

Issaquah School District Ends Monitoring Report

E-2 Academics and Foundations October 2007

Introduction

This monitoring report addresses four of eight elements of *E-2, Academics and Foundations*: 2.1, 2.2, 2.4, and 2.5 related to the academic preparation of our students.

Mission: E1 Upon graduation, students will be academically prepared and confident to pursue higher education or specialized career training.

E-2: Academics and Foundations

Students will:

- 2.1 **think and solve problems using both creative and critical thinking skills;**
- 2.2 **read, write and speak the English language effectively for a wide range of purposes;**
- 2.3 communicate effectively in oral and written form in another world language;
- 2.4 **know and apply mathematics to a level of fluency that ensures a broad range of post-secondary opportunities and career choices;**
- 2.5 **use analytic and scientific principles to draw sound conclusions;**
- 2.6 understand geography, natural resources, and their shaping effect on government, economics and social patterns;
- 2.7 understand the concept of community within the context of national and world history, comparative forms and influences of governments and major world religions;
- 2.8 apply academic skills to life situations.

Interpretation

1. General Assumptions and Limitations

- A. **Mission embodied in Ends.** For monitoring purposes, reasonable progress toward the Board's separate Ends Statements (E-2 through E-6) is viewed as reasonable progress toward achievement of the District mission (E-1).

B. Interpretation/definition of E-2 stem. For monitoring purposes, K-11 students will be viewed as *academically prepared* if 75% or more meet grade-level standards corresponding to *E-2.1, E-2.2, E-2.4 and E-2.5* as measured by the Washington Assessment of Student Learning. Grade 12 students will be viewed as *academically prepared* if 80% or more achieve on-time graduation. (Note: Some Special Education, English Language Learners, and alternative high school students require more than four years to graduate. When these students do graduate, they are counted in the extended graduation rate which is included in the data portfolio.) For the class of 2008, graduation requirements include WASL proficiency in reading and writing.

For monitoring purposes, *the confidence of ISD students to pursue* higher education or specialized career training will be interpreted as synonymous with students' enrollment in college, university, and career or technical training programs without the need for remedial course-taking. These data are treated in a second monitoring report, scheduled annually in December.

C. Dynamic reporting. We view the Board's development of Ends statements as evolutionary, intended to guide systemic improvement in student learning as the District adds capacity for new work and higher performance. The interpretation of successful District performance (reasonable progress toward Board-established Ends for students) must also be dynamic. Data are readily available for 2.1, 2.2, 2.4, and 2.5 through state and local assessments. The interpretation will change with:

- 1) new Ends requirements
- 2) increases in achievement
- 3) changes in assessment instruments
- 4) increased data collection capability
- 5) refinement of data collection methodologies, especially for consistency
- 6) availability of trend data
- 7) increased capacity for data analysis.

D. The Board's Ends Statements for Students imply a full system. The Board's Ends Statements for Students – Academics and Foundations – are very broadly conceived. The interpretation of these global elements encompasses the implicit system of Essential Academic Learning Requirements (EALRs), Grade-level Expectations (GLEs) and aligned assessments; ISD scope and sequence in selected disciplines, standards-based instructional practices, research-based best practices in pedagogy, and District-adopted instructional support materials.

E. Multiple measures with “value added” analysis are desirable. Ends achievement is best monitored through multiple measures including “value added” analysis (a statistical determination of how much value the system is adding to student learning). This analysis should be completed for each student, all students, males and females, gifted and talented students, and all federally reported AYP sub-groups. The current monitoring includes multiple measures; due to resource priorities, monitoring does not yet include a “value-added” analysis.

F. Definition of “students” for monitoring of Board Ends. I interpret “students” to mean all K-12 students, incorporating in the aggregate all sub-groups differentiated for federal reporting. Specifically, this includes:

- 1) American Indian
- 2) Asian / Pacific Islander
- 3) Black
- 4) Hispanic
- 5) White
- 6) Low income (by known federal free/reduced lunch program eligibility)
- 7) English language learners (by federal guidelines)
- 8) Special Education (by IEP)
- 9) Gifted and talented (by District-recognized testing)
- 10) Male/female

G. Monitoring of elements. This monitoring report treats four of eight elements under *E-2 – Academics and Foundations*. With one exception, I interpret these four elements, *2.1, 2.2, 2.4 and 2.5*, to be adequately measured by the instrumentation identified in the table below for the purpose of determining “reasonable progress.”

I interpret that English-speaking ability is monitored by classroom teachers within the teaching of literacy (reading, writing, communication). If students are not making reasonable progress in spoken English, they receive extra assistance in the classroom and if necessary receive extra support. Progress in these areas is monitored by the Reading and Writing sections of the WASL and within the disaggregated reports in the District Data Portfolio.

Academics and Foundations	Evidence
2.1 think and solve problems using both creative and critical thinking skills;	WASL – state goal 3. <i>Think analytically, logically and creatively; integrate experience and knowledge to form reasoned judgments and solve problems;</i> The Washington State Test Specifications show that approximately 30-50% of each WASL focuses on creative and critical thinking skills.
2.2 read, write and speak the English language effectively for a wide range of purposes;	WASL Reading Assessment WASL Writing Assessment
2.4 know and apply mathematics to a level of fluency that ensures a broad range of post-secondary opportunities and career choices;	WASL Mathematics Assessment
2.5 use analytic and scientific principles to draw sound conclusions;	WASL Science Assessment

H. **Change, growth, and trends are different.** Under existing data collection limitations, it is not possible to report *growth* for individual students. Until we have the tools to perform more complex statistical analysis, we are able to report *change*, but cannot label it *growth*.

Three or more years of comparable data are necessary to identify a *trend*. Wherever possible, this year's report includes three-year analysis for the first time.

I. **“Significance” requires common definition.** To attribute significance to any change, I interpret that a difference of 5 points must be present on any measurement scale (i.e., percentile rank, percent proficient, or scale score). This assumption will guide all work with student data, including the development of Continuous Improvement Plans (CIPs).

J. **Current vs. past and future progress reporting.** Our initial monitoring in December 2004 reported 2003-04 student performance in terms of policy *compliance* (i.e., compliance, partial compliance, or non-compliance).

In October 2005, in keeping with advice from policy governance experts, we moved to reporting whether District students have made “reasonable progress” toward an established standard.

In 2006-2007, three years of comparable measures were available, offering a clearer and more reliable picture of District performance over time. The monitoring report specifically focuses on two types of three-year data sets: 1) three-year trends in ISD student achievement data, and 2) three-year comparisons of disaggregated Issaquah data with comparable Eastside districts (Bellevue, Lake Washington, North Shore, and Shoreline).

Over time, assessments reported in the district data portfolio will be modified (i.e., State ITBS was last given in Spring, 2005; additional grade-level WASLs (reading and math in grades 3, 5 6, and 8) and Stanford 10 reports are now included).

K. **Rigorous standard.** To hold to a rigorous interpretation, I have maintained a 75% proficiency level. Only those cells showing 75% of students proficient are reported as *YES*. If students showed significant improvement (improvement of 5% or more) in cells marked *NO* in the following data tables, we have added an asterisk. Next year the State Uniform Bar requirements will change. I anticipate increasing our proficiency level to 80% in the academic areas and 85% for graduation rates in 2008-2009.

The following points provide rationale for the interpretation that 75% is an appropriate achievement target for student performance on a large-scale, point-in-time assessment such as a WASL content area assessment:

- 75% exceeds the Grade 4 State Uniform Bar Goal through 2007 and the Grade 7 and 10 Goals extending through 2010.
- Various independent studies show Washington State standards and the WASL assessment to rank high in difficulty in comparison to other states. While reports are somewhat contradictory, a 2003 study by the *Princeton Review* found that only four states had set

higher standards than Washington.

- A 2003 study of 14 states' math standards by Northwest Evaluation Association found the WASL proficiency standard to be the equivalent of scoring at the 72nd percentile.
- A 2002 study by the Washington Education Research Association found grade 10 WASL math cut scores to be very high compared to the ITBS and ITED. The WASL proficiency cut score was found to be equivalent to the 73rd percentile.
- An independent study by Achieve, Inc. for the A+ Commission found the WASL writing and reading tests to be more rigorous than the math test.
- Based on experience in other states, the Achieve, Inc. study hypothesizes that lack of student motivation to perform well on the grade 10 WASL will keep achievement scores artificially low until proficiency is made a requirement for high school graduation (2008).

In light of these comparability studies, District resource limitations, and the Issaquah School District community's expressed desire to maintain a comprehensive educational program, 75% sets a high but reasonable standard at this time.

Norm-referenced test results (ITBS, ITED and Stanford 10) are included in the District Data Portfolio for information only. These tests help to validate our judgments regarding student achievement by showing the performance of Issaquah students in relation to national norm groups, but we anchor our judgment of student progress to standards-based performances.

L. **Graduation rate – modified reporting.** In past reports, *preliminary* graduation data were included, then later reconciled with final state-reported graduation rates released later in the year. In order to provide clear, accurate reports and ultimately focus on trends, the monitoring of graduation rates beginning in October 2006 lagged by one year behind the academic data provided. This monitoring includes corrected data on 2005-06 extended graduation rate. If OSPI provides updated information in time for the December update, 2006-2007 preliminary will be included.

M. **Report of reasonable progress.**

Based on the three year trend data described in item F, I am reporting reasonable progress toward Board-established Ends if ISD student performance reaches either of two target levels:

- if the three-year ISD average exceeds 75% of students proficient, or
- if the three-year ISD average is equal to or greater than the average of the five comparable districts noted in section F. This methodology is reasonable because it mirrors a methodology of the state plan and because in a year of anomalies that raise questions about stability of portions of the WASL, reference to a norm group about the relative progress of comparable student populations increases confidence about actual performance.

Cells showing “no data” cannot be reliably reported because they represent fewer than ten students. In areas with less than three years of student performance data, the data were used to confirm or refute previously identified trends.

2. Data provided as evidence. The following data are provided in the District's data portfolio appended to this report:

- A. Grade K: Stanford Reading, Math (2006, 2007)
- B. Grade 1: Stanford Reading, Math (2006, 2007)
- C. Grade 2: Stanford Reading, Math (2006, 2007)
- D. Grade 3: Stanford Reading, Math (2006, 2007)
WASL Reading, Math (2006, 2007)
ITBS Reading, Math (2003, 2004, 2005)
- E. Grade 4: Stanford Reading, Math (2006, 2007)
WASL Reading, Math, Writing (2005, 2006, 2007)
- F. Grade 5: Stanford Reading, Math (2006, 2007)
WASL Reading, Math (2006, 2007)
WASL Science (2005, 2006, 2007)
ITBS Reading, Language (2004, 2005)
- G. Grade 6: Stanford Reading, Math (2006, 2007)
WASL Reading, Math (2006, 2007)
- H. Grade 7: Stanford Reading, Math (2006, 2007)
WASL Reading, Math, Writing (2005, 2006, 2007)
- I. Grade 8: Stanford Reading, Math (2006, 2007)
WASL Reading, Math (2006, 2007)
WASL Science (2005, 2006, 2007)
- J. Grade 9: Stanford Reading, Math (2006, 2007)
WASL Reading, Math, Writing, Science (2006, 2007)
Grade 10 WASL taken early (2006, 2007)
ITED Reading, Expression, Quantitative (2003, 2004, 2005)
- K. Grade 10: Stanford Reading, Math (2006, 2007)
WASL Reading, Math, Writing, Science (2004, 2006, 2007)
- L. Grade 11: Stanford Reading, Math (2006, 2007)
- M. Grade 12: District Graduation Data (2003, 2004, 2005, 2006)
- N. Grades K-12 For Board information only: District Attendance and Discipline Data

3. Reports of reasonable progress. The following tables report that students are *demonstrating reasonable progress (YES)*, or *not demonstrating reasonable progress (NO)*. As noted in Paragraph 1.G, sub-populations making gains of 5% or more below the 75% level are reported as “*NO**,” but significant growth is evident.

Based on trend data, I certify that Issaquah School District students continue to make reasonable progress toward achievement of the Board’s Ends 2.1, 2.2, 2.4 and 2.5 because they have achieved the reasonable progress targets in 13 of the 13 measured areas.

- Grade 4: Reading, Math, Writing
- Grade 5 Science
- Grade 7 Reading, Math, Writing
- Grade 8 Science
- Grade 10 Reading, Math, Writing, Science
- Grade 12 Graduation

District-Wide Trends

This analysis taken from the trend analysis on the worksheets following.

Several trends found throughout this analysis are repeated on multiple worksheets. For the purpose of identifying district-wide trends in this report, all achievement test data and graduation data will be considered, while attendance and discipline data will not be considered within this analysis. Three-year trend data exists for WASL in reading and math at grades 4, 7, 10 and for WASL Science at grades 5, 8, and 10. ITBS and ITED data are included because three-year trends exist for those data, while Stanford data exists only for 2006 and 2007. ITBS and ITED testing was discontinued in 2005 and will no longer be reported after this year.

1. There is considerable evidence that an achievement gap exists between the performance of Asian and White students and that of Black and Hispanic students.
2. Where sufficiently measurable numbers of American Indian students exist (more than 10 students), their performance is also significantly lower than that of Asian and White students.
3. Females usually outperform males, but this varies by content area and grade level.
4. There is a significant and consistent gap between the performance of All Students and that of Low Income, Special Ed, and ELL students.
5. Gifted students consistently and significantly outperform All Students, where that data is available.

Although only two years of data exist for Stanford 10 at grades 3-9 and for WASL Reading and Math at grades 3, 5, 6, and 8, in general these data confirm what has been reported in existing three-year trend information on both WASL and ITBS/ITED results.

Achievement Test Data (3rd ITBS)

Reported as: % students in top quartile

Disaggregate Categories	Reading			Language			Math		
	2002-2003	2003-2004	2004-2005	2002-2003	2003-2004	2004-2005	2002-2003	2003-2004	2004-2005
All Students	45.9	50.6	45.7	58.5	51.9		64.9	57.9	61.9
American Indian	44.4	14.3	40	44.4	14.3		55.6	14.3	40
Asian / Pacific Islander	34	45.4	42.9	66.4	54.6		74.3	68.7	73.7
Black	25	35	24.1	43.7	35		62.5	40	37.9
Hispanic	12.5	22.2	23.4	21.9	34.6		28.1	25.9	25.5
White	48.2	52.8	48.3	59.4	52.9		64.7	58.5	62
Low Income									
ELL	0	0	0	0	0		14.3	33.3	25.8
Special Ed	26.4	31.9	19.7	35.9	38.1		41.4	39.5	26.4
Gifted			83.7						96.3
Male			37.6						63.5
Female			54.1						60.2

Achievement Test Data (3rd ITBS)

Reported as: % students in top quartile

Collecting Issues:

05 - Blank cells are those not coded on ITBS / ITED

Correcting Issues:

Observations / Trends:

- With the exception of one year in math, there is a significant achievement gap between the performance of Asian and White students v the performance of Black and Hispanic students with Hispanic students having the lowest performance of all ethnic groups.
- There is also a significant achievement gap between the Special Ed, ELL, v All Students populations.
- Of the twenty-one 3year data trends (3 yr Math trend for Blacks, 3 yr Reading trend for All Students, etc.), 11 of these indicate a drop in students within the top quartile in the 02-03 data.
- Special Ed students increased their percentages within the top quartile for each of the three year patterns in math, reading, and language.

Achievement Test Data (4th Stanford/WASL)

Disaggregate Categories	Stanford Reported as Percentile Rank			
	Reading		Math	
	2005-06	2006-07	2005-06	2006-07
All Students	77	78	79	77
American Indian	72	N=6	71	N=6
Asian/Pacific Islander	83	83	87	86
Black	60	57	62	57
Hispanic	52	58	53	53
White	77	78	78	76
Low Income	50	49	49	51
ELL		33		50
Special Ed	41	46	45	49
Gifted	94		94	
Female	81	80	80	77
Male	73	75	78	77

WASL Reported as % Meeting Standard								
Reading			Math			Writing		
2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07
91.2	87.3	85.0	78.6	77.5	77.8	75.4	78.2	79.0
N=9	66.7	N=7	N=9	66.7	N=7	N=9	75.0	N=7
90.8	92.9	92.5	84.5	83.0	87.0	85.0	89.6	88.5
81.8	69.0	64.5	45.5	51.7	40.6	59.1	65.5	54.8
81.8	72.5	71.2	47.7	43.1	55.9	54.5	52.9	65.5
92.1	87.7	84.7	79.8	79.2	78.1	75.1	77.4	78.2
77.0	63.7	63.9	56.3	41.6	45.9	57.5	48.5	47.9
72.0	48.0	40.7	28.0	32.0	37.0	36.0	44.0	29.6
62.7	47.6	46.2	39.6	34.7	40.7	35.1	41.1	42.2
100.0	99.0		99.1	99.5		96.1	95.2	
92.5	90.1	87.7	79.6	78.4	79.2	83.4	85.8	86.0
90.0	84.4	82.5	77.7	76.6	76.6	68.2	70.7	72.3

Achievement Test Data (4th Stanford/WASL)

Collecting Issues:

Correcting Issues:

The ELL coding issue was corrected in the upload of the data files for 2006-07.

Observations/Trends:

Stanford

Trends- With only two years of test results, there is no trend data for Stanford.

Observations-

- There is a significant achievement gap between the performance of Asian and White students and that of Hispanic and Black students, with Hispanic students having the lowest achievement scores of all ethnic groups.
- Low income and Special Ed students scored significantly below All Students.
- There was no significant gender difference in performance.

WASL

Trends-

- Asian and White students met standard at significantly higher rates than Black and Hispanic students, with Black students scoring lower than all other ethnic groups.
- Low Income, Special Ed and ELL students met standard at rates significantly below All Students.
- Gifted students met standard at significantly higher rates than All Students.
- Females generally met standard at significantly higher rates higher than males in reading and writing.

Achievement Test Data (4th Stanford/WASL)

Achievement Test Data (5th Stanford/WASL)

Disaggregate Categories	Stanford Reported as Percentile Rank				WASL Reported as % Meeting Standard						
	Reading		Math		Reading		Math		Science		
	2005-06	2006-07	2005-06	2006-07	2005-06	2006-07	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07		
All Students	82	80	85	85	86.9	81.7	79.0	78.0	57.7	61.1	64.7
American Indian	N=8	75	N=8	81	N=8	61.5	N=8	61.5	40.0	N=8	61.5
Asian/Pacific Islander	85	83	92	91	92.3	86.7	90.9	84.1	66.0	70.1	72.1
Black	62	67	64	67	68.4	76.7	52.6	43.3	43.3	36.8	40.0
Hispanic	66	59	65	64	72.4	62.7	50.0	50.8	25.0	37.9	35.6
White	82	80	84	85	87.2	82.1	79.0	79.6	58.1	61.5	65.5
Low Income	59	49	59	58	64.5	51.0	49.5	38.0	31.6	33.3	30.0
ELL		27		58	52.0	14.3	40.0	23.8	15.8	12.0	3.6
Special Ed	51	42	51	46	44.3	32.7	36.8	23.9	18.8	17.1	15.9
Gifted	95		96		98.6		98.6		91.7	93.9	
Female	84	82	85	84	90.1	87.4	79.8	79.2	60.9	68.0	67.7
Male	80	77	85	86	84.1	76.2	78.3	77.0	54.6	55.2	61.8

Achievement Test Data (5th Stanford/WASL)

Collecting Issues:

Correcting Issues:

The ELL coding issue was corrected in the upload of the data files for 2006-07.

Observations/Trends:

Stanford

Trends- With only two years of test results, there is no trend data for Stanford tests.

Observations-

There is a significant achievement gap between the performance of Asian and White students and that of Hispanic and Black students, with Hispanic students having the lowest achievement scores of all ethnic groups.

- Low income and Special Ed students scored significantly below All Students.
- Female students scored higher in reading than males.

WASL

Trends- With only one year of test results in reading and math, there is no trend data for these subjects. Trend data are available for Science.

- Asian and White students meet standard at significantly higher rates than Black and Hispanic students, with Hispanic students scoring the lowest of all ethnic groups in Reading and Science.
- Low Income and Special Ed students met standard at significantly lower rates than All Students.
- Females met standard at significantly higher rates than males in Reading and Science.

Achievement Test Data (5th Stanford/WASL)

Achievement Test Data (5th ITBS)

Reported as: % students in top quartile

Disaggregate Categories	Reading			Language					
	2002-2003	2003-2004	2004-2005	2002-2003	2003-2004	2004-2005			
All Students		35.1	39.5		33.5	42.1			
American Indian		(N=1)	(N=5)		(N=0)	(N=5)			
Asian / Pacific Islander		16.1	39.4		22.5	56.1			
Black		(N=3)	(N=7)		(N=4)	(N=7)			
Hispanic		(N=6)	(N=4)		(N=7)	(N=7)			
White		81.2	41.1		74.5	40.7			
Low Income			(N=7)			14.3			
ELL		0	0		0	0			
Special Ed		5.5	14.6		(N=5)	11.7			
Gifted			86.1			82			
Female		49.9	40.3		61	48.8			
Male		50.1	38.7		39	35.6			

Achievement Test Data (5th ITBS)

Reported as: % students in top
quartile

Collecting Issues: We have not historically kept records as a district on the percent of students scoring in the top quartile. To access this data, we used Skyward. The Skyward download only included current 04-05 students which automatically withdrew 32 students in Reading and 29 students in Language from last year's data to this year. This information was drawn from the ITBS data disk, added to a Skyward download of current students, and put together in access by student ID number. Percentile ranks came from the district hard copy report. Due to the time consuming nature of gathering this data, it was not possible to obtain the information from the previous two years. Percentiles for subgroups are based on the 'All Students' total percent.

05 - Subgroups NOT calculated as percentages of the 'All Students' group. Blank cells are those not coded on ITBS.

Correcting Issues:

Observations / Trends:

- There is a significant gap between the % of White students v Asian students who are in the top quartile in Reading and Language.
- Female students had a significantly higher % in the top quartile in Language than did male students.
- There is a significant gap between the performance of All Students v Special Ed and ELL students.

Achievement Test Data (6th Stanford/WASL)

Disaggregate Categories	Stanford Reported as Percentile Rank				WASL Reported as % Meeting Standard			
	Reading		Math		Reading		Math	
	2005-06	2006-07	2005-06	2006-07	2005-06	2006-07	2005-06	2006-07
All Students	80	81	76	80	80.6	81.7	71.5	72.8
American Indian	64	69	54	68	66.7	N=9	50.0	N=9
Asian/Pacific Islander	83	86	88	90	88.7	91.5	84.1	85.5
Black	70	61	53	58	74.1	57.7	48.1	46.2
Hispanic	45	58	47	56	48.9	58.7	38.3	38.1
White	80	82	74	78	80.8	81.7	71.4	73.1
Low Income	55	60	45	50	57.1	54.2	39.0	39.2
ELL		30		44	N=7	43.8	N=8	25.8
Special Ed	45	52	37	43	40.0	35.7	26.9	28.3
Gifted	95		93		97.4		99.0	
Female	81	84	75	80	86.9	86.5	72.9	74.8
Male	78	79	75	80	74.5	77.5	70.1	71.0

Achievement Test Data (6th Stanford/WASL)

Collecting Issues:

Correcting Issues:

The ELL coding issue was corrected in the upload of the data files for 2006-07.

Observations/Trends:

Stanford

Trends- With only two years of test results, there is no trend data for Stanford tests.

Observations-

- There is a significant achievement gap between the performance of Asian and White students and that of Hispanic and Black students.
- Low income, ELL and Special Ed students scored significantly below All Students.

WASL

Trends- With only two years of test results, there is no trend data available for WASL.

Observations-

- Asian and White students met standard at significantly higher rates than Black and Hispanic students.
- Low Income and Special Ed students met standard at significantly lower rates than All Students.
- Gifted students met standard at significantly higher rates than All Students.
- Females met standard in reading at significantly higher rates than males.

Achievement Test Data (6th Stanford/WASL)

Achievement Test Data (7th Stanford/WASL)

Disaggregate Categories	Stanford Reported as Percentile Rank				WASL Reported as % Meeting Standard								
	Reading		Math		Reading			Math			Writing		
	2005-06	2006-07	2005-06	2006-07	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07
All Students	76	78	77	80	88.8	77.9	80.8	76.7	68.9	75.0	84.1	81.3	86.9
American Indian	N=7	N=9	N=7	N=9	N=6	N=6	72.7	N=5	N=6	72.7	N=5	N=6	81.8
Asian/Pacific Islander	78	81	88	90	93.0	83.1	90.8	84.5	80.6	89.3	90.9	86.1	94.4
Black	54	61	51	56	56.0	48.6	56.3	48.0	38.2	43.8	60.0	64.9	71.9
Hispanic	44	48	57	51	69.6	73.3	47.2	45.7	38.6	35.8	67.4	75.6	73.6
White	77	80	76	80	89.8	78.7	81.7	77.6	69.7	75.3	84.6	81.9	86.7
Low Income	50	55	50	56	59.0	52.9	51.7	43.4	33.7	41.4	50.6	60.8	69.0
ELL		14		45	N=9	N=7	0.0	N=9	N=7	14.3	N=8	N=7	14.3
Special Ed	45	41	41	40	42.9	25.4	29.7	25.5	18.1	18.0	35.7	40.1	49.5
Gifted	92		94		98.4	96.8		97.2	97.3		97.3	92.4	
Female	79	80	78	80	91.0	84.8	86.5	76.4	72.7	78.1	89.8	90.3	91.0
Male	74	77	76	81	86.9	72.0	75.3	76.9	65.8	71.9	79.1	73.7	82.9

Achievement Test Data (7th Stanford/WASL)

Collecting Issues:

Correcting Issues:

The ELL coding issue will be corrected in the upload of the data files for 2005-06.

Observations/Trends:

Stanford

Trends- With only two years of test results, there is no trend data for Stanford tests.

Observations

- There is a significant achievement gap between the performance of Asian and White students and that of Black and Hispanic students, with Hispanic students scoring significantly lower than other ethnic groups.
- Special Ed and Low Income students scored significantly lower than All Students.
- There was no significant gender difference in performance.

WASL

Trends

- Asian and White students met standard at a significantly higher rate than Hispanic and Black students, with Hispanic students generally meeting standard at rates lower than all other ethnic groups.
- Low income and Special Ed students scored significantly below All Students.
- Gifted students met standard at rates significantly higher than All Students.
- Females generally met standard at rates significantly higher than males.

Achievement Test Data (7th Stanford/WASL)

Achievement Test Data (8th Stanford/WASL)

Disaggregate Categories	Stanford Reported as Percentile Rank				WASL Reported as % Meeting Standard						
	Reading		Math		Reading		Math		Science		
	2005-06	2006-07	2005-06	2006-07	2005-06	2006-07	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07		
All Students	80	77	84	81	88.4	77.5	73.4	68..5	58.4	73.1	73.3
American Indian	N=5	N=7	N=5	N=7	N=8	N=6	N=7	N=6	N=9	N=9	N=6
Asian/Pacific Islander	81	79	91	90	93.8	83.0	82.3	76.2	65.1	76.8	76.7
Black	60	51	61	54	60.0	43.3	48.0	29.0	17.6	48.0	43.3
Hispanic	60	67	55	65	71.4	71.1	40.5	46.7	37.8	34.9	69.6
White	81	78	83	81	89.1	78.2	74.1	69.5	58.8	75.0	74.1
Low Income	54	53	55	53	61.8	47.4	35.5	33.6	19.0	30.7	43.1
ELL		17		56	N=5	21.4	N=5	14.3	N=4	N=6	7.1
Special Ed	43	45	37	39	35.3	18.3	16.5	14.7	11.5	18.8	20.9
Gifted	94		97		99.4		98.9			91.6	97.2
Female	79	78	82	82	92.1	84.0	73.3	70.7	61.0	71.2	74.9
Male	80	76	85	81	85.1	71.6	73.5	66.5	55.8	74.8	72.0

Achievement Test Data (8th Stanford/WASL)

Collecting Issues:

Correcting Issues:

The ELL coding issue was corrected in the upload of the data files for 2006-07.

Observations/Trends:

Stanford

Trends- With only two years of test results, there is no trend data for Stanford tests.

WASL

Trends- With only two years of test results, there is no trend data for reading and math. Trend data does exist for Science.

- There is no significant difference in the percentage of females and males meeting standard in science.
- Asian and White students meet standard in science at significantly higher rates than Hispanic and Black students, with Black students lower than all other ethnic groups.
- Low income and Special Ed students met standard at percentages significantly below All Students
- Gifted students met standard at significantly higher rates than All Students.

Observations-

- Asian and White students met standard at significantly higher rates in reading and math than Hispanic and Black students, with Black students lower than all other ethnic groups.
- Females met standard at significantly higher percentages in reading than males.

Achievement Test Data (8th Stanford/WASL)

Achievement Test Data (9th Stanford/WASL)

Disaggregate Categories	Stanford Reported as Percentile Rank					
	Reading		Math		Science	
	2005-06	2006-07	2005-06	2006-07	2005-06	2006-07
All Students	78	81	85	85	73	78
American Indian	N=6	N=5	N=6	N=5	N=6	N=5
Asian/Pacific Islander	79	83	91	91	76	79
Black	49	57	59	72	50	61
Hispanic	58	63	66	63	52	54
White	79	82	85	84	74	79
Low Income	47	56	60	65	47	56
ELL		N=6		N=6		56
Special Ed	41	38	48	86	48	44
Gifted	93		96			
Female	80	82	85	83	71	75
Male	76	80	85	86	76	80

WASL Reported as Percent Meeting Standard						
Reading		Math		Writing		Science
2005-06	2006-07	2005-06	2006-07	2005-06	2006-07	2006-07
75.4	68.9	86.3	74.5	65.6	47.2	33.0
78.6	68	85.7	80	64.3	52.0	52.0
N=1	N=1	N=1	N=1	N=1	N=1	N=1
74.3	69.6	86.3	45.6	65.7	45.6	25.3
N=2	N=1	N=4		N=1		
75.0		91.7		55.6		
74.2	73.8	87.1	69	61.3	45.2	31.0
76.5	65.6	85.5	78.1	69.6	48.4	34.4

Achievement Test Data (9th Stanford/WASL)

Collecting Issues:

Correcting Issues:

The ELL coding issue was corrected in the upload of the data files for 2006-07.

Observations/Trends:

Stanford

Trends- With only two years of test results, there is no trend data for Stanford.

Observations-

- Asian and White students performed higher than Hispanic and Black students with Black students scoring the lowest of all ethnic groups.
- Low Income and Special Ed students performed significantly lower than All Students.
- There was no significant difference in the performance of male and female students, except in science where males out performed females.

WASL

Trends- With only two years of test results, there is no trend data for WASL. Ninth grade students may take the high school WASL early and "bank" passing scores.

Observations-

- With the exception of one Hispanic student, all students attempting the WASL in grade 9 were Asian or White.
- Gifted students met standard at higher percentages in math than All Students, but not in reading or writing.
- Very few students attempted the science portion of the test, which is not a graduation requirement until 2013, and not available to 9th graders until 2006-07 school year.
- Females out performed males in reading, while males out performed females in math.
- Percentage results for grade 9 are deceiving as OSPI reports the identical number of participants (106) for all subtests, not just the number actually taking that specific subtest. In actuality, 75 students took the reading WASL, with 74 meeting standard (98.7%). Fifty-two students took the writing WASL with 51 meeting standard (98.1%). Nine students took the math WASL with 55 meeting standard (94%). Forty-two students took the science WASL with 38 meeting standard (90.5%).

scores.

7 school year.

that specific
dard (98%). Eighty-

Achievement Test Data (9th ITED)

Reported as: % students in top quartile

Disaggregate Categories	Reading			Expression			Quantitative		
	2002-2003	2003-2004	2004-2005	2002-2003	2003-2004	2004-2005	2002-2003	2003-2004	2004-2005
All Students	50.6	48.5	51.8	53.2	52	55.3	57.9	59	59
American Indian	33.3	40	(N=9)	40	0	(N=9)	33.3	60	(N=9)
Asian / Pacific Islander	49.6	46	49.7	61.5	54.7	62.5	73.8	69.4	68.2
Black	22.2	29.4	13	38.9	23.5	17.4	22.2	18.8	17.4
Hispanic	34.4	37.1	41.5	34.4	40	39	36.4	38.9	43.9
White	52.1	49.6	53.8	53.3	52.6	55.9	57.4	58.7	59.3
Low Income									
ELL		(N=4)	(N=6)		(N=4)	(N=6)		(N=4)	(N=6)
Special Ed	11.9	22.3	12.1	11	17	11.1	12.5	18.3	9.2
Gifted	91	84.7	88.4	88.6	80.1	89.4	92.2	93	90.5
Female			54.4			62			54.4
Male			49.4			49			63.3

Achievement Test Data (9th ITED)

Reported as: % students in top quartile

Collecting Issues:

- Gifted student data is based on gifted students tested in 04 and still in the district in November 04.

05 - Blank cells are those not coded on ITBS / ITED.

Correcting Issues:

- We are awaiting the legislature's decision on the future of ITED administration in Washington.

Observations / Trends:

- Blacks have seen a significant decrease in the percent of students at standard across each of the three year trends in Reading, Language, and Math.
- Hispanics have seen a significant increase in the percent of students at standard across each of the three year trends in Reading, Language, and Math.
- Special Ed students are seeing an increase in the percent of students at standard in each of the three year trends in Reading, Language, and Math.
- Of the twenty-one 3year data trends within this worksheet (3 yr Math trend for Blacks, 3 yr Reading trend for All Students, etc.), 7 of these indicate a drop in student achievement in the 02-03 data.
- There is a significant gap between the performance of All Students v Special Ed Students.
- Gifted students significantly and consistently outperform All Students.

Achievement Test Data (10th Stanford/WASL)

Disaggregate Categories	WASL Reported as % Meeting Standard											
	Reading			Math			Writing			Science		
	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	2005-06	2006-07	2006-07	2005-06	2006-07	2006-07
All Students	88.2	93.8	92.5	70.9	76.4	74.8	83.1	93.6	94.7	60.0	57.6	54.9
American Indian	N=7	N=7	N=6	N=7	N=7	N=6	N=7	N=7	N=6	N=7	N=7	N=6
Asian/Pacific Islander	92.0	92.8	95.0	77.3	81.1	80.0	86.3	96.1	95.6	65.0	66.1	63.8
Black	73.7	82.6	61.1	42.1	29.2	35.3	73.7	86.4	94.4	15.8	12.5	16.7
Hispanic	80.0	85.7	86.5	57.1	73.5	55.3	71.4	91.2	84.6	47.2	54.5	32.5
White	88.5	94.8	93.0	71.0	77.0	75.5	83.5	93.6	95.1	60.7	57.7	54.9
Low Income	65.7	72.2	64.7	46.3	50.7	40.4	56.7	75.7	69.8	31.3	26.4	17.0
ELL	N=3	N=3	N=7	N=3	N=3	N=8	N=3	N=3	N=8	N=3	N=3	N=8
Special Ed	40.6	66.3	73.0	12.9	27.5	27.5	39.6	68.8	74.3	10.9	11.2	8.8
Gifted	97.5	99.0		96.2	96.9		93.6	99.5		91.7	89.8	
Female	92.0	95.8	94.9	71.1	74.5	75.9	88.7	96.1	97.2	60.1	56.8	58.9
Male	84.6	91.8	90.4	70.8	78.2	73.8	77.6	91.2	92.4	59.8	58.4	51.1

Achievement Test Data (10th Stanford/WASL)

Collecting Issues:

Correcting Issues:

The ELL coding issue was corrected in the upload of the data files for 2006-07.

Observations/Trends:

Stanford

The Stanford test is no longer given at grade 10.

WASL

Trends

- White and Asian students met standard at significantly higher rates than Black and Hispanic students, with Black students generally scoring lower than all other ethnic groups.
- Special Ed and Low Income students met standard at significantly lower rates than All Students.
- Gifted students met standard at significantly higher rates than All Students.
- There is no significant difference in the performance of females and males, except in science and writing where females out perform males.

Achievement Test Data (10th Stanford/WASL)

District Attendance Data

Reported as number of unexcused absences

Disaggregate Categories	Elementary			Middle School			High School		
	04-05	05-06	06-07	04-05	05-06	06-07	04-05	05-06	06-07
All Students	2706 (out of 7560)	2800.0	3216.0	4006.95	2014.5	1751.2	13833.00	13495.4	10807.5
American Indian	20.0	34.5	63.0	95.73	38.9	22.2	102.59	77.6	111.9
Asian/Pacific Islander	346.5	282.5	575.5	312.64	317.2	127.7	957.24	1083.2	111.5
Black	172.5	227.0	159.0	239.44	235.4	122.7	288.92	445.5	577.3
Hispanic	282.0	328.0	537.5	289.63	301.1	233.3	685.34	808.7	948.1
Multi-Racial			9.0			33.6			3.0
White	1885.0	1907.5	2056.5	3069.23	1396.7	1211.1	11786.08	11077.5	8055.7
Low Income	465.5	576.5	750.0	943.73	635.2	544.1	1235.30	2192.4	2077.7
ELL	135.5	199.0	327.5	40.93	48.3	93.3	61.54	158.1	388.6
Special Ed	527.0	408.0	478.5	917.42	471.6	253.8	2572.36	2590.6	1290.2
Gifted	160.5	77.0	91.0	347.75	74.0	164.9	865.41	818.2	727.9
Female	1478.0	1039.0	1617.5	1829.00	971.8	838.6	8310.61	5493.5	4986.9
Male	1228.0	1265.5	1777.5	2177.95	1139.3	1159.5	5522.02	8001.9	5820.6

District Attendance Data

Reported as number of unexcused absences

Collecting Issues:

In 05, the total for "ethnicity" does not equal "all students" due to rounding and additional categories.
Data collection for 05-06 was hampered by staff turnover.

Correcting Issues:

Ongoing efforts continue to refine data entry processes to ensure that data is accurate and consistent across buildings. Training will occur in June each year so that buildings have accurate data at the close of school before the student information system is rolled up for the following school year.

Observations/Trends:

- Unexcused absences are increasing each year in some subgroups but decreasing in others. There is variability by level and sub-group.

District Attendance Data

Reported as number of unexcused absences

District Discipline Data Reported as number of incidences									
Disaggregate Categories	Elementary			Middle School			High School		
	04-05	05-06	06-07	04-05	05-06	06-07	04-05	05-6	06-07
All Students		119	155	1428 (1026 students)	477	593	3204 (2157 students)	1789	5690
American Indian			0	9	7	10	35	16	122
Asian/Pacific Islander		6	6	111	28	101	193	135	293
Black		6	18	90	33	177	130	141	1106
Hispanic		25	11	71	27	162	159	85	412
Multi-Racial			0			7			31
White		80	0	1137	379	1107	2687	1403	3726
Low Income		21	78	296	99	470	228	266	279
ELL		12	27	5	1	57	13	15	18
Special Ed		65	41	483	161	426	768	534	1671
Gifted		4	7	91	9	31	86	96	69
Female		13	34	1169	69	214	2259		1536
Male		106	124		408	1350	945		4154

District Discipline Data

Reported as number of incidences

Collecting Issues:

Staff turnover resulted in inconsistent data collection and reporting. Some schools reported all day suspension while some reported both full and partial day. Some schools reported only out of school suspensions while some reported both in-house and out of school suspensions.

Correcting Issues:

Ongoing efforts focus on accurate and consistent data entry as well as accurate reporting out. Additional training will occur in June prior to the end of school. New templates and training are being developed.

Observations/Trends:

Inconsistent data reporting continues to make many conclusions inaccurate.

District Discipline Data

Reported as number of incidences

District Graduation Data

Reported as percent of students who graduated

Disaggregate Categories	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06
All Students	* (87.3) <u>86</u>	*(90.8) <u>91</u>	*(82.4) <u>94% on time</u> <u>97% extended time</u>	90% on time <u>94%</u> extended time
American Indian	(N=6)	(N=9)	(N=8)	100
Asian/Pacific Islander	87.9 <u>86</u>	91.2 <u>91</u>	83.1 <u>97</u>	95.7
Black	65.2 <u>75</u>	81.8 <u>90</u>	80 <u>100</u>	82.6
Hispanic	72 <u>69</u>	61.5 <u>74</u>	71.9 <u>95</u>	88.6
White	88.5 <u>87</u>	91.7 <u>91</u>	82.7 <u>97</u>	94.1
Low Income		<u>89</u>	<u>87</u>	80.9
ELL	(N=4)	(N=3)	<u>93</u>	80
Special Ed	71.2	84.1 <u>85</u>	<u>99</u>	80.4
Gifted				
Female	89.4	92.4	86.9	
Male	85.4	89.3	78.9	

District Graduation Data

Reported as percent of students who graduated

Collecting Issues:

We have collected and compiled graduation data for the past three years in the Assessment Office. That data is represented above. We have learned that matching graduation rate on what states report and on what districts report around the country is a difficult connection. The state has updated its criteria for the third year in a row on what constitutes on-time graduation. The graduation rate must now be calculated based on the year the student enters the 9th grade EXCEPT for special education students whose projected year of graduation can be adjusted up until their 16th birthday after which point it can no longer be changed. Additionally, the district's reporting timeframe for this data does not match the timeline for state reporting, so the district data does not match what is reported on the OSPI website.

*(__) Data in parentheses represents district estimates. Underlined data represent final OSPI rates. Different collection and reconciliation software is used, leading to discrepancies in the numbers. Additionally, the district's reporting timeframe for this data does not match the timeline for state reporting, so the district data does not always match what is reported on the OSPI website.

Correcting Issues:

We have worked to update our record keeping procedures so that our data can more accurately match the state's graduation rate, but due to ongoing changes in state and federal reporting practices, accurate rates are not always available.

Observations/Trends:

There is considerable variability in the graduation rates of identified sub-groups.

Achievement Test Data (K Stanford)

Disaggregate Categories	Stanford Reported as Percentile Rank			
	Reading		Math	
	2005-06	2006-07	2005-06	2006-07
All Students	78	80	64	68
American Indian	45	N=2	33	N=2
Asian/Pacific Islander	88	89	71	71
Black	71	52	50	41
Hispanic	58	51	41	35
White	75	78	65	71
Low Income	31	37	30	30
ELL		67		53
Special Ed	48	58	40	40
Gifted	NA	NA	NA	NA
Female	80	84	64	68
Male	76	75	65	67

Achievement Test Data (K Stanford)

Collecting Issues:

Correcting Issues:

The ELL coding issue was corrected in the upload of the data files for 2006-07.

Observations/Trends:

Trends- With only two years of test results, there is no trend data for Stanford tests.

Observations

- There is a significant achievement gap between the performance of Asian and White students and that of Hispanic and Black students.
- Low Income and Special Ed students scored significantly below All Students.
- There was no significant difference in the performance of males and females in math, but a widening gap appears this year in reading with females outperforming males.

Achievement Test Data (K Stanford)

Achievement Test Data (1st Stanford)

Disaggregate Categories	Stanford Reported as Percentile Rank			
	Reading		Math	
	2005-06	2006-07	2005-06	2006-07
All Students	63	70	70	71
American Indian	N=3	38	N=3	35
Asian/Pacific Islander	74	80	82	82
Black	44	56	43	46
Hispanic	37	51	43	44
White	62	68	68	68
Low Income	23	34	37	35
ELL		54		50
Special Ed	29	48	36	43
Gifted	NA	NA	NA	NA
Female	67	72	67	67
Male	58	68	58	74

Achievement Test Data (1st Stanford)

Collecting Issues:

Correcting Issues:

The ELL coding issue was corrected in the upload of the data files for 2006-07.

Observations/Trends:

Trends- With only two years of test results, there is no trend data for Stanford tests.

Observations-

-There is a significant achievement gap between the performance of Asian and White students and that of Hispanic and Black students, with Hispanic students having the lowest achievement scores of all ethnic groups, except when sufficient numbers of American Indian students exist. Low Income and Special Ed students scored significantly below All Students.

-There was no significant difference in the performance of males and females in reading, but males outperformed females in math. Male students showed significant gains in scores this year in both subjects.

Achievement Test Data (1st Stanford)

Achievement Test Data (2nd Stanford)

Disaggregate Categories	Stanford Reported as Percentile Rank			
	Reading		Math	
	2005-06	2006-07	2005-06	2006-07
All Students	69	71	69	72
American Indian	N=8	N=3	N=8	N=3
Asian/Pacific Islander	74	79	80	83
Black	49	51	46	47
Hispanic	36	50	33	45
White	70	71	69	71
Low Income	43	37	41	37
ELL		30		35
Special Ed	34	37	38	44
Gifted	NA	NA	NA	NA
Female	71	75	65	71
Male	67	67	73	74

Achievement Test Data (2nd Stanford)

Collecting Issues:

Correcting Issues:

The ELL coding issue was corrected in the upload of the data files for 2006-07.

Observations/Trends:

Trends- With only two years of test results, there is no trend data for Stanford tests.

Observations-

-There is a significant achievement gap between the performance of Asian and White students and that of Hispanic and Black students, with Hispanic students having the lowest achievement scores of all ethnic groups.

- Low income and Special Ed students scored significantly below All Students.

- Females performed significantly higher than males in Reading. There was no significant gender difference in performance in Math for 2007.

Achievement Test Data (2nd Stanford)

Achievement Test Data (3rd Stanford/WASL)

Disaggregate Categories	Stanford <small>Reported as Percentile Rank</small>				WASL <small>Reported as % Meeting Standard</small>			
	Reading		Math		Reading		Math	
	2005-06	2006-07	2005-06	2006-07	2005-06	2006-07	2005-06	2006-07
All Students	74	74	76	76	85.7	87.7	82.8	84.6
American Indian	N=4	N=7	N=4	N=7	N=5	N=7	N=5	N=7
Asian/Pacific Islander	81	78	86	84	90.5	89.1	90.9	91.9
Black	52	54	54	50	64.0	75.0	64.0	50.0
Hispanic	53	49	54	49	74.5	56.9	66.7	49.2
White	73	75	74	75	85.7	90.0	82.2	85.8
Low Income	48	49	50	51	62.7	63.1	59.5	52.4
ELL		27		37	47.4	32.1	60.5	42.9
Special Ed	45	41	49	45	53.0	55.4	47.8	52.7
Gifted	94		94		99.3		100.0	
Female	77	76	76	74	87.5	91.3	84.0	85.6
Male	71	73	76	77	84.0	84.2	81.6	83.7

Achievement Test Data (3rd Stanford/WASL)

Collecting Issues:

Correcting Issues:

The ELL coding issue was corrected in the upload of the Stanford data files for 2006-07.

Observations/Trends:

Stanford

Trends- With only two years of test results, there is no trend data for Stanford.

Observations-

- There is a significant achievement gap between the performance of Asian and White students and that of Hispanic and Black students, with Black students having the lowest achievement scores of all ethnic groups.
- Low income and Special Ed students scored significantly below All Students.
- There was no significant difference in the scores of males and females in Reading or Math.

WASL

Trends- With only two years of test results, there is no trend data for WASL.

Observations-

- There is a significant achievement gap between the performance of Asian and White students and that of Hispanic and Black students, with Black students having the lowest achievement scores of all ethnic groups.
- Low Income, Special Ed, and ELL students met standard at rates significantly below All Students.
- There was no significant difference in the performance of males and females in 2007.

Achievement Test Data (3rd Stanford/WASL)

-There was no significant difference in the performance of males and females in 2007.