



Oak Park Elementary School District 97

970 Madison ▪ Oak Park ▪ Illinois ▪ 60302 ▪ ph: 708.524.3000 ▪ fax: 708.524.3019 ▪ www.op97.org

TO: Dr. Albert Roberts, Superintendent

**FROM: Felicia Starks Turner, Coordinator for Administrative Services
Harla Hutchinson, Teacher Leader for Student Data Analysis**

RE: Student Performance: State ISAT Testing Results from Spring 2012

DATE: September 27, 2012

This report summarizes the 2012 State testing information for grades 3-8 in Oak Park Elementary School District 97. The topics covered include:

1. NCLB requirements related to Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) are outlined.
2. District performance on Spring 2012 ISAT and AYP status for the district and schools are presented.
3. Plans for further analysis are presented.
4. Next steps and School Improvement planning are discussed.

OAK PARK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT 97
Oak Park, Illinois

September 27, 2012

Student Performance: State Testing Results from Spring 2012

The purpose of this report is to provide the Board of Education with a look at student performance data from State testing conducted during March 2012 in grades 3-8.


Connections to District Goals

Monitor improvement in student performance and social interactions:

- a. Support schools and the District to make AYP.
- b. Develop and utilize additional progress monitoring to identify and improve individual student academic performance.

No Child Left Behind Act and Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Primer

Since 2007, AYP targets have been raised every year to achieve the overall goal that 100% of students are meeting state standards by spring of 2014. The target for 2010 was 77.5% and for 2011, it was 85%. The Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE) applied for and received a waiver from the federal government that allowed the target for 2012 to remain at the 2011 target of 85%. The target for 2013 will be 92.5% of students meeting or exceeding state standards in both reading and math.



Targets must be met by not only the school or district as a whole, but also by all key subgroups having at least 45 students in them. Schools and groups are considered meeting AYP if the percent meeting standards is within the 95% confidence interval for the size of the group.

When a subgroup of at least 45 students does not meet the target two years in a row, the Safe Harbor provision provides an alternate method of achieving AYP. A subgroup is considered in Safe Harbor if the number of students not meeting standards has decreased by at least 10% from the one year to the next.

Three overall requirements were applied in 2012 to schools and districts in determining if AYP was met:

1. At least 95 % of all students in each subgroup must be tested in reading and math.
2. At least 85% of students must meet or exceed standards in the subject. If the percentage is less than 85%, the 95% confidence interval is applied. If a subgroup did not make AYP the previous year, the Safe Harbor provision may allow it to meet the conditions.
3. Students must have at least a 91% attendance rate.

When a school or district does not make AYP, sanctions can be imposed, depending on the length of time the entity has failed to meet standards.

Although these requirements appear to be straightforward, the calculations that are used to determine if a school has met AYP can be very complex. In addition to Safe Harbor and 95% confidence intervals, the calculation also considers the size of the subgroup, which school is considered a child's "home" school, and which children were in attendance at the school and in the district as of May 1 of the previous year.



The purpose of this report is to provide some overall background on the AYP assessment process, show how District 97 fared in light of these requirements, and discuss how these results can help provide direction for our efforts in the coming school year.

2012 ISAT and IAA Testing Data: AYP Results



Oak Park Elementary School District 97 recently received the results of the 2012 AYP calculations and ISAT/IAA scores from the State for the March 2012 testing. ISAT and IAA test results as well as scores across grade levels are combined to calculate AYP status.

Scores continue to be above the state average in reading and math in the majority of our schools and across many subgroups. Scores for students in the Asian, Hispanic, White, and Two or more races subgroups are above the passing line across the District, but students in the Black, Students with Disabilities, and Economically Disadvantaged subgroups vary quite widely from school to school. Several schools have only one or two subgroups large enough to count separately for AYP.

READING: % of Student Meeting or Exceeding Standards (Spring 2012)



MATH: % of Student Meeting or Exceeds Standards (Spring 2012)



Although overall, District 97 is very high achieving, the same high level of success is not enjoyed by all of our students. Based on the test scores of one or more subgroups, two of our schools were identified as not making AYP, one school for a second consecutive year and one for a third consecutive year. Those schools are required to file a School Improvement Plan with the State of Illinois. Two schools that did not meet AYP in 2011 remain in State Status. To be removed from state or federal status, a school needs to make AYP for two consecutive years. The district as a whole also failed to make AYP.

The following tables provide an overview of the AYP status of our District and the schools for Reading and Math. In viewing these exhibits and the discussion that follows, it is important to keep in mind some important facts that pertain to the way AYP status is determined:

- When gauging school progress from one year to the next, the results for two different groups of students are compared. Last year's fifth graders are this year's sixth graders and this year's eighth graders will no longer be with us. Just as no two children in an individual family are alike in their needs and talents, no two cohorts are the same. Comparing the performance on one group in a particular year to the performance of a different group in another year is inherently unfair.

- AYP status for 2012 is based on students who were enrolled in the district as of May 1, 2011. Some of the students represented in these figures may no longer be active students in District 97.
- The state distinguishes between a student's home school (the one the student should attend based on where he lives) and his serving school (the one in which the student receives instruction). For most students, these are one and the same. However, we do have students with special needs who attend schools other than their home school, most often outside the district entirely. Regardless of where the students receive instruction, their test results are counted in the results of their home school.
- Finally, students are counted in every subgroup for which they qualify. This can make it appear that more students are failing to meet state standards than actually do. In addition, the intense focus on subgroups tends to mask the fact that a very large percentage of students are successful. District-wide, there were 447 students who did not meet state standards in one or both of the tested subjects. Of those students, 127 (28.4%) were classified as Black, Economically Disadvantaged, **and** Students with Disabilities. (Note: This percentage is quite a bit higher than last year, when only about 22% of students not meeting standards fell into all three categories. Overall, of the 447 students not meeting standards, 94 students – 21.0% -- did not meet standards for math alone, 169 students -- 37.8% -- did not meet standards only in reading, and 184 students – 41.2% -- did not meet standards in both subjects.)

**Subgroup Membership of Students not Meeting Standards in Reading or Math
(n=447)**

Subgroup	# of students	% of students	Subgroup	# of students	% of students
No subgroup	45	10.1%	Black + Disability	36	8.1%
Black only	26	5.8%	Black + Economically Disadvantaged	78	17.4%
Students with Disabilities only	78	17.4%	Disability + Economically Disadvantaged.	40	8.9%
Economically Disadvantaged only	17	3.8%	Black + Disability + Economically Disadvantaged	127	28.4%

AYP Status of District and Schools in Reading

Building	Asian	Black	Hispanic	White	Multiracial	Economically Disadvantaged	Students with Disabilities
DISTRICT	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Beye		N		Y			
Hatch				Y			
Holmes		Y		Y		Y	
Irving		Y		Y		Y	
Lincoln		Y		Y			
Longfellow		Y		Y		Y	
Mann				Y			
Whittier				Y			
Brooks		Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
Julian		Y		Y	Y	Y	Y

An unshaded cell represents a subgroup with fewer than 45 students.

AYP Status of District and Schools in Math

Building	Asian	Black	Hispanic	White	Multiracial	Economically Disadvantaged	Students with Disabilities
DISTRICT	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N
Beye		N		Y			
Hatch				Y			
Holmes		Y		Y		Y	
Irving		Y		Y		Y	
Lincoln		Y		Y			
Longfellow		Y		Y		Y	
Mann				Y			
Whittier				Y			
Brooks		Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
Julian		Y		Y	Y	Y	Y

An unshaded cell represents a subgroup with fewer than 45 students.

Here's a closer look at the results for each of the schools, compared to last two years, with a focus on subgroups that did not make AYP. Keep in mind that the students being compared from one year to the next are not the same students. Approximately one third

of the students tested in 2011 have left the school to move on either to the middle school or the high school. They were replaced in 2012 by a new group of students at the lowest grade level for the school.

To provide some perspective, the number of students who took the ISAT in 2012 in each listed group is displayed in parentheses. It is especially important to remember that the number represents the entire size of the subgroup, not the number of students who did not meet standards. For example, Irving had 51 Black students who took the ISAT and counted for AYP at the school. Of those students, 84.3% (43 students) met or exceeded standards in Math.

Beye

For the second consecutive year, Beye did not make AYP. In 2012, they failed to meet the goal of 85% in both Reading and Math for Black students. Beye School is in State Improvement Status: Academic Early Warning Year 1. Because it receives Title I funds, the school is also in Federal Improvement Status and is required to offer school choice to all students.

Student group	READING			MATH		
	2010	2011	2012	2010	2011	2012
All students (199)	85.6%	86.5%	84.9%	88.8%	90.5%	91.5%
Black (47)	70.0%	57.0%	50.0% ¹	70.6%	71.0%	73.9% ¹
Economically Disadvantaged (44)	68.9%	64.6% ¹	47.7% ²	76.1%	77.1%	68.2% ²

¹ Did not make AYP

² Not enough students to be considered for AYP calculations

Hatch

Hatch has consistently made AYP as a school for the past three years. Hatch does not have any subgroups (beside White students) large enough to report separately.

Student group	READING			MATH		
	2010	2011	2012	2010	2011	2012
All students (156)	91.3%	90.5%	92.9%	94.9%	96.6%	94.9%

Holmes

Holmes School made AYP in 2012. In 2011, it did not make AYP in Reading for Economically Disadvantaged students. Holmes remains in State Improvement Status: Academic Early Warning Year 1 until they have made AYP for two consecutive years.

Student group	READING			MATH		
	2010	2011	2012	2010	2011	2012
All students (212)	84.5%	88.8%	92.0%	90.0%	93.4%	93.8%
Black (54)	62.5% ¹	81.1%	81.1%	77.1%	86.7%	86.8%
Economically Disadvantaged (51)	50.8% ²	73.1% ¹	83.0%	72.5%	88.2%	89.4%

¹ Did not make AYP

² Not enough students to be considered for AYP calculations

Irving

Irving School also made AYP in 2012. In 2011, it failed to make AYP for Economically Disadvantaged students in Math and for both Black and Economically Disadvantaged students in Reading.

Student group	READING			MATH		
	2010	2011	2012	2010	2011	2012
All students (190)	87.0%	82.0%	88.9%	96.2%	89.2%	93.7%
Black (51)	72.1%	61.9% ¹	76.5%	90.2%	79.4%	84.3%
Economically Disadvantaged (55)	69.6%	61.2% ¹	78.4%	89.3%	76.1% ¹	88.2%

¹ Did not make AYP

Lincoln

Lincoln made AYP for the second consecutive year.

Student group	READING			MATH		
	2010	2011	2012	2010	2011	2012
All students (247)	82.4%	86.6%	87.8%	93.8%	95.0%	95.1%
Black (44)	56.5% ¹	66.0% ²	72.7% ³	80.4%	83.0%	86.4% ³
Students with Disabilities (42)	58.3% ¹	66.7% ²	42.9% ³	81.7%	88.2%	73.8% ³

¹ Did not make AYP

² Made AYP through the Safe Harbor provision

³ Not enough students to be considered for AYP calculations

Longfellow

Longfellow made AYP for the third consecutive year.

Student group	READING			MATH		
	2010	2011	2012	2010	2011	2012
All students (238)	90.6%	90.2%	96.6%	94.4%	96.4%	98.3%
Black (68)	78.8%	78.0%	95.6%	86.3%	92.3%	97.1%
Economically Disadvantaged (55)	78.6%	78.6%	92.5%	83.6%	90.0%	96.2%

Mann

Mann has achieved AYP for the past three years. Mann does not have any subgroups large enough to report separately.

Student group	READING			MATH		
	2010	2011	2012	2010	2011	2012
All students (230)	92.2%	93.8%	93.9%	96.1%	97.1%	96.5%

Whittier

Whittier made AYP in 2012. In 2011, Whittier failed to make AYP for Student with Disabilities in both Reading and Math.

Student group	READING			MATH		
	2010	2011	2012	2010	2011	2012
All students (191)	90.3%	86.1%	93.7%	94.6%	91.2%	96.9%
Students with Disabilities (31)	66.0%	61.7% ¹	67.7% ²	80.9%	69.6% ¹	80.6% ²

¹ Did not make AYP

² Not enough students to be considered for AYP calculations

Brooks

Brooks did not make AYP for the third consecutive year. This year, the standard was not met by Economically Disadvantaged students in either Reading or Math. In 2011, Student with Disabilities did not make AYP in Reading or Math, but met the goal in 2012 through the Safe Harbor provision. The previous year, Brooks did not make AYP in Math for Economically Disadvantaged students. Because this is the third consecutive year in which one or more subgroups did not make AYP in the same subject, the school is now in State Improvement Stats: Academic Early Warning Year 2.

SUBGROUP	READING			MATH		
	2010	2011	2012	2010	2011	2012
All students (800)	90.4%	90.0%	90.5%	89.4%	90.0%	90.4%
Black (197)	74.4%	75.7%	76.5% ²	74.5%	74.6%	78.6% ²
Students with Disabilities (142)	63.1%	57.9% ¹	61.7% ²	64.1%	58.6% ¹	61.7% ²
Economically Disadvantaged (163)	73.1%	78.3%	73.1% ¹	71.7% ¹	76.1% ²	73.9% ¹

¹ Did not make AYP

² Made AYP through the Safe Harbor provision

Julian

This year, Julian met the AYP target in all subgroups. In 2011, Julian did not meet AYP in Reading or Math for either Black or Economically Disadvantaged students, while in 2010, it did not make AYP in either Reading or Math for Students with Disabilities. Although Julian made AYP in 2012, the school remains in State Improvement Status: Academic Early Warning Year 1; it will need to make AYP for two consecutive years to be removed from stat status.

SUBGROUP	READING			MATH		
	2010	2011	2012	2010	2011	2012
All students (821)	91.8%	91.2%	91.4%	90.9%	90.3%	91.4%
Black (231)	81.3%	77.3% ¹	78.3% ²	76.9%	73.4% ¹	79.6% ²
Students with Disabilities (151)	65.8% ¹	67.3% ²	69.5% ²	64.4%	64.7% ²	72.2% ²
Economically Disadvantaged (179)	79.0%	77.2% ¹	76.9% ²	77.1%	74.4% ¹	74.6% ²

¹ Did not make AYP

² Made AYP through the Safe Harbor provision

As indicated in these charts, we have three schools in Academic Early Warning Status Year 1, one school in Academic Early Warning Status Year 2, and one school in Federal Improvement Status (choice). The No Child Left Behind Act outlines a series of actions a school must undertake as a result of not making Adequate Yearly Progress. Please see the Appendix for details about the requirements of the NCLB Act.

Measuring Student Growth

As we have said many times, District 97 is not defined by its AYP reports alone. Our mission is to help every child achieve his or her own potential and drawing conclusions about the success of our efforts based on the results of a single test at a single point in time is not a useful way to achieve our purpose. Using average ISAT results to describe student growth across the district can be very misleading. It is much more instructive to look at the same group of students from year to year. As a District, we continue moving toward a growth model that examines the individual improvements made by each child from year to year. This allows us to focus on the needs of each child and ensure a year's growth or more in a year's time. Now that MAP testing results are available for Fall 2012, we will be pulling together a number of data points from both ISAT and MAP to develop a picture of student growth over the last three years. Our conclusions will be presented at an upcoming Board meeting.

Next Steps and School Improvement Planning

Making AYP will be more challenging as the target percentage increases. Last year all ten schools participated in the School Improvement Planning process, aided by staff at West 40 which was serving as our consultants. The process includes a visit for each school from a West 40 consultant to review the plan, discuss progress to date, and to determine next steps. In May, Felicia Starks Turner accompanied Cynthia Baranowski

from West 40 as she conducted site visits at Julian, Brooks and Julian. On October 1st, 2nd and 3rd Ms. Baranowski will conduct visits at the remaining schools.

Again this year, we have engaged the services of West 40 as consultants to help guide all ten of our schools through the School Improvement Planning process. An initial meeting is being planned for October 4 that will include building principals and central office staff. At that meeting, principals will be informed of the new Rising Star tool for school improvement planning. As was the case last year, the planning process has a fairly short timeline and some of the indicators have to be entered into the Rising Star platform by October 12. Schools are currently in the process of creating their SIP teams, establishing a set of meeting dates and checkpoints, and gathering data.

The goal of the School Improvement planning process is to have all of a district's official plans – school improvement, Title I, and technology – working together in support of the goal of improving student achievement. The intent is to change the focus of teacher efforts from "I taught..." to "The students learned..." School improvement plans are intended to cover two school years; because all of our schools developed initial plans last year, they are all in the second year of their plans. This is a great time to evaluate progress over the past year and to make decisions about direction for the year to come.

We want to make it clear that if the requirements of No Child Left Behind disappear tomorrow, our mission will remain the same – to educate every student to his or her fullest potential. We will continue to refine our growth model and to use all relevant student data to help identify areas of concern and address individual student needs for all of our students. We will continue to review the effectiveness of our programs and targeted interventions. We are committed to making sure all of our children achieve success and experience at least a year's growth every year.

Felicia Starks Turner, Ed.D.
Coordinator for Administrative Services

Harla Hutchinson,
Teacher Leader for Student Data Analysis

Appendix:

NCLB Requirements for Title I Schools Not Making Adequate Yearly Progress

This table lists the requirements for Title I schools not making AYP over the course of multiple years. The requirements for non-Title I schools are the same except there are no financial sanctions.

Year of not making AYP	Federal Status	NCLB Requirements
1	No change in status	No consequences in Year 1
2	School Improvement Status Year 1	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Reserve 20% of Title I base allocation (\$458,947) to offer school choice to students (\$91,790) 2. Reserve 10% of Title I allocation for professional development (\$45,895) 3. Complete a School Improvement Plan
3	School Improvement Status Year 2	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Reserve 20% of Title I allocation to offer Supplemental Educational Services to students on Free & Reduced Lunch <u>and</u> offer school choice with transportation 2. Reserve 10% of Title I allocation for professional development 3. Complete a School Improvement Plan
4	Corrective Action	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Reserve 20% of Title I allocation to offer SES to students on Free & Reduced Lunch <u>and</u> offer school choice with transportation 2. Reserve 10% of Title I allocation for professional development 3. Complete a School Improvement Plan 4. Corrective Action which includes one of the following: replace the school staff who are deemed relevant to the school not making adequate progress; significantly decrease management authority at the school; restructure the internal organization of the school or appoint one or more outside experts to advise the school with regard to (1) how to revise and strengthen the improvement plan it created while in school improvement status; and (2) how to address the specific issues underlying the school's continued inability to make AYP.
5	Restructuring Planning	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Reserve 20% of Title I allocation to offer SES to students on Free & Reduced Lunch <u>and</u> offer school choice with transportation 2. Reserve 10% of Title I allocation for professional development 3. Complete a School Improvement Plan 4. Planning for restructuring which may include the following: reopen the school as a public charter school, replacing school staff, implement new curriculum, extend the school day/year, etc. 5. Planning to possibly enter into a contract with an entity, such as a private management company with a demonstrated record of effectiveness, to operate the school as a public school
6+	Restructuring Implementation	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Reserve 20% of Title I allocation to offer SES to students on Free & Reduced Lunch <u>and</u> offer school choice with transportation 2. Reserve 10% of Title I allocation for professional development 3. Complete a School Improvement Plan 4. Corrective Action such as reopening the school as a public charter school, replacing school staff, implementing a new curriculum, extending the school day/year, etc. 5. Corrective Action such as entering into a contract with an entity, such as a private management company with a demonstrated record of effectiveness, to operate the school as a public school.