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## Wellesley Public Schools: Schools of Recognition

Hardy Elementary - High Achievement
\& Exceeding Targets
Fiske Elementary - High Growth
Bates Elementary - High Growth
Sprague Elementary - High Growth

## Accountability Basics

## Accountability Basics

# Purpose <br> To monitor district success in meeting student needs 

Use<br>Information to adjust instruction<br>Identify overlooked patterns of unmet needs

Indicators

Achievement (MCAS score): ELA, Math, Science

## Accountability Basics: Points

| Points | Achievement* <br> Range: 440-560 |  | Growth Percentile <br> Range: 1-99 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Label | Average <br> Scaled Score | Label | Average <br> SGP |
|  | Exceeded target | $\geq 2$ pts above 2018 <br> or <br> $90^{\text {th }}$ percentile | Exceeded typical |  |

## Accountability Basics: Weights

Non-high school gre * weern



## Lowest Performing Group



## Lowest Performing Group



## Lowest Performing Group



## Lowest Performing Group Non-high school

LPG identification - cohort (grades 4-8):

- Enrolled in WPS in 2017-2018 and 2018-2019
- Took at least 1 standard MCAS test in 2018 (not ALT)
- Students ranked across grades 4-8 by 2018 average ELA and math scaled scores
- LPG is the lowest $25 \%$ of eligible students
- Targets are set based on the 2019 LGP's 2018 scores

LPG members:

- Any economic status
- Any EL/ FEL status (not first- or second-year EL in 2019)
- Any IEP status (must have taken at least 1 non-ALT MCAS)
- Any EWIS risk level
- Any cultural, ethnic, or religious background


## Lowest Performing Group High school



LPG identification - year-to-year (high school):

- Enrolled in WPS in 2017-2018 and 2018-2019
- Took at least 1 standard MCAS test in 2019 (not ALT)
- Students ranked by 2019 average ELA and math scaled scores
- LPG is the lowest $25 \%$ of eligible students
- Targets are set based on the 2018 LPG's 2018 scores

LPG members:

- Any economic status
- Any EL/ FEL status (not first- or second-year EL in 2019)
- Any IEP status (must have taken at least 1 non-ALT MCAS)
- Any EWIS risk level
- Any cultural, ethnic, or religious background


## High Needs Group

Membership Definition:

- IEP
- EL and Former EL
- Economically Disadvantaged

WPS High Needs MCAS composition:

- 58\% IEP alone
- $14 \%$ EL/ FEL alone (6\% EL)
- 15\% Economically Disadvantaged alone
- $13 \%$ combination of 2 or 3 characteristics


## 2019 Accountability Results

## 2019 Points Awarded

## 2019 Points awarded



## 2019 Points Awarded by Weight

Nơn-nıgn school grades
All students


## 2019 Overall Accountability Report



## 2019 High Needs Accountability



## Key Takeaways: Accountability

## Meeting or exceeding:

- Every district achievement target
- Every district math growth target
- Every high school completion target
- Every district additional indicator target
- District English proficiency target for English learners

Targeted efforts to better meet needs:

## 2019 ELA Results

## 2019 Reasons for ELA Points Assignments

# Spring 2019 ELA MCAS Percent Meeting/ Exceeding and SGP 

| Grade | 3-8 <br> \% Meet/Exceed | 3-8 <br> SGP | 10 <br> \% Meet/Exceed | SGP <br> SGP |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| All | $80 \%$ | T-High | $85 \%$ | T-Low |
| High Needs | $51 \%$ | T-Low | $56 \%$ | T-Low |
| Economically Disadvantaged | $53 \%$ | T-Low | $68 \%$ | - |
| EL \& Former EL | $70 \%$ | T-High | - | - |
| Students with Disabilities | $40 \%$ | T-Low | $53 \%$ | Low |
| Asian | $92 \%$ | T-High | $87 \%$ | T-Low |
| African Amer./ Black | $53 \%$ | T-Low | $50 \%$ | - |
| Hispanic or Latino | $59 \%$ | T-Low | $65 \%$ | - |
| Multi-race | $84 \%$ | T-High | $83 \%$ | T-High |
| White | $80 \%$ | T-High | $87 \%$ | T-Low |

# Spring 2019 ELA MCAS Percent Meeting/ Exceeding \& SGP Levels 

| Grade | $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{4}$ | $\mathbf{5}$ | $\mathbf{6}$ | $\mathbf{7}$ | $\mathbf{8}$ | $\mathbf{1 0}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Percent <br> Meeting/ Exceeding | $85 \%$ | $82 \%$ | $79 \%$ | $81 \%$ | $69 \%$ | $81 \%$ | $85 \%$ |
| SGP Level | - | High | High | T-High | T-Low | T-High | T-Low |

## Historical ELA MCAS Percent Meeting/ Exceeding 2017-2019

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Class of 2028 | $85 \%$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Class of 2027 | $76 \%$ | $82 \%$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Class of 2026 | $65 \%$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Historical ELA MCAS SGPs 2017-2019

| Grade | $\mathbf{4}$ | $\mathbf{5}$ | $\mathbf{6}$ | $\mathbf{7}$ | $\mathbf{8}$ | $\mathbf{9}$ | $\mathbf{1 0}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Class of 2027 | High |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Class of 2026 | High | High |  |  |  |  |  |
| Class of 2025 | High | High | T-High |  |  |  |  |
| Class of 2024 |  | T-High | T-High | T-Low |  |  |  |
| Class of 2023 |  |  | T-High | High | T-High |  |  |
| Class of 2022 |  |  |  | High | T-High |  |  |
| Class of 2021 |  |  |  |  | T-High |  | T-Low |

MCAS taken in 2019
Average Student Growth Percentile increased by 2+ points compared to previous year. Average Student Growth Percentile decreased by 2+ points compared to previous year.

## 2019 Math Results

## 2019 Reasons for Math Points Assignments

| Math | All students | Lowest <br> performing <br> students | All students | Lowest <br> performing <br> students |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | (Non-high <br> school <br> grades) | (Non-high <br> school <br> grades) | (High school <br> grades) | (High school <br> grades) |
| Achievement | Exceeded <br> $(4)$ | Met <br> $(3)$ | Exceeded <br> $(4)$ | Exceeded <br> (4) |
| Growth | Typical - high <br> (3) | Typical - high <br> (3) | High <br> $(4)$ | Typical - high <br> (3) |

# Spring 2019 Math MCAS Percent Meeting/ Exceeding and SGP 

| Grade | 3-8 <br> \% Meet/Exceed | 3-8 <br> SGP | 10 <br> \% Meet/Exceed | 10 <br> SGP |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| All | $74 \%$ | T-High | $88 \%$ | High |
| High Needs | $44 \%$ | T-Low | $61 \%$ | T-High |
| Economically Disadvantaged | $40 \%$ | T-High | $73 \%$ | - |
| EL \& Former EL | $75 \%$ | T-High | - | - |
| Students with Disabilities | $31 \%$ | T-Low | $52 \%$ | High |
| Asian | $94 \%$ | High | $98 \%$ | High |
| African Amer./ Black | $37 \%$ | T-Low | $57 \%$ | - |
| Hispanic or Latino | $48 \%$ | T-High | $75 \%$ | - |
| Multi-race | $83 \%$ | T-High | $82 \%$ | High |
| White | $74 \%$ | T-High | $90 \%$ | High |

# Spring 2019 Math MCAS Percent Meeting/ Exceeding and SGP 

| Grade | 3-8 <br> \% Meet/Exceed | 3-8 <br> SGP | 10 <br> \% Meet/Exceed | 10 <br> SGP |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| All | $74 \%$ | T-High | $88 \%$ | High |
| High Needs | $44 \%$ | T-Low | $61 \%$ | T-High |
| Economically Disadvantaged | $40 \%$ | T-High | $73 \%$ | - |
| EL \&Former EL | $75 \%$ | T-High | - | - |
| Students with Disabilities | $31 \%$ | T-Low | $52 \%$ | High |
| Asian | $94 \%$ | High | $98 \%$ | High |
| African Amer. |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

# Spring 2019 Math MCAS Percent Meeting/ Exceeding \& SGP Levels 

| Grade | $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{4}$ | $\mathbf{5}$ | $\mathbf{6}$ | $\mathbf{7}$ | $\mathbf{8}$ | $\mathbf{1 0}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Percent <br> Meeting/ Exceeding | $78 \%$ | $78 \%$ | $75 \%$ | $74 \%$ | $71 \%$ | $75 \%$ | $88 \%$ |
| SGP Level | - | T-High | High | T-Low | T-Low | T-High | High |

## Historical Math MCAS Student Growth Percentiles 2017-2019

## Key Takeaways: Math

## Highlights:

- Meeting expectations average scaled score at every grade level
- Exceeding typical growth (grades 5 \& 10)


## Targeted efforts to better meet needs:

- High Needs students, particularly economically disadvantaged and students with disabilities - achievement
- African American/ Black students - achievement
- Hispanic or Latino students - achievement
- $6^{\text {th }}$ and $7^{\text {th }}$ grade students - growth


## 2019 Science Results

## 2019 Reasons for Science Points Assignments

|  | All students | All students |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Science | (Non-high <br> school <br> grades) | (High school <br> grades) |
| Achievement | Exceeded <br> $(4)$ | Exceeded <br> $(4)$ |

## Spring 2019 Science MCAS

## Spring 2019 Science MCAS

## Spring 2019 Science MCAS Percent Meeting/ Exceeding or Advanced/Proficient

| Grade | $\mathbf{5}$ | $\mathbf{8}$ | $\mathbf{1 0}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Percent <br> Meeting/ Exceeding | $67 \%$ | $79 \%$ |  |
| Percent |  |  | $96 \%$ |

## Spring 2019 Science MCAS Percent Meeting/ Exceeding or Advanced/Proficient

| Grade | $\mathbf{5}$ | $\mathbf{8}$ | $\mathbf{1 0}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Percent <br> Meeting/ Exceeding | $67 \%$ | $79 \%$ |  |
| Percent |  |  | $96 \%$ |

## Key Takeaways: Science

## Highlights:

- Meeting expectations average scaled score/ CPI at every grade level


## Targeted efforts to better meet needs:

- High Needs students
- African American/ Black students
- Hispanic or Latino students
- $5^{\text {th }}$ grade students


## Peer District Comparisons

## 2019 Accountability <br> District Comparisons

## District Comparisons Percent Meeting/ Exceeding

| District | ELA |  | Math |  | Science |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\mathbf{3 - 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 0}$ | $3-\mathbf{8}$ | $\mathbf{1 0}$ | $\mathbf{5}$ \& 8 | 10 Adv/Prof |
| Concord-Carlisle | $76 \% / 80 \%$ | $86 \%$ | $73 \% / 79 \%$ | $88 \%$ | $71 \% / 81 \%$ | $98 \%$ |
| Dover-Sherborn | $85 \% / 76 \% / 77 \%$ | $89 \%$ | $86 \% / 77 \% / 77 \%$ | $91 \%$ | $84 \% / 78 \% / 81 \%$ | $98 \%$ |
| Lexington | $79 \%$ | $90 \%$ | $82 \%$ | $94 \%$ | $78 \%$ | $97 \%$ |
| Lincoln-Sudbury | $61 \% / 76 \%$ | $86 \%$ | $59 \% / 73 \%$ | $86 \%$ | $55 \% / 71 \%$ | $92 \%$ |
| Natick | $68 \%$ | $77 \%$ | $66 \%$ | $79 \%$ | $61 \%$ | $94 \%$ |
| Needham | $76 \%$ | $84 \%$ | $73 \%$ | $88 \%$ | $70 \%$ | $90 \%$ |
| Newton | $73 \%$ | $78 \%$ | $73 \%$ | $84 \%$ | $66 \%$ | $91 \%$ |
| Wayland | $77 \%$ | $87 \%$ | $77 \%$ | $87 \%$ | $74 \%$ | $98 \%$ |
| Wellesley | $79 \%$ | $\mathbf{8 5 \%}$ | $75 \%$ | $\mathbf{8 9 \%} \%$ | $73 \%$ | $\mathbf{9 6 \%}$ |
| Weston | $83 \%$ | $88 \%$ | $81 \%$ | $87 \%$ | $78 \%$ | $90 \%$ |
| Westwood | $77 \%$ | $84 \%$ | $77 \%$ | $89 \%$ | $76 \%$ | $96 \%$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## District Comparisons Percent Meeting/ Exceeding

## District Comparisons Student Growth Percentiles

| District | ELA |  | Math |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\mathbf{4 - 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 0}$ | $\mathbf{4 - 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 0}$ |
| Concord-Carlisle | T-/T+ | T+ | T-/T+ | High |
| Dover-Sherborn | High/T+/T- | $\mathrm{T}+$ | High/T+/T- | $\mathrm{T}+$ |
| Lexington | $\mathrm{T}+$ | $\mathrm{T}+$ | High | $\mathrm{T}+$ |
| Lincoln-Sudbury | $\mathrm{T}+/ \mathrm{T}+$ | $\mathrm{T}+$ | $\mathrm{T}-/ \mathrm{T}+$ | High |
| Natick | $\mathrm{T}+$ | $\mathrm{T}-$ | $\mathrm{T}+$ | $\mathrm{T}-$ |
| Needham | $\mathrm{T}+$ | $\mathrm{T}+$ | $\mathrm{T}+$ | $\mathrm{T}+$ |
| Newton | $\mathrm{T}+$ | $\mathrm{T}-$ | $\mathrm{T}+$ | $\mathrm{T}+$ |
| Wayland | $\mathrm{T}+$ | $\mathrm{T}-$ | $\mathrm{T}+$ | $\mathrm{T}-$ |
| Wellesley | $\mathrm{T}+$ | $\mathrm{T}-$ | $\mathrm{T}+$ | High |
| Weston | $\mathrm{T}+$ | High | $\mathrm{T}+$ | $\mathrm{T}+$ |
| Westwood | $\mathrm{T}+$ | $\mathrm{T}+$ | $\mathrm{T}+$ | High |
| Winchester | $\mathrm{T}+$ | $\mathrm{T}-$ | $\mathrm{T}+$ | $\mathrm{T}+$ |

## District Comparisons

## Next Steps

## 1. Determine whether and how to adjust curriculum \&instruction

## Next Steps

2. Continue to investigate and address patterns of unmet needs (e.g. with Admin Council,
Academic Council, Achievement Gap Task Force, School Wellness Advisory Council)

- High Needs students
- African American/ Black students
- Hispanic or Latino students


## Next Steps

3. Review data from other high priority areas in

## Next Steps

## 4. Utilize data for strategic planning

- Teaching and learning resources (e.g. materials, professional development, staffing allocation)
- Teaching and learning structures to support learning for ALL students (e.g. schedules, differentiated instruction)
- 21st century tools for assessment (e.g. standards-based grading, mastery approach)


## Links for Parents/ Guardians

## MCAS Resources for Parents/Guardians

- General Information

O Why testing matters

- Test Questions and Practice Tests

○ Student Work and Scoring Guides

- Information for Parents of High School Students

O Class of 2021 Parent Guardian Letter

- Class of 2023 Parent Guardian Letter
- Understanding MCAS Test Results

O Parent/ Guardian Report templates and translations
○ Grade 10 Annotated Parent/ Guardian Reports
O Grades 3-8 Annotated Parent/Guardian Reports

- MCAS results
- MCAS-Related Scholarships

○ John and Abigail Adams Scholarship
O Stanley Z. Koplik Certificate of Mastery Award

