



MAP Assessment Update 2019



Factors for consideration

- We have a robust curriculum that is nearly aligned in all subject areas
- We believe in utilizing multiple assessments in order to make decisions
- We appreciate the Board's support in offering the NWEA MAP (Measure of Academic Progress) testing, as it has remained the most consistent
- We have strong, dedicated teachers who use data both to inform their instruction and to better understand student progress and growth



NWEA MAP Testing

- NWEA uses anonymous assessment data from over 10.2 million students to create national norms
- Equal-interval scale continuous across grades can track longitudinal growth over a student's entire career
- Aligned to the Illinois Learning Standards
- Assess students in reading and math in grades 2 - 8
- Continue to meet & surpass our growth expectations
 - 2016 - all schools made expected growth
 - 2017 - 8 schools made expected growth, 1 school made higher than expected growth
 - 2018 - 8 schools made expected growth, 1 school made higher than expected growth

District Mean/National Mean: Reading

READING	Spring 2016		Spring 2017		Spring 2018	
	District Mean RIT	Norm Mean RIT	District Mean RIT	Norm Mean RIT	District Mean RIT	Norm Mean RIT
Grade 2	196.5	188.7	197.4	188.7	197.2	188.7
3	206.9	198.6	205.7	198.6	205.2	198.6
4	215.5	205.9	214.7	205.9	212.4	205.9
5	221.7	211.8	220.9	211.8	218.3	211.8
6	224.9	215.8	226.4	215.8	223.1	215.8
7	229	218.2	229.1	218.2	228.9	218.2
8	232	220.1	232.4	220.1	231	220.1

District Mean/National Mean: Math

MATH	Spring 2016		Spring 2017		Spring 2018	
	District Mean RIT	Norm Mean RIT	District Mean RIT	Norm Mean RIT	District Mean RIT	Norm Mean RIT
Grade 2	199	192.1	197.5	192.1	196.3	192.1
Grade 3	211.3	203.4	209.8	203.4	207.6	203.4
Grade 4	223.9	213.5	222.8	213.5	219.1	213.5
Grade 5	234.5	221.4	232.7	221.4	229.9	221.4
Grade 6	237.2	225.3	235.8	225.3	233.5	225.3
Grade 7	243.3	228.6	241.4	228.6	240.7	228.6
Grade 8	247.5	230.9	248.2	230.9	245.5	230.9



MAP Growth in Reading

Reading	2015-2016	2016-2017	2017-2018	2018-2019
Dryden	Expected Growth	Expected Growth	Expected Growth	Expected Growth
Greenbrier	Expected Growth	Expected Growth	Expected Growth	Expected Growth
Ivy Hill	Expected Growth	Expected Growth	Expected Growth	Expected Growth
Olive-Mary Stitt	Expected Growth	Expected Growth	Expected Growth	Expected Growth
Patton	Expected Growth	Expected Growth	Expected Growth	Expected Growth
South	Expected Growth	Higher Than Expected Growth	Expected Growth	Higher Than Expected Growth
Thomas	Expected Growth	Expected Growth	Expected Growth	Expected Growth
Westgate	Expected Growth	Expected Growth	Expected Growth	Expected Growth
Windsor	Expected Growth	Expected Growth	Expected Growth	Expected Growth

MAP Growth in Math

Math	2015-2016	2016-2017	2017-2018	2018-2019
Dryden	Expected Growth	Expected Growth	Lower Than Expected Growth	Higher Than Expected Growth
Greenbrier	Expected Growth	Expected Growth	Expected Growth	Higher Than Expected Growth
Ivy Hill	Expected Growth	Higher Than Expected Growth	Higher Than Expected Growth	Higher Than Expected Growth
Olive-Mary Stitt	Expected Growth	Expected Growth	Expected Growth	Expected Growth
Patton	Expected Growth	Expected Growth	Expected Growth	Expected Growth
South	Expected Growth	Expected Growth	Expected Growth	Expected Growth
Thomas	Expected Growth	Expected Growth	Expected Growth	Expected Growth
Westgate	Expected Growth	Expected Growth	Expected Growth	Expected Growth
Windsor	Expected Growth	Expected Growth	Expected Growth	Expected Growth

MAP Math Growth: Dryden

Math	2015-2016	2016-2017	2017-2018	2018-2019
Dryden	Expected Growth	Expected Growth	Lower Than Expected Growth	Higher Than Expected Growth

- Lower than expected growth in 2017-2018
- Created a School Improvement Goal for 2018-2019 focused on math instruction
- Planned specific activities after reviewing data
- Used MAP data to determine areas of growth



Comparing Feeder School Information

- Currently collecting MAP data from all schools that feed into District 214
- In comparing to one district, how our students perform is slightly higher. When we look at growth, however, some years we are showing more growth and some years they are showing more growth.
- In comparison to another district, while our students are in a certain growth range, the other district has extreme scores in various pockets (both relatively low and relatively high).
- In reviewing a couple of districts, we have observed their growth from 5th to 6th grade drops off significantly, whereas our students only dip slightly in growth. Students are administered a different version of the assessment beginning in 6th grade.



Questions for Further Exploration

- How often do each of these districts administer the MAP assessment?
- How do various personnel analyze the data?
- How are teachers using the MAP data to improve instruction?
- What types of professional learning are being utilized?
- What curriculum changes have occurred during the years in which we have collected data?



Annual LEA Determination

Aimée LeBlanc

Department of Student Services

May 23, 2019





“

Individuals with Disabilities Act, §616:

Requires all states to make a determination on the performance of their local districts with regard to provision of special education and related services

Indicators

- ISBE assessed eight performance indicators for 2017-18
- District 25 exempt from one indicator (#13)
- Indicators awarded points
 - 1 or 4 points (yes/no)
 - 1-4 points based on percentage of compliance

Criteria for Assessment

- Meets Requirements- 4.0
- Needs Assistance- 3.0-3.99
- Needs Intervention- 2.0-2.99
- Needs Substantial Intervention- 1.0-1.99

Data Collection

- Staff receive ongoing professional development on ISBE requirements
- Staff submit data sheets for individual students following every IEP meeting
- Student data reported to ISBE throughout the school year
 - Final “Child Count” due December 1


Specific Indicators, single score



4b: Significant discrepancy in suspension/expulsion rates for students with IEPs; policies/procedures/practices that contribute to that discrepancy

9: Disproportionate representation of ethnic/racial groups in special education

10: Disproportionate representation of ethnic/racial groups in specific disability categories



Specific Indicators, by Percentage



Percentage of students:

11: evaluated (with parental consent) within 60 school days

12: referred prior to age 3, found eligible with an IEP developed and implemented by their 3rd birthday

13: Not applicable- for students aged 16 and above



Specific Indicators, cont.

- ◎ Correction of Non-compliance
 - D25 did not have a non-compliance finding for 2016-17
- ◎ IDEA Part B Audit
 - No audit findings were noted

Moving Forward

- No corrective action or training required
- Information from LEA Determination will appear on school report card
- More information on ISBE's LEA Determination process is available at:

<https://www.isbe.net/Pages/Special-Education-LEA-Determinations.aspx>

A decorative network diagram in the top-left corner, consisting of various sized circles (nodes) connected by thin lines (edges). Some nodes are solid grey, while others are hollow with a grey outline. The connections form a complex, branching structure.

Any questions?

A decorative network diagram in the bottom-right corner, similar to the one in the top-left. It features a cluster of nodes connected by lines, with some nodes being solid grey and others hollow with grey outlines.