

District Data - Report Card Analysis



Summary - What do the District Report Card data tell you about student performance in your district? If appropriate, the district will consider grade-level and subgroup performance.

The percent of students meeting or exceeding on the Reading ISAT dropped for grades 5-8, and 11 between 2010 and 2011, however the 2011 fourth graders showed growth in each subgroup, except LEP when compared to the 3rd grade 2011 scores.

The overall percentage in 2011 for 3rd grade was 73.2%, and the overall percentage in 2011 for 4th grade was 70.1%.

Figure 1 shows Reading subgroup comparisons for the 2010-2011 Grade 3-Grade 4 cohort.

Figure 1:

Reading Grade 3 Cohort 2010 2011

	2010	2011
Black	65.1	60.0
Two or more Races	79.3	85.2
Students with Disabilities	32.4	32.7
Low Income	62.9	61.0

Reading Grade 4 Cohort 2010 2011

	2010	2011
Black	57.0	57.4
Two or more Races	69.2	80.0
Students with Disabilities	29.1	30.0
Low Income	57.0	60.3

At the 8th grade level for 2011 all subgroups except Hispanic posted percentage gains and meet or exceeded AYP goals in Reading.

The percent of students meeting or exceeding on the Math ISAT increased for grades 3,4,7, and 8 between 2010 and 2011 and the 2011 fourth graders showed the highest overall percent gain compared to all measured grades. Additionally each subgroup posted significant growth when compared to the 5th grade 2011 scores. The only subgroup in 2011 with a percent gain was Two or more

Races.

The overall percentage in 2011 for 4th grade was 85.2%, and the overall percentage in 2011 for 5th grade was 75.8%.

Figure 2 shows Math subgroup comparisons for the 2010-2011 Grade 4-Grade 5 cohort.

Figure 2:

Math Grade 4 Cohort 2010 2011

	2010	2011
Black	59.0	73.0
Two or more Races	73.1	92.0
Students with Disabilities	36.4	68.8
Low Income	68.8	78.8

Math Grade 5 Cohort 2010 2011

	2010	2011
Black	60.7	59.7
Two or more Races	73.9	82.3
Students with Disabilities	48.1	37.3
Low Income	73.4	66.9

 **Analysis** - What areas of strength are indicated? What areas of weakness, if any, are indicated by these data? What factors are likely to have contributed to these results? Consider both external and internal factors to the school that can be influenced or improved by the district.

External Factors:

- There are several population shifts that may have an impact on the results:

-
- The percent of low socioeconomic students increased from 47.4% (2004) to 65.9% (2011).
 - The percent of LEP students increased from 5.5% (2004) to 8.4% (2011).
 - The district enrollment dropped from 4424 (2002) to 3974 (2011).
 - The mobility rate for the district has been between 21.1% and 28.3% between 2004 and 2011.

Other external factors:

- The reauthorization of IDEA (2004) that provided support for Response to Intervention (RtI).

Internal Factors:

- Adoption of new reading and math series at the elementary level.
- Ongoing professional development for math, literacy, and technology instruction.
- Restructuring of English and reading courses at the high school level.
- Restructured reading courses at the middle school.
- Implemented Discovery Education Assessments for reading and math grades 3-11.
- Implementation of RtI at K-5 during the 06-07 and 07-08 school years.
- District lacks a central database for student achievement data that can be used to correlate state mandated assessments to local data points (e.g. Discovery Education Assessments, DIBELS, attendance, discipline, grades). However, the District is working towards a resource that will allow all databases to communicate and be SIF compliant.
- Extended learning opportunities (after school, Saturday school, Summer school), academic programs in reading and math (funded by grants and local funds).
- Implementation of co-taught special education classes at the secondary level.

- Students with disabilities IEP goals may not be aligned to the state assessments.
- Insufficient monitoring of progress toward curriculum goals in both core curriculum and support services for SpEd students.
- In some buildings the service delivery model is based on resource for regular classroom work rather than providing interventions that will help SpEd students become independently successful.
- The Board of Education recently sold working cash bonds to improve technology hardware, software and infrastructure.



Conclusions - What do these factors imply for next steps in continuous improvement planning? Address these improvement priorities in Assess Indicators (Step 2), Create Plan (Step 3) and Monitor Plan (Step 4).

Schools and district need to provide opportunities for all students to learn core content that is aligned with the Illinois Learning Standards, Common Core Standards (including National Educational Technology Standards (*NETS*) for Teachers, Administrators, and Students), and the Illinois Assessment Framework.

Schools and district need to utilize technology to analyze multiple sources of data (e.g. summative and formative assessment; attendance; discipline) in order to make decisions about instruction, student learning, and progress.

Schools and district need to ensure that core curriculum and interventions are supported through professional development and monitoring of implementation.

Models for integrating technology and instruction need to be refined in order to better meet the educational needs of our students.