

## ACADEMIC COMPETENCE

### Monitoring Report, October 2013

*The requirements of policy are in bold type. The report on progress is in standard font.*

**It is the Board's desire that all NMSD students meet or exceed high academic standards by acquiring the core and basic knowledge and skills essential for success in secondary education post-secondary education, and the world of work. The Board establishes the following standards by which academic progress is to be measured:**

- 1. Student achievement in the district will exceed that of Washington State and the nation as measured by all standardized state and federally-mandated testing data, as well as other standardized tests such as Measures of Academic Progress (MAP), the Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT), American College Test (ACT), Preliminary Scholastic Aptitude Test (PSAT), and Explore (middle school test similar to ACT).**

#### State Assessment Results

The following tables show the last several years of state testing. The acronyms can be confusing, as the state has been making changes to its system. Up through 2009, the state had the Washington Assessment of Student Learning (WASL). Beginning in 2010, the elementary and middle school tests became the Measure of Student Progress (MSP) and the high school test became the High School Proficiency Examination (HSPE). Proficiency on the HSPE also became an evolving graduation requirement. Most recently, high school exams are changing to End of Course (EOC) exams. Math now has EOC 1 (algebra) and EOC 2 (geometry). Science is now an EOC in biology.

In the tables I have highlighted successes and "bright spots" in green, and concerns in red. You will see a couple of areas where we have both colors: green because of good growth yet still red because of how we lag behind the state.

NOTE: These charts include WASL data. You cannot well translate WASL results into the new MSP results. They are different tests, taken and scored differently from each other. However, the comparison to state-wide scores across the tests is a reasonable yard stick of our progress.

#### Results over Time: Elementary

While reading dropped over last year, we continue to outscore the state in 3<sup>rd</sup> grade reading. Fourth improved this year and is now also above state-wide scores. Fifth grade improved to equal statewide scores.

Reading 3rd	WASL 2009	MSP 2010	MSP 2011	MSP 2012	MSP 2013
District	72.1	67.4	81.2	78.3	<b>75.9</b>
Belfair	77.5	79.6	81.3	82.6	<b>82.1</b>
Sand Hill	65.2	60.2	81.1	75.3	<b>68.7</b>
State	71.3	72.1	73.1	68.7	73.0

Elementary Reading (continued)

4th

District	72.4	73.6	63.9	67.9	<b>73.1</b>
Belfair	75.0	80	72.1	61.6	<b>65.6</b>
Sand Hill	69.4	69.4	58.8	75.9	<b>79.7</b>
State	73.5	67.2	67.3	71.4	72.4

5th

District	76.8	70.4	71.6	62.0	<b>72.6</b>
Belfair	83.5	76.6	77.5	65.2	<b>68.8</b>
Sand Hill	68.3	63.5	66.7	58.4	<b>80.4</b>
State	73.9	69.6	67.6	71.0	72.6

We continue to progress, in general, in mathematics at the elementary level, with district scores nearing state-wide scores in third grade, solid gains in fourth grade, and less success in fifth grade.

Math	WASL	MSP	MSP	MSP	MSP
3rd	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
District	60	55.6	53.4	61.1	<b>64.1</b>
Belfair	62	75.9	53.8	65.2	<b>61.5</b>
Sand Hill	59.1	44.3	52.8	58.1	<b>67.2</b>
State	66.3	61.8	61.5	65.3	65.2

4th

District	49.7	46.5	45.9	44.3	<b>55.2</b>
Belfair	56.3	60	58.1	38.4	<b>51.6</b>
Sand Hill	41.9	34.7	37.6	53.7	<b>59.4</b>
State	52.3	53.7	59.3	59.3	62.5

5th

District	62.7	50.0	56.0	48.6	<b>50.7</b>
Belfair	69.6	62.3	63.4	45.5	<b>44.1</b>
Sand Hill	54	34.9	49.3	51.3	<b>64.7</b>
State	61.9	53.6	61.2	63.7	62.6

Writing is a district-wide concern, and we are focusing on improving our writing scores across the district and across the grades.

Writing	WASL	MSP	MSP	MSP	MSP
4th	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
District	47.6	62.5	48.0	55.7	<b>45.5</b>
Belfair	48.8	77.1	62.9	46.9	<b>45.3</b>
Sand Hill	46.8	50.0	37.6	70.4	<b>44.9</b>
State	60.3	61.1	61.4	61.3	62.1

Science scores at elementary made a substantial gain over previous scores, bringing us very near state-wide average scores.

Science	WASL	MSP	MSP	MSP	MSP
5th	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
District	33.8	26.8	57.1	52.1	65.1
Belfair	44.3	32.5	56.3	54.5	66.7
Sand Hill	20.6	20.6	58.8	50	64.7
State	44.9	34	55.6	66.1	66.5

As a district, we improved scores in 2/3 of the areas tested over last year. Sand Hill improved in 75% of the areas. Writing continues to be the greatest concern.

Total	#	%
Improved	16	66.7%
Decline	8	33.3%
Total	24	

Belfair	#	%
Improved	4	50.0%
Decline	4	50.0%
Total	8	

Sand Hill	#	%
Improved	6	75.0%
Decline	2	25.0%
Total	8	

### Results over Time: Middle School

We had two areas of improvement in 2013 over 2012, however we lag behind state scores in every grade and subject tested. In several cases, our deficit is substantial.

Reading	WASL	MSP	MSP	MSP	MSP
6th	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
District	63.1	56.9	60.1	62.1	65.0
Hawkins	62.4	57.7	60.6	61.8	65.2
State	72.0	64.6	70.6	70.6	71.4
7th					
District	32.5	52.6	43.6	62.3	57.8
Hawkins	31.9	52.4	43.5	62.4	56.3
State	59.3	63.4	56.4	71.2	68.7
8th					
District	53.8	56.0	70.3	64.0	54.5
Hawkins	53.3	57.1	70.2	64.2	54.4
State	67.5	69.4	68.6	67.2	66.2

Math	WASL	MSP	MSP	MSP	MSP
6th	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
District	38.9	36.6	41.1	41.4	30.3
Hawkins	38.4	36.9	41.3	41.0	30.7
State	50.9	51.9	58.8	61.4	59.3
7th					
District	31.9	41.6	45.0	41.5	49.0
Hawkins	31.9	42.3	45.7	40.8	48.6
State	51.8	55.3	56.9	59.2	63.7

MS Math (continued)

8th					
District	31.8	32.9	33.1	46.8	<b>36.6</b>
Hawkins	31.4	34.0	33.9	47.4	<b>36.5</b>
State	50.8	51.6	50.3	55.4	53.2

Writing	WASL	MSP	MSP	MSP	MSP
7th	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
District	52.1	54.9	60.7	61.0	<b>51.0</b>
Hawkins	51.9	54.8	60.1	60.5	<b>51.8</b>
State	69.7	70.3	71.0	71.0	71.0

Science	WASL	MSP	MSP	MSP	MSP
8th	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
District	27.3	32.9	53.7	63.3	<b>54.9</b>
Hawkins	26.8	33.3	54.8	63.5	<b>54.7</b>
State	51.1	54.5	61.5	66.3	64.9

Our scores decrease in six of the 11 areas assessed. These decreases were from already unsatisfactory results.

HMS	#	%
Increase	3	27.3%
Decline	6	54.5%
No Change	2	18.2%

**Results over Time: High School**

Overall, we made very good progress at the high school level. Reading made a substantial jump, getting us back near statewide scores.

Reading	WASL	HSPE	HSPE	HSPE	HSPE
10th	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
District	73.5	70.0	83.4	72.8	<b>81.4</b>
NMHS	77.0	71.7	83.9	74.9	<b>82.1</b>
State	80.9	78.9	82.3	81.1	83.5

Our students are making steady progress in math. EOC 1 is the standard Algebra End of Course assessment. We are now very close to statewide scores. Additionally, while EOC 2 (Geometry) scores dropped, these are advanced students who are still doing very well. Geometry is typically a 10<sup>th</sup> grade course.

Math*	EOC 1	EOC 1	EOC 1	EOC 2	EOC 2	EOC 2
9th	2011	2012	2013	2011	2012	2013
District	25.4	55.8	<b>69.3</b>	81.6	94.3	<b>85.7</b>
NMHS	26.3	56.4	<b>69.8</b>	83.8	94.3	<b>90.2</b>
State			72.6	90.7	92.5	94.8

\* Math EOC percent proficient includes all 9<sup>th</sup> graders who have passed the test, including those passing the test "early" in middle school. The 9<sup>th</sup> graders passing EOC 2 (geometry) this year will also be included in next year's 10<sup>th</sup> grade results.

We experience a slight drop in Geometry (EOC 2) scores from prior years among 10<sup>th</sup> grade students, dropping farther behind statewide scores, which improved significant in 2013. We have not quite attained statewide averages

<b>EOC 2</b> 2011	<b>EOC 2</b> 2012	<b>EOC 2</b> 2013
47.5	75.2	<b>73.8</b>
52.8	75.2	<b>73.2</b>
66.3	76.1	89.4

Writing scores showed nice improvement, bring us back up to statewide averages again, after several years of lagging scores.

<b>Writing</b> 10th	<b>WASL</b> 2009	<b>HSPE</b> 2010	<b>HSPE</b> 2011	<b>HSPE</b> 2012	<b>HSPE</b> 2013
District	92.1	78.0	86.3	73.6	<b>82.3</b>
NMHS	95.5	78.9	87.1	75.2	<b>82.7</b>
State	86.3	86.0	86.0	85.2	84.9

Our science (biology End of Course) results improved dramatically, rising 26 percentage points over 2013. The state experienced a similar gain, however, keeping our scores lagging statewide results. The reason for this significant change is mostly due to a new graduation requirement for last year's 10<sup>th</sup> graders that they must pass the EOC Biology exam to graduate.

<b>Science</b> 10th	<b>WASL</b> 2009	<b>HSPE</b> 2010	<b>HSPE</b> 2011	<b>EOC Bio</b> 2012	<b>EOC Bio</b> 2013
District	27.7	40.4	41.5	42.0	<b>68.3</b>
NMHS	29.1	41.3	44.1	42.9	<b>70.7</b>
State	38.6	44.8	49.7	61.0	81.7

NMHS	#	%
improved	8	72.7%
declined	3	27.3%

**Comparisons to Other District**

In spite of some areas of growth, we continue to lag behind our neighboring and other comparison districts in most subjects. A great sign, however, that we are on the right track is our third and fourth grade reading scores, which are above state scores. Third grade math is getting stronger and moving up the list, too. Another positive set of indicators is that we are moving up, closing the gap with the other districts, with a couple clear exceptions.

**District Comparisons: Elementary**

	3rd RD
Sequim	80.1
SK	77.7
NK	77.4
CK	76.1
<b>NM</b>	<b>75.9</b>
STATE	73.0
Brem	71.3
Fife	67.4
Shelton	64.1

	3rd MTH
SK	78.2
Sequim	75.6
NK	71.8
CK	66.5
STATE	65.2
Brem	64.8
<b>NM</b>	<b>64.1</b>
Shelton	53.5
Fife	52.5

	4th RD
SK	79.3
Sequim	77.8
NK	74.9
<b>NM</b>	<b>73.1</b>
STATE	72.4
CK	72.0
Fife	69.8
Brem	66.7
Shelton	66.7

	4th MTH
SK	73.2
Sequim	70.0
NK	64.8
STATE	62.5
CK	59.8
Shelton	56.0
<b>NM</b>	<b>55.2</b>
Brem	51.8
Fife	51.2

	4th WRT
NK	66.6
SK	66.3
Sequim	64.1
Fife	62.3
STATE	62.1
CK	59.2
Shelton	55.2
Brem	54.4
<b>NM</b>	<b>45.5</b>

	5th RD
Sequim	87.6
NK	82.5
SK	80.4
CK	77.5
Brem	74.4
Fife	74.1
<b>NM</b>	<b>72.6</b>
STATE	72.6
Shelton	62.4

	5th MTH
SK	75.0
NK	69.8
Sequim	69.6
Brem	64.1
STATE	62.6
CK	61.9
Fife	56.6
<b>NM</b>	<b>50.7</b>
Shelton	49.2

	5th SCI
Sequim	79.4
SK	77.0
NK	73.4
CK	69.2
Brem	66.3
STATE	65.5
<b>NM</b>	<b>65.1</b>
Fife	60.3
Shelton	55.2

**District Comparisons: Middle School**

As the board is aware, our middle school scores are not acceptable, and the HMS staff are working in a much more focused way to improve these scores. I am convinced that the elements for a successful school are generally in place. We now need to be consistent in implementation, including having high expectations for our students and staff.

	6th RD
NK	82.0
SK	77.5
CK	74.0
Sequim	73.4
Fife	73.0
STATE	71.4
Shelton	66.1
NM	<b>66.0</b>
Brem	58.6

	6th MTH
NK	73.7
SK	71.5
CK	64.7
STATE	59.3
Shelton	56.4
Sequim	53.6
Fife	52.4
Brem	49.0
NM	<b>30.7</b>

	7th RD
NK	76.7
Sequim	70.4
SK	70.3
STATE	68.7
CK	68.2
Shelton	65.0
Brem	62.3
Fife	61.4
NM	<b>57.8</b>

	7th MTH
NK	71.5
CK	68.5
Shelton	64.3
STATE	63.7
Fife	61.7
SK	61.3
Brem	61.2
Sequim	60.3
NM	<b>49.0</b>

	7th WRT
NK	77.2
Shelton	71.5
SK	71.2
STATE	71.0
Sequim	69.0
CK	68.5
Fife	67.2
Brem	63.2
NM	<b>51.0</b>

	8th RD
Sequim	71.4
NK	67.4
STATE	66.2
Fife	65.6
CK	65.5
SK	65.3
Shelton	59.9
NM	<b>54.5</b>
Brem	51.1

	8th MTH
Shelton	59.9
CK	59.8
NK	55.9
STATE	53.2
SK	51.5
Brem	48.9
Sequim	46.7
Fife	42.3
NM	<b>36.6</b>

	8th SCI
Sequim	75.6
SK	68.7
NK	67.9
CK	67.0
STATE	64.9
Fife	58.7
NM	<b>54.9</b>
Brem	49.2
Shelton	48.6

**District Comparisons: High School**

High school scores have clearly improved from previous years, when we compare ourselves to local and/or comparable districts. While our relative ranking is near the bottom of the list (we were AT the bottom last year), we are getting closer to median scores for the group and statewide scores for all subjects.

	10th RD
NK	91.9
CK	88.8
Sequim	87.0
SK	85.3
STATE	83.5
NM	<b>81.8</b>
Shelton	81.8
Fife	81.7
Brem	75.1

	10th WRT
CK	88.4
NK	88.2
Fife	87.4
Sequim	87.4
SK	85.0
STATE	84.9
Shelton	84.2
NM	<b>82.8</b>
Brem	75.6

	9th Math EOC1
CK	89.2
Sequim	86.4
NK	84.7
STATE	80.7
Fife	80.3
SK	79.9
Brem	78.5
NM	<b>77.3</b>
Shelton	75.1

	10th Math EOC2
NK	95.0
Sequim	94.3
CK	93.3
Fife	90.6
STATE	89.4
SK	87.2
Brem	85.6
NM	<b>83.2</b>
Shelton	78.4

	10th EOCB
NK	89.9
Sequim	86.2
CK	85.4
SK	81.7
STATE	81.7
Shelton	80.5
Fife	78.3
NM	<b>77.9</b>
Brem	77.5



**2. The percent of students scoring Level 1 of state assessments will decrease.**

The following tables show the percent of students scoring at Level 1 (the lowest level) of the 4 possible scores on the state assessments. You can see that we have a higher percentage of our students scoring at Level 1 than is true state-wide, with mathematics and middle school scores continuing to be major concerns. With the exception of writing, elementary scores are similar to state-wide scores. Science scores at all levels are similar to state scores.

<b>Reading</b>	Percent of Students Scoring Level 1 2009-10 NMSD/State	Percent of Students Scoring Level 1 2010-11 NMSD/State	Percent of Students Scoring Level 1 2011-12 NMSD/State	Percent of Students Scoring Level 1 2012-13 NMSD/State
Grade 3	16.0/10.7	9.8/8.0	7.0/8.4	13.8/12.9
Grade 4	5.6/7.5	15.6/8.9	7.1/5.4	<b>3.01/5.4</b>
Grade 5	9.2/9.7	5.0/9.3	15.5/9.0	7.51/6.4
Grade 6	8.5/10.2	13.3/7.3	14.5/8.4	18.4/8.5
Grade 7	16.2/10.5	15.0/12.3	10.1/7.5	12.2/7.9
Grade 8	13.7/10.7	8.6/11.1	19.4/12.2	17.61/13.7
Grade 10	9.0/6.5	4.8/5.3	12.2/6.1	9.1/5.2

<b>Mathematics</b>	Percent of Students Scoring Level 1 2009-10 NMSD/State	Percent of Students Scoring Level 1 2010-11 NMSD/State	Percent of Students Scoring Level 1 2011-12 NMSD/State	Percent of Students Scoring Level 1 2012-13 NMSD/State
Grade 3	25.7/16.0	22.6/17.0	13.9/13.7	15.91/14.7
Grade 4	27.1/24.9	35.1/26.6	40.0/23.6	23.1/20.8
Grade 5	25.4/23.6	16.3/18.6	33.1/19.1	24.01/16.5
Grade 6	27.5/23.6	27.5/21.7	32.4/18.8	39.3/21.4
Grade 7	29.5/24.3	27.9/23.2	36.5/21.0	35.41/19.6
Grade 8	37.7/25.5	33.7/25.6	29.5/23.8	40.2/25.7
Grade 9 EOC1				21.7/20.00
Grade 10	33.7/27.9	36.2/32.3	36.6/32.2	11.3/8.4

<b>Writing</b>	Percent of Students Scoring Level 1 2009-10 NMSD/State	Percent of Students Scoring Level 1 2010-11 NMSD/State	Percent of Students Scoring Level 1 2011-12 NMSD/State	Percent of Students Scoring Level 1 2012-13 NMSD/State
Grade 4	14.6/13.7	22.3/13.0	16.4/12.6	21.61/12.7
Grade 7	9.8/9.7	15.0/9.2	13.8/9.6	15.21/9.8
Grade 10	5.8/2.6	4.8/3.0	10.3/2.9	6.1/3.2

<b>Science</b>	Percent of Students Scoring Level 1 2009-10 NMSD/State	Percent of Students Scoring Level 1 2010-11 NMSD/State	Percent of Students Scoring Level 1 2011-12 NMSD/State	Percent of Students Scoring Level 1 2012-13 NMSD/State
Grade 5	27.5/27.9	20.7/20.3	22.5/14.4	15.1/14.3
Grade 8	36.5/20.4	12.0/13.7	13.7/10.3	<b>9.8/10.1</b>
Grade 10	38.4/29.4	39.4/31.1	26.3/23.0	<b>6.1/6.4</b>

**3. Students will make more than one year growth, on average as demonstrated by fall to spring MAP results.**

The Measure of Academic Progress (MAP) is a test that we can give students three times during the year: fall, winter and spring. Results can show growth over time for individual students as well as groups of students, which the state assessment results cannot do.

The following table shows that, on average, our students make more growth than the national sample from other districts using MAP. The last column on the chart shows the “average” growth of our students in reading. In all but two cases, our growth exceeded the expected.

It is important to note that this is average growth. If our already proficient students make more than one year’s growth, we can “beat the national standard” without having any of our non-proficient students move from “basic” to “proficient.” Without such movement, our scores will not improve. For the middle school especially, this seems to be the story the data are telling us. Some kids are doing great, but too many kids are remaining “basic” and not moving to “proficient.”

**MAP Reading, Fall-Spring Growth, 2012-2013**

Location Grade Level	NMSD Fall mean scores 2011	NMSD Spring mean scores 2012	MAP Norm Fall mean Scores	MAP Norm Spring mean Scores	NMSD Spring vs MAP Norm	Growth Fall 2011 to Spring 2012	Typical Growth (MAP Norms)	NMSD Growth Above National
<b>District</b>								
<b>2</b>	172.5	188.3	175.9	189.6	(1.3)	15.8	13.7	<b>2.1</b>
<b>3</b>	188.2	200.3	189.9	199.2	1.1	12.1	9.3	<b>2.8</b>
<b>4</b>	196.2	204.9	199.8	206.7	(1.8)	8.7	6.9	<b>1.8</b>
<b>5</b>	200.1	208.6	207.1	212.3	(3.7)	8.5	5.2	<b>3.3</b>
<b>6</b>	212.9	215.6	212.3	216.4	(0.8)	2.7	4.1	<b>(1.4)</b>
<b>7</b>	215.5	219.0	216.3	219.7	(0.7)	3.5	3.4	<b>0.1</b>
<b>8</b>	218.2	221.8	221.4	222.9	(1.1)	3.6	1.5	<b>2.1</b>
<b>Belfair</b>								
<b>2</b>	172.4	188.7	179.7	189.6	(0.9)	16.3	9.9	<b>6.4</b>
<b>3</b>	192.7	202.9	191.6	199.0	3.9	10.2	7.4	<b>2.8</b>
<b>4</b>	194.0	202.6	200.1	205.8	(3.2)	8.6	5.7	<b>2.9</b>
<b>5</b>	199.2	206.9	206.7	211.1	(4.2)	7.7	4.4	<b>3.3</b>
<b>Sand Hill</b>								
<b>2</b>	172.8	188.5	179.7	189.6	9.8	15.7	9.9	<b>5.8</b>
<b>3</b>	185.2	199.4	191.6	199.0	9.7	14.2	7.4	<b>6.8</b>
<b>4</b>	199.8	208.7	200.1	205.8	2.9	8.9	5.7	<b>3.2</b>
<b>5</b>	200.7	210.1	206.7	211.1	(1.0)	9.4	4.4	<b>5.0</b>
<b>Hawkins</b>								
<b>6</b>	212.8	215.5	211.6	214.8	0.7	2.7	3.2	<b>(0.5)</b>
<b>7</b>	215.4	218.9	215.4	217.9	1.0	3.5	2.5	<b>1.0</b>
<b>8</b>	218.6	222.2	219.0	221.2	1.0	3.6	2.2	<b>1.4</b>

**MAP Mathematics, Fall-Spring Growth, 2012-2013**

This table shows the same information as above, except this displays mathematics results. Again, our average growth exceeds expected growth, yet our final spring scores are below the MAP national norm (column 6, "NMSD Spring vs MAP Norm). Where we are below, however, we are in almost all grades very close. For example, a difference of less than 2.0 is not considered significant.

Based on these data, and based on the demonstrated correlations between performance on the spring MAP and performance on our state assessments, you would anticipate that we would be at or above state scores and, where we are below, be quite close.

The problem with this is that the state doesn't report our "average score" but rather the percent of our students with a "proficient" or above score. We appear to have a solid average, but this appears to be the result of having many very strong performers (raising the average score) while also leaving many students behind. Our plans for improvement focus intently on this issue.

Location Grade Level	NMSD Fall 2011	NMSD Spring 2012	MAP Norm Fall Scores	MAP Norm Spring Scores	NMSD Spring vs MAP Norm	NMSD Growth F11 to S12	Typical Growth (MAP Norms)	NMSD Growth Above National
<b>District</b>								
2	174.7	190.5	178.2	191.3	(0.8)	15.8	13.1	2.7
3	191.1	203.8	192.1	203.1	0.7	12.7	11.0	1.7
4	199.7	211.0	203.8	212.5	(1.5)	11.3	8.7	2.6
5	207.5	217.6	212.9	221.0	(3.4)	10.1	8.1	2.0
6	219.1	224.1	219.6	225.6	(1.5)	5.0	6.0	(1.0)
7	223.6	229.1	225.6	230.5	(1.4)	5.5	4.9	0.6
8	229.8	233.7	230.2	234.0	(0.3)	3.9	3.8	0.1
<b>Belfair</b>								
2	174.2	189.6	178.2	191.3	(1.7)	15.4	13.1	2.3
3	193.6	205.9	192.1	203.1	2.8	12.3	11.0	1.3
4	198.9	209.8	203.8	212.5	(2.7)	10.9	8.7	2.2
5	208.0	218.6	212.9	221.0	(2.4)	10.6	8.1	2.5
<b>Sand Hill</b>								
2	175.3	191.1	178.2	191.3	(0.2)	15.8	13.1	2.7
3	189.9	203.1	192.1	203.1	0.0	13.2	11.0	2.2
4	200.8	213.0	203.8	212.5	0.5	12.2	8.7	3.5
5	206.9	217.0	212.9	221.0	(4.0)	10.1	8.1	2.0
<b>Hawkins</b>								
6	219.0	224.1	219.6	225.6	(1.5)	5.1	6.0	(0.9)
7	223.3	228.8	225.6	230.5	(1.7)	5.5	4.9	0.6
8	223.4	234.2	230.2	234.0	0.2	10.8	3.8	7.0

**MAP Results, Percent of Students Making Expected (1 year) Growth, 2012-2013**

MAP also produces a score comparing a student’s fall-to-spring growth to a calculated projection of “expected” growth. If students do not make their projected growth, they are falling behind their peers and the national standards embedded in MAP. These data are not “averages” as shown in the previous tables. These more closely reflect how the state tests are reported.

In a perfect system, 100% of students would meet their growth projection. Our data indicate that large percentage of students are failing to gain a year’s learning each year. Many students who are already behind are not growing enough in any one year to catch up. “Proficient” students who fail to make a year’s growth every year will eventually fall to “basic.” This is especially true at our middle school, causing us to consider why many students are not responding to the various instructional and system changes put in place over the last couple of years.

	% Meeting Growth Projection 2009-10	% Meeting Growth Projection 2011-12	% Meeting Growth Projection 2012-13
<b>Math</b>			
Grade 2	43.9	64.7%	<b>75.7%</b>
Grade 3	54.4	58.8%	<b>70.9%</b>
Grade 4	65.2	71.2%	61.1%
Grade 5	65.2	64.0%	<b>69.2%</b>
Grade 6	53.6	46.2%	38.9%
Grade 7	58.5	61.7%	57.8%
Grade 8	57.7	55.4%	42.9%

	% Meeting Growth Projection 2009-10	% Meeting Growth Projection 2011-12	% Meeting Growth Projection 2012-13
<b>Reading</b>			
Grade 2	45.5	59.4%	49.6%
Grade 3	55.1	63.7%	61.8%
Grade 4	55.2	62.9%	46.4%
Grade 5	56.4	65.4%	61.9%
Grade 6	49.6	46.6%	44.2%
Grade 7	57.3	49.7%	44.4%
Grade 8	54.3	56.0%	46.4%

**4. The district will make yearly progress toward eliminating the achievement gap(s) among identified student sub-groups.**

We have enough English Language Learners to get group scores from the state, and our ELL students perform significantly worse than state averages. Our low income students’ scores are very similar to low income student scores statewide.

Our special education scores vary greatly from year to year, as you would statistically anticipate because of the smaller number of individuals in the group. This year, our special education students performed similarly to special education students statewide. Some grades/subjects we did better, and in some the state did better – but this was about “even” and the differences were relatively minor.

Each group persists in scoring well below higher income, non-disabled, English speakers.

To go to the state’s Report Card showing the results for Low Income students, [CLICK HERE](#).

To go to the state’s Report Card showing the results for Special Education, [CLICK HERE](#).

**5. The grade level cohorts within the district will make continuous progress over time and when compared to their state peers on all available measures and indicators, including percent passing all parts of the assessment and the improvement of performance of each quartile.**

We have compared each graduating class’ performance on state assessments to their state-wide graduating class cohort. Our long-term trend is to start behind the state in the third grade test (first

year of state testing), fall farther behind through middle school, then improve into high school, often dramatically. This improvement in reading begins in eighth grade. By 10<sup>th</sup> grade, we typically have been at or above the state in reading and writing, and behind the state in science and math. Our “lag” in science is less at 10<sup>th</sup> grade than the prior assessment years (5<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> grade).

This long-established trend appears to be changing. For the last two years, third grade has done better than statewide averages in reading. The fifth- through seventh grade slide, however, continues.

**6. An increased percentage of students will score “proficient” on the assessment of technology skills.**

We no longer administer this assessment. It was a state requirement for several years, then was removed as a requirement.