

**Agenda Item:** Connecticut Smarter Balanced Summative Assessment Results

**Meeting Date:** November 21, 2017

**From:** Donna Nestler-Rusack, Ed.D.  
Assistant Superintendent for Teaching and Learning

This report presents the Spring 2017 results for the Connecticut Smarter Balanced Summative Assessment that was administered in grades 3-8.

## 2017 Connecticut Smarter Balanced Summative Assessment Results

The Smarter Balanced Summative Assessment is Connecticut's master assessment administered to all students in Grades 3-8. The content of the test is based on the Connecticut Core Standards, which define learning expectations for what students should know and be able to do at each grade level. The standards focus on English Language Arts and Mathematics, as well as literacy in history/social studies, science and technical subjects in grades 6-12.

The overall scores in English Language Arts/Literacy and Mathematics are reported in scale-score units. Vertical scale scores are reported in the thousands and span all grades from 3 to 11. Within the scale-score range, there are four achievement levels for each content area. These four achievement levels are:

- Level 1 – Does Not Meet
- Level 2 – Approaching
- Level 3 – Meets
- Level 4 – Exceeds

Students scoring at Level 3 or 4 meet state expectations and are considered on track for success in the next grade. It is important to remember that the scores on these assessments should not be compared to the previous CMT or CAPT results, as the current achievement levels measure different knowledge and skills.

In English Language Arts/Literacy, four areas of knowledge and skills are assessed. They include:

- Reading, which requires students to read closely and analytically to comprehend a range of increasingly complex literary and information texts
- Writing, which requires students to produce effective and well-grounded writing for a range of purposes and audiences
- Listening, which requires students to employ effective speaking and listening skills for a range of purposes and audiences
- Research/Inquiry, which requires students to engage in research and inquiry to investigate topics, and to analyze, integrate and present information

For Mathematics, there are three areas of knowledge and skills assessed. They are:

- Concepts and Procedures, where students explain and apply mathematical concepts and interpret and carry out mathematical procedures with precision and fluency
- Problem Solving and Modeling and Data Analysis, where students solve a range of complex well-posed problems in pure and applied mathematics, making productive use of knowledge and problem solving strategies. Students also analyze complex, real-world scenarios and construct and use mathematical models to interpret and solve problems
- Communicating Reasoning, where students need to clearly and precisely construct viable arguments to support their own reasoning and to critique the reasoning of others

The Smarter Balanced Summative Assessment includes a computer adaptive test for both ELA and Mathematics and a performance task for Mathematics. The computer adaptive test presents students with short-answer responses, multiple-choice questions and interactive test items. The computer program adjusts the difficulty of the questions throughout the assessment, basing the difficulty of future questions on previous responses. The performance task is a collection of questions and activities that are connected to a single theme or scenario. These tasks challenge students to apply their knowledge and higher-order thinking skills to explore and analyze a complex, real-world scenario. The performance task is administered on a computer but is not computer adaptive.

The table below summarizes the percentage of students at Level 3 or Above for each of the content areas since 2015, the first year of administration. Please note that the ELA performance task has been removed from the 2015 administration in order to perform a true baseline analysis. Grade level performance can be tracked horizontally and the performance of student cohorts can be tracked diagonally.

**Overall Results: Percentage of Students by Content Area At Level 3 or Above for 2015-2017**

<b>Grade Level / Content Area</b>	<b>2015</b>	<b>2016</b>	<b>2017</b>
Grade 3 ELA	88	78	79
Grade 4 ELA	75	83	76
Grade 5 ELA	82	78	84
Grade 6 ELA	82	84	75
Grade 7 ELA	76	84	81
Grade 8 ELA	79	80	85
<b>Mathematics</b>			
Grade 3 Mathematics	84	76	77
Grade 4 Mathematics	74	77	71
Grade 5 Mathematics	64	63	69
Grade 6 Mathematics	76	76	67
Grade 7 Mathematics	73	83	77
Grade 8 Mathematics	77	77	82

The table below indicates for English Language Arts/Literacy and Mathematics the percentage of students performing in each of the four performance levels: Level 1 (Does Not Meet), Level 2 (Approaching), Level 3 (Meets) and Level 4 (Exceeds). A large percentage of our students reached Level 3 and Level 4 with significantly fewer students falling within Levels 1 and 2. Levels 1 and 2 help us to determine the students who might need additional instructional interventions and supports.

**Percent of Students by Performance Level**

<b>Content Area</b>	<b>Grade</b>	<b># Tested</b>	<b>Level 1 Does Not Meet</b>	<b>Level 2 Approaching</b>	<b>Level 3 Meets</b>	<b>Level 4 Exceeds</b>	<b>% At/Above Level 3</b>
<b>ELA</b>	3	229	8	13	23	56	79
	4	251	9	15	25	51	76
	5	221	8	8	30	54	84
	6	278	7	18	32	43	75
	7	277	5	14	39	42	81
	8	273	5	10	42	43	85
<b>Mathematics</b>	3	228	6	17	34	43	77
	4	251	6	23	30	41	71
	5	221	9	22	24	45	69
	6	278	10	23	28	39	67
	7	277	7	16	28	49	77
	8	273	7	11	20	62	82

The next section of tables detail student performance in the areas of special education, English Learners, and gender. The percentage of students performing in each of the four performance levels: Level 1 (Does Not Meet), Level 2 (Approaching), Level 3 (Meets) and Level 4 (Exceeds) are listed in addition to the percentage of students performing at or above Level 3.

**Percent of Special Education Students by Performance Level - ELA**

<b>Grade</b>	<b># Tested</b>	<b>Level 1 Does Not Meet</b>	<b>Level 2 Approaching</b>	<b>Level 3 Meets</b>	<b>Level 4 Exceeds</b>	<b>% At/Above Level 3</b>
<b>3</b>	15	46	20	27	7	34
<b>4</b>	22	36	23	32	9	41
<b>5</b>	10	80	10	0	10	10
<b>6</b>	24	63	33	4	0	4
<b>7</b>	19	37	26	21	16	37
<b>8</b>	26	38	19	35	8	43

**Percent of Special Education Students by Performance Level - Mathematics**

<b>Grade</b>	<b># Tested</b>	<b>Level 1 Does Not Meet</b>	<b>Level 2 Approaching</b>	<b>Level 3 Meets</b>	<b>Level 4 Exceeds</b>	<b>% At/Above Level 3</b>
<b>3</b>	15	33	34	20	13	33
<b>4</b>	22	27	41	23	9	32
<b>5</b>	10	70	20	0	10	10
<b>6</b>	24	62	38	0	0	0
<b>7</b>	19	48	26	21	5	26
<b>8</b>	26	46	31	19	4	23

**Percent of English Learner Students by Performance Level - ELA**

<b>Grade</b>	<b># Tested</b>	<b>Level 1 Does Not Meet</b>	<b>Level 2 Approaching</b>	<b>Level 3 Meets</b>	<b>Level 4 Exceeds</b>	<b>% At/Above Level 3</b>
<b>3</b>	9	22	22	33	23	56
<b>4</b>	8	37	37	13	13	26
<b>5</b>	*	*	*	*	*	*
<b>6</b>	*	*	*	*	*	*
<b>7</b>	*	*	*	*	*	*
<b>8</b>	*	*	*	*	*	*

\*the data are suppressed to ensure confidentiality

**Percent of English Learner Students by Performance Level - Mathematics**

<b>Grade</b>	<b># Tested</b>	<b>Level 1 Does Not Meet</b>	<b>Level 2 Approaching</b>	<b>Level 3 Meets</b>	<b>Level 4 Exceeds</b>	<b>% At/Above Level 3</b>
<b>3</b>	9	11	33	45	11	56
<b>4</b>	8	13	37	25	25	50
<b>5</b>	*	*	*	*	*	*
<b>6</b>	*	*	*	*	*	*
<b>7</b>	*	*	*	*	*	*
<b>8</b>	*	*	*	*	*	*

\*the data are suppressed to ensure confidentiality

**Percent of Students by Gender by Performance Level - ELA**

<b>Grade</b>	<b>Group</b>	<b># Tested</b>	<b>Level 1 Does Not Meet</b>	<b>Level 2 Approaching</b>	<b>Level 3 Meets</b>	<b>Level 4 Exceeds</b>	<b>% At/Above Level 3</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>All</b>	229	8	13	23	56	79
	<b>Male</b>	105	6	15	28	51	79
	<b>Female</b>	124	10	10	19	61	80
<b>4</b>	<b>All</b>	251	9	15	25	51	76
	<b>Male</b>	128	12	12	24	52	76
	<b>Female</b>	123	7	16	26	51	77
<b>5</b>	<b>All</b>	221	8	8	30	54	84
	<b>Male</b>	107	9	9	25	57	82
	<b>Female</b>	114	8	6	34	52	86
<b>6</b>	<b>All</b>	278	7	18	32	43	75
	<b>Male</b>	138	8	19	38	35	73
	<b>Female</b>	140	6	16	26	52	78
<b>7</b>	<b>All</b>	277	5	14	39	42	81
	<b>Male</b>	147	7	16	44	33	77
	<b>Female</b>	130	2	12	34	52	86
<b>8</b>	<b>All</b>	273	5	10	42	43	85
	<b>Male</b>	156	6	11	44	39	83
	<b>Female</b>	117	3	9	40	48	88

**Percent of Students by Gender by Performance Level - Mathematics**

<b>Grade</b>	<b>Group</b>	<b># Tested</b>	<b>Level 1 Does Not Meet</b>	<b>Level 2 Approaching</b>	<b>Level 3 Meets</b>	<b>Level 4 Exceeds</b>	<b>% At/Above Level 3</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>All</b>	228	6	17	34	43	77
	<b>Male</b>	104	5	15	36	44	80
	<b>Female</b>	124	7	19	32	42	74
<b>4</b>	<b>All</b>	251	6	23	30	41	71
	<b>Male</b>	128	5	20	27	48	75
	<b>Female</b>	123	7	26	33	34	67
<b>5</b>	<b>All</b>	221	9	22	24	45	69
	<b>Male</b>	107	9	15	24	52	76
	<b>Female</b>	114	10	28	24	38	62
<b>6</b>	<b>All</b>	278	10	23	28	39	67
	<b>Male</b>	138	10	20	30	40	70
	<b>Female</b>	140	10	25	26	39	65
<b>7</b>	<b>All</b>	277	7	16	28	49	77
	<b>Male</b>	147	7	12	30	51	81
	<b>Female</b>	130	5	21	27	47	74
<b>8</b>	<b>All</b>	273	7	11	20	62	82
	<b>Male</b>	156	6	12	20	62	82
	<b>Female</b>	117	8	10	20	62	82

Avon is in District Reference Group (DRG) B. The tables below compare the performance of Avon with DRG A and similar DRG B school districts. These scores represent the percentage of students scoring at Level 3 or above in the areas of English Language Arts/Literacy and Mathematics.

This year Avon holds the number one position in English Language Arts/Literacy for grade 8 in DRG B and the number two position for DRG A. Additionally, we hold the number one position in Mathematics for grade 7 and 8 in DRG B

Percent of Students at Level 3 or Above Compared with DRG A/B Districts - English Language Arts/Literacy							
DRG	District	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8
A	Darien	78.6	83.9	84.7	86.4	87.1	87.9
A	Easton	80.2	85.7	85.3	89.2	85.3	81.9
A	New Canaan	87.3	91.8	92.0	84.7	87.0	85.1
A	Redding	76.3	85.7	74.7	66.3	75.8	78.3
A	Ridgefield	84.3	84.5	84.8	75.9	76.9	73.5
A	Weston	69.8	76.2	78.2	77.2	72.1	72.9
A	Westport	80.3	88.0	86.5	80.6	76.7	72.9
A	Wilton	72.1	77.2	81.7	71.3	79.8	72.8
<b>B</b>	<b>Avon</b>	<b>79.5</b>	<b>76.5</b>	<b>84.2</b>	<b>75.2</b>	<b>80.9</b>	<b>85.3</b>
B	Brookfield	58.2	60.7	72.5	69.0	64.6	67.4
B	Cheshire	77.4	77.6	81.2	83.5	69.6	73.9
B	Fairfield	66.6	74.0	76.8	74.0	79.6	75.5
B	Farmington	74.7	85.0	83.8	83.4	69.8	76.8
B	Glastonbury	80.1	76.0	79.1	81.3	75.3	71.8
B	Granby	62.5	68.3	79.7	75.0	82.1	71.6
B	Greenwich	77.6	74.7	79.6	70.6	73.4	77.5
B	Guilford	69.5	77.1	80.6	75.2	86.9	78.4
B	Madison	68.9	79.0	76.6	65.0	65.3	50.0
B	Monroe	80.8	80.3	86.6	84.7	72.9	76.4
B	New Fairfield	75.9	72.7	75.8	64.3	73.5	68.3
B	Newtown	75.4	70.0	77.2	68.9	67.0	65.1
B	Orange	63.1	67.8	80.5	83.5		
B	Region 5					79.0	78.1
B	Region 15	69.8	75.4	80.1	82.5	74.1	75.8
B	Simsbury	78.7	78.8	81.1	86.6	82.4	74.5
B	South Windsor	75.2	80.6	75.6	70.9	77.9	70.7
B	Trumbull	75.2	84.9	84.7	78.8	83.6	81.3
B	West Hartford	71.3	73.4	71.6	68.6	70.2	71.2
B	Woodbridge	73.7	72.1	70.8	90.5		
<b>Avon's Ranking/DRG A</b>		<b>5/9</b>	<b>8/9</b>	<b>6/9</b>	<b>7/9</b>	<b>4/9</b>	<b>2/9</b>
<b>Avon's Ranking/DRG B</b>		<b>3/20</b>	<b>9/20</b>	<b>3/20</b>	<b>10/20</b>	<b>5/19</b>	<b>1/19</b>

Percent of Students at Level 3 or Above Compared with DRG A/B Districts - Mathematics							
DRG	District	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8
A	Darien	80.9	77.9	76.0	84.2	81.3	85.1
A	Easton	79.1	89.7	72.5	67.5	74.5	71.3
A	New Canaan	86.4	92.0	84.3	81.8	82.0	83.7
A	Redding	83.9	87.8	69.2	59.4	73.4	79.2
A	Ridgefield	79.2	76.6	69.7	62.2	67.3	66.3
A	Weston	79.6	71.9	66.5	72.3	68.8	79.2
A	Westport	77.4	80.0	76.6	71.7	77.7	62.9
A	Wilton	71.0	73.6	74.0	58.5	75.0	63.7
<b>B</b>	<b>Avon</b>	<b>76.8</b>	<b>70.9</b>	<b>68.8</b>	<b>66.9</b>	<b>77.3</b>	<b>82.1</b>
B	Brookfield	61.7	62.4	47.5	64.5	65.5	67.0
B	Cheshire	77.4	69.1	66.4	77.6	54.4	59.6
B	Fairfield	71.0	68.8	69.3	65.9	65.5	66.9
B	Farmington	76.5	82.3	70.0	72.9	65.7	75.5
B	Glastonbury	79.1	77.0	73.4	75.8	71.8	66.3
B	Granby	60.6	61.8	60.9	64.8	66.2	60.5
B	Greenwich	81.0	73.0	67.5	65.7	67.2	68.5
B	Guilford	81.0	82.6	73.5	69.2	71.7	77.3
B	Madison	76.0	80.0	65.8	44.8	61.6	49.8
B	Monroe	79.9	78.1	68.4	70.8	54.3	67.2
B	New Fairfield	82.8	70.4	63.6	59.3	55.6	56.1
B	Newtown	74.5	67.7	64.8	67.1	70.2	66.9
B	Orange	57.0	70.1	71.6	77.6		
B	Region 5					69.4	72.5
B	Region 15	82.2	76.6	68.3	67.1	55.4	68.9
B	Simsbury	75.9	71.2	68.4	78.2	64.7	60.0
B	South Windsor	77.3	77.9	66.3	66.5	65.3	65.1
B	Trumbull	83.6	82.7	75.3	76.8	72.1	74.2
B	West Hartford	67.0	66.9	56.1	59.8	60.6	56.5
B	Woodbridge	77.1	77.7	54.7	76.8		
<b>Avon's Ranking/DRG A</b>		<b>8/9</b>	<b>9/9</b>	<b>8/9</b>	<b>6/9</b>	<b>4/9</b>	<b>3/9</b>
<b>Avon's Ranking/DRG B</b>		<b>11/20</b>	<b>12/20</b>	<b>7/20</b>	<b>12/20</b>	<b>1/19</b>	<b>1/19</b>

## **Conclusion:**

Overall, our students continue to perform well on the Smarter Balanced Summative Assessment. Most notably in DRG B where Avon students scored in the top position in grade 7 mathematics and grade 8 ELA and mathematics.

The Smarter Balanced Summative Assessment uses a matched student cohort growth model, which allows for quantifying the amount of growth achieved by the same students from one year to the next. The approach is criterion referenced and based on a vertical scale that spans grades 3 through 8 for ELA and mathematics. The amount of growth made by a student from one year to the next is evaluated against a fixed standard – or criterion – and not against how other students grew. As student cohort and individual scores are reviewed across three administrations a few patterns have emerged. Generally, there is more variability from year to year at the lower grades (3, 4, 5) than in the upper grades (6, 7, 8). Once a cohort reaches grade 6, scores increase or in one case decreased by one-percent after a seven-percent increase.

While the Smarter Balanced Summative Assessment is an important measure of our students' achievement, many different indicators of success are critical to our understanding of both the accomplishment and needs of all our students. Some of the other measures that we utilize include universal screenings, common grade level/course assessments, benchmark assessments, course grades, Advanced Placement tests and the SAT. Through the analysis of these various data points we can identify patterns and trends in the scores, students who might be in need of academic remediation or enrichment, as well as the overall effectiveness of our district curriculum and instruction.

In closing, it is important for the community to recognize that these accomplishments are the direct result of our teachers engaging in a model of continuous improvement in the areas of curriculum, instruction, and assessment as well as our hard working students who have been supported by all school personnel and their parents/guardians.