



*Brookfield Public Schools*

*"Create Your Tomorrow"*



# Smarter Balanced Assessment Results 2015-16

*Brookfield Public Schools*  
*September 21, 2016*



# Agenda

- Purposes of the State Summative Assessment
- Background Information on the Summative Assessment
- Scale Scores and Achievement Levels
- The Results
- Next Steps



# Purposes of the State Summative Assessment

- Legal Requirement
  - ❖ Federal and state law require that all students in Grades 3 through 8, and once in high school be assessed annually in English language arts and mathematics.
- Matter of Equity
  - ❖ Annual summative assessment serves as an important academic checkup and an accountability measure that helps us know if we are delivering on the promise of a high quality public education to all students.
- State and Local Responsibility
  - ❖ The Connecticut State Department of Education (CSDE) and local education agencies (LEAs) are legally responsible to administer these assessments to all students.



# Purposes of the State Summative Assessment (continued)

## Useful for these Purposes:

- Accurately describe student achievement and growth as part of program evaluation and school, district, and state accountability systems
- Provide valid, reliable, and fair measures of students' progress/attainment of the knowledge and skills required to be college- and career-ready at the end of Grade 12
- Provide an annual snapshot of student achievement that should be used along with other information, such as class work and other tests, when making educational decisions



# Purposes of the State Summative Assessment (continued)

## Not Useful As:

- A sole measure of student achievement, program evaluation or school, district, and state accountability systems
- The sole source of guidance for curriculum or instruction. The Connecticut Core Standards provide the only needed blueprint for student learning. The Smarter Balanced Assessment is a global measure. “Teaching to the test” is never quality instruction and does not result in student engagement or genuine, long-lasting learning



# Purposes of the State Summative Assessment (continued)

## Not Useful As:

- A substitute for a wide variety of other relevant ways to assess student learning, such as:
  - classroom assessments
  - teacher observations
  - student work portfolios
  - universal screening
  - frequent progress monitoring
  - detailed diagnostic assessment or evaluation



# Background Information on the Summative Assessment

- Aligned to the Connecticut Core Standards for English language arts and mathematics
- Administered in the last 12 weeks of school to students in Grades 3-8
- Designed as a global measure of student learning.
- A major undertaking by a consortium of states, including Connecticut
- Test items developed by educators and assessment experts from consortium states, including the CSDE



# Background Information on the Summative Assessment (continued)

- Utilizes computer adaptive testing which adjusts the test to each student by basing the difficulty of future questions on previous answers – results in more efficient testing
- Mathematics also includes a performance task that expects students to apply knowledge and skills to a complex task, and better measures depth of understanding, research skills, and the ability to analyze information



# Background Information on the Summative Assessment (continued)

## What is expected on the ELA Test?

Students will:

- Show they can read and understand a variety of complex, grade appropriate informational and literary texts
- Use evidence from source materials to support their ideas in written responses at every grade level
- Interpret and use information delivered orally to determine main ideas, summarize or analyze



# Background Information on the Summative Assessment (continued)

English Language Arts	
Areas of Knowledge and Skills Measured	Statement About Student Learning From Which the Assessment was Built
<b>Reading</b>	Students can read closely and analytically to comprehend a range of increasingly complex literary and informational texts.
<b>Writing*</b>	Students can produce effective and well-grounded writing for a range of purposes and audiences.
<b>Listening</b>	Students can employ effective speaking and listening skills for a range of purposes and audiences.
<b>Research/Inquiry*</b>	Students can engage in research/inquiry to investigate topics, and to analyze, integrate, and present information.

\*For reporting purposes, Claim 2 (Writing) and Claim 4 (Research/Inquiry) are combined into one reporting category in Connecticut: Writing and Research/Inquiry."



# Background Information on the Summative Assessment (continued)

## **What is expected on the Mathematics Test?**

Students will:

- Explain and use mathematics to solve problems
- Complete math problems quickly and accurately
- Understand how math concepts link together
- Apply their mathematical knowledge to solve real-world problems
- Communicate their mathematical reasoning

# Background Information on the Summative Assessment (continued)

Mathematics	
Areas of Knowledge and Skills Measured	Statement About Student Learning From Which the Assessment was Built
<b>Concepts and Procedures</b>	Students can explain and apply mathematical concepts and interpret and carry out mathematical procedures with precision and fluency.
<b>Problem Solving*</b>	Students can solve a range of complex well-posed problems in pure and applied mathematics, making productive use of knowledge and problem-solving strategies.
<b>Communicating Reasoning</b>	Students can clearly and precisely construct viable arguments to support their own reasoning and to critique the reasoning of others.
<b>Modeling and Data Analysis*</b>	Students can analyze complex, real-world scenarios and can construct and use mathematical models to interpret and solve problems.

\*For reporting purposes, Claims 2 and 4 are combined into one reporting category.



# Scale Scores and Achievement Levels

- Scale scores are the basic unit of reporting
- They fall along a continuous vertical scale across grades and range from 2000 to 3000
- These scores can be used to illustrate students' current level of achievement and their growth over time
- When aggregated, they can also describe school- or district-level changes in performance or measure gaps in achievement among different groups of students



# Scale Scores and Achievement Levels (continued)

## Four Achievement Levels

- Level 1 = Does not meet the achievement standard
- Level 2 = Approaching the achievement standard
- Level 3 = Meets the achievement standard
- Level 4 = Exceeds the achievement standard



# Scale Scores and Achievement Levels (continued)

- Achievement level descriptors specify the knowledge and skills displayed by the students at a level
- Achievement levels are a familiar reporting feature
- Characterizing a student's achievement solely in terms of a "level" is an oversimplification
- Achievement levels will be less precise than scale scores for describing student gains over time or changes in achievement gaps among groups
- There is not a critical shift in student knowledge or understanding that occurs at a single cut score point

# Scale Scores and Achievement Levels (continued)

- Students also receive a “performance category” for each area of knowledge and skills within a subject
- This provides a general indication of where the students have strengths and weaknesses in their learning within each subject area

For example:

Areas of Knowledge and Skill	Performance
Reading	 Above Standard
Listening	 At/Near Standard
Writing and Research/Inquiry	 Above Standard

# Three Ways to Understand Change in Performance

	Achievement Change	“Rough Cohort” Change	Matched Student Cohort Growth
<b>What is it?</b> <b>How does it work?</b>	Compares student achievement across years (e.g., achievement of Grade 3 students in 2014-15 is compared to the achievement of Grade 3 students in 2015-16)	Compares the achievement of a group of students from one grade in year 1 to a group of students in the next higher grade in year 2 (e.g., Grade 3 in 2014-15 to Grade 4 in 2015-16)	Compares the achievement of the <b>same student</b> from one grade in year 1 to the next higher grade in year 2 (e.g., student in Grade 3 in 2014-15 to Grade 4 in 2015-16)
<b>Who is compared?</b>	Different students across different years	Mostly the same students though there can be some mismatches due to student mobility, entry, and exit	The same students from one year to the next... no mismatches
<b>What is measured?</b>	Proficiency rate (e.g., percent at or above level 3) and/or average scale scores	Proficiency rate (e.g., percent at or above level 3) and/or average scale scores	The amount of growth to standard achieved by each student and groups of students
<b>What does it offer?</b>	The starting point for understanding change	A “rough estimate” of growth	The gold standard for growth and for understanding curricular and instructional effectiveness

# The Results: ELA – All Students

Grade	Percent Scoring Level 3 and Above (Achievement Range)		Average Vertical Scale Score (Rough Cohort Range)	
	2014-15* (State)	2015-16 (State)	2014-15* (Level)	2015-16 (Level)
3	72.9% (53.6%)	65% (54.0%)	2469 (3)	2463 (3)
4	71.4% (54.9%)	70% (55.6%)	2510 (3)	2506 (3)
5	65.7% (58.5%)	75% (58.8)	2534 (3)	2546 (3)
6	61.2% (55.5%)	64% (55.0%)	2554 (3)	2564 (3)
7	74.5% (57.1%)	63% (55.2%)	2593 (3)	2582 (3)
8	80% (54.0%)	76% (55.5%)	2621 (3)	2619 (3)
<b>All Grades</b>	76.9% (55.6%)	68.8% (55.7%)	N/A	N/A

\*Score based only on CAT portion; Performance task removed to allow for comparison.<sup>18</sup>

# The Results: Mathematics - All Students

Grade	Percent Scoring Level 3 and Above (Achievement Range)		Average Vertical Scale Score (Rough Cohort Range)	
	2014-15 (State)	2015-16 (State)	2014-15 (Level)	2015-16 (Level)
3	72.8% (47.7%)	69% (52.8%)	2468 (3)	2463 (3)
4	68.1% (44.0%)	63% (40.0%)	2509 (3)	2503 (3)
5	46.2% (37.6%)	52% (40.9%)	2517 (2)	2525 (2)
6	54.4% (37.2%)	52% (40.6%)	2560 (3)	2549 (2)
7	60.4% (38.6%)	62% (41.8)	2582 (3)	2589 (3)
8	55.8% (36.6%)	72% (40.4%)	2594 (3)	2626 (3)
<b>All Grades</b>	59.6% (40.9%)	61.8% (44.0%)	N/A	N/A



# Data Highlights

## ELA

- District Vertical Scores are within the proficient range
- All grade levels achieving above state level % proficiency
- Not all grades achieving at same % proficient from year to year; overall total decrease
- Rough Cohort data comparison analysis demonstrates cohort growth



# Data Highlights

## Mathematics

- District Vertical Scores are within the proficient range with exception of current 7<sup>th</sup> grade cohort
- All grade levels achieving above state level % proficiency with exception of current 6<sup>th</sup> & 7<sup>th</sup> grade cohort
- Not all grades achieving at same % proficient from year to year; overall total increase
- Rough Cohort data comparison analysis demonstrates some cohort growth



# Data Implications

- Mathematics for current grade 6 & 7 students is a concern
- Coherence in curricular tools and assessments needed for both mathematics and ELA
- For ELA, need for alignment of professional development provided for Units of Study K-4, need for alignment of instruction of K-5 CT Core Standards in Reading Foundational Skills, and need for usage and alignment of benchmark and progress monitoring likely have had a negative impact on outcomes
- Data confirm district analysis of curriculum, instruction, and assessment as addressed in SCP



# Next Steps in Curriculum/Instruction

- Our District Strategic Coherence Plan, District Implementation Plan and School Implementation Plans all address the needs that emerge from the analysis of the SBAC data set.
  - BOE adoption of new curricular tools for K-8 Mathematics, K-8 writing, and K-5 reading, as well as the coherent focus on professional development are designed to address the district instructional needs
  - The assessment plan for benchmarking and progress monitoring, as well as school and district data teams and monthly curricula area district level team meetings, will allow for ongoing monitoring of student instructional and faculty PD needs.
- Assessment Literacy is an area of need for both administrators and teachers.



# Whisconier CMT Science results

<b>% Students At or Above Goal CMT Science</b>		
	<b>Grade 5</b>	<b>Grade 8</b>
<b>2015 Brookfield</b>	<b>80.1 %</b>	<b>81.1%</b>
<b>2015 State</b>	<b>55.5%</b>	<b>61.1%</b>
<b>2016 Brookfield</b>		
<b>2016 Brookfield</b>	<b>81.0%</b>	<b>81.0%</b>
<b>2016 State</b>	<b>59.6%</b>	<b>60.2%</b>



# Data Implications

- Whisconier grade 5 and grade 8 students at or above goal % surpasses state %
- No significant change in percentage of students at or above goal in 2016 and compared to 2015