

Evaluation of Local Educational Agency (LEA) with MAP Data 2015

Introduction

Each year, the Local Educational Agency (LEA) Plan is evaluated for its effectiveness. The information in this document serves to contribute to the student achievement component of the LEA Plan.

The first of the five performance goals adopted with the LEA Plan in May 2013 by the Alpine County Unified School District Board of Education is:

All students will reach high standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better, in reading and mathematics by 2013-2014.

As stated in the [LEA Plan Evaluation \(includes AYP and API\)](#) document posted on the district's website, "no state testing in ELA and Math was offered for grades 2-8 in the spring of 2014 as schools transitioned to the Common Core." Therefore the district is using its MAP scores to determine if students are continuing to benefit from the instructional program provided in ELA and Math.

MAP scores were used as the publisher of MAP, Northwestern Evaluation Association (NWEA), has made great efforts to ensure results can be compared across grade levels and that test items measure student mastery of the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) for English Language Arts and Math.

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
Overall MAP Scores for Winter 2014, Fall 2015, and Winter 2015	1
Statistical Test for Significant Differences	3
Conclusion.....	3

Overall MAP Scores for Winter 2014, Fall 2015, and Winter 2015

Student achievement in the Common Core State Standards aligned instruction was measured using MAP assessment results. Reading, Language, and Math scores were compared for three different testing periods: winter 2014, fall 2014, and winter 2015. Tables 1, 2, and 3 below show the results for grades three through eight. Grade levels that had fewer than 10 valid results were not shown for the sake of protecting individual student identity. 64 valid results were obtained for each of these three testing periods and their results are shown in the tables. The results reveal that MAP scores for Reading, Language, and Math increased in the Fall of 2014 from the winter of 2014. The results also reveal scores increased again in the winter of 2015.

Grade Level *	Winter 2014 Reading Map RIT Score	Fall 2014 Reading Map RIT Score	Winter 2015 Reading Map RIT Score
	Mean	Mean	Mean
3	179.1	187.5	193.5
4	198.4	203.0	206.3
5	194.0	205.9	208.9
6	211.1	215.2	216.6
8	218.1	222.4	226.4
Total (64)	199.9	205.0	209.2

Table 1. MAP Reading testing averages for three testing periods – Winter 2014, Fall 2014, and Winter 2015.

* Note: Grade levels with less than 10 students are not shown for the sake of protecting privacy. They are included in totals.

Grade Level *	Winter 2014 Language Map RIT Score	Fall 2014 Language Map RIT Score	Winter 2015 Language Map RIT Score
	Mean	Mean	Mean
3	181.9	191.3	189.4
4	200.8	202.3	207.3
5	200.2	205.0	209.2
6	209.4	209.3	213.3
8	216.4	222.4	224.7
Total (64)	202.0	204.7	208.5

Table 2. MAP Language testing averages for three testing periods– Winter 2014, Fall 2014, and Winter 2015.

* Note: Grade levels with less than 10 students are not shown for the sake of protecting privacy. They are included in totals.

Grade Level *	Winter 2014 Math Map RIT Score	Fall 2014 Math Map RIT Score	Winter 2015 Math Map RIT Score
	Mean	Mean	Mean
3	188.5	193.8	196.4
4	200.7	205.9	207.8
5	201.6	205.7	210.7
6	220.6	218.6	223.2
8	231.2	231.9	239.4
Total (64)	208.4	209.5	214.9

Table 3. MAP Math testing averages for three testing periods– Winter 2014, Fall 2014, and Winter 2015.

* Note: Grade levels with less than 10 students are not shown for the sake of protecting privacy. They are included in totals.

Statistical Test for Significant Differences

Winter 2014 MAP results were compared to winter 2015 results to determine if the differences in growth were statistically significant. A paired samples test was used to make this determination. 44 valid results existed for each assessment, Reading, Language, and Math. That is, 44 students were present during and took both the winter 2014 and winter 2015 assessments.

Table 4 shows that Reading scores grew by 11.02 RIT scores between the winter of 2014 and the winter 2015. This difference was statistically significant. Similarly, language scores grew by 7.16 RIT scores and this difference was statistically significant. Similarly, Math scores increased by 8.32 RIT scores which was also statistically significant. The standard deviations for each difference reveal these differences were also substantial.

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Mean Difference	Std. Deviation	Statistical Significance
Winter 2015 Reading RIT Score	44	207.136	15.8475	11.0227	9.4216	Yes
Winter 2014 Reading RIT Score	44	196.114	18.8213			
Winter 2015 Language RIT Score	44	206.273	16.3485	7.1591	7.2045	Yes
Winter 2014 Language RIT Score	44	199.114	17.8067			
Winter 2015 Math RIT Score	44	212.750	17.3797	8.3182	5.3777	Yes
Winter 2014 Math RIT Score	44	204.432	16.4831			

Conclusion

This report reveals statistically significant and substantial growth occurred in Reading, Language, and Math between the winter of 2014 and winter of 2015. Therefore, this report concludes that students have made significant and substantial progress toward meeting this LEA Plan Goal: **All students will reach high standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better, in reading and mathematics by 2013-2014.**