

	Lo %ile < 21		LoAvg %ile 21-40		Avg %ile 41-60		HiAvg %ile 61-80		Hi %ile > 80	
Overall Performance	count	%	count	%	count	%	count	%	count	%
Mathematics	17	25%	10	14%	18	26%	16	23%	8	12%

- Assessment is done three specific points throughout the year.

Implementation

- Teachers have access to a variety of reports--individual and class--to create groups and plan for interventions

- Individual student data shows where students are working below grade level, on grade level, and above grade level in specific skills

- Interventions to address Beginning of Year (BOY) data will take place between now and late January when we will take Middle of Year (MOY) test to see growth

Individual Student Report

205*

Error Margin: +/- 2.9
Possible range: 202-208
11/17/2017 - 57 minutes
Percentage of Disengaged Responses: N/A
Est. Impact of Disengagement on RIT: N/A
Growth: Math 2-5 TX 2012
*Fall 2017-18

▲ CLOSE HIGHLIGHTS

READING ---

LANGUAGE USAGE ---

[redacted] mathematics score could benefit from focus in Numerical Representations and Relationships and Geometry and Measurement. Visit Instructional Areas for more details about which skills and concepts he is ready to learn.

Compared to his overall score, I and Monetary Transactions. As strength when he is learning ne

COMPARISONS

59TH — **Norms Percentile**
Achievement for this term, ranked against NWEA 2015 Norms Study

Approaches — **State of Texas Assessments of Academic Readiness**
Projected result for test taken in **spring**

INSTRUCTIONAL AREAS

198 — **Geometry and Measurement** →
Suggested Area of Focus

198 — **Numerical Representations and Relationships** →
Suggested Area of Focus

210 — **Computations and Algebraic Relationships** →

213 — **Data Analysis and Monetary Transactions** →
Relative Strength

Individual Student Data

Use Place Value: Whole Numbers and Decimals

1.2.C: use objects, pictures, and expanded and standard forms to represent numbers up to 120;

is ready to DEVELOP these skills (191-200):

Reads and writes whole numbers within 100 as tens and ones

2.2.A: use concrete and pictorial models to compose and decompose numbers up to 1,200 in more than one way as a sum of so many thousands, hundreds, tens, and ones;

is ready to DEVELOP these skills (191-200):

Represents whole numbers within 1,000 with models

3.2.D: compare and order whole numbers up to 100,000 and represent comparisons using the symbols >, <, or =.

is ready to DEVELOP these skills (191-200):

Compares whole numbers within 10,000 using symbols

Compares whole numbers within 10,000 using terms

Orders whole numbers within 10,000

4.2.C: compare and order whole numbers to 1,000,000,000 and represent comparisons using the symbols >, <, or =;

is ready to DEVELOP these skills (191-200):

Compares whole numbers greater than 10,000 using symbols

4.2.D: round whole numbers to a given place value through the hundred thousands place;

is ready to DEVELOP these skills (191-200):

Rounds whole numbers within 1,000,000

Class Breakdown by Goal

Mathematics

Growth: Math 2-5 TX 2012 / TX Essential Knowledge and Skills Math: 2012

Goal	Goal Score							
	151-160	161-170	171-180	181-190	191-200	201-210	211-220	221-230
Numerical Representations and Relationships		STUDENT A STUDENT B STUDENT C	STUDENT D STUDENT E STUDENT F	STUDENT A STUDENT E STUDENT D STUDENT G	STUDENT A STUDENT C STUDENT H STUDENT i	STUDENT D STUDENT E STUDENT F	STUDENT A STUDENT E STUDENT D STUDENT G	STUDENT A STUDENT E STUDENT D STUDENT G
Computations and Algebraic Relationships	STUDENT A STUDENT E STUDENT D STUDENT G	STUDENT D STUDENT E STUDENT F	STUDENT A STUDENT E STUDENT D STUDENT G	STUDENT D STUDENT E STUDENT F	STUDENT A STUDENT E STUDENT D STUDENT G	STUDENT A STUDENT E STUDENT D STUDENT G	STUDENT D STUDENT E STUDENT F	STUDENT D STUDENT E STUDENT F
Geometry and Measurement	STUDENT D STUDENT E STUDENT F		STUDENT D STUDENT E STUDENT F	STUDENT D STUDENT E STUDENT F	STUDENT A STUDENT E STUDENT D STUDENT G	STUDENT D STUDENT E STUDENT F	STUDENT A STUDENT E STUDENT D STUDENT G	
Data Analysis and Monetary Transactions	STUDENT A STUDENT E STUDENT D STUDENT G	STUDENT D STUDENT E STUDENT F	STUDENT A STUDENT E STUDENT D STUDENT G	STUDENT A STUDENT E STUDENT M	STUDENT X STUDENT L STUDENT M	STUDENT D STUDENT E STUDENT F	STUDENT A STUDENT E STUDENT M	

Learning Continuum--Class View

161-170

K.2.I: compose and decompose numbers up to 10 with objects and pictures.
- Decomposes whole numbers within 10 in more than one way, using models

1.2.C: use objects, pictures, and expanded and standard forms to represent numbers up to 120;
- Represents whole numbers within 100 with models
- Represents whole numbers within 20 with models

1.2.E: use place value to compare whole numbers up to 120 using comparative language;
- Compares whole numbers within 100 using terms

1.2.G: represent the comparison of two numbers to 100 using the symbols >, <, or =.
- Compares whole numbers within 10 using symbols

2.2.A: use concrete and pictorial models to compose and decompose numbers up to 1,200 in more than one way as a sum of so many thousands, hundreds, tens, and ones;
- Represents whole numbers within 1,000 with models

2.2.B: use standard, word, and expanded forms to represent numbers up to 1,200;
- Knows place value names through hundred thousands
- Reads and writes whole numbers within 1,000 as hundreds, tens, and ones
- Reads and writes whole numbers within 1,000 in word form
- Reads and writes whole numbers within 100 in word form

3.2.A: compose and decompose numbers up to 100,000 as a sum of so many ten thousands, so many thousands, so many hundreds, so many tens, and so many ones using objects, pictorial models, and numbers, including expanded notation as appropriate;
- Knows place value names through hundred thousands

4.2.C: compare and order whole numbers to 1,000,000,000 and represent comparisons using the symbols >, <, or =;
- Compares whole numbers greater than 10,000 using terms

5.2.B: compare and order two decimals to thousandths and represent comparisons using the symbols >, <, or =; and
- Compares decimals to the hundredths, with the same number of digits after the decimal point, using terms

STUDENT A
Overall RIT: 159
Goal Range: 156-168

STUDENT B
Overall RIT: 168
Goal Range: 162-174

STUDENT C
Overall RIT: 169
Goal Range: 163-175

STUDENT D
Overall RIT: 176
Goal Range: 162-174

After 4 Weeks of Instruction: Projections for Math Grades 3-8, as of Sept. 28, 2018

Grade	Approaches	Meets	Masters
3	52%	16%	3%
4	49%	17%	4%
5	68%	21%	4%
6	68%	19%	1%
7	55%	14%	1%
8	66%	24%	3%
Total	60%	18%	3%

Goal Progress Measures 2.1, 2.2, 2.3

	Grade	Performance Level	Goal for 2019	Current Projection based on 4 weeks of instruction
Goal Progress Measure 2.1	3rd Grade	Masters	11.75%	3.4%
Goal Progress Measure 2.2	5th Grade	Masters	17.75%	3.6%
Goal Progress Measure 2.3	8th Grade	Meets	24%	23.9%

Elementary Projected Performance Levels

	Approaches	Meets	Masters
Armstrong	59%	14%	4%
Benavidez	60%	22%	3%
Carrillo	42%	12%	1%
Five Palms	59%	18%	4%
Hutchins	58%	21%	6%
Kindred	47%	13%	2%
Madla	58%	18%	2%
Palo Alto	52%	16%	4%
Price	66%	24%	6%

Middle School Projected Performance Levels

	Approaches	Meets	Masters
Dwight	67%	20%	1%
Shepard	63%	18%	1%
Zamora	62%	20%	2%

ANALYSIS

- Grades 5th, 6th, 8th:
  - Scored ABOVE district average
    - Targeted Support:
      - 5th: Math facilitator leading targeted professional learning
      - 6th: Middle School Academy Curriculum, Project Based Learning, and AVID
      - 8th: District-wide planning led by instructional coaches on planning (July, Aug, Oct, Nov)

ANALYSIS

- Grades 3rd, 4th, 7th:
  - Scored below district average
    - Targeted Support:
      - 3rd: Math Coaches planning directly with teachers
      - 4th: Targeted professional learning beginning in July (5 sessions thus far)
      - 7th: District-wide planning led by instructional coaches on planning (Aug, Oct, Nov)

ANALYSIS

- Kindred & Carrillo
  - Lowest Scoring Elementary Schools
    - Both are IR schools
    - Significant Gaps have been identified & are areas of focus
      - Kindred - 3rd grade
      - Carrillo - 4th grade
    - Additional teachers have been hired to reduce class size
    - Each campus has a dedicated, full-time math instructional coach
    - 5th Grade at both campuses are performing at district average 60%