Shorewood School District
Appendix
R-2.1 (Grades K5-12 Reading/English Language Arts)

Multi-Age Classroom and Single Grade Classroom Data:
- ✓ K5-6 Grade Running Records
  - o Percent of students that met their Grade level benchmark for "Running Records" assessments

Shorewood	% At Benchmark
MAC	83.6%
Single Grade	84.4%

Lake Bluff	% At Benchmark
MAC	83.9%
Single Grade	84.1%

Atwater	% At Benchmark
MAC	85.5%
Single Grade	82.7%

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

Shorewood	N Sample Size	% of students Prof/Adv on ELA
MAC	308	72%
Single Grade	426	62%

Lake Bluff (3rd through 6th)	N Sample Size	% of students Prof/Adv on ELA
MAC	130	70.8%
Single Grade	178	66.9%

Atwater (3rd and 4th)	N Sample Size	% of students Prof/Adv on ELA
MAC	40	77.5%
Single Grade	82	51.2%

Provided here is the Multi-Age classroom data side by side with Single Age classroom data. As we can see according to our Running Records 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 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 reading 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 shown in previous years. I would posit that the similarity in scores from Running Records and Lake Bluff's Forward assessment 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:

An interesting pattern between our Running Records and Forward exam performance can be seen that happened both this year and last year. 86.3% of our students hit their grade level benchmarks for Running Records, however 59.3% of our students perform "proficient" or "advanced" on the Forward assessment. It is important to note that the two tests often assess different reading skills. Running Records can often times be more focus on phonetics and the process of reading words as well as oral questions about comprehension of the reading, while the Forward assessment asks student not only to read, but then comprehend *and* write a response (text dependent analysis). These two skills are important, yet explain why there are discrepancies between the two assessment results. It potentially may be worthwhile to consider looking at our universal screener and/or evaluating our current screener to see if it might be a 3rd data point to aide in identification of instructional "next steps."

ELA curriculum is a focus for our elementary staff this year. Last year they collaboratively developed a common structure for Reading Workshop Lessons and this year teachers self-analyzed their practice and were provided personalized PD to help them identify an area or two to work on this year. Both elementary schools have set ELA goals for their school:
>   -Atwater: I can analyze the common reading assessment data to inform literacy instruction.
>   -Lake Bluff: I can intentionally map literacy standards into expeditions and case studies.

Because of this, many teachers will set their Student Learning Outcomes (SLO's) on specific strategies they would like to work on for ELA instruction and monitor them throughout the year.

SIS/SHS: Teacher in ELA at both SIS and SHS participated in a year-long analysis of curriculum utilizing "Teaching Tolerance" resources. They learned

more about Social Justice Standards for students and how social justice can become part of their everyday classroom. They curriculum mapped their current curriculum as part of the curriculum improvement cycle (OE-11) which gave them an opportunity to find space where Social Justice Standards could fit it. Like elementary teachers, SIS and SHS teachers set Student Learning Outcomes (SLO's) based off of achievement gap data.

Suggested Changes to R-2 English Language Arts Report
- It would be worthwhile to consider adding an additional subgroup to monitor in our reports. That subgroup would be: "Students with Disabilities" and "Students without Disabilities."