

School Administrative Unit Report Card

Our Local Comprehensive Assessment System – Longitudinal Data Trends and Analysis: 2005-2010

Testing, Accountability and Progress Within the Gorham Schools

(Presented to the Gorham School Committee: April 28, 2010)

Outline of Contents

- ***The Big Picture: Gorham School Department Local Comprehensive Assessment System 2009 – 2010***
 - *Preface Statement* *Page 2*
 - *Current External Testing Within our District* *Page 3*

- ***Data Analysis - Longitudinal Summative Data Analysis: Gorham Achievement Reporting and Progress - March 2010***
 - *Gorham General Data Observations* *Page 5*
 - *Grades K-5 General Inferences and Conclusions* *Page 6*
 - *Review of Middle School Results* *Page 7*
 - *Review of High School Results* *Page 8*

- ***Gorham “White Paper” 2008: Our “90%” Goal in Reading and Math - Progress Benchmarks*** *Page 9*

- ***Initiatives and Interventions to Support our Progress in Numeracy & Literacy***
 - *General Short-Term Interventions* *Page 13*
 - *Strategic District Long-Term Interventions* *Page 14*
 - *K-5 White Rock, Narragansett and Village Schools Plan Components* *Page 15*
 - *Gorham Middle School Individual Plan Components* *Page 16*
 - *Gorham High School Individual Plan Components* *Page 16*

- ***Data Sources***
 - *2009 MEA Overview and Release of Results* *Page 18*
 - *Aggregated Data Sources for Gorham School Department – 4-Year MEA Data Trends*
 - *School Achievement and Progress* *Page 19*
 - *Comparison to State Averages* *Page 20*
 - *AYP Notations* *Page 21*
 - *Cohort Group Tracking* *Page 22*
 - *Five Year Trend: CBM / DIBELS* *Page 24*
 - *2009 NECAP General Information and Data Comparisons to State* *Page 25*

**The Big Picture: Gorham School Department
Local Comprehensive Assessment System
2009 – 2010**

Preface Statement

External Testing within the Gorham School Department occurs as a major part of our overall local assessment system. This is a system of assessments designed to improve student learning – it is fair and comprehensive, using multiple measures to assess student competencies. The system serves to inform instruction, monitor progress and certify student achievement.

Our local assessment system is in compliance with Maine’s Comprehensive Assessment System that consists of a series of external assessments that measure MDOE Regulation 131 for accountability purposes in reading, mathematics and science. While writing is not part of the federal accountability system, Maine chooses to assess writing at grades 5, 8, and 11.

The Parameters for Essential Instruction are statements of content / process knowledge that every child should know within a given subject, such as Math, ELA (English-Language Arts), Science, Social Studies, Health & PE, and the Visual and Performing Arts, as well as Career Education and World Languages.

There are 3 levels of assessments that make up our local assessment system:

- ***Classroom Level Assessments*** - *These are given at the classroom level – such as unit exams, quizzes, projects, presentations, and so on.*
- ***Common Grade Level Assessments*** - *These are tests given to all children within a given grade level in a specific subject area. Typically, these are developed by a team of staff, who align the assessment with the standards presented through a given unit of study.*
- ***External (State, Federal and Nationally-Normed) Level Assessments*** - *These are tests given by the state that check a student’s progress and competencies in meeting state standards as defined by the Maine Learning Results. In Maine, this is the NECAP (New England Common Assessment Program) given to students in grades 3 – 8 in the areas of Reading and Math, and the MEA (Maine Educational Assessment) given to students in grades 5 & 8 in the area of science. This group also includes federal assessments such as the NAEP (National Assessment of Educational Progress) and nationally-normed assessments such as NWEA-MAP (Northwest Evaluation Association – Measures of Academic Progress) that our district chooses to offer because of power of the data gleaned both in terms of student growth, achievement and ability to inform instruction.*

Current External Testing Within our District

- **CogAT** (*Cognitive Abilities Test*): Given to 3rd grade students in January – February of each school year and any new Referrals / New to District Students as a screening for Gifted & Talented education programming. The CogAT is administered to gain information on each child's learning style and pattern of cognitive reasoning. Students who are tested through Special Educational Services might not be tested at this time. The CogAT measures developed abilities in verbal, quantitative, and nonverbal categories. Teachers can use the information gained to plan instructional activities, adapt instructional strategies, and identify students who may benefit from different or additional academic programming. We are required to evaluate all students for Gifted and Talented identification. The CogAT will provide important information for the classroom teachers as well as helping in the identification of our gifted and talented population

- **CBM & DIBELS** (*Curriculum-Based Measurement and Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills*) : Grades K-2. Given in Fall, Winter & Spring of each school year. Designed for benchmark screening and progress monitoring, CBM is administered in the area of reading and math. Oral reading fluency is selected for grades 1 and 2 and DIBELS area a type of CBM for literacy skills given to students in Kindergarten. Both tests are considered reliable indicators of overall reading comprehension and ability. CBM is also administered in the area of math for specific skill areas to students in Kindergarten through 2nd grade.

- **MEA** (*Maine Educational Assessment*): Grades 5 & 8 only in the area of Science. Given in May of each school year. The MEA is a statewide test. Before the 2009-10 School Year, MEA tested all areas of ELA, Math, Science and Writing. It has been replaced by the NECAP assessments that are now administered to all students in grades 3 – 8 in Reading, Math and Writing. MEA has been used as a statewide measure to track AYP (Adequate Yearly Progress) at the federal, state and local levels during the previous 4 years as part of the NCLB (No Child Left Behind) Act requirements for student achievement accountability.

- **MHSA** (*Maine High School Assessment*) Consists of SAT (Scholastic Aptitude Test) and Science: Grade 11 only. This consists of two components – Critical Reading, Writing and Math that is given as the SAT exam in May of each school year and the Maine High School Science Assessment that is given in late March – early April each year.

- **NAEP** (*National Assessment of Educational Progress*): This assessment is administered every 2 years in February to a percentage of randomly-selected students at selected statewide sites in grades 4, 8 and 11 in the areas of reading, math and science. Scores are reported at the state level only – not individually by students, schools or districts.

- **NECAP** (New England Comprehensive Assessment Program): This assessment is used to meet No Child Left Behind Act requirements for testing reading and mathematics once each year from grade 3 through grade 8. There is also a writing assessment administered at grades 5 and 8. The NECAP is administered in October of each school year. Skills tested are from the previous year's instruction for all students. The NECAP also serves as our district measure in achieving our goal of having 90% of our students reading and doing math on grade level by the year 2013.
- **NWEA-MAP** (Northwest Evaluation Association – Measures of Academic Progress): Given in September and May to all students in Grades 3 – 10, this on-line computer assessment measures student academic growth in the areas of Reading, Language Usage and Math. This assessment meets the state and federal requirement as a twice yearly universal screening for RTI (Response to Intervention), as mandated under the IDEA (Individuals with Disabilities Education Act) which went into effect in 2010. The advantage of this instrument is that it allows every child to experience success and challenge within an on-line testing experience in math and language arts. It then is used to predict and measure their individual growth in these areas over time, as this will be given in the fall and spring of each year. The NWEA-MAP test is a key part of our local assessment system and proves to be a valuable tool in measuring every child's successes, as well as offering staff important data to inform their instruction within the classroom.
- **PAAP** (Personalized Alternate Assessment Portfolio): Offered at grades 2-7 and 2nd and 3rd year high school for reading and mathematics; at grades 5, 8, and 3rd year high school for science; and at grades 4, 7 and 3rd year high school for writing. PAAPs will be completed (during the "teaching year" beginning with Grade 2 in Reading and Math) in conjunction with agreed upon accommodations through the IEP process.
- **PSAT** (Preliminary Scholastic Aptitude Test): Given to 10th and 11th grade high school students in October of each school year.
- **WIDA ACCESS for ELLs®** for all K-12 Enrolled English Language Learners is an assessment for English Language Proficiency. All K-12 English language learners (ELLs) in Maine, including recently arrived ELLs, must be assessed for English language proficiency by participating in the WIDA ACCESS for ELLs® during the testing window of December to February of each school year. Those students who arrive after the testing window has closed must be assessed with another English language proficiency assessment in order to count as participating in the NECAP reading test. A recently arrived ELL is an ELL who has arrived in the United States for the first time on or after September 1, 2008.

**Data Analysis – Longitudinal Summative Data Analysis:
Gorham Achievement Reporting and Progress
March 2010**

Gorham General Data Observations:

- In terms of this state reporting, the following are Gorham's 3-Year Average Combined Percentage of students meeting or exceeding the standards in reading and math:
 - K-5 (Village) = 68.48%
 - 6-8 (GMS) = 71.22%
 - 9-12 (GHS) = 56.61%
 - All compared to the overall (K-12 state average score of 59% / HS state average score of 43%)

- The following are Gorham's Progress Reporting Scores in terms of cumulative percentage growth in reading and math over three years:
 - K-5 (Village) = 6.04%
 - 6-8 (GMS) = 7.18%
 - 9-12 (GHS) = -0.28%
 - All compared to the overall (K-12 state median growth score of 4.18% / HS state median growth score of 2.88%)

- The 3-Year Pattern of combined scores at each level for Gorham students shows some fluctuation but definitive end of cycle growth as noted here:
 - K-5 (Village) = 68.18% (06-07) to 63.04% (07-08) to 74.22% (08-09)
 - 6-8 (GMS) = 67.55% (06-07) to 71.39% (07-08) to 74.73% (08-09)
 - 9-12 (GHS) = 56.40% (06-07) to 57.29% (07-08) to 56.12% (08-09)
 - Scores at each level were consistently higher than the state averages throughout these time periods.

- In terms of 4-year MEA Data Trends, when tracking cohort groups, we find that there are general; increases across each of the 4-year span groups in both reading and math.

Grades K-5 General Inferences and Conclusions:

- When looking at yearly MEA data, in Reading, there has been steady progress above the state average as students moved through from grades 3-5.

- Math follows a similar trend... by 5th grade, all students are well above the state average.
- In reading, all grade levels from 07-08 to 08-09 have jumped almost 10% AND all 3 grade levels have scores in reading the highest that they've ever been in 08-09*
 - Grade 3 Reading in 07-08 jumped from 59% to 74% in 08-09 as 4th graders
 - Grade 4 Reading in 07-08 jumped from 64% to 76% in 08-09 as 5th graders
 - * It is important to note that 2008-09 was the first full year of our core reading program implementation at the K-5 level.
- In math, all grade levels are also showing the highest scores in 08-09 that they've ever been
- From the White Paper in 06-07, we were ranked 11th in reading and math at 3rd grade level in comparison to the 10-School Pool. At that time, we were 3% below the state average in reading and 5% below the state average in math.
- When looking at the 3-year average of combined elementary reading and math scores, we are actually almost 10% higher than the state average (that includes scores from 3rd through 11th grades).
- When looking at the 3-year average growth progress of combined elementary reading and math scores, we are almost 2% higher than the state average (that includes scores from 3rd through 11th grades).
- In all three grade levels, in both reading and math, we've gone from below state average to above state average.
- Commensurate to this, we have moved to the middle of the 10-School Pool in terms of both achievement and growth. E.g. there are 24 elementary schools in the 10-School Pool. In the 3 year average combining reading and math, Gorham is now #12 in the ranking in terms of achievement.
- In looking at the amount of progress that we've made in the last 3 years, we are 14th out of 24 in the 10-School Pool of Elementary Schools.
- In terms of demographics, when comparing to similar district districts within the 10-School Pool, Gorham is in the upper third at the elementary level and 2nd highest out of 6 at the Middle and High School Levels in terms of 3-year averages in reading and math.
- It is safe to say that we are moving in the right direction.

Review of Middle School Results

- These numbers reflect an average of math and reading scores, and do not highlight progress made in each content;
- GMS progress over the 3 years is 3.00% above the state median for all schools in the state, placing us 4th in 3 year progress within our cohort;
- Within our demographically similar cohort, only two schools out of seven attained a higher 3-year average and both schools did not experience the level of growth that GMS did.
- The following chart documents the improvement that students have made in reading during their time at the Middle School:

Cohorts

	6th Grade (Mar 2005)	7th Grade (Mar 2006)	8th Grade (Mar 2007)
Class of 2011			
Scaled Score		748	845
% Proficient		68%	76%
% Non Proficient		32%	24%

	6th Grade (Mar 2006)	7th Grade (Mar 2006)	8th Grade (Mar 2008)
Class of 2012			
Scaled Score	648	748	845
% Proficient	71%	80%	79%
% Non Proficient	29%	20%	21%

	6th Grade (Mar 2007)	7th Grade (Mar 2008)	8th Grade (Mar 2009)
Class of 2013			
Scaled Score	648	748	845
% Proficient	75%	80%	79%
% Non Proficient	25%	20%	21%

- The Above numbers reflect between a 0 and +14 point difference in the state average for each grade in reading.
- We have very similar results for math at each grade level where our scaled scores are between -1 and +15 above the state average at each grade (note: the -1 score was back in 2005).
- These results are a nice “summative” assessment of our progress over the 3 years, however they do not identify what our next steps should be.

- While we are please with our results, we recognize that the climb get much more steep and achieving the levels of gains will be far more difficult.

Review of High School Results

- First and foremost we want to stress that we have a great high school with a hard-working and dedicated staff. We think most of us agree that the SAT is not the best measure to access school progress, but it is the same measure every high school in the state is having to use. We need to aim to utilize this data to help guide us in decisions about curriculum, instruction, and assessment. However, it is important to not become solely focused upon SAT results. It is our belief that if we are helping students improve their knowledge and skills of literacy and math we will see incremental improvements in our SAT scores over time.
- We are pleased that our 3 year average (reading & math combined by the DOE), 56.61%, is 13% points above the 3 year state average, 43.23%.
- When looking at yearly SAT data, in reading, GHS has remained steady. In both 07-08 and 08-09 59% of GHS third year students met the reading standard.
- When looking at yearly SAT data, in math, in 07-08 54% of GHS met the math target score and in 08-09 51% met the math target score.
- We are pleased that our 3 year average ranks GHS 9th out of 96 high schools in the state.
- GHS ranks 8th in 3 year average in the large school pool (23 high schools chosen by the cabinet).
- We are pleased that our 3 year average is at least 13% points ahead of Windham, Bonny Eagle, Westbrook, and Gray-New Gloucester (area schools that share our demographics).
- We believe that we all recognize that we need to demonstrate "progress" over time. We can continue to improve our scores above the plateau of around 56% and certainly improve our progress above -.28% . The state SAT progress average is 2.88%. We can perform better.
- We believe our GHS SAT/AYP plan that was first implemented during the 08-09 school year will make a difference.
- We are excited that the positive growth seen in the Gorham elementary schools and at GMS will have a future positive impact at GHS.

Gorham White Paper 2008
District Goals in Reading and Math
(For School Committee, Administrators,
Literacy and Math Committee Members and Staff)

Teaching all children to read and do math proficiently has always been the promise of public education. –*Delivering On The Promise*

PURPOSE and RATIONALE:

The purpose of this White Paper is to present to our stakeholders the compelling issues and rationale for educating the children of Gorham to high academic standards. Unlike a district policy, state regulation, or federal mandate, this paper is self-imposed and articulates the reasons for dedicating personnel, time, effort, and financial support in attaining the goals in reading and math. It is hoped this paper will invite dialogue, reflection and ultimately commitment from all within the system. A primary aim of schooling is to develop citizens who are competent in reading and math. In today's economy, math and reading skills are the best predictors of future success. In Gorham along with character education, effective literacy and numeracy skills are the most important goals.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

Below are several passages quoted directly from *Delivering On The Promise* by Fielding, Kerr, and Rosier. These frame our commitment for this ambitious proposal.

- When children enter kindergarten with the math and literacy skills of a two or three year old, they start two to three years behind. If they make annual growth in kindergarten, first and second grade, they will still be three years behind. (p. 44)
- Sometimes the truth is so obvious it eludes us for years. Students who are behind do not learn more in the same amount of time as students who are ahead. Catch-up growth is driven primarily by proportional increases in direct instructional time. (P.52)
- Differences in teacher effectiveness are the dominant factors affecting student academic growth in all subjects, especially in math. (P.269)
- There is no point in testing if you don't look at the data, don't understand it, and don't change. (p. 282)
- Rigor, engagement, lesson purpose, and results are hallmarks of excellent instruction. High rigor, engagement, and purpose occur during only 17% of instructional time in most classrooms. (P.283)

The Gorham School Department frequently uses a “Ten School Pool” when examining a variety of educational factors, such as expenditures, salaries, staffing levels, and academic performance. Using the Ten School Pool for academic comparison, Gorham’s record in meeting and exceeding the standards in math and literacy on the MEA has not been strong. The data is clear and is summarized in the chart below.

Grade	Test and year	% Met/Exceeds Gorham	% Met/Exceeds State	# Diff. from State ave.	Rank in 10 school pool (out of 11)
3	Reading 07	62%	65%	-3	11
3	Reading 06	68%	65%	+3	11
3	Math 07	60%	65%	-5	11
3	Math 06	64%	58%	+6	Tied for 9th
8	Reading 07	76%	65%	+11	7
8	Reading 06	59%	59%	0	10
8	Math 07	51%	52%	-1	8
8	Math 06	44%	45%	-1	8-9
11	Reading 07	58%	46%	+12	7
11	Reading 06	53%	45%	+8	7
11	Math 07	53%	40%	+13	Tied for 6th
11	Math 06	51%	47%	+4	7

Ninety per cent of the students in the best schools in the state are meeting or exceeding the standards on state and national testing in reading and math. In Maine, this means that a student should at least *meet* the standard on the MEA (grades 3 through 8) and the SAT (grade 11). This is attainable for Gorham. Gorham has made a number of strides in the last few years in the areas of curriculum, instruction, and assessment. We have aligned curriculum between grade levels and standardized curriculum among grade level teachers by implementing a four-year review cycle. We have adopted *Everyday Math*, a core program K-5 in 2007 and *Reading Street*, as our core reading program K-5 beginning in the fall of 2008. During the course of the year, DIBELS, CBM and NWEA assessments monitor individual progress in reading and math K-10 and inform instruction for individual students. The district is committed to reporting student progress toward these curriculum standards to both students and parents with a standards-based reporting system.

NEW GOAL:

The Gorham School Department is setting a goal that 90% of its students will meet the standards in reading and math by 2013.

It can be framed this way. In a grade level class of two hundred, it means increasing the number of students meeting the standards by one student per class, per year in each of ten classrooms.

It is expected that each grade level will work toward the benchmarks and goals. Each school and grade level will vary given their initial baseline, and the following benchmarks may be used as a guide. The goal, however, in all our schools, is for 90% of students to meet standards in reading and math by 2013. We will use the MEA and the SAT to measure progress with the following as annual goals:

Benchmarks for annual progress:

- 70% by 2009
- 75% by 2010
- 80% by 2011
- 85% by 2012

Goal for all schools/grade levels:

- 90% by 2013

OUR CHALLENGES:

Now that the goal is set, the plan to attain the goal must be developed and implemented at both the district and building levels. K-12 ELA and Math Committees will submit an action plan to administration. Schools will include these goals into their Comprehensive School Plan.

Making annual progress in math and reading for all students and closing the achievement gap for at-risk students is the first challenge. It requires viewing student achievement differently than we have in the past. As our goals and aspirations for our students change and as we raise our expectations of schools, teachers and students, the philosophy or theoretical base and rationale for our change efforts must be transformed and explained to reflect what is known as best educational practices. For the last century and throughout the time that most of us went to school, the bell curve has been actively in use and is so commonplace that it is rarely questioned. The bell curve is based on the notion that achievement is a function of ability, which boils down in laymen's terms like "some students have 'it,' and will get 'it' and some don't and won't." The bell curve has been a system of great impact, sorting out people for success or failure in the industrial, assembly line model of schooling. The bell curve has allowed teachers to validate their programs and grading practices and under serve those with specialized instructional needs on either end of the learning spectrum. Given the goals and results that we expect to set and meet for all students, we cannot expect sustainable results without first being clear that we must change the bell curve mentality and its practices.

In contrast, the J curve is based on the beliefs that achievement is a function of time and motivation where all or most students can achieve at high levels. The J curve is based on the work of Ray Kurzweil and the law of accelerating returns. The J curve is closely related to the 85:15 rule where student achievement and grade distribution are a reflection of the work processes created by the educator rather than the efforts and abilities of

individual students who function within the work processes. As we move forward to higher expectations for all our learners and our faculty, we promote that success is a choice for each student, each teacher and each school in this new paradigm. We understand that curriculum focus, high quality instruction, standards- based learning practices, ongoing professional development, and a strong repertoire of responsive interventions over time combined with great motivation and support will be vital to our change efforts. Making the shift from the bell curve to the J curve needs to be one of our most explicit first steps.

A second challenge that is essential is a commitment to increasing the quality of instruction through professional development. This will take dedicated time at in-service and early release days, and other opportunities for educators to enhance their skills.

Aligning our will (administrators and teachers) and our resources (personnel, time and money) so that we move steadily toward the goal is the final challenge. Excellent leadership, excellent data systems and excellent initial instruction have always been important to high performing schools. This requires a commitment of both the mind and the heart from all of us, because achieving the goals will require sacrifices at both the district and the building levels.

It is our firm belief that 90% of Gorham students will reach proficiency in reading and math by 2013. In making this commitment together, we will be delivering on the promise of public education.

Barnes, B., & Van Wormer, J., (2004). J-curve: improving classroom systems [Electronic version] *Baldrige In the Classroom*, Retrieved April 12, 2008, from: <http://www.grand-blanc.k12.mi.us/qip/j-curve.htm>

Explanation of the J-Curve [Electronic version]. Clark County Public Schools. Retrieved April 12, 2008, from: http://clarke.k12.va.us/Information/J_Curve/clarke_jcurve.html#

Fielding L., Kerr N., and Rosier P., (2004). *Delivering On the Promise*. Kennewick, Washington: The New Foundation Press, Inc.

The Shift to "J Curve" Mentality [Electronic version]. J.J. Burgard & Associates, Inc. Retrieved April 12, 2008, from: <http://www.jjburgard.com/sub/Support/jcurve2.htm>

April 2008

Gorham School Department

Summary of Initiatives and Interventions to Support our Progress in Numeracy and Literacy

Our Plan for Progress – Individual Action Plans Developed and Adopted, April 2010

As a District, we need to consider:

- Short-Term (Triage) Interventions
- Long-Term (Systemic) Interventions

Short-Term Interventions

- **Test Preparation:**
 - Student Practice / Familiarity with Testing (Question) Formats
 - Staff integration of new MLR's (*Parameters of Essential Understandings*) into curriculum, instruction & assessment
 - Staff Professional Development
 - Data Analysis and Review
 - Team Level Strategic Planning and Interventions
- **Test Conditions:**
 - Greater Testing Accommodation Implementation – IEP / PLP
 - Facilitated Conversations with Instructional Strategists
 - Facilitating Favorable Testing Conditions / Schedules / Environmental Factors, etc
- **Motivation (Adults and Students)**
 - Differentiated Staff Professional Development in Terms of Numeracy and Literacy (Action Research Teams, Learning Teams, etc.)
 - Collaboration Between General and Special Education Staff
 - Development of Strategies to Motivate Students for NECAP / Test-Taking Skills

Long-Term (Systemic) Interventions (6 Strategies that Work for Schools)

Long-Term (Systemic) Interventions are reflected through individual site-based action plans to address common themes: Programmatic, Personnel, Organizational, Communication

- Inclusion of students in the regular classroom
- Full teacher in regular, consistent staff development
- Integration of Content Area Literacy
- Models of Differentiating Instruction
- Co-Teaching Models of Instructional Delivery
- Extensive Use of Formative Assessment
- Consistent, Core Reading Street Program K-5
- Everyday Math Program K-5
- Instructional Strategists at Every Building K-12
- Moving toward a Combined Services Support Model for Instructional Support K-5
- Implementation of RTI (Response to Intervention) to address academic & behavioral needs K-12
- Implementation of SBR (Standards Based Reporting) K-12
- K-5 Transition – Cultural / Mindset Shifts
- K-5 Implementation of new intensive Learning Lab Model for K-5 students furthest behind in Reading and Math.
- Extensive Data Analysis and Intervention Supports for Impacted Students
- Formation of AYP Action Planning Teams at All Levels – K-5 / 6-8 / 9-12
- Formation of Data Monitoring / Screening Teams at All Levels – K-5 / 6-8 / 9-12
- Contact and Communications with Maine Department of Education
- Forums for Discussion with Staff & Colleagues
- Communications with External Constituencies
- Ongoing Progress Monitoring
 - Data Monitoring and Oversight
 - RTI Teams at Each Level
 - Formation of Data Monitoring Teams at Each Building
 - For K-5, Collection of Reading Street and Everyday Math Testing Data

- Standardized Testing Data (CBM, CogAT, NWEA, NECAP, SAT, etc.)

K-5 White Rock, Narragansett and Village Schools:

Specific Tier 1 Strategies:

- 90 minute daily instruction with math & reading core programs with fidelity
- In class coaching by literacy & math specialists
- Enhanced differentiation of instruction at classroom level
- Data reviews by staff
- School-wide common block schedules for math and reading

Specific Tier 2 Strategies:

- Implementation of directed Personal Learning Plans through the RTI process
- Intensive Learning Lab Design for reading and math support
- Enhanced fluency clinics in reading and math
- Use of Combined Services Model
- Jump Start and Family Literacy Support at the K-2 Level
- Intensive support for the lowest students in grades K-2, including Extended K options.
- Enhanced Parent Communications through RTI and informal conferences with specific strategies to assist parents in helping students at home.

Specific Tier 3 Strategies:

- Special Education and Reading / Math Support Programs have combined to offer a learning lab setting, providing more scientifically based programs to our at-risk student populations.

Additional Strategies:

- PreSchool Meetings with entering Kindergarten parents / Kindergarten screening.
- In-depth and formalized implementation of Code of Conduct through aspects of school community with implications on classroom management and increased instructional time.

Gorham Middle School Individual Plan components:

- In Reading, identify those students who are struggling in reading, identify the specific weakness and provide direct interventions through Learning Labs
- Identify individual students who are struggling with proficiency
- Identify areas of weakness in the area of reading
- Provide additional direct instruction to meet their needs.
- Targeted interventions in math using researched-based intervention programs in the learning labs.
- Review of the MEA, NWEA and NECAP results to determine areas of weakness

Gorham High School Individual Plan Components:

- Formation of SAT Oversight Team (Inclusive membership)
- Guide the approach of GHS in making AYP
- Meets on a monthly basis
- Communication with other schools
- Administration and specialists attend AYP Interpretation Workshops by MDE and Measured Progress that focuses on analyzing data, improving classroom instruction and test preparation
- Each Department Embeds SAT Prep
- SAT Motivation Squad Formed
- Literacy Specialist and Instructional Strategist Target Help Through Examination of Data
- New Strategic Math, Reading and Literacy Classes
- Targeted professional development for staff in the area of content literacy
- All sophomores and juniors take the PSAT in the fall to provide practice and familiarity with exam
- Consider revamping study hall system into focused learning centers
- Enhanced parental communication through newsletters, mailings, and PIE groups to share information about SAT and AYP.

Data Sources

- *2009 MEA Overview and Release of Results*

- *Aggregated Data Sources for Gorham School Department*
 - *4 Year MEA Data Trends – School Achievement and Progress*
 - *4 Year MEA Data Trends – Comparison to State Averages*
 - *4 Year MEA Data Trends – AYP Notations*
 - *4 Year MEA Data Trends – Cohort Group Tracking*

- *Five Year Trend: CBM / DIBELS*

- *2009 NECAP General Information and Data Comparisons to State*

Maine Educational Assessment (MEA) Overview

Beginning with the 2005-06 School Year, all students in Grades 3 through 8 were administered a statewide assessment referred to as the Maine Educational Assessment (MEA) each March in the areas of Reading and Math. This assessment has been directly linked and correlated with the state level standards in reading and math referred to as Grade Level Expectations (GLE's). These tests are given to all students in the state and check students' progress and competencies in meeting state standards as defined by the Maine Learning Results, which directly link to the GLE's noted above.

Results Released From Last Major MEA Testing in Maine

In a statement released from the Commissioner of Education, Susan Gendron noted that the percentage of students meeting achievement level standards on the 2009 Maine Educational Assessment increased in all grades from 3 to 8 in both reading and mathematics, except for grade 8 reading where scores remained unchanged from the year before.

The percentage of students meeting standards increased by as much as 8 percentage points in 4th grade reading and as little as 1 percent in 8th grade mathematics. The increase in students meeting achievement standards is a continuation of a three-year trend showing slow but steady increases after several years of generally unchanged performance.

"The Department is keenly aware of, and wishes to recognize, the intensified efforts of teachers and administrators at the local level who are largely responsible for these gains," said Commissioner Sue Gendron of the Maine Department of Education. "We also know that more work needs to be done to support those students who are not yet meeting standards."

In the science portion of the MEA, 55 percent of students in grade 5 and 62 percent of students in grade 8 met or exceeded the achievement standards. The scores cannot be compared to previous years because science standards were revised in 2007, with spring 2009 being the first time they were tested. As is typical with such revisions, which are made periodically, a new trend line is established and comparisons to previous years are not possible.

The 2008–2009 school year testing program marks the end of the 25-year MEA reading and mathematics state testing program originally developed in 1985 with Measured Progress (formally known as Advanced Systems) based in Dover, New Hampshire. Beginning with the 2009–2010 school year, Maine will join The New England Common Assessment Program (NECAP—a regional assessment collaboration that includes New Hampshire, Vermont, and Rhode Island) for grades 3–8 reading, mathematics and writing assessments.

By joining the collaborative, Maine significantly reduces its costs for testing and joins a growing regional approach to education that will benefit its students. The tests are developed in common by all partner states and are aligned with the standards (what all students should know and be able to do at each grade level) that all NECAP states have adopted. Maine's standards in reading, writing and mathematics were already closely aligned with the NECAP standards, meaning that teachers will not have to make substantial changes to accommodate the transition.

A significant change in moving to the NECAP program is the date of test administration. Unlike the traditional March MEA administration window, NECAP testing begins on October 1st of the new school year. Because of the early administration, students are tested on the standards from the previous year. For example, grade 6 students are tested on the 5th grade standards.

Maine did not administer the MEA writing test in spring 2009 because of the move to the NECAP assessment for writing. The new NECAP writing test is substantially different and will allow for reporting of writing scores even if an individual question or writing prompt is found to be problematic, as happened with the grade 8 writing test in 2008. Assessment of writing is not a requirement under the federal No Child Left Behind Act.

GSD 4-Year MEA Data Trends: School Achievement & Progress

	<i>Year</i>	<i>% Meets Exceeds Reading</i>	<i>% Meets Exceeds Math</i>	<i>Rdg & Math AVG %</i>	<i>Progress (Change) %</i>
Grade 3					
*	05-06	68	64		
	06-07	62	60		
	07-08	59	64		
	08-09	68	83		
Grade 4					
*	05-06	70	64		
	06-07	72	69		
	07-08	64	55		
	08-09	74	74		
Grade 5					
*	05-06	60	66		
	06-07	72	71		
	07-08	66	71		
	08-09	76	70		
K-5 AVG					
	<i>06-07</i>	<i>69</i>	<i>67</i>	<i>68</i>	
	<i>07-08</i>	<i>63</i>	<i>63</i>	<i>63</i>	<i>-5</i>
	<i>08-09</i>	<i>73</i>	<i>76</i>	<i>74.5</i>	<i>+11.5</i>
Overall				<i>68.5</i>	<i>+6.5</i>
Grade 6					
*	05-06	71	61		
	06-07	75	59		
	07-08	84	60		
	08-09	82	65		
Grade 7					
*	05-06	68	56		
	06-07	80	66		
	07-08	80	66		
	08-09	88	73		
Grade 8					
*	05-06	59	44		
	06-07	76	51		
	07-08	79	62		
	08-09	78	64		
6-8 AVG					
	<i>06-07</i>	<i>77</i>	<i>59</i>	<i>68</i>	
	<i>07-08</i>	<i>81</i>	<i>63</i>	<i>72</i>	<i>+4</i>
	<i>08-09</i>	<i>83</i>	<i>67</i>	<i>75</i>	<i>+3</i>
Overall				<i>72</i>	<i>+7</i>
Gr. 11					
	05-06				
	06-07	58	53		
	07-08	59	54		
	08-09	59	51		
AVG					
	<i>06-07</i>	<i>58</i>	<i>53</i>	<i>55.5</i>	
	<i>07-08</i>	<i>59</i>	<i>54</i>	<i>56.5</i>	<i>+1</i>
	<i>08-09</i>	<i>59</i>	<i>51</i>	<i>55</i>	<i>-1.5</i>
Overall				<i>55.7</i>	<i>-.5</i>

Gorham School Department: 4-Year MEA Data Trends

	<i>Year</i>	<i>% Meets Exceeds Reading</i>	<i>State Average</i>	<i>% + or -</i>	<i>% Meets Exceeds Math</i>	<i>State Average</i>	<i>% + or -</i>
Grade 3							
*	05-06	68	65	3	64	58	6
	06-07	62	65	-3	60	65	-5
	07-08	59	64	-5	64	67	-3
	08-09	68	65	3	83	69	14
	Avg						
Grade 4							
*	05-06	70	61	9	64	59	5
	06-07	72	67	5	69	61	8
	07-08	64	63	1	55	60	-5
	08-09	74	70	4	74	66	8
	Avg						
Grade 5							
*	05-06	60	58	2	66	55	11
	06-07	72	60	12	71	60	11
	07-08	66	63	3	71	64	7
	08-09	76	67	9	70	65	5
	Avg						
Grade 6							
*	05-06	71	59	12	61	50	11
	06-07	75	65	10	59	55	4
	07-08	84	70	14	60	53	7
	08-09	82	70	12	65	54	11
	Avg						
Grade 7							
*	05-06	68	60	8	56	47	9
	06-07	80	69	11	66	52	14
	07-08	80	73	7	66	53	13
	08-09	88	79	9	73	58	15
	Avg						
Grade 8							
*	05-06	59	59	0	44	45	-1
	06-07	76	65	11	51	51	0
	07-08	79	71	8	62	51	9
	08-09	78	71	7	64	53	11
	Avg						
Grade 11							
	05-06						
	06-07	58	46	8	53	40	13
	07-08	59	48	9	54	41	13
	08-09	59	49	10	51	42	9
	Avg						

Gorham School Department 4-Year MEA Data Trends

	<i>Year</i>	<i>Average Reading Score</i>	<i>% Meets Exceeds Reading</i>	<i>Meets AYP Reading</i>	<i>Average Math Score</i>	<i>% Meets Exceeds Math</i>	<i>Meets AYP Math</i>
Grade 3							
*	05-06	344	68		345	64	
	06-07	344	62		344	60	
	07-08	342	59		344	64	
	08-09	345	68		351	83	
	Avg						
Grade 4							
*	05-06	445	70		446	64	
	06-07	446	72		447	69	
	07-08	444	64		444	55	
	08-09	448	74		449	74	
	Avg						
Grade 5							
*	05-06	545	60	Yes - SH	546	66	Yes - SH
	06-07	547	72	Yes - CI	548	71	Yes
	07-08	546	66	No	548	71	Yes - CI
	08-09	548	76	Yes - SH	547	70	Yes - CI
	Avg						
Grade 6							
*	05-06	648	71		645	61	
	06-07	648	75		647	59	
	07-08	653	84		645	60	
	08-09	651	82		646	65	
	Avg						
Grade 7							
*	05-06	748	68		743	56	
	06-07	752	80		748	66	
	07-08	753	80		749	66	
	08-09	756	88		751	73	
	Avg						
Grade 8							
*	05-06	844	59	Yes - SH	838	44	No
	06-07	852	76	Yes - SH	844	51	Yes - SH
	07-08	854	79	No	846	62	Yes - SH
	08-09	854	78	Yes - SH	848	64	Yes - SH
	Avg						
Grade 11							
	05-06	-	-	No	-	-	No
**	06-07	1144	58	No	1143	53	No
	07-08	1142	59	No	1143	54	Yes - SH
	08-09	1144	59	Yes - SH	1143	51	Yes - SH
	Avg						

Gorham School Department
4-Year MEA Data Trends
Cohort Group Tacking

	Reading 06	Reading 07	Reading 08	Reading 09	Math 06	Math 07	Math 08	Math 09
Grade 3	68	62	59	68	64	60	64	83
Grade 4	70	72	64	74	64	69	55	74
Grade 5	60	72	66	76	66	71	71	70
Grade 6	71	75	84	82	61	59	60	65
Grade 7	68	80	80	88	56	66	66	73
Grade 8	59	76	79	78	44	51	62	64

Special Notations

Last data entry date = September 2009

AYP calculated for grade span 3-5 (K-5) and noted at Grade 5 for each year

AYP calculated for grade span 6-8 and noted at Grade 8 for each year

AYP calculated for grade span 9-11 and noted at Grade 11

AYP Designations

SH = Safe Harbor

CI = Confidence Interval

* Began Data Trends with 05-06 School Year, as this was the year that the MEA's were recalibrated and the first year of Grades 3-8 Testing

** Began Data Trends at GHS with the 06-07 School Year as this was the year when the MHSA became the SAT for all Grade 11 Students

Gorham School Department

5-Year Data Trends – CBM and DIBELS

	04-05	05-06	06-07	07-08	08-09
Kindergarten	11	67	46	50	63
First Grade	50	58	68	60	49
Second Grade	30	?	49	63	50

Reading: Percent Meeting/Exceeding Target (NWF, ORF)

Narragansett School

	04-05	05-06	06-07	07-08	08-09
Kindergarten	51	76	76	68	81
First Grade	52	57	70	70	75
Second Grade	43	57	60	72	75

New England Common Assessment Program (NECAP) Overview

Maine has joined New Hampshire, Rhode Island and Vermont in the yearly development and administration of the New England Common Assessment Program (NECAP). This assessment is used by participating states to meet *No Child Left Behind Act* requirements for testing reading and mathematics once each year from grade 3 through grade 8. The states also include a writing assessment administered at grades 5 and 8. The first NECAP administration in Maine began in October 2009.

NECAP assesses the learning of NECAP Grade Level Expectations (GLEs), which are located at the NECAP Standards link on the Maine.gov website under the category of K-12 Education / Assessments / NECAP.

NECAP is designed to assess learning from the prior year (teaching year) at the beginning of the next school year (testing year). Therefore, grades 2-7 reading and mathematics are assessed at the beginning of grades 3-8. Fourth and 7th grade writing is assessed at the beginning of grades 5 and 8. Maine's personalized alternate assessment program (PAAP) will now be provided for students in grades 2-7.

The NECAP testing window begins on October 1st or the first school day following October 1st each year and is 3 weeks long. Assessment reports are released during the third week of the following January.

Most content area tests consist of a combination of multiple-choice (1 point) and constructed-response (4 points) questions. The mathematics sessions also include short-answer questions worth 1 or 2 points, but do not include constructed-response items at grades 3 or 4. (Constructed-response questions require students to develop their own answers to questions. On the mathematics test, students may be required to provide the correct answer to a computation or word problem, draw or interpret a chart or graph, or explain how they solved a problem. On the reading test, students may be required to make a list or write a few paragraphs to answer a question related to a literary or informational passage.)

Writing sessions also include one extended-response prompt (12 points), in addition to the multiple-choice and constructed-response questions. The NECAP writing test design consisted of a field test only in 2009. (This year's writing test is a pilot designed to field-test new material, therefore no score reports will be produced this year for writing.)

Students' scores are based on 52 points in reading, 65 or 66 points in mathematics (depending on grade level), and 34 points in writing. Students are allowed up to 100% extra time to complete the test.

NECAP student results will be reported in one of four achievement levels:

- Proficient with Distinction
- Proficient
- Partially Proficient
- Substantially Below Proficient

NECAP testing accommodations are available for students with specialized learning needs.

NECAP test results are used primarily for school improvement and accountability. Achievement level results are used in the state accountability system required under No Child Left Behind (NCLB). More detailed school and district results are used by schools to help improve curriculum and instruction. Individual student results are used to support information gathered through classroom instruction and assessments.

Results Released From First NECAP Testing in Maine...

In a press release dated, February 2, 2010, the Maine Department of Education released the results of its first administration of the New England Common Assessment Program test. Maine joined Vermont, New Hampshire and Rhode Island in the testing consortium last year as a replacement to the Maine Educational Assessment for reading, writing, mathematics. Students in grades 3 through 8 took the NECAP for the first time in October 2009.

In grades 3 through 8 in mathematics, roughly 62 percent of Maine students scored “proficient” or “proficient with distinction,” roughly equivalent to the “meeting expectations” and “exceeding expectations” levels on the MEA. In reading, 70 percent of students scored proficient or above. In both cases, the percentages are similar to the results on last year’s MEA, though direct comparisons cannot be made. No writing scores are reported for this year because this year’s NECAP writing test contained pilot test items that will be analyzed and used in future administrations. NECAP pilots new writing questions every five years.

By joining NECAP, Maine saved more than \$1 million annually in testing. Also, the test is considered slightly more rigorous than Maine’s MEA, which was already among the more rigorous assessment systems in the country. The National Assessment of Educational Progress has long shown that the New England states consistently place in the upper echelon of student performance when compared to other states and regions. Maine generally scores in the top five to 10 states, depending on grade level and subject area. The NECAP results again show Maine to be in good company.

“We know that to be successful in college, careers, and other post-secondary education, as well as informed and engaged citizens, our students need high expectations and rigorous assessments to match,” said Maine Education Commissioner Susan A. Gendron.

Gendron also thanked and praised Maine’s public school teachers and students for making the move to the NECAP in such a short time period. The last MEA for reading, writing, and mathematics was administered in March 2009; the first NECAP administration was in October 2009.

Because it is given at the beginning of the school year, the NECAP tests the previous year’s expectations. For example, fifth graders were tested on fourth grade expectations. As a result, second grade material is being tested in Maine for the first time at the beginning of third grade.

Maine continues to use its own MEA for science because Maine’s approach and standards vary significantly from NECAP’s. Maine also uses the SAT as the 11th grade assessment, an effort to increase college aspirations.

Maine Department of Education staff, along with staff of Measured Progress, the company that develops the test, are holding workshops across the state this week to explain the NECAP reports, the information they contain, and how to analyze the data.

Summary of Gorham Schools NECAP Results

As noted, Gorham Schools received NECAP testing results at the end of January. The summary of average scores (combined percentages of students at the levels of “proficient” and “proficient with distinction” are noted in the following table.

Fall 2009 NECAP Tests Summary of Average Scores* in Reading and Mathematics Gorham Schools compared to the State of Maine

*Average Scores represent the combined percentage of students at the levels of “proficient “
(meeting the standards) or
“proficient with distinction” (exceeding the standards)

Reading	State	Gorham	Difference	
Beginning of Grade 3	73%	78%	+5%	
Beginning of Grade 4	67%	71%	+4%	
Beginning of Grade 5	72%	76%	+4%	
Beginning of Grade 6	69%	74%	+5%	
Beginning of Grade 7	68%	73%	+5%	
Beginning of Grade 8	69%	73%	+4%	
Average:	70%	74%	+4%	
Mathematics				
Beginning of Grade 3	62%	64%	+2%	
Beginning of Grade 4	62%	72%	+10%	
Beginning of Grade 5	64%	70%	+6%	
Beginning of Grade 6	63%	68%	+5%	
Beginning of Grade 7	60%	67%	+7%	
Beginning of Grade 8	59%	71%	+12%	
Average:	62%	69%	+7%	

The following points may be noted from this data:

- The percentage of students in Gorham at proficiency levels or above are higher than the state average in reading and math across all grade levels, 3-8.
- In the area of Reading, Gorham students scored 4-5% higher with an average of 4% higher across all six grades.
- In the area of Mathematics, Gorham students scored 2-12% higher with an average of 7% higher across all six grade levels.

In general, we are extremely pleased with our first NECAP results for Gorham and look forward to using the baseline data from this year’s testing administration to compare future student performance.

Staff members at each school will use district, school and student data to document student achievement as well as to inform instruction and strategic interventions for students as needed.