

Worksheet 3-A: ANALYZE PSSA DATA (Part 1)

↪ What you need to do:

- ◆ Respond to the statements below regarding your PSSA and AYP data.
- ◆ Consider strengths or concerns in the *Comments/Rationale/Explanations* column.
- ◆ Summarize (in Worksheet 4) the Areas of Strength and Areas of Concern that you identified based on your responses.

By responding to the “Yes/No” statements below, you can begin to “paint a portrait” of student learning and achievement based on PSSA data only. When this analysis is combined with insights from other PSSA-based “portraits,” and with analyses of PVAAS, 4Sight, and locally relevant assessments, you will have a more comprehensive assessment of the current state of student achievement. Corresponding questions for other types of assessment are provided to assist you.

1.0	PSSA DATA & “AYP” INQUIRY	No ☹	Yes ☺
1.1	The district met <i>overall school-wide AYP targets</i> set by the state for the most recent testing cycle – for all relevant subgroups; in all relevant areas (i.e., student proficiency, attendance, graduation rate, participation in PSSA tests); and without provisions such as “confidence interval”, “safe harbor”, “proxy”, etc.	X	
1.2	The district <i>met AYP target in Reading</i> (i.e., at least 54% of all students are proficient for 2005-2007) – for all relevant subgroups and without provisions such as “confidence interval” or “safe harbor”.	X	
1.3	<u>No</u> relevant subgroup had a <i>significant decline in Reading</i> this year vs. last year.	X	
1.4	The district <i>met AYP target in Math</i> (i.e., at least 45% of all students are proficient for 2005-2007) – for all relevant subgroups and without provisions such as “confidence interval” or “safe harbor”.	X	
1.5	<i>“Achievement gap” in Math and Reading</i> among subgroups is smaller/narrower this year compared to last year. <i>(There is still a huge gap among all subgroups as compared to the White student population. There still continues to be a 20% difference among these populations.)</i>	X	
1.6	<u>No</u> relevant subgroup had a <i>significant decline in Math</i> this year vs. last year.	X	
1.7	The district met AYP target in <i>Attendance for all relevant subgroups</i> . <i>(type Comments/Observable Evidence/Explanation, as appropriate) →</i>		X
1.8	The district met AYP target in <i>High school graduation for all relevant subgroups</i> . <i>(type Comments/Observable Evidence/Explanation, as appropriate) →</i>		X
1.9	The district met AYP target in <i>Participation on PSSA tests for all relevant subgroups</i> . <i>(type Comments/Observable Evidence/Explanation, as appropriate) →</i>		X
1.10	Overall, the <i>district is making steady, year-to-year continuous improvement</i> and is highly likely to meet/exceed its AYP targets in all relevant areas within 1-to-2 years. <i>(Comment: Making yearly gains for White students, but still a achievement gap for African-American, Special Education, and Economically Disadvantaged students.)</i>	X	

Worksheet 3-B: ANALYZE PSSA DATA (Part 2)

🔗 What you need to do

- ◆ As a team, discuss strengths and concerns about student achievement highlighted by the data.
- ◆ Summarize (in Worksheet 4) the student achievement Areas of Strength.
- ◆ Summarize (in Worksheet 4) the student achievement Areas of Concern.

Using the PSSA datasets from Worksheet 2-A, describe your *fact-based* observations and questions about the current state of student learning and achievement *based solely on PSSA data*. **CONSIDER DATA FOR MULTIPLE YEARS.** *All observations must be supported by data.*
Encouraging diverse points of view will lead to better diagnosis and greater ownership of the current state of student learning and achievement.

“Standard” PSSA Datasets for Every School <i>(from Worksheet 2-A)</i>	What do you SEE in the data? What do the data SAY?	What QUESTIONS do the data raise? What questions do you have about what you see?
<u>1.</u> <i>All Students; Reading; all Grade levels</i>	SEE ANALYSES DETAILED FOR READING AND MATH ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES	
<u>2.</u> <i>All Students; Math; all Grade levels</i>		
<u>3.</u> <i>By Ethnicity; Reading; all Grade levels</i>		
<u>4.</u> <i>By Ethnicity; Math; all Grade levels</i>		
<u>5.</u> <i>By Economically Disadvantaged; Reading; all Grade levels</i>		
<u>6.</u> <i>By Economically Disadvantaged; Math; all Grade levels</i>		
<u>7.</u> <i>By IEP and LEP; Reading; all Grade levels</i>		
<u>8.</u> <i>By IEP and LEP; Math; all Grade levels</i>		
Additional PSSA Datasets that are locally relevant to Your School <i>(Optional)</i>	What do you SEE in the data? What do the data SAY?	What QUESTIONS do the data raise? What questions do you have about what you see?
9. <i>(Describe PSSA dataset)</i>		
10. <i>(Describe PSSA dataset)</i>		

What do you see in the Data?

The data show consistent failure to reach AYP (Adequate Yearly Progress) for several groups over the course of three years. There was little significant change in the percentage growth showing progress toward AYP for this population over a three-year period. A similar result was evident for the IEP (Individual Education Plan/Special Education) and Economically Disadvantaged students across grades 3, 5, 8 and 11.

Student participation was very high for 2004-05 and 2005-06, with both years exceeding the 90% target goal. The data show no recorded percentage for 2003-04.

What questions do the data raise?

1. Why are African American students failing in large percentages below AYP for three consecutive years? Although in 2005-06 the data indicated that 35% of the population made AYP, PPI (PA Performance Index), it is not a great enough gain to be considered in a mastery category when the target is 54%. This indicates that a large percentage of math and reading skills are deficient, and a different teaching style is needed to target these weaker skills, as outlined on the PSSA examination.
2. What percentage of African American students fall into the other BB (Below Basic) populations, such as IEP, Economically Disadvantaged? The "All" students in the Proficient/Advanced category for grades 5 and 11 for 2004-05 through 2005-07 shown "N" for AYP in Reading. In 2003 "All" students showed a "Y" in math and reading, yet failed to reach AYP in 11th grade for math and reading in 2005-06. The question is why the "N" for 11th grade math and reading? Strategies need to target 8th grade and to outline a list of weak skills over a period of time, particularly those skills necessary to master Algebra. Weakness in Skills should be taken from the PSSA and reinforced in early lessons. The attendance results provide evidence that students are attending school regularly; therefore, it would be assumed that they are not missing the core skills. Thus, skills need to be better monitored for understanding. While graduation rates are still unacceptably low, there is an increase in the number of high school student graduation rates, almost 20% for the measured three-year period, from 2003-2006. This suggests that students are interested in school and may realize its importance for their future. Although AYP is measured by the PSSA, the district's Terra Nova results show somewhat similar findings for math and reading, particularly in the African American population.

Worksheet 4: COMPILE AND PRIORITIZE AREAS OF STRENGTH AND AREAS OF CONCERN

↪ What you need to do

- ◆ Compile below the Areas of Strength and Areas of Concern you identified from the analysis of PSSA, PVAAS, 4Sight, and other student achievement data.
- ◆ Prioritize the “vital few” student achievement Areas of Strength and Areas of Concern for “root cause” analysis.

AREAS OF STRENGTH and AREAS OF CONCERN based on Analysis of Student Achievement Data <u>ONLY</u>	<i>Is this a <u>S</u>trength or a <u>C</u>oncern [<u>S</u> or <u>C</u>]?</i>	<i>Check [<u>X</u>] highest- priority Areas of Strength and Concern</i>
◆ <i>Compile</i> Areas of Strength and Areas of Concern from Worksheets 3-A, 3-B, 3-C, 3-D, 3-E, 3-F, 3-G (as applicable), based on your analysis of student data from multiple sources (e.g., PSSA, PVAAS, 4Sight assessments, curriculum-based assessments, etc.). Each statement listed below <u>must relate to student achievement ONLY</u> .		
◆ Then, prioritize [mark with an “X”] the highest-priority Areas of Strength and Areas of Concern for “root cause” analysis or similar technique.		
1.		
2. SEE ANALYSES OF READING AND MATHEMATICS DETAILED ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES		
3.		
4.		
5.		
6.		
7.		
8.		
9.		
10.		
11.		
12.		
13.		
14.		
15.		
16.		

Some Strength in Reading—2004-2006

- Identify and describe how the author uses literacy devices to convey meaning.
- Understand fiction text.
- Interpret and analyze concepts and organization of non-fiction texts. Showing percentage of 70% or better.

Some Weakness in Reading

2003-2004 show reading results below 70% in the correct category for a great number of academic standards. However, slight progress is shown in some areas for years 2004-05 and 2005-06.

- weak skills
- reading, analyzing and interpreting literature
- understanding nonfiction text
- analyze components within and across texts
- analyze the effectiveness of the author's use of literacy devices.

These weaknesses increase as students progress to literature in the upper grades.

PSSA in Math 2003-06

In 2003-04, the average correct percentage below 70% falls in every concept measured on the test for the fifth grade. There is some increase in understanding in 2005-06; however, the 8th and 11th grades show a lower % of correct in understanding of concepts.

Some Strengths in Math

3rd Grade:

- Demonstrate an understanding of patterns, relations and functions.
- Represent and analyze mathematical situations using numbers, symbols, words, tables, and/or graphs.
- Apply appropriate techniques, tools, and formulas to determine measurements.
- Identify and/or apply concepts of transformations or symmetry.

5th Grade:

- No strengths

8th Grade

- No strengths

11th Grade

- Although one concept reached an average of 70% correct, there is still no significant number to suggest concept strengths.

Some Weaknesses in Math

3rd Grade

- No measures 2003-04

5th Grade 2004-05, 2005-06

- understand the meaning of operations, use operations, and understand how they relate to each other.
- tools and formulas to determine measurements.
- problem solving
- analyze characteristics, properties of 2- and 3-dimensional geometric shapes; demonstrate an understanding of geometric relationships.

8th Grade

- problem solving
- data analysis
- demonstrate an understanding of measurable attributes of objects.
- describe or use models to represent quantitative relationships
- apply appropriate techniques, tools, and formulas to determine measurements

11th Grade

- problem solving
- algebraic functions
- geometry
- locate points or describe relationships using the coordinate plane
- methods to analyze data

Although these are skills concepts, in order to target for improvement, teachers must have curriculum information that provides the mathematical steps that apply to each weak concept. The same is applicable for reading improvement.

	Student Group	Grade 5	Grade 8	Grade 11	Met AYP, Y,N, Provisions District Level Reporting
READING 2005-2007 NCLB/AYP Target 54%	ALL Students: (<i>% Proficient/Advanced</i>)	43%	54%	49%	Y
	Student Group 1: White	60%	73%	67%	Y
	Student Group 2: African-American	31%	40%	31%	N
	Student Group 3: Latino/Hispanic	65%	47%	73%	Y
	Student Group 4: Asian/Pacific Islander	61%	59%	77%	Y
	Student Group 5: American Indian/Native Alaskan	100%	100%	0%	na
	Student Group 6: Multi-racial/Ethnic	55%	67%	55%	Y
	Student Group 7: IEP-Special Education	15%	19%	9%	N
	Student Group 8: Limited English Proficiency	40%	13%	50%	N
	Student Group 9: Economically-Disadvantaged	36%	44%	24%	N
MATH 2005-2007 NCLB/AYP Target 45%	ALL Students: (<i>% Proficient/Advanced</i>)	41%	38%	38%	Y
	Student Group 1: White	62%	59%	57%	Y
	Student Group 2: African-American	27%	22%	18%	N
	Student Group 3: Latino/Hispanic	65%	53%	60%	Y
	Student Group 4: Asian/Pacific Islander	76%	77%	81%	Y
	Student Group 5: American Indian/Native Alaskan	100%	50%	0%	na
	Student Group 6: Multi-racial/Ethnic	48%	41%	33%	Y
	Student Group 7: IEP-Special Education	19%	12%	7%	N
	Student Group 8: Limited English Proficiency	54%	20%	67%	Y
	Student Group 9: Economically-Disadvantaged	33%	28%	23%	N
PARTICIPATION 2005-2007 NCLB/AYP Target 95%	ALL Students: (<i>% Proficient/Advanced</i>)	Reading = Met		Math = Met	
	Student Group 1: White	Reading = Met		Math = Met	
	Student Group 2: African-American	Reading = Met		Math = Met	
	Student Group 3: Latino/Hispanic	Reading = Met		Math = Met	
	Student Group 4: Asian/Pacific Islander	Reading = Met		Math = Met	
	Student Group 5: American Indian/Native Alaskan	Reading = Met		Math = Met	
	Student Group 6: Multi-racial/Ethnic	Reading = Met		Math = Met	
	Student Group 7: IEP-Special Education	Reading = Met		Math = Met	
	Student Group 8: Limited English Proficiency	Reading = Not Met		Math = Not Met	
	Student Group 9: Economically-Disadvantaged	Reading = Met		Math = Met	
STUDENT ATTENDANCE	ALL Students: (K-8 only)	not reported for AYP			
	2005-2007 NCLB/AYP Target: 90%				
4 YEAR GRADUATION	ALL Students: (High School)				75.45%
	2005-2007 NCLB/AYP Target: 80%				

Data Sources: % A+P (emetric.net); AYP Status, Participation, Graduation and Attendance (paayp.com).

AYP data are not reported for subgroups containing less than 40 students.

Student Group		Grade 3	Not counted for AYP*	Grade 5	Met AYP, Y,N, Provisions	Grade 8	Met AYP, Y,N, Provisions	Grade 11	Met AYP, Y,N, Provisions	
READING	ALL Students: (<i>% Proficient/Advanced</i>)	49%	*	46%	N	49%	N	51%	N	
	Student Group 1: White	68%	*	62%	Y	71%	Y	72%	Y	
	2005-2007	Student Group 2: African-American	36%	*	35%	N	36%	N	31%	N
	NCLB/AYP Target	Student Group 3: Latino/Hispanic	67%	*	67%	na	59%	na	73%	na
	54%	Student Group 4: Asian/Pacific Islander	48%	*	64%	na	61%	na	66%	na
	Student Group 5: American Indian/Native Alaskan	100%	*	25%	na	na	na	100%	na	
	Student Group 6: Multi-racial/Ethnic	64%	*	68%	Y	48%	Y	67%	na	
	Student Group 7: IEP-Special Education	26%	*	20%	N	16%	N	12%	N	
	Student Group 8: Limited English Proficiency	45%	*	59%	na	35%	na	50%	na	
	Student Group 9: Economically-Disadvantaged	41%	*	39%	N	39%	N	35%	N	
MATH	ALL Students: (<i>% Proficient/Advanced</i>)	67%		56%	N	46%	Y	38%	N	
	Student Group 1: White	83%	*	72%	Y	67%	Y	59%	Y	
	2005-2007	Student Group 2: African-American	56%	*	45%	N	32%	Y, SH	17%	N
	NCLB/AYP Target	Student Group 3: Latino/Hispanic	75%	*	50%	na	53%	na	36%	na
	45%	Student Group 4: Asian/Pacific Islander	79%	*	83%	na	89%	na	76%	na
	Student Group 5: American Indian/Native Alaskan	100%	*	75%	na	na	na	100%	na	
	Student Group 6: Multi-racial/Ethnic	76%	*	70%	Y	53%	Y	48%	na	
	Student Group 7: IEP-Special Education	44%	*	27%	N	14%	N	4%	N	
	Student Group 8: Limited English Proficiency	72%	*	69%	na	59%	na	41%	na	
	Student Group 9: Economically-Disadvantaged	61%	*	49%	N	36%	Y	22%	N	
PARTICIPATION	ALL Students: (<i>% Proficient/Advanced</i>)		*	R=99%	M=99%	R=97.8%	M=97.8%	R=96.3%	M=96.1%	
	Student Group 1: White		*	R=99.6%	M=99.8%	R=98.8%	M=98.7%	R=97.7%	M=97.5%	
	2005-2007	Student Group 2: African-American		*	R=98.8%	M=99.1%	R=97.2%	M=97.3%	R=94.9%	M=94.8%
	NCLB/AYP Target	Student Group 3: Latino/Hispanic		*	na	na	na	na	na	na
	95%	Student Group 4: Asian/Pacific Islander		*	na	na	na	na	na	na
	Student Group 5: American Indian/Native Alaskan		*	na	na	na	na	na	na	
	Student Group 6: Multi-racial/Ethnic		*	R=100%	M=100%	R=97.1%	M=100%	na	na	
	Student Group 7: IEP-Special Education		*	R=98.2%	M=98.3%	R=95%	M=95.3%	R=91.5%	M=90.6%	
	Student Group 8: Limited English Proficiency		*	na	na	na	na	na	na	
	Student Group 9: Economically-Disadvantaged		*	R=99%	M=99.3%	R=97.3%	M=97.4%	R=95.2%	M=94.8%	
STUDENT ATTENDANCE	ALL Students: (K-8 only)	93.02%								
4 YEAR GRADUATION	2005-2007 NCLB/AYP Target: 90%									
	ALL Students: (High School)	76.76%								
	2005-2007 NCLB/AYP Target: 80%									

Data Sources: % A+P (emetric.net); AYP Status, Participation, Graduation and Attendance (paayp.com).

AYP data are not reported for subgroups containing less than 40 students.

Worksheet 2-B:

DATA for Year: 2005-2006

Student Group		Grade 3	Met AYP, Y,N, Provisions	Grade 5	Met AYP, Y,N, Provisions	Grade 8	Met AYP, Y,N.	Grade 11	Met AYP, Y,N.	
READING	ALL Students: (<i>% Proficient/Advanced</i>)	52%	N	46%	N	58%	Y	51%	N	
	Student Group 1: White	67%	Y	64%	Y	77%	Y	68%	Y	
	Student Group 2: African-American	41%	N	34%	N	45%	Y, SH	35%	Y, PPI	
	Student Group 3: Latino/Hispanic	58%	Y	65%	Y	40%	na	44%	na	
	Student Group 4: Asian/Pacific Islander	71%	Y	63%	Y	85%	na	74%	na	
	Student Group 5: American Indian/Native Alaskan	na	na	33%	na	33%	na	67%	na	
	Student Group 6: Multi-racial/Ethnic	62%	Y	44%	Y	68%	Y	58%	na	
	Student Group 7: IEP-Special Education	28%	N	15%	N	18%	N	8%	N	
	Student Group 8: Limited English Proficiency	54%	Y, CI	32%	Y, CI	17%	na	40%	N	
	Student Group 9: Economically-Disadvantaged	44%	N	37%	N	48%	Y, SH	35%	N	
MATH	ALL Students: (<i>% Proficient/Advanced</i>)	72%	Y	58%	Y	46%	Y	40%	N	
	Student Group 1: White	84%	Y	78%	Y	66%	Y	61%	Y	
	Student Group 2: African-American	64%	Y	45%	Y	33%	N	21%	N	
	Student Group 3: Latino/Hispanic	75%	Y	74%	Y	40%	na	44%	na	
	Student Group 4: Asian/Pacific Islander	88%	Y	76%	Y	80%	na	70%	na	
	Student Group 5: American Indian/Native Alaskan	0%	Y	67%	Y	33%	na	33%	na	
	Student Group 6: Multi-racial/Ethnic	76%	Y	55%	Y	51%	Y	42%	na	
	Student Group 7: IEP-Special Education	50%	Y, SHCI	23%	Y, SHCI	11%	N	4%	N	
	Student Group 8: Limited English Proficiency	70%	Y	36%	Y	32%	na	30%	na	
	Student Group 9: Economically-Disadvantaged	66%	Y	51%	Y	38%	N	24%	N	
PARTICIPATION	ALL Students: (<i>% Proficient/Advanced</i>)	Combined Grade 3 & 5 R=99.1% M=99.6%				R=98.1% M=98.2%	R=96.1% M=96.2%			
	Student Group 1: White	Combined Grade 3 & 5 R=99.4% M=99.8%				R=98.5% M=98.5%	R=97.2% M=97.2%			
	Student Group 2: African-American	Combined Grade 3 & 5 R=99.1% M=99.4%				R=98.2% M=98.4%	R=95.5% M=96%			
	Student Group 3: Latino/Hispanic	Combined Grade 3 & 5 R=97.8% M=100%				na	na			
	Student Group 4: Asian/Pacific Islander	Combined Grade 3 & 5 R=100% M=100%				na	na			
	Student Group 5: American Indian/Native Alaskan	na				na	na			
	Student Group 6: Multi-racial/Ethnic	Combined Grade 3 & 5 R=99.3% M=99.6%				R=97.7% M=98.2%	na			
	Student Group 7: IEP-Special Education	Combined Grade 3 & 5 R=98.1% M=98.9%				R=94.7% M=95%	R=90.8% M=90.4%			
	Student Group 8: Limited English Proficiency	Combined Grade 3 & 5 R=100% M=100%				na	na			
	Student Group 9: Economically-Disadvantaged	Combined Grade 3 & 5 R=99% M=99.5%				R=97.9% M=98.2%	R=95.1% M=95.5%			
STUDENT ATTENDANCE	ALL Students: (K-8 only)	93.1%								
	2005-2007 NCLB/AYP Target: 90%									
4 YEAR GRADUATION	ALL Students: (High School)								90.59%	
	2005-2007 NCLB/AYP Target: 80%									

Data Sources: % A+P (emetric.net); AYP Status, Participation, Graduation and Attendance (paayp.com).

AYP data are not reported for subgroups containing less than 40 students.