E-2 Summary Report

From: Jeff Loupas
Assistant Superintendent of Teaching and Learning

Purpose: Report on E-2 Academic Competence

Summary Statement

Last January, there was almost no typical data available for reporting progress toward E-2 ends. This year, there is significantly more data than last year, but not all the same data that has been presented in years past. In many cases only a portion of the data is available, or some different and useful data can fill the void until we return to some sort of normalcy. These circumstances have dictated a modified structure for this report. In the bulleted sections below, the Board will find contextual information about the available data, why it was chosen and how it will be useful, or not. The goal of these sections is to describe, or construct, a comprehensive view of Ends progress with limited data. This section is organized by Standards 1-3, and Goals 4-6 as written in the policy.

After the bulleted section on measures and context, each Standard and Goal are presented with a more specific data overview, a general interpretation, and a general summary of results. Because there is overlap between the Standards (1-3) and Goals 2 and 3, there is a general interpretation in the Standards sections and more specific interpretations in the Goal sections that follow.

Constructing a comprehensive view of Ends progress with limited data - The role of the evidence and data in E2 for the Board includes both identifying whether the district and students met Ends expectations and monitoring the district’s progress toward these ends. From the district perspective, the data in this report typically serves as a guide for leaders to allocate the resources and provide the relevant staff development required to reach these Ends. Many historic sources of data are unavailable or have been rendered less reliable as Ends measures or as guiding measures for this report. As such, the compilation of data within this report provides a transparent representation of current student achievement levels, as well as a baseline upon which the district can measure progress during recovery.

- Standard 1 - State SBA and WCAS data for the fall is not yet available for Goal 3. Additionally, state reported participation rates are significantly different (lower) than those in UPSD. This discrepancy is likely due to the difficulties of testing in a
pandemic environment and the lower participation rate among online students statewide. As such, I have included data from the state-wide District Assessment Coordinators (DACs) network as a substitute. This group has been collecting, compiling and sharing district data for twelve years. Their historic results, by grade level, are typically comparable to eventual state scores. Other data (non-SBA) for Goal 2 are available and presented below.

- **Standard 2** - Typical SBA, WCAS, GMADE and GRADE data which compare gaps between subgroups in a year-to-year fashion (S2.1) are not available. State comparison data for subgroups to measure whether each subgroup is outperforming state peers (S2.2) are also unavailable and not provided as part of the DAC network data share. I am providing a comparison of baseline performance and gaps between 2019 and 2021 in place of these unavailable sources. In the long run (over two years), the report will revert to the previously existing measures. The scores reported in this section provide current achievement levels and a method to measure progress toward recovery in the coming years.

- **Standard 3** - Growth percentiles and year-to-year cohort comparisons, which constitute nearly all reporting for Standard 3, are unavailable at this time. There is no substitute for this data. After school closures and disruptions, the role of such data historically used for measuring continuous progress is to establish current levels of performance, identify intervention needs, and apply upcoming growth measures to guide recovery efforts and intervention resources.

One significant measure of continuous progress or cohort growth that is still available is Read Well unit data. Students’ progress through Read Well units is equivalent to progress toward fluency. In Kindergarten, we hope students progress through unit 20 or so and in first grade we hope for progress through units 37 or 38. The available graphs (slides 35-36) indicate student movement and ending places in the Read Well curriculum. In many cases, students may have progressed onto the next grade level Read Well system, allowing them to complete more units than are in their grade level.

- **Goal 4** - Adequate Growth of Newly Enrolled and Underperforming Students - This language was added to E-2 just prior to the pandemic in an effort to build in accountability for intervention and monitoring of growth for students who are new to the district. We have yet to provide a substantial data profile for this goal and such data are currently unavailable. Subsequently, there is no data to report for this goal this year.
• Goal 5 - The Arts and Social Studies - Typical reports include CBA and CBPA data for classes within these content areas. The goal of this data is to maintain high and consistent expectations for performance and learning in these areas. Due to remapping of curricula and online instruction, there are very few CBA and CBPA scores to report. There is no report available for the 2020-21 school year. These historic tools have been built back into our curriculum maps and should be available in 2023.

• Goal 6 - AP participation, Test Taking and Rates of Passing - These fall under Standard 1 along with SAT and ACT scores as well, so I will lump my discussion of this data together here. There are scores, graphs and data for the 2020-21 school year. As the Board considers the purpose of data like AP, SAT and ACT and policy language related to it, you should be aware that Covid has changed the testing landscape in some more permanent ways. My perception is that the Board has included AP, SAT and ACT as part of E-2 for the purpose of guaranteeing rigor and preparation for post-secondary education within the system. However, nearly all post-secondary education institutions have modified or eliminated their historic use of these tests. These changing requirements influence students’ decisions. As an example, in this report there are scores for 98 students on the SAT, 26% of the quantity we had in 2019. Our post-secondary enrollment numbers remain consistent and high, while SAT participation has decreased precipitously. These changes create a misalignment between a “ready for post-secondary education” designation and the test scores on the whole.

1. District Standards. The Board establishes the following three standards by which academic progress (in subjects for which standardized test and other data are available) is to be measured:

Standard 1. Student achievement in the district will exceed that of Washington State and the nation as measured by standardized tests and other available data. This standard specifically includes all standardized state and federally-mandated testing data, as well as standardized college entry tests such as the SAT and ACT.

Data Overview: State Fall SBA comparison data is not yet available for 3a, b and c. In order to provide a basis for comparison, I have included data from the DAC network in place of state grade level overall scores. These scores are historically comparable to final state scores.

Standard 1 General Interpretation Statement - UPSD students will outperform their state peers where direct comparisons and data are available. In other instances,
where specified, UPSD students will outperform state achievement level estimates provided by the state DACs.

**General Summary of Results** - As I stated in the Board SBA Notes (attached) at the last meeting, district proficiency decreased an average of 10.6% in ELA and 22.9% in mathematics between the Spring of 2019 and Fall of 2021. These decreases are substantial, but in line with nation-wide research and results regarding school closures and disruptions. In the previous Board SBA Notes, I identified three main remediable causes of what is being nationally called “learning loss”. These pandemic-related causes included - loss of instructional time, reduction of instructional effectiveness, and purposeful exclusion of grade level content with long-term learning in mind. These are not the only causes of reduced learning. Other causes include: inequitable learning environments and resources, stress caused by the pandemic, economic stress, mobility due to the pandemic, social emotional factors, etc. The list is truly endless. Our broader supports for recovery and two-year intervention plans are designed with these causes at the center. As I stated during the Superintendent's Update at the last meeting, scores in science on the WCAS actually increased over 2019 by an average of 6.6%. I believe this change is due to modifications in the test, which were meant to shorten the test. I do not believe these increases are representative of increased learning during the pandemic.

**Standard 2.** The district will make (S2.1) continuous progress toward eliminating the achievement gap of disparate performance among identified student sub-groups; (S2.2) further, identified student sub-groups will outperform their peers when measures that yield standardized disaggregated data are implemented.

**Data Overview:** No state subgroup data is available for comparison, nor are there year-to-year comparisons available for 2019-2020. I have provided 2019 and 2021 comparisons by subgroups and gaps, which will serve to illustrate students’ current baseline achievement levels, and serve as a guide to recovery progress. These data are more informative for S2.1 than for S2.2.

**Standard 2 General Interpretation Statement** - Comparing percent meeting standard and scale score baselines and gaps for subgroups from the Spring of 2019 and Fall of 2021, identified subgroups in UPSD will demonstrate increased achievement and reduce gaps of disparate performance.

**General Summary of Results** - Whether you look locally or nationally, the “learning losses” caused by the disruption of school were not experienced in an equitable way. The same social and systemic causes of the previously existing achievement gaps were, in many cases, magnified by the pandemic. These more specific
results are bullets in the Goal 3 section below. In general, some subgroups decreased more or less in terms of proficiency and scale score than the All category. Not unexpectedly, however, all of them experienced a decrease.

For both ELA and math, where a substantial gap existed between identified subgroups previously, the resultant loss of proficiency (whether greater or less than the district’s loss of proficiency) is more impactful to students in these groups. For example, when we look at gaps we may say, “The All group went down 22.9% in proficiency and the students in a subgroup only decreased 16%.”. This is a linear way to look at the learning decrease. In this sense the students in the subgroup lost less ground, which is certainly better than the alternative. However, in most cases, the previous gap between groups means that a higher percentage, or proportion, of students moved from proficient to not-proficient in the subgroups. This is a proportional look at learning loss. The proportionate view is a more accurate reflection.

The recovery plans and interventions in place for the next few years reflect the idea that disruptions in learning disproportionately affect families and students on the lower performing side of existing achievement gaps. The result of this disproportionate effect is reflected in the Standard 3 summary below.

**Standard 3.** The grade level cohorts within the district will make continuous progress over time and when compared to their state peers on all available measures and indicators, including (S3.1 in packet) percent passing, percent passing all parts of the assessment and (S3.2 in packet) the improvement of performance of each quartile.

**Data Overview:** No data is available for this standard. The state will reinstitute Student Growth Percentiles in the spring of 2023. While no data is available to measure the cohort and quartile progress across such a gap of learning and assessment, there is some Standard 3 related data provided by GMADE and GRADE tests that I will summarize here.

**General Summary of Results** - The results of GMADE and GRADE tests comparing the Fall of 2019 and the Fall of 2021 mirror those described in Standard 1 SBA data. The decrease in proficiency for math is more than twice that of ELA. Overall percentile ranks indicated that the 2021 cohort of students tested 6.4 percentile rank lower in ELA and 17.5 percentile rank lower in math than their 2019 peers in grades 2/3 - 7 (slides 23-32). When you divide the learners into quartiles, however, you find that this decrease is not evenly distributed. This distribution of decreased proficiency should guide our intervention and recovery plan as well.
ELA - On the GRADE test, the second from the bottom quartile (B) experienced the greatest decrease, followed by the lowest performing quartile (A). We have historically described the 35th Percentile Rank (PR) mark as the achievement level at which students begin to access increasing amounts of core instruction and can accelerate learning. This quartile B decrease puts most of the students in that quartile out of reach, below the 35th PR. Students in quartiles D and C (highest achieving) experienced decreases, but not to a degree that would endanger access to core instruction. So, our recovery efforts should focus on the students in the button two quartiles (actually about halfway up Quartile B), or the bottom 35% of learners.

Math - On the GMADE test, quartiles B, then C had the greatest decreases, followed by quartile A. The amount of PR loss in these middle and middle-lower quartiles means that nearly 50% of math learners in grades 2-7 are in danger of reduced access to core instruction (35th PR line). To promote continuous learning of the whole and each quartile, we need to provide nearly twice as much math intervention as ELA intervention in grades 2-7. As you may recall, the structure of standards and learning targets in math means that students are more susceptible to larger learning loss during school disruptions. This is born out in our data as well and in NWEA studies.

2. UPSD students will meet the above three standards (where applicable) for the following:

   a. On-Time Graduation Rates
   b. Attendance
   c. Post-Secondary Enrollment

For Goal 2a - Standard 1 - UPSD students will have a higher four year adjusted graduation rate than the state (slides 53-54). In addition, the 9th grade On-Track rate for students in UPSD will exceed the state’s rate.

   - I believe UPSD is making reasonable progress as indicated by a graduation rate greater than the state rate at approximately 93.7% (2021). The state graduation rate was 83% (2020).

   - I believe UPSD is making reasonable progress as indicated by a 9th grade On-Track rate which is 91.2%, 13.6% above the state.

For Goal 2a - Standard 2 - UPSD students in identified subgroups will graduate “on time” at a higher rate than their state peers. State data for subgroups is delayed, so the comparison below is for 2020 (slide 54).
I believe UPSD is making reasonable progress with six out of six subgroup rates exceeding their state peers and five out of six exceeding 90%.
- Low Income - UPSD 91.3%, state 75.1%
- White - UPSD 95.7%, state 84.7%
- Black/African American - UPSD 96.6%, state 76.3%
- Two or More Races - UPSD 98.2%, state 83.9%
- Hispanic/Latino - UPSD 93.3%, state 77.7%
- Special Education - UPSD 69.6%, 64.5%

For Goal 2b - Standard 1 - UPSD will have higher Regular Attendance rates than the state.

I believe UPSD is making reasonable progress with a Regular Attendance rate which is 3.9% higher than the state.

For Goal 2b - Standard 2 - UPSD identified subgroups will have higher Regular Attendance rates than their state peers.

I believe UPSD is making reasonable progress for Regular Attendance, with six out of six rates for identified subgroups exceeding their state peers.
- Low Income - UPSD 89.0%, state 84.4%
- White - UPSD 93.7%, state 90.9%
- Black/African American - UPSD 91.9%, state 85.9%
- Two or More Races - UPSD 93.4%, state 88.7%
- Hispanic/Latino - UPSD 91.3%, state 86.9%
- Special Education - UPSD 88.4%, 83.4%

For Goal 2c - Standard 1 - The district’s post secondary enrollment rate will be higher than the state in both 2 and 4 year categories.

I believe UPSD is making reasonable progress with a 2 year post secondary rate 4% higher than the state and a 4 year post secondary rate 8% higher than the state.

For Goal 2c - Standard 2 - The district’s post secondary enrollment rate for identified subgroups will be higher than their state peers in both 2 and 4 year categories.

I believe UPSD is making reasonable progress with 2 and 4 year post secondary rates for identified subgroups exceeding their state peers in 9 of 12 categories (2yr/4yr).
- Low Income - UPSD 31% (2yr) and 29% (4yr), state 27% and 21%
- White - UPSD 28% and 45%, state 24% and 36%
- Black/African American - UPSD 31% and 40%, state 32% and 29%
- Two or More Races - UPSD 27% and 38%, state 25% and 36%
- Hispanic/Latino - UPSD 35% and 33%, state 28% and 26%
- Special Education - UPSD 21% and 5%, state 22% and 6%

3. UPSD students will meet the above three standards for the following subjects:
   a. English Language Arts
   b. Mathematics
   c. Science

For Goal 3a, English Language Arts - Standard 1 - UPSD students will outperform the DAC estimated scores in every grade level.

- I believe UPSD is making reasonable progress, outperforming the state (DACs) in every grade level (grades 3-8 and 10) by percentages ranging from 9% to 17% (see slide 37)

For Goal 3a, English Language Arts - Standard 2 - Comparing percent meeting standard and scale score baselines and gaps for subgroups from the Spring of 2019 and Fall of 2021, identified subgroups in UPSD will demonstrate increased achievement and reduce gaps of disparate performance. Not unexpectedly, students in identified subgroups did not meet this interpretation threshold (slides 7-14)

- ELA - The overall loss of proficiency (comparing 2019 to 2021) was 10.6% and 25 scale score points. The loss in proficiency and scale score points by identified subgroups exceeded the overall total in all but the Of Two or More Races subgroup:
  - Low Income - 14.8% (% proficiency loss), 31 (scale score loss)
  - Black/African American - 12.3%, 27 scale points
  - Two or More Races - 8.7%, 24 scale points
  - Hispanic/Latino - 15.5%, 27 scale points
  - The special education results indicate more loss of proficiency and scale score than the All category, but group size prevents reporting or analysis beyond this general statement.

For Goal 3a, English Language Arts - Standard 3 - The ending units for UPSD students will be equal to or greater than 20 for Kindergarten and equal to or greater than 38 to demonstrate continuous growth of the cohort for the 2020-21 school year (slides 35-36).
• Kindergarten students averaged an ending unit of 20. This is an increase of one unit over 2020.
• First grade students averaged an ending unit of 38 for the 2020-2021 school year. This was a decrease of four units when compared to the previous year, but demonstrates continuous growth.

For Goal 3b, Mathematics - Standard 1 - UPSD students will outperform the DAC estimated scores in every grade level.

• I believe UPSD is making reasonable progress, outperforming the state in every grade level (grades 3-8 and 10) by percentages ranging from 2% to 20% (see slide 38)

For Goal 3b, Mathematics - Standard 2 - Comparing percent meeting standard and scale score baselines and gaps for subgroups from the Spring of 2019 and Fall of 2021, identified subgroups in UPSD will demonstrate increased achievement and reduce gaps of disparate performance. Not unexpectedly, students in identified subgroups did not meet this interpretation threshold (slides 15-22).

• Mathematics - The overall loss of proficiency (comparing 2019 to 2021) was 22.9% and 55 scale score points. The identified subgroups were split, with some groups experiencing greater decreases and other groups experiencing smaller decreases than the All category:
  ○ Low Income - 25.4% (% proficiency loss), 59 (scale score loss)
  ○ Black/African American - 21.8%, 59 scale points
  ○ Two or More Races - 19.5%, 51 scale points
  ○ Hispanic/Latino - 25.8%, 60 scale points
  ○ The special education results indicate more loss of proficiency and scale score points than the All category, but group size prevents reporting or analysis beyond this general statement.

For Goal 3c, Science - Standard 1 - UPSD students will outperform the DAC estimated scores in every grade level.

• I believe UPSD is making reasonable progress, outperforming the state in every grade level (grades 5, 8 and 11) by percentages ranging from 5% to 15% (see slide 39)
6. UPSD students will achieve high levels of participation, test-taking, and passing rates for Advanced Placement courses.

**Data Overview:** As stated above, the data for SAT participation and scores is not comparable to previous years due to changes in usage caused by the pandemic. In addition, many of the students who took the SAT at Curtis were taking the test in order to satisfy a graduation requirement instead of seeking access to higher education. The use and purpose for the test further skews the results.

On the ACT, the district also saw a decrease in the number of students testing - from 81 in 2019 to 40 in 2021. Similar to the SAT, Covid began a shift away from the ACT that may not reverse in coming years. Unlike the SAT, fewer students seeking graduation pathways were directed toward taking the ACT as a first choice.

AP testing was also modified by the pandemic, with condensed tests, testing from home (instead of the classroom), and changes in timing of the tests. While enrollment in courses remained relatively stable, test taking percentages decreased significantly.

**Interpretation Statement - AP -** We interpret Goal 6 to mean UPSD will have a consistently high level of participation in AP courses as measured by the number of courses taken (as opposed to the number of students). Additionally, UPSD students will take and pass AP tests at rates greater than their state and national peers. Passing rates are measured as the percentage of testers who scored a 3 or higher on an exam.

- I believe that UPSD is making adequate progress with 808 AP courses being taken and 560 students testing. In addition, the passing rate for students taking the test was 70%. Nationally, the passing rate was 55.8% (slide 52).

**Interpretation Statement - SAT and ACT -** UPSD students will consistently participate in the SAT and ACT at a higher rate than their state and national peers. UPSD students will reach the SAT College and Career Readiness benchmark at a high rate. UPSD students will achieve higher average Evidenced Based Reading/Writing, and math SAT scores than their state and national peers. UPSD students will achieve higher average English, math, reading, science, and composite scores on the ACT than their state and national peers (slides 40-51).

- The district did not have higher participation rates or scores, nor did students reach the national benchmark at a higher level than the state or nation. Participation
declined from 374 students in 2019 to 98 in 2021. Many of these participants were encouraged to test as a pathway for graduation.

- **On the ACT, UPSD (40 students) exceeded the state and nation in** -
  - Mathematics by 5.0 points and 8.2 points respectively
  - English by 4.9 points and 8.2 points respectively
  - Reading by 3.5 points and 7.0 points respectively
  - Science by 3.2 points and 6.2 points respectively
  - Composite by 4.2 points and 7.5 points respectively

Conclusion: The actions and decisions of teachers and administrators matter in the lives and achievement of students. It is clear that after the school closure and disruptions, the students in UPSD continue to outperform the DAC projections of state performance. Still, results of the Fall SBA scores reveal a decrease in proficiency of about 10 points in ELA and just over 20 points in math. GMADE and GRADE results mirror these declines in proficiency. These decreases align with available research and expected results across the state. The Fall SBA provides us with a baseline for recovery efforts against which we can measure the progress of students and the system as a whole.

Standard 2 and Goal 3 results clearly indicate that decreases in proficiency are not evenly or equitably distributed. Identified subgroup scores are split when looked at linearly. When approached as a percentage of students for whom proficiency is reduced, however, it is clear that students in identified subgroups are disproportionately impacted by the school disruptions. While we don’t have comprehensive quartile data for Fall SBA, the GMADE and GRADE quartile profiles provide us with a picture of where to focus intervention efforts to help students remain proficient and/or regain proficiency.

The data profiles constructed to provide the Board with a view of progress toward expected Ends also provide the district with a baseline of achievement levels and a structure to monitor progress through recovery over the next few years. This process allows the district to monitor and align both core and intervention staffing to the needs of students and cohorts. Additionally, this structure provides a comprehensive method to adjust resources to benefit the students impacted most by school disruption.