

Escuela Avancemos! Academy
Summer Loss Analysis
Fall 2014—Fall 2015
NWEA MAP Reading & Math

Background:

Although EA Academy showed tremendous growth during the 2014—2015 academic year, there was reasonable speculation surrounding the retention of skills and information as expressed in student achievement levels, i.e., percentiles. The concern was, ultimately, “would students return after summer break, retaining their achievement level, with respect to national norms?” Thus, after the conclusion of this year’s fall testing, student percentile rankings were compared with their previous year’s spring rankings.

Results:

Below are two tables, representing data for the NWEA MAP Reading and Math tests. The second column represents the mean percentile for the beginning of the 2014—2015 school year. The third column shows the final mean percentile rankings for last year. Finally, the fourth column shows the percentile rankings for the same students at the beginning of the 2015—2016 academic year. For any given row, the second and third columns are one grade level below the final fourth column due to grade promotion.

Reading			
Grade	Fall 2014	Spring 2015	Fall 2015
K	14 th	23 rd	24 th
1	10 th	15 th	16 th
2	6 th	10 th	12 th
3	12 th	17 th	17 th
4	8 th	6 th	6 th
5	7 th	15 th	N/A*

Math			
Grade	Fall 2014	Spring 2015	Fall 2015
K	6 th	16 th	16 th
1	9 th	12 th	17 th
2	4 th	8 th	9 th
3	9 th	8 th	11 th
4	4 th	6 th	5 th
5	5 th	15 th	N/A*

*students are now in 6th grade. Data not available.

Discussion:

In 9/10 (90%) of testing scenarios, students either retained or grew from their previous year’s percentile ranking in spring. In 6/10 (60%) of testing scenarios, students actually began the current academic year, on average, in a higher percentile ranking than their previous mean in the spring. Although, on average, summer loss affects most students to a degree, it did not affect the students at EA Academy as much. In other words, students, on average, retained more of their skills and knowledge associated with reading and math when compared to national norm depreciations. Furthermore, the information and ability retained means that the school is starting off with fundamentally, higher-performing students than in the previous year. See below (kindergarten testing not yet complete)

Reading		
Grade	Fall 2014	Fall 2015
1	10 th	24 th
2	6 th	16 th
3	12 th	12 th
4	8 th	17 th
5	7 th	6 th

Math		
Grade	Fall 2014	Fall 2015
1	9 th	16 th
2	4 th	17 th
3	9 th	9 th
4	4 th	11 th
5	5 th	5 th

Simplified Evaluation Tool

Student Growth	Ineffective	Minimally Effective	Effective	Highly Effective
Student Growth Objective	One of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> SGO not set $X^* < 60\%$ of growth target 	All of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> SGO submitted $61\% \leq X \leq 75\%$ of growth target 	All of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> SGO submitted $76\% \leq X \leq 100\%$ of growth target 	All of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> SGO submitted $X > 100\%$ of growth target
Conditional Growth Index	$1^{st} \leq X^{**} \leq 25^{th}$ ile	$26^{th} \leq X \leq 40^{th}$ ile	$41^{st} \leq X \leq 65^{th}$ ile	$X > 65^{th}$ ile
Growth Relative to District Mean	$X^{***} < 60\%$ of previous year's growth for applicable grade level	$61\% \leq X \leq 75\%$	$76\% \leq X \leq 100\%$	$X > 100\%$
College Readiness	$X^{****} < \text{Open Enrollment RIT}$	$\text{Open Enrollment} \leq X < \text{State University}$	$X = \text{State University}$	$X > \text{State University}$

Legend:

*where X is the quantity of RIT submitted as a goal by teacher

**where X is the mean of the Median Conditional Growth Percentile found on the [Achievement Status and Growth Summary Quadrant Chart](#), as seen below:

Summary data by subject

	Mathematics	Reading
Percentage of Students who Met or Exceeded their Projected RIT	54.2%	50.0%
Percentage of Projected Growth Met	105.9%	115.6%
Count of Students with Growth Projection Available and Valid Beginning and Ending Term Scores	24	26
Count of Students who Met or Exceeded their Projected Growth	13	13
Median Conditional Growth Percentile	52.5	48.5

This excerpt, from a sample teacher report would yield a mean of 50.5, which, given the rubric above, would result in an 'Effective' rating.

***where X is the amount of growth in RIT as seen on the Student Growth Summary report. See the explanation below.

Grade (Spring 2015)	District				State				Growth Count	Observed Growth
	Count	Mean RIT	SD	Percentile	Count	Mean RIT	SD	Percentile		
K	51	126.4	9.9	**	42	146.2	11.7	**	38	19.8

Here, we see that Kindergarten teachers grew their students by 19.8 RIT (Observed Growth Column). If a teacher exceeds that number, they would receive a 'Highly Effective Rating.'

****where X is the mean of the two RIT scores that correspond to the chart below.

Grade & Testing Season	Reading				Math			
	Open Enrollment	State Universities	Top Public Universities	Ivy League	Open Enrollment	State Universities	Top Public Universities	Ivy League
	ACT 16	ACT 24	ACT 29	ACT 32	ACT 16	ACT 24	ACT 29	ACT 32
Grade 3 Fall	179	205	216	221	179	207	217	222
Grade 3 Spring	189	213	224	229	188	220	234	241
Grade 4 Fall	190	214	225	231	189	217	228	234
Grade 4 Spring	197	221	231	236	197	227	240	246
Grade 5 Fall	196	220	231	236	197	228	241	247
Grade 5 Spring	204	226	235	240	207	240	253	260
Grade 6 Fall	203	226	236	241	205	239	252	258
Grade 6 Spring	209	230	239	244	214	246	258	265

The first four columns of RIT scores correspond to Reading; the last 4 columns to Math. If, for instance, a 4th grade teacher's Spring Reading RIT was 205, that would equate to a 2 on the teacher scoring rubric, since that score is Open Enrollment < X < State University.

For an SAT conversion, the following link can be used: <http://www.act.org/solutions/college-career-readiness/compare-act-sat/>

Final Note: In the example provided above, the hypothetical teacher received an 'Effective' rating on Conditional Growth Percentile; a 'Highly Effective' rating on District Comparison; and a 'Minimally Effective' rating on the College Readiness Target mandate. If this teacher also met his/her goal (but did not exceed it), he/she would receive an 'Effective' rating in SGO.

Thus, SGO=3; Conditional Growth Index=3; District Comparison=4; and College Readiness=2 ÷ 4 = **3 (Effective)**