

LEXINGTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS SCHOOL COMMITTEE 2007 MCAS PRESENTATION

Lexington's 2007 MCAS results are once again impressive. However, it is important to remember that they are only one component of how we assess student and district performance. Generally, these results are only reported in aggregate. Lexington's assessment includes MCAS, SAT'S, PSAT's, K-5 3-Tier Literacy and Mathematics Assessments, as well as varied performance-based classroom assessments. Some assessment materials are used by our teachers in Scott Foresman reading and Everyday Mathematics to make the assessment portfolio truly varied. It is only when we assess children comprehensively that we get a complete picture of student and district performance, academic strengths and opportunities for growth. Further, it is important to disaggregate this data to look at individual subgroups and individual students to assess learning progress and make appropriate interventions based upon this analysis.

The goal of any quality assessment system is to gather data to inform teaching, for short term and long term planning, in an effort to increase student achievement. It is with this in mind that we look carefully at the 2007 MCAS results for the Lexington Public Schools, keeping in mind, that MCAS is merely a small piece of this important holistic assessment.

Three (3) Year Trends

Grade 3 English Language Arts

2005	2006	2007
Proficient 81%	Proficient 77%	Proficient 83%
Needs Improvement 18%	Needs Improvement 19%	Needs Improvement 16%
Warning 1%	Warning 3%	Warning 2%

Grade 3 Math

2006	2007
Proficient 77%	Proficient 80%
Needs Improvement 16%	Needs Improvement 15%
Warning 7%	Warning 5%

Grade 4 English Language Arts

2005	2006	2007
Advanced 32%	Advanced 16%	Advanced 28%
Proficient 48%	Proficient 59%	Proficient 53%
Needs Improvement 17%	Needs Improvement 22%	Needs Improvement 16%
Warning 2%	Warning 4%	Warning 3%

Grade 4 Mathematics

2005	2006	2007
Advanced 40%	Advanced 37%	Advanced 40%
Proficient 34%	Proficient 30%	Proficient 36%
Needs Improvement 23%	Needs Improvement 29%	Needs Improvement 20%
Warning 3%	Warning 4%	Warning 4%

Grade 5 English Language Arts

2006	2007
Advanced 40%	Advanced 30%
Proficient 47%	Proficient 56%
Needs Improvement 11%	Needs Improvement 12%
Warning 2%	Warning 2%

Grade 5 Math

2006	2007
Advanced 51%	Advanced 49%
Proficient 29%	Proficient 35%
Needs Improvement 16%	Needs Improvement 10%
Warning 5%	Warning 5%

Grade 5 Science/Engineering/Technology

2005	2006	2007
Advanced 38%	Advanced 40%	Advanced 33%
Proficient 41%	Proficient 37%	Proficient 44%
Needs Improvement 18%	Needs Improvement 21%	Needs Improvement 19%
Warning 4%	Warning 2%	Warning 4%

Grade 6 English Language Arts

2006

Advanced 29%
Proficient 60%
Needs Improvement 9%
Warning 2%

2007

Advanced 38%
Proficient 53%
Needs Improvement 8%
Warning 2%

Grade 6 Mathematics

2005

Advanced 50%
Proficient 32%
Needs Improvement 12%
Warning 6%

2006

Advanced 44%
Proficient 33%
Needs Improvement 15%
Warning 8%

2007

Advanced 54%
Proficient 29%
Needs Improvement 13%
Warning 4%

Grade 7 English Language Arts

2005

Advanced 43%
Proficient 47%
Needs Improvement 7%
Warning 2%

2006

Advanced 38%
Proficient 53%
Needs Improvement 7%
Warning 2%

2007

Advanced 35%
Proficient 57%
Needs Improvement 6%
Warning 2%

Grade 7 Mathematics

2006

Advanced 38%
Proficient 38%
Needs Improvement 17%
Warning 8%

2007

Advanced 45%
Proficient 33%
Needs Improvement 15%
Warning 7%

Grade 8 English Language Arts

2006

Advanced 44%
Proficient 50%
Needs Improvement 5%
Warning 1%

2007

Advanced 41%
Proficient 53%
Needs Improvement 4%
Warning 1%

Grade 8 Mathematics

2005	2006	2007
Advanced 43%	Advanced 45%	Advanced 51%
Proficient 34%	Proficient 31%	Proficient 29%
Needs Improvement 14%	Needs Improvement 18%	Needs Improvement 13%
Warning 8%	Warning 7%	Warning 7%

Grade 8 Science/Engineering/Technology

2005	2006	2007
Advanced 16%	Advanced 17%	Advanced 14%
Proficient 52%	Proficient 50%	Proficient 51%
Needs Improvement 23%	Needs Improvement 27%	Needs Improvement 28%
Warning 8%	Warning 7%	Warning 6%

Grade 10 English Language Arts

2005	2006	2007
Advanced 44%	Advanced 32%	Advanced 51%
Proficient 45%	Proficient 59%	Proficient 41%
Needs Improvement 8%	Needs Improvement 7%	Needs Improvement 6%
Warning 3%	Warning 2%	Warning 2%

Grade 10 Mathematics

2005	2006	2007
Advanced 67%	Advanced 75%	Advanced 76%
Proficient 23%	Proficient 14%	Proficient 15%
Needs Improvement 7%	Needs Improvement 9%	Needs Improvement 6%
Warning 3%	Warning 2%	Warning 3%

Focus Areas of Strength

The overall 2007 MCAS scores are once again very strong for the Lexington Public Schools. At several levels, the Lexington Public Schools have performed at the exemplary level, and have been highlighted as such publicly. In English Language Arts the Composite Performance Index (CPI) is 96.0, an increase of .9 from 2006. In Mathematics, the Composite Performance Index (CPI) is 92.2, and increase of 1.9 from 2006. The CPI is part of the Massachusetts Comprehensive accountability system and the goal for performance is 100, by 2014. In 2007, the overall district Special Education subgroup improved. In English Language Arts this subgroup district-wide improved 1.3

points and in Mathematics, this subgroup improved 4.3 points. These are commendable gains in both academic areas. In 2007, the overall district Limited English Proficient (LEP) subgroup improved. In English Language Arts this subgroup district-wide improved 4.8 points and in Mathematics, this subgroup improved 3.9` points. Again, these are commendable gains in both academic areas.

Additionally, the Grade 10 English Language Arts and Mathematics MCAS scores improved. In 2006, 32% of the students scored in the Advanced category and in 2007 51% scored in the Advanced category. Further, in Grade 10, if you combine the Advanced and Proficient categories in English Language Arts in 2006, 91% of the students scored in these top two categories, and in 2007, 92% of the students scores in these top two categories. Also, in Grade 10, if you combine the Advanced and Proficient categories in Mathematics in 2006, 89% of the students scored in these top two categories, and in 2007, 91% of the students scores in these top two categories. This represents significant achievement in these areas.

Opportunities for Growth

It is important to underscore, that overall the Lexington Public Schools performed very well on the 2007 MCAS. However, as with any accountability system, there are always areas that we can look at to continue our improvement. We will continue to use MCAS to improve in even the smallest areas.

Data analysis helps us to identify the small areas for growth. Even though overall the Special Education subgroup across the district made improvement, there are pockets where particular attention needs to be paid to assure that this continued improvement affects all Special Education students.

In other small pockets across the district, it is necessary to look at the Grades 3-5 African/American subgroup in the area of English Language Arts, as identified by the Department of Education, to also assure that they continue to improve. With analysis of individual student data, we can plan specific instructional interventions that will target individual students in this subgroup, to help assure continued academic improvement. By looking closely at this subgroup, and analyzing individual students, we can inform our instruction to best address the academic needs of the students and plan instruction appropriately.

Additionally, in Elementary English Language Arts and Mathematics there are specific questions throughout the district that would indicate further analysis. Administrators and Program Leaders will look carefully at these questions and plan appropriate student-based interventions, as well as curricula modifications, to assure learning success.

In K-12 Science, we need to continue to align our curriculum with the Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks to assure the standards are clearly articulated grade level to grade level. Science/Technology/Engineering is in Year 1 of Curriculum Review/Program Evaluation. K-12 vertical articulation of standards is a primary focus of

a Curriculum Review/Program Evaluation process. The Curriculum Review Process will assure this K-12 articulation.

Lexington Public Schools continue to be high performing. Focusing on the highlighted areas, we can help inform instruction to best address the learning needs of all our students, and assure this continued high performance.

Next Steps

Short Term Goals

- Focus on achievement of students in specific subgroups, i.e. K-5 African American/Black, as indicated by the Department of Education
- Continue to analyze data to inform instruction
- Develop Student Success Plans to target individual student achievement
- Supplement Curricula

Long Term Goals

- Curriculum Review/Program Evaluation process
- Articulate K-12 Curriculum
- Target Professional Development
- Ancillary resources

Questions