Improving Student Achievement

ED2000A Final Project
The following presentation is an evaluation of student learning for grades 6-8 from the years 2018-2019. The purpose of this evaluation is to quantitatively report the level of student learning in the building, develop findings from the student achievement data, draw conclusions based on the collected data and make recommendations for improvement.
Demographics

These graphs show “the composition of the student body by various population groups. The Demographic information includes all enrolled students.

Changing demographics have important implications for schools and the community-at-large. The 5-year trend display provides a quick look at how the composition of the school or district has changed or remained constant over time.”

(Above explanation and proceeding graphs from https://ksreportcard.ksde.org/home.aspx?org_no=D0229&bldg_no=7787&rptType=1)
Gender
Socioeconomic Status

- Econ. Disadvantaged
- Non-Econ. Disadvantaged

Year: 2015, 2016, 2017, 2018, 2019
Students with Disabilities
Data Collection Method

Kansas Department of Education (KSDE): State Assessment

● “Building, district, and state-level reports provide summaries of the percent of students at each performance level.”
● “Assessment results capture a point-in-time and represent one part of a student’s and schools’ overall educational experience.”
● Kansas assessment results are now reported in four Performance Levels.
● “For each of the four Performance Levels there are specific subject and grade-level Performance Level Descriptors (PLDs).”
  ○ “PLDs define what students should know and be able to do at each of the four performance levels.”

(https://ksreportcard.ksde.org/assessment_results.aspx?org_no=D0229&bldg_no=7787&rptType=1)
Findings

The subjects represented are Math and Reading/English Language Arts (ELA), as those are the only two subjects tested in each grade level by the Kansas Department of Education.
Findings: 6th Grade Math (KSDE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Level 1</th>
<th>Level 2</th>
<th>Level 3</th>
<th>Level 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bldg - 2018</td>
<td>8.45%</td>
<td>31.84%</td>
<td>32.33%</td>
<td>27.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bldg - 2019</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>34.37%</td>
<td>35.26%</td>
<td>18.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dist - 2018</td>
<td>11.29%</td>
<td>34.58%</td>
<td>32.16%</td>
<td>21.95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dist - 2019</td>
<td>12.84%</td>
<td>34.89%</td>
<td>34.49%</td>
<td>17.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State - 2018</td>
<td>28.82%</td>
<td>39.84%</td>
<td>22.09%</td>
<td>9.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State - 2019</td>
<td>30.09%</td>
<td>37.96%</td>
<td>22.43%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Findings: 7th Grade Math (KSDE)
Findings: 8th Grade Math (KSDE)
# Comparing Findings: 6th-8th Math (KSDE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization Level</th>
<th>% Level 1</th>
<th>% Level 2</th>
<th>% Level 3</th>
<th>% Level 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bldg - 2018</td>
<td>8.45</td>
<td>31.84</td>
<td>32.33</td>
<td>27.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bldg - 2019</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>34.37</td>
<td>35.26</td>
<td>18.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bldg - 2018</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>48.01</td>
<td>10.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bldg - 2019</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>43.14</td>
<td>36.04</td>
<td>16.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bldg - 2018</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>20.87</td>
<td>31.55</td>
<td>31.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bldg - 2019</td>
<td>17.32</td>
<td>27.72</td>
<td>34.15</td>
<td>20.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*6th Grade*  
*7th Grade*  
*8th Grade*
Findings: 6th-8th Grade ELA (KSDE)
Findings: 7th Grade ELA (KSDE)
Findings: 8th Grade ELA (KSDE)
## Comparing Findings: 6th-8th ELA (KSDE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization Level</th>
<th>% Level 1</th>
<th>% Level 2</th>
<th>% Level 3</th>
<th>% Level 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bldg - 2018</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bldg - 2019</td>
<td>13.39</td>
<td>22.32</td>
<td>51.33</td>
<td>12.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bldg - 2018</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>26.73</td>
<td>43.56</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bldg - 2019</td>
<td>25.38</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>28.42</td>
<td>19.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bldg - 2018</td>
<td>10.67</td>
<td>37.37</td>
<td>37.37</td>
<td>14.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bldg - 2019</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>46.3</td>
<td>33.49</td>
<td>6.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Commendations (Math)

- % of students in Level 3 & 4 is consistently higher than the district and state average
- 8th grade has the highest % of students in Level 1, but that fits with district and state trends
- % of students is highest in Level 3 across all grades
Commendations (Reading)

- % of students in Levels 1 & 2 is consistently lower than the state average
- % of students is highest in Level 3 across all grades
- % of students in Level 4 is consistently more than double the state average
Concerns (Math)

- From 2018-2019 % of students in Level 1 increased and Level 4 decreased in 6th and 8th grades
- From 2018-2019 % of students in Level 3 decreased in 7th grade
Concerns (Reading)

- % of students in Level 1 increased in all grades (7th grade considerably)
- % of students in Level 2 increased in all grades, but this is consistent with district and state trends
- In all grades, % of students in Levels 3 & 4 decreased (7th grade Level 3 considerably), but this is also consistent with district and state trends
- In 2019 the % of 6th grade students in Levels 1 & 2 was higher than the district average
Recommendations

**MATH**
- In all grades look into activities that teach to the mid-level achievers (2&3), perhaps there is more attention being given to the highest and lowest achieving students.

**ELA**
- Have a vertical conversation with the elementary feeder schools to help address deficits in 6th grade.
- 7th grade needs the most attention across the board, the lower-level achieving students in particular. Look into various reading intervention programs such as READ180 and System 44.

**BOTH**
- Since 6th -8th graders also take the NWEA MAP Growth Assessment, look at individual strands/ target learning areas to get a more specific understanding of areas of need within both Math and ELA.
Anticipated Impacts

**MATH**
- Mid-range interventions and activities should not only increase the % of students in levels 2 and 3, but will have a trickle down effect at level 1 as well.

**ELA**
- Have a vertical conversation with the elementary feeder schools to help address deficits in 6th grade.
- Reading intervention programs such as READ180 and System 44 have statistically proven positive results.

**BOTH**
- Analyzing RIT from MAP Growth Assessment can help create differentiated lessons.
Conclusion

The data indicates that our building overall is performing higher than both district and state norms, however, there has been a slight decline in the last year in the students scoring in the midrange in math and at the lowest and highest levels in reading. Looking deeper into deficits within particular learning target areas and establishing interventions programs will lead to student improvement.