THIRD GRADE READING LEVEL ASSESSMENT TEAM REPORT OUT
Our Goals

I. Evaluate existing student data.
II. Make recommendations on future assessment tool(s).
II. Determine what success looks like on proposed assessment tool(s).
Evaluate Existing Student Data:

How is third grade reading level currently assessed?
How Our State Currently Monitors Third Grade Reading Level

- For the past 14 years, Georgia has utilized the CRCT.

- Recently, Georgia also began to use CRCT data to produce a Lexile score for every reader.

- A Lexile is a standard score that matches a student’s reading ability with difficulty of text material. A Lexile can be interpreted as the level of book that a student can read with 75% comprehension.
How Our State Plans to Monitor Grade Level in the Future

- In 2014-2015, Georgia will replace the CRCT with the GMAP for grades 3-12.
  - Comprehensive test combining EOCT, writing tests, etc.
  - Will include a mix of multiple choice, open-ended questions.
  - Will be administered on computers.
  - Will combine English, Reading, and Writing in one section.
- Retain Lexile Levels for reading proficiency
  - Increase expectations for what students can read.
State Guidance for Future Tests

- **On Current CRCT:**
  - Below 800 = Does not meet standards
  - 800 – 849 = Meets standards
  - 850 and above = Exceeds standards

- **To help systems prepare for increased rigor, Georgia produced “CRCT Readiness Indicators”:**
  - Below 828 = Needs additional support
  - 828 - 876 = “On Track”
  - 877 = Commendable
State Guidance Regarding Lexile Levels

- Current third grade expectations:
  - 410 – 769 Lexile “Meets Expectations”
  - 770 plus Lexile “Exceeds Expectations”

- Projected future third grade expectations:
  - 520 – 820 Lexile will “Meet Expectations”
    - A projection, not a firm number.
How Our Schools Currently Monitor Third Grade Reading Level

- Each system uses a host of indicators, but:
  - Whitfield County’s primary assessment tool is the MAP test.
  - Dalton Public Schools uses Literacy Collaborative text levels.
Georgia recognized it has the lowest expectations for proficiency in the nation.

The new GMAP test will reflect raised expectations.

The state will continue to rely on Lexile scores.

The state has given us guidance on interpreting current CRCT and Lexile scores with future benchmarks in mind.

In addition to the CRCT, our schools utilize secondary measures to determine grade reading level.
Evaluate Existing Student Data

What Data Was Available?
Test Data Overview

- 2007-2013 CRCT and Lexile data for each system
- Whitfield County Schools 2009-2013 fall MAP data
- Dalton Public Schools Literacy Collaborative text level data in third grade for fourth quarter 2013
- Race/ethnicity/gender data
Limitations on Data

- We did not have socioeconomic data on an individual student basis, so we could not make conclusions about performance and family income.

- The CRCT cannot be utilized for longitudinal purposes. It can be used for comparing this year’s class of third graders to last year’s class of third graders, but it cannot be used to demonstrate that last year’s class of third graders grew/declined in fourth grade.
Evaluate Existing Student Data

Summary of Findings
The Data Revealed . . .

- There is no statistically significant difference on CRCT performance between our two systems.
- There is no statistically significant difference on CRCT performance between genders.
- There is a statistically significant difference between some racial/ethnic groups in our community on the CRCT, particularly in early grades. However, over time, this difference declines.
The Data Revealed . . .

- There is only a statistically significant difference between a few of the schools.
- In general, students perform consistently across subject matters on the CRCT.
- There is a correlation between the CRCT, MAP, and Literacy Collaborative Text Levels.
  - In other words, each assessment is a similar predictor of the other.
Local districts have higher standards for third grade reading level than current CRCT standards.

Expectations from local districts appear similar to guidance from the state about what to expect from future tests.
Evaluate Existing Student Data

A Closer Look at Key Findings
2013 Mean Scores in Third Grade Reading:

Georgia: 847
Dalton: 839
WCS: 839

No significant statistical difference exist between the school systems for CRCT Reading scores.
Relationship Between Genders on CRCT

Boxplot of CRCT Scaled Score for Reading Total (REAss)

Grade = 3
Year = 2013

No significant statistical difference exist between genders.
Relationship Between Race/Ethnicity and School Systems on CRCT

1: Asian/Pacific Islander
2: Black/Non-Hispanic
3: Hispanic
4: American Indian/Alaskan Native
5: White/Non-Hispanic
6: Multiracial
* blank/omitted

Boxplot of CRCT Scaled Score for Reading Total (REAss)

Grade = 3
Year = 2013

No significant statistical difference exist between the school systems by ethnic group. A statistical difference exist between ethnic groups.
Relationship Between Schools on CRCT

If the medians (center lines) between two schools do not intersect with the gray box of each other, there is a significant difference.
Student CRCT Performance is Generally Consistent Across Subjects

Reminder:
The new GMAP will combine reading, language arts, and writing.
There is a Correlation Between CRCT & MAP

Regression Model of CRCT (REA•ss) vs. MAP (TestRITScore) for WCS

\[ \text{REA•ss} = 1034 - 3.780 \text{TestRITScore} + 0.01461 \text{TestRITScore}^{**2} \]

\[ \text{Grade = 3 Year = 2013} \]

- \( S = 20.0612 \)
- \( R-Sq = 56.9\% \)
- \( R-Sq(adj) = 56.8\% \)
3rd grade students scoring on grade level on the MAP in the fall achieved “on track” scores on the spring CRCT according to Georgia’s future readiness guidelines.

### Assessment Tool Comparison Grade 3 WCS 2012-2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall MAP Test RITScore</th>
<th>Regression Model Calculated Spring REAss</th>
<th>Spring CRCT Actual REAss (Avg.)</th>
<th>MAP Definitions</th>
<th>CRCT Definitions</th>
<th>Future Readiness Indicators</th>
<th>CRCT: Future Readiness Equivalent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>223</td>
<td>918</td>
<td>909</td>
<td>Above Grade Level*</td>
<td>850-920 (Exceeds Expectations)</td>
<td>Commendable</td>
<td>877 and above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>193</td>
<td>849</td>
<td>854</td>
<td>Grade Level*</td>
<td>800-849 (Meets Expectations)</td>
<td>On Track</td>
<td>828-876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>185</td>
<td>835</td>
<td>829</td>
<td>Below Grade Level*</td>
<td>650 – 799 (Does Not Meet Expectations)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: MAP representatives confirmed that they define grade level as a score falling between the 40-60% nationally.
There is a Correlation Between CRCT & LC Text Levels

Regression Model of CRCT (REAss) vs. Lit Collaborative (LC) for DCS

REAss = 822.9 - 8.535 LC
+ 0.5815 LC**2

Grade = 3 Year 2013

- S = 22.5324
- R-Sq = 42.6%
- R-Sq(adj) = 42.3%
Dalton Public Schools’ “Meets Expectations” text level correlates very closely with the CRCT target score recommended by the state.

**Assessment Tool Comparison Grade 3 DCS 2012-2013**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F&amp;P LC</th>
<th>Regression Model Calculated REAss</th>
<th>CRCT Actual REAss (Avg.)</th>
<th>DCS LC Definitions</th>
<th>CRCT Definitions</th>
<th>Future Readiness Indicators</th>
<th>CRCT: Future Readiness Equivalent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>846</td>
<td>844</td>
<td>Exceeds Expectations</td>
<td>850-920</td>
<td>Commendable</td>
<td>877 &amp; above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>835</td>
<td>834</td>
<td>Meets Expectations</td>
<td>800-849</td>
<td>On Track</td>
<td>828-876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>826</td>
<td>822</td>
<td>Approaches Expectations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>817</td>
<td>813</td>
<td>Does Not Meet Expectations</td>
<td>650-799</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Future Lexile Standards Will Be More Rigorous

Projected guidelines will narrow the “meets expectations” category.
Recommendations on Future Assessment Tools
Recommendations on Future Assessment Tool(s)

- There is no objective evidence that one measurement is better than another.
- School measurements are consistent and aligned with each other and state CRCT scores.
What is third grade reading level?

What does success look like on the proposed tools?
The Data Shows Consensus

3rd grade “Meets Expectations” consensus across all assessment tools:

**Table: Assessment Meets Expectations Spring CRCT Equivalent Actual Spring CRCT Range**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment</th>
<th>Meets Expectations</th>
<th>Spring CRCT Equivalent</th>
<th>Actual Spring CRCT Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spring LC</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>834</td>
<td>800-890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall MAP</td>
<td>186-193</td>
<td>843</td>
<td>797-909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRCT</td>
<td>800-849</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidance from state re: future test</td>
<td>828-876 (On track)</td>
<td>828-876</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Note: 26% of all students in third grade in 2013 fall in the 800-827 CRCT range.
Suggestions on Data Management
Path Forward Data Analysis

- Dedicate staff resources necessary to regularly review data for trends and relationships
- Work between systems to keep your eye on emerging trends
- Provide professional development (Six Sigma Training) for committed staff member
  - Shaw has volunteered to train one professional from each school system
Store Data with Analysis in Mind:

- Standardize all student information by anonymous student identifier so you can work together between systems to review trends. Useful data includes:
  - Testing data
  - Gender/ethnicity/other variables
  - Socioeconomic data
  - Anything else you have that could impact test performance
- Store data by school year, not calendar year (it is easy for outsiders to confuse the information)