

Administrator Student Learning Objective

Administrator Name: Mark Johnson

School Name: River Run Elementary School

Academic Year: 2015–16

Please populate each section of the *Administrator Student Learning Objective (SLO) Template* using the guidance provided before each field. Refer to the *Administrator SLO Checklist* while completing this template.

Baseline and Trend Data

What information is being used to inform the creation of the SLO and establish the amount of growth that should take place?

This SLO is based on the Northwest Evaluation Association (NWEA) Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) Assessment¹ for Primary Grades for Grades K–2 and the NWEA MAP Assessment for Grade 3. We are using NWEA because it gives a holistic picture of student performance in reading and mathematics. We are using data from NWEA as a growth measure for SLOs because we do not administer this assessment as a growth measure in our building’s teacher evaluation system. Average student performance on the mathematics portion of the MAP assessment at our school has been consistent during the past two years.

Table 1 describes student performance groups by their mathematics MAP cut scores. We grouped students into five basic performance groups: *below basic*, *basic*, *low proficient*, *high proficient*, and *advanced*.

Table 1. K–3 Student Mathematics Performance Groups by MAP Cut Scores

Student Group	Group 1: <i>Below Basic</i>	Group 2: <i>Basic</i>	Group 3: <i>Low Proficient</i>	Group 4: <i>High Proficient</i>	Group 5: <i>Advanced</i>
Grade	Cut score	Cut score	Cut score	Cut score	Cut score
K	120–129	130–139	140–149	150–159	160–169
1	140–149	150–159	160–169	170–179	180–189
2	160–169	170–179	180–189	190–199	200–209
3	<179	180–189	190–199	200–209	>210

¹ The Ohio Educator Standards Board, the State Board of Education, and the Ohio Department of Education do not recommend or endorse any specific interventions, products, programs, curricula, or student learning objectives. The student learning objective presented here uses targets for student performance that are measured by an assessment from the department’s list of approved instruments. These assessments meet criteria established by the department that are defined online. This student learning objective is just one of many examples that educators may use as they develop student growth measures for their students.

Table 2 describes how students have performed on MAP from fall 2013 through fall 2015. More than half of students across Grades K–3 have consistently scored in the *low proficient* range or higher, showing mastery of most or all grade-level mathematics skills and knowledge, as well as some knowledge and skills beyond their grade level. About a quarter to a third of students across Grades K–3 have consistently scored in the *basic* or *below basic* ranges, indicating that they are performing below grade level in mathematics. Since we began using MAP in fall 2012, most students have scored within the same group each year. It is important to note, however, that many students are still scoring below grade level, and there are few high-performing students. Overall, these trends are similar across grade levels. We have used color-coding in the table to highlight cohort performance over time, with blue indicating the current fourth graders’ performance in years past, green indicating the current third graders’ performance this year and in years past, yellow indicating the current second graders’ performance this year and in years past, and pink indicating the current first graders’ performance this year and last year.

Table 2. MAP Trend and Baseline Data by Student Groups

Year	Grade	Number of Students	<i>Below Basic</i> % (n)	<i>Basic</i> % (n)	<i>Low Proficient</i> % (n)	<i>High Proficient</i> % (n)	<i>Advanced</i> % (n)
Fall 2013–14 Baseline	K	89	4% (4)	24% (22)	67% (60)	2% (2)	1% (1)
	1	86	6% (5)	33% (28)	55% (47)	3% (3)	3% (3)
	2	83	3% (2)	32% (27)	61% (51)	4% (3)	1% (1)
	3	84	5% (4)	27% (23)	65% (55)	2% (2)	0% (0)
Fall 2014–15 Baseline	K	90	4% (4)	26% (23)	65% (58)	2% (2)	1% (1)
	1	88	6% (5)	33% (28)	55% (47)	3% (3)	3% (3)
	2	86	3% (2)	32% (27)	61% (51)	2% (2)	2% (2)
	3	84	6% (5)	27% (23)	65% (55)	2% (2)	0% (0)
Fall 2015–16 Baseline	K	91	4% (4)	24% (22)	67% (60)	2% (2)	1% (1)
	1	86	6% (5)	33% (28)	55% (47)	3% (3)	3% (3)
	2	88	3% (2)	32% (27)	61% (51)	4% (3)	1% (1)
	3	86	6% (5)	27% (23)	65% (55)	2% (2)	0% (0)

Table 3 shows the average growth students in each performance group have made each year and the overall range of student scores. These data show that students generally grow fewer points across the year as they move up in grade. These averages were used to inform growth targets.

Table 3. Average Growth and Score Range for Student MAP Performance by Performance Group

Year	Grade	Range of Growth Points	Average Growth Points				
			<i>Below Basic</i>	<i>Basic</i>	<i>Low Proficient</i>	<i>High Proficient</i>	<i>Advanced</i>
Fall 2013–14 Average MAP Score	K	9–24	17.1	18.3	20.4	19.2	19.4
	1	8–26	15.4	16.2	16.4	16.9	16.4
	2	8–17	11.2	13.4	13.1	12.2	12.9
	3	5–13	7.8	8.6	7.2	7.5	7.8
Fall	K	10–22	16.8	18.4	19.8	20.2	19.8

2014–15 Average MAP Score	1	9–25	15.8	16.1	16.9	16.8	16.4
	2	8–15	11.4	12.2	12.1	13.5	10.3
	3	6–14	8.7	9.8	7.9	7.7	7.3
Fall 2015–16 Average MAP Score	K	8–26	17.3	18.3	20.4	19.2	19.4
	1	7–21	16.1	16.3	16.5	17.1	16.0
	2	6–18	9.8	11.2	12.3	13.1	11.9
	3	4–14	8.8	9.1	7.5	7.4	8.1

Student Population

Which student population will be included in this SLO? When applicable, include subject, grade level, and number of students. Include the rationale for determining the student population by grade level, content area, or targeted needs, as appropriate.

All students in Grades K–3 take the MAP assessment in fall, winter, and spring each year. This SLO includes all the students who complete the MAP assessment in fall and spring. We are able to offer enough makeup testing dates to ensure that all or nearly all eligible students are able to participate in each testing window. Last year, our school had a 7 percent mobility rate, so this year we expect about 450 out of the 461 students in our school to be included in the final SLO. Demographic information is included here.

Grade Level	Total Students	Percentage White	Number White	Percentage Black or Non-Hispanic	Number Black or Non-Hispanic	Percentage American Indian	Number American Indian	Percentage Hispanic	Number Hispanic	Percentage Special Education	Number Special Education	Percentage Free or Reduced-Price Lunch Eligible	Number Free or Reduced-Price Lunch Eligible
K	91	57%	51	14%	13	7%	6	22%	20	4%	4	35%	32
1	86	59%	51	15%	13	6%	5	20%	17	14%	12	45%	41
2	88	54%	45	18%	15	5%	4	23%	19	17%	14	42%	38
3	86	55%	48	13%	11	7%	6	25%	22	15%	13	38%	34
Total	351	56%	195	15%	52	6%	21	19%	68	12%	43	41%	145

Interval of Instruction

What is the duration of the SLO? Include beginning and end dates.

September 1, 2015, to April 15, 2016

Standards and Content

What content will the SLO cover? To what related standards is the SLO aligned? Include rationale for selecting comprehensive or targeted content and skills.

This SLO focuses on Ohio's Learning Standards for mathematics within four strands of standards: Operations and Algebraic Thinking, Numbers and Operations in Base Ten, Measurement and Data, and Geometry. The MAP assessment is aligned to Ohio's Learning Standards for mathematics and is able to be disaggregated to the strand level. We have chosen to focus on these four strands because they are common across Grades K–3 and represent the foundational mathematics concepts needed for success in more advanced mathematics in upper elementary school and secondary school. These standards also represent the conceptual knowledge and thinking students will need to develop over time. This SLO has a more comprehensive approach; it includes all standards within these strands to ensure that all students are able to consistently meet the performance expectations of Ohio's Math Learning Standards, a district goal.

The standards are described in detail across grades here: <https://education.ohio.gov/getattachment/Topics/Ohio-s-New-Learning-Standards/Mathematics/Math-Standards.pdf.aspx>

Assessment(s)

What assessment(s) will be used to measure student growth for this SLO? Specify how multiple assessment measures will be combined, as appropriate (e.g., if your student population spans multiple grade levels).

This SLO is based on the NWEA MAP Assessment for Primary Grades for Grades K–2 and the NWEA MAP Assessment for Grade 3. The assessment is given in fall, winter, and spring. The winter assessment will be used as monitoring data. The mathematics portion of MAP across Grades K–3 covers the four standards described previously. It is a multiple-choice, computer-based assessment that chooses questions based on student success and performance in real time.

Growth Target(s)

Considering all available data and content requirements, what growth target(s) can students be expected to reach?

Descriptions of growth targets for each grade level follow. Tiered growth targets reflect both academic stretch for students *and* reachable goals. To set growth targets, we looked at the average performance within each student performance group and chose targets that did the following:

- Require lower performing students in the *below basic* and *basic* categories to show enough growth to start to close their performance gap. These targets are based on the scores in the top half of the score range in each performance category during the past two years.
- Require students performing at or above proficiency to demonstrate growth that exceeds the average growth for each performance category during the past two years.

Table 4 describes the growth targets for each group of students in each grade level. The number of points indicated in each cell reflects the minimum number of points that students scoring at that level on the pretest will need to grow on the posttest. The number in parentheses after each growth target is the number of students who scored in this range on the pretest.

Table 4. Growth Targets for Grades K–3 MAP Scores by Performance Group

Grade Level	Expected Points Increase				
	<i>Below Basic</i> Required points (no. of students)	<i>Basic</i> Required points (no. of students)	<i>Low Proficient</i> Required points (no. of students)	<i>High Proficient</i> Required points (no. of students)	<i>Advanced</i> Required points (no. of students)
K	22 (4 students)	21 (22 students)	20 (60 students)	20 (2 students)	20 (1 students)
1	19 (5 students)	19 (28 students)	17 (47 students)	17 (3 students)	17 (3 students)
2	14 (2 students)	14 (27 students)	13 (51 students)	13 (3 students)	13 (1 students)
3	10 (5 students)	10 (23 students)	8 (55 students)	8 (2 students)	8 (0 students)

Rationale for Growth Target(s)

What is your rationale for setting the above target(s) for student growth within the interval of instruction? Include rationale for any decisions made at the building or district levels related to selection of the student population, content, assessment, and growth targets.

By demonstrating growth in the higher range of previous scores, lower performing students in the *below basic* and *basic* categories will substantially raise their average performance and start to close their performance gap. By demonstrating growth near the average student performance in previous years, students performing in the *low proficient* and higher categories also will improve their overall performance. By targeting lower performing students, implementing rigorous mathematics instruction, and focusing on both foundational and conceptual mathematics skills and knowledge, we expect to push all students to improve their performance and academic progress over time. These targets are realistic, given that student performance has remained static in the last two years, but still rigorous enough to reflect significant changes in student performance. These goals reflect the district goal of improving students' mathematics fluency, accuracy, and readiness for more advanced mathematics work in middle and high school and the performance expectations for Ohio's State Assessment. These targets also will help to move our teachers away from looking only at proficiency levels to instead considering growth goals for all students and long-term goals for student performance. To facilitate student attainment of these targets, our school will focus on integrating common goals, data analysis, and conversations about effective strategies in grade-level and whole-school meetings.