

PARCC RESULTS:  
SPRING 2015 AND SPRING 2016  
ADMINISTRATIONS

CHARLES SEIPP  
ASSISTANT SUPERINTENDENT  
ROXBURY PUBLIC SCHOOLS

SEPTEMBER 6, 2016

Measuring  
College and  
Career Readiness

# NEW JERSEY'S STATEWIDE ASSESSMENT PROGRAM

- 2016 marks the 2<sup>nd</sup> administration of the Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers (PARCC) and the first opportunity to compare year-to-year results as the following slides will show.
- Students took PARCC English Language Arts and Literacy Assessments (ELA/L) in grades 3 – 11.
- Students took PARCC Mathematics Assessments in grades 3 – 8 and End of Course Assessments in Algebra I, Geometry, and Algebra II.

# PARCC PERFORMANCE LEVELS

- Level 1: Not yet meeting grade-level expectations
- Level 2: Partially meeting grade-level expectations
- Level 3: Approaching grade-level expectations
- Level 4: Meeting grade-level expectations
- Level 5: Exceeding grade-level expectations

## COMPARISON OF NEW JERSEY'S SPRING 2015 AND SPRING 2016 PARCC ADMINISTRATIONS ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS/LITERACY

	Not Yet Meeting Expectations (Level 1)		Partially Meeting Expectations (Level 2)		Approaching Expectations (Level 3)		Meeting Expectations (Level 4)		Exceeding Expectations (Level 5)		% Change in Level 1 and Level 2	% Change in Level 4 and Level 5 (College and Career Ready)
	2015	<b>2016</b>	2015	<b>2016</b>	2015	<b>2016</b>	2015	<b>2016</b>	2015	<b>2016</b>		
Grade 3	15.1%	<b>13.5%</b>	17.8%	<b>16.0%</b>	23.7%	<b>23.0%</b>	38.6%	<b>41.3%</b>	4.9%	<b>6.2%</b>	↓ 3.4%	↑ 4.1%
Grade 4	7.8%	<b>8.2%</b>	14.5%	<b>13.5%</b>	26.6%	<b>24.8%</b>	39.4%	<b>40.8%</b>	11.7%	<b>12.7%</b>	↓ 0.6%	↑ 2.4%
Grade 5	7.2%	<b>6.7%</b>	15.1%	<b>14.7%</b>	26.1%	<b>25.3%</b>	45.1%	<b>46.4%</b>	6.4%	<b>6.9%</b>	↓ 0.9%	↑ 1.7%
Grade 6	7.9%	<b>7.5%</b>	15.5%	<b>14.1%</b>	27.8%	<b>26.2%</b>	39.7%	<b>41.3%</b>	9.1%	<b>11.0%</b>	↓ 1.9%	↑ 3.5%
Grade 7	10.8%	<b>9.5%</b>	14.5%	<b>12.5%</b>	23.1%	<b>21.6%</b>	33.9%	<b>35.6%</b>	17.7%	<b>20.7%</b>	↓ 3.3%	↑ 4.7%
Grade 8	11.5%	<b>10.1%</b>	14.6%	<b>13.0%</b>	22.3%	<b>21.7%</b>	39.1%	<b>40.7%</b>	12.5%	<b>14.5%</b>	↓ 3.0%	↑ 3.6%
Grade 9	17.6%	<b>12.9%</b>	19.0%	<b>15.0%</b>	23.6%	<b>23.1%</b>	30.3%	<b>35.8%</b>	9.5%	<b>13.2%</b>	↓ 8.7%	↑ 9.2%
Grade 10	25.3%	<b>20.9%</b>	17.7%	<b>14.2%</b>	20.3%	<b>20.4%</b>	25.6%	<b>31.0%</b>	11.0%	<b>13.4%</b>	↓ 7.8%	↑ 7.7%
Grade 11*	16.7%	<b>18.5%</b>	18.7%	<b>18.1%</b>	23.5%	<b>23.3%</b>	30.1%	<b>31.7%</b>	10.9%	<b>8.4%</b>	↑ 1.1%	↓ 0.9%

\*Grade 11 does not include students who took an AP/IB test.

Notes: Data shown is preliminary. Percentages may not total 100 due to rounding.

## COMPARISON OF NEW JERSEY'S SPRING 2015 AND SPRING 2016 PARCC ADMINISTRATIONS MATHEMATICS

	Not Yet Meeting Expectations (Level 1)		Partially Meeting Expectations (Level 2)		Approaching Expectations (Level 3)		Meeting Expectations (Level 4)		Exceeding Expectations (Level 5)		% Change in Level 1 and Level 2	% Change in Level 4 and Level 5 (College and Career Ready)
	2015	2016	2015	2016	2015	2016	2015	2016	2015	2016		
Grade 3	8.3%	<b>8.1%</b>	18.5%	<b>15.9%</b>	28.3%	<b>24.3%</b>	36.9%	<b>39.0%</b>	8.0%	<b>12.7%</b>	↓ 2.8%	↑ 6.8%
Grade 4	7.2%	<b>8.0%</b>	21.9%	<b>18.6%</b>	30.3%	<b>26.8%</b>	36.3%	<b>41.2%</b>	4.3%	<b>5.4%</b>	↓ 2.5%	↑ 5.9%
Grade 5	6.1%	<b>6.2%</b>	20.7%	<b>18.3%</b>	32.1%	<b>28.2%</b>	34.9%	<b>38.4%</b>	6.1%	<b>8.8%</b>	↓ 2.3%	↑ 6.2%
Grade 6	7.6%	<b>8.9%</b>	21.4%	<b>19.1%</b>	30.2%	<b>29.1%</b>	34.8%	<b>35.6%</b>	6.0%	<b>7.3%</b>	↓ 1.0%	↑ 2.2%
Grade 7	7.7%	<b>9.0%</b>	22.3%	<b>20.1%</b>	33.3%	<b>32.3%</b>	33.0%	<b>33.5%</b>	3.8%	<b>5.2%</b>	↓ 0.9%	↑ 1.9%
Grade 8*	21.9%	<b>21.5%</b>	26.2%	<b>25.3%</b>	28.4%	<b>27.5%</b>	23.0%	<b>24.9%</b>	0.5%	<b>0.7%</b>	↓ 1.3%	↑ 2.1%
Algebra I	13.8%	<b>12.8%</b>	25.3%	<b>21.3%</b>	25.0%	<b>24.8%</b>	32.9%	<b>37.3%</b>	3.1%	<b>3.9%</b>	↓ 5.0%	↑ 5.2%
Algebra II	31.7%	<b>33.5%</b>	24.5%	<b>22.6%</b>	19.9%	<b>18.8%</b>	22.3%	<b>22.7%</b>	1.6%	<b>2.4%</b>	↓ 0.1%	↑ 1.1%
Geometry	12.4%	<b>10.5%</b>	35.6%	<b>31.1%</b>	29.7%	<b>31.4%</b>	19.5%	<b>23.2%</b>	2.9%	<b>3.8%</b>	↓ 6.3%	↑ 4.6%

\*Approximately 30,000 New Jersey students in grade 8 participated in the PARCC Algebra I assessment. Thus, PARCC Math 8 outcomes are not representative of grade 8 performance as a whole.

Notes: Data shown is preliminary. Percentages may not total 100 due to rounding.

**COMPARISON OF NEW JERSEY STUDENTS TESTED  
 SPRING 2015 AND SPRING 2016 PARCC ADMINISTRATIONS  
 ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS/LITERACY**

	Students Tested		Year to Year Increase
	2016	2015	
Grade 3	99,045	95,227	3,818
Grade 4	96,823	93,769	3,054
Grade 5	95,760	94,599	1,161
Grade 6	96,896	92,578	4,318
Grade 7	95,979	90,227	5,752
Grade 8	94,266	88,421	5,845
Grade 9	93,830	81,574	12,256
Grade 10	84,903	71,659	13,244
Grade 11*	68,862	61,768	7,094
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>826,364</b>	<b>769,822</b>	<b>56,542</b>

\*Grade 11 does not include students who took an AP/IB test.

Note: Data shown is preliminary. "Students Tested" represents individual valid test scores for English Language Arts/Literacy.

**COMPARISON OF NEW JERSEY STUDENTS TESTED  
SPRING 2015 AND SPRING 2016 PARCC ADMINISTRATIONS  
MATHEMATICS**

	Students Tested		Year to Year Increase
	2016	2015	
Grade 3	99,846	95,932	3,914
Grade 4	97,620	94,484	3,136
Grade 5	96,449	95,293	1,156
Grade 6	97,546	93,128	4,418
Grade 7	93,114	87,300	5,814
Grade 8*	60,768	58,078	2,690
Algebra I	106,118	91,740	14,378
Algebra II	74,643	58,026	16,617
Geometry	84,589	71,137	13,452
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>810,693</b>	<b>745,118</b>	<b>65,575</b>

\*Approximately 30,000 New Jersey students in grade 8 participated in the PARCC Algebra I assessment in place of the 8<sup>th</sup> grade Math assessment.

Notes: Data shown is preliminary. "Students Tested" represents individual valid test scores for Mathematics.

# ROXBURY STRATEGIC PLANNING GOAL #1

- Enhance an active, inclusive and multifaceted learning experience that maximized each student's potential and empowers individual achievement
  - Modification to EMS schedule
  - Application for AP Capstone Program
  - Curricular improvements at all levels including adoption of FOSS Science in Grades 3 – 5
  - **Data analysis:** Renaissance, **PARCC**, and benchmark assessments
  - Expansion of 1:1 program Grades 5 – 12
  - Expansion of EMS and RTHS electives



# COMPARISON OF ROXBURY'S SPRING 2015 AND SPRING 2016 PARCC ADMINISTRATIONS ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS/LITERACY

	Not Yet Meeting Expectations (Level 1)		Partially Meeting Expectations (Level 2)		Approaching Expectations (Level 3)		Meeting Expectations (Level 4)		Exceeding Expectations (Level 5)	
	2015	2016	2015	2016	2015	2016	2015	2016	2015	2016
Grade 3	10%	<b>5%</b>	13%	<b>15%</b>	25%	<b>25%</b>	49%	<b>50%</b>	3%	<b>5%</b>
Grade 4	3%	<b>4%</b>	21%	<b>8%</b>	34%	<b>28%</b>	37%	<b>51%</b>	6%	<b>9%</b>
Grade 5	3%	<b>4%</b>	18%	<b>19%</b>	30%	<b>33%</b>	47%	<b>42%</b>	2%	<b>1%</b>
Grade 6	6%	<b>4%</b>	9%	<b>13%</b>	32%	<b>33%</b>	48%	<b>39%</b>	5%	<b>11%</b>
Grade 7	7%	<b>6%</b>	12%	<b>6%</b>	26%	<b>19%</b>	39%	<b>44%</b>	16%	<b>25%</b>
Grade 8	10%	<b>8%</b>	15%	<b>8%</b>	27%	<b>27%</b>	45%	<b>46%</b>	2%	<b>12%</b>
Grade 9	15%	<b>8%</b>	21%	<b>14%</b>	26%	<b>33%</b>	29%	<b>40%</b>	9%	<b>5%</b>
Grade 10	38%	<b>35%</b>	24%	<b>18%</b>	20%	<b>21%</b>	14%	<b>20%</b>	5%	<b>7%</b>
Grade 11*	31%	<b>51%</b>	13%	<b>26%</b>	24%	<b>14%</b>	16%	<b>8%</b>	16%	<b>1%</b>

\*Grade 11 does not include students who took an AP/IB test.

Notes: Percentages may not total 100 due to rounding.

## COMPARISON OF ROXBURY'S SPRING 2015 AND SPRING 2016 PARCC ADMINISTRATIONS MATHEMATICS

	Not Yet Meeting Expectations (Level 1)		Partially Meeting Expectations (Level 2)		Approaching Expectations (Level 3)		Meeting Expectations (Level 4)		Exceeding Expectations (Level 5)	
	2015	2016	2015	2016	2015	2016	2015	2016	2015	2016
Grade 3	5%	<b>6%</b>	8%	<b>13%</b>	27%	<b>35%</b>	42%	<b>37%</b>	8%	<b>10%</b>
Grade 4	5%	<b>6%</b>	31%	<b>15%</b>	29%	<b>29%</b>	33%	<b>46%</b>	2%	<b>3%</b>
Grade 5	3%	<b>4%</b>	16%	<b>17%</b>	39%	<b>38%</b>	38%	<b>36%</b>	3%	<b>5%</b>
Grade 6	3%	<b>5%</b>	15%	<b>20%</b>	35%	<b>32%</b>	45%	<b>37%</b>	3%	<b>6%</b>
Grade 7	3%	<b>5%</b>	15%	<b>13%</b>	34%	<b>33%</b>	44%	<b>42%</b>	5%	<b>7%</b>
Grade 8*	18%	<b>12%</b>	24%	<b>23%</b>	36%	<b>32%</b>	22%	<b>32%</b>	0%	<b>0%</b>
Algebra I	13%	<b>7%</b>	30%	<b>18%</b>	19%	<b>25%</b>	36%	<b>48%</b>	3%	<b>3%</b>
Algebra II	30%	<b>34%</b>	21%	<b>20%</b>	21%	<b>15%</b>	27%	<b>29%</b>	1%	<b>1%</b>
Geometry	7%	<b>10%</b>	26%	<b>33%</b>	38%	<b>38%</b>	29%	<b>19%</b>	1%	<b>0%</b>

\*Some students in grade 8 participated in the PARCC Algebra I assessment in place of the 8<sup>th</sup> grade Math assessment. Thus, PARCC Math 8 outcomes are not representative of grade 8 performance as a whole.

Notes: Percentages may not total 100 due to rounding.

# COMPARISON OF ROXBURY'S 2015-2016 SPRING PARCC ADMINISTRATIONS ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS/LITERACY

	% Change in Level 1 and Level 2				% Change in Level 4 and Level 5			
	2015	2016		Change	2015	2016		Change
Grade 3	23	20	↓	3.0%	52	55	↑	3.0%
Grade 4	24	12	↓	12.0%	43	60	↑	17.0%
Grade 5	21	23	↑	2.0%	49	43	↓	6.0%
Grade 6	15	17	↑	2.0%	53	50	↓	3.0%
Grade 7	19	12	↓	7.0%	55	69	↑	14.0%
Grade 8	25	16	↓	9.0%	47	58	↑	11.0%
Grade 9	36	22	↓	14.0%	38	45	↑	7.0%
Grade 10	62	53	↓	9.0%	19	27	↑	8.0%
Grade 11*	44	77	↑	33.0%	32	9	↓	23.0%

\*Grade 11 does not include students who took an AP/IB test.

Notes: Percentages may not total 100 due to rounding.

- An up arrow indicates an increase of the % change from the previous year where a down arrow shows a decrease of the % change from the previous year.

# COMPARISON OF ROXBURY'S 2015-2016 SPRING PARCC ADMINISTRATIONS MATHEMATICS

	% Change in Level 1 and Level 2				% Change in Level 4 and Level 5			
	2015	2016		Change	2015	2016		Change
Grade 3	13	19	↓	6.0%	50	47	↓	3.0%
Grade 4	36	21	↓	15.0%	35	49	↑	14.0%
Grade 5	19	21	↓	2.0%	41	41	↔	0.0%
Grade 6	18	25	↓	7.0%	48	43	↓	5.0%
Grade 7	18	18	↔	0.0%	49	49	↔	0.0%
Grade 8	42	35	↓	7.0%	22	32	↑	10.0%
Algebra I*	43	25	↓	18.0%	39	51	↑	12.0%
Algebra II	51	54	↑	3.0%	28	30	↑	2.0%
Geometry	33	43	↓	10.0%	30	19	↓	11.0%

\*Some students in grade 8 participated in the PARCC Algebra I assessment in place of the 8<sup>th</sup> grade Math assessment. Thus, PARCC Math 8 outcomes are not representative of grade 8 performance as a whole.

Notes: Data shown is preliminary. Percentages may not total 100 due to rounding.

- An up arrow indicates an increase of the % change from the previous year where a down arrow shows a decrease of the % change from the previous year.

# COMPARISON OF ROXBURY'S 2015-2016 SPRING PARCC ADMINISTRATIONS % MET OR EXCEEDED EXPECTATIONS

## Language Arts/Literacy

School	Grade	Content	% change Grade Level	% Change Student cohort
Franklin	3	ELA	6%	
Jefferson	3	ELA	9%	
Kennedy	3	ELA	-8%	
Nixon	3	ELA	1%	
Franklin	4	ELA	15%	12%
Jefferson	4	ELA	16%	17%
Kennedy	4	ELA	-3%	-9%
Nixon	4	ELA	40%	8%
L/R	5	ELA	-6%	0%
L/R	6	ELA	-3%	-1%
EMS	7	ELA	14%	16%
EMS	8	ELA	11%	3%
RHS	9	ELA	7%	-2%
RHS	10	ELA	8%	-11%
RHS	11	ELA	-23%	-10%

## Mathematics

School	Grade	Content	% change Grade Level	% Change Student cohort
Franklin	3	Math	6%	
Jefferson	3	Math	2%	
Kennedy	3	Math	-21%	
Nixon	3	Math	-3%	
Franklin	4	Math	19%	9%
Jefferson	4	Math	-2%	19%
Kennedy	4	Math	11%	-28%
Nixon	4	Math	34%	-10%
L/R	5	Math	0%	6%
L/R	6	Math	-5%	2%
EMS	7	Math	0%	1%
EMS	8	Math	10%	
EMS	8	Algebra I	5%	
RHS		Algebra I	19%	13%
RHS		Geometry	-11%	-20%
RHS		Algebra II	2%	0%

# ROXBURY'S

## 2016 SPRING PARCC SCHOOL- & GRADE-LEVEL OUTCOMES

### ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS/LITERACY

	Grade 3 % >= Level 4	Grade 4 % >= Level 4	Grade 5 % >= Level 4	Grade 6 % >= Level 4	Grade 7 % >= Level 4	Grade 8 % >= Level 4	Grade 9 % >= Level 4	Grade 10 % >= Level 4	Grade 11 % >= Level 4
State	47	54	53	52	57	56	48	43	39
Franklin	54	59							
Jefferson	58	66							
Kennedy	47	47							
Nixon	59	66							
L/R			43	50					
EMS					69	58			
RHS							45	27	9

# ROXBURY'S 2016 SPRING PARCC SCHOOL- & GRADE-LEVEL OUTCOMES MATHEMATICS

	Grade 3 % >= Level 4	Grade 4 % >= Level 4	Grade 5 % >= Level 4	Grade 6 % >= Level 4	Grade 7 % >= Level 4	Grade 8 % >= Level 4	Algebra I % >= Level 4	Algebra II % >= Level 4	Geometry % >= Level 4
State	52	46	47	43	38	26	41	25	27
Franklin	46	50							
Jefferson	46	64							
Kennedy	37	30							
Nixon	58	51							
L/R			41	43					
EMS					49	32	100		
RHS							35	30	19

COMPARISON OF ROXBURY'S  
STUDENTS TESTED  
SPRING 2015 AND SPRING 2016 PARCC ADMINISTRATIONS  
ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS/LITERACY

	Students Tested		Year to Year Increase
	2016	2015	
Grade 3	213	197	+16
Grade 4	224	193	+31
Grade 5	213	191	+22
Grade 6	238	211	+27
Grade 7	283	179	+104
Grade 8	236	174	+62
Grade 9	336	149	+187
Grade 10	304	144	+160
Grade 11*	151	59	+92
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2198</b>	<b>1497</b>	<b>+701</b>

\*Grade 11 does not include students who took an AP/IB test.

Note: "Students Tested" represents individual valid test scores for English Language Arts/Literacy.



COMPARISON OF ROXBURY'S  
STUDENTS TESTED  
SPRING 2015 AND SPRING 2016 PARCC ADMINISTRATIONS  
MATHEMATICS

	Students Tested		Year to Year Increase
	2016	2015	
Grade 3	215	196	+19
Grade 4	225	192	+33
Grade 5	214	191	+23
Grade 6	238	211	+27
Grade 7	284	179	+105
Grade 8*	157	125	+32
Algebra I	343	155	+188
Algebra II	208	72	+136
Geometry	290	133	+157
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2174</b>	<b>1454</b>	<b>+720</b>

\*Some students in grade 8 participated in the PARCC Algebra I assessment in place of the 8<sup>th</sup> grade Math assessment. Thus, PARCC Math 8 outcomes are not representative of grade 8 performance as a whole.

Notes: "Students Tested" represents individual valid test scores for Mathematics.

## ROXBURY'S 2016 SPRING PARCC ADMINISTRATIONS

### ONE BIG HIGHLIGHT

- Nixon – Fourth Grade ELA performance improved by 40%
- Franklin – Fourth Grade Math performance improved by 19%
- Jefferson – Fourth Grade students averaged 77% meeting or exceeding expectations in writing expression and conventions
- Kennedy – Third Grade Math performance improved by 21%
- L/R – Sixth grade outperformed the state and PARCC consortium in LAL and Math
- EMS – Improved in every measure including 100% meeting or exceeding expectations in Algebra I
- RHS – Participation improved over 100% on every test

## ROXBURY'S 2016 SPRING PARCC ADMINISTRATIONS

### ONE BIG GOAL

- Nixon – Increase math focus on connecting content and reasoning skills
- Franklin – Increase use of modeling and reasoning to support mathematical content
- Jefferson – Focus on informational text with content specific vocabulary
- Kennedy – Structure PLC time so teachers can disaggregate data within the grade level clusters
- L/R – Support writing conventions with a focus on informational writing
- EMS – Continue to develop and implement PARCC-like performance tasks aligned to standards
- RHS – Integrate non-fiction/informational texts, as well as analytical reading skills, into instruction across all subject areas.

## COMPARISONS OF SPRING PARCC AND NAEP RESULTS GRADE 4 ELA/L AND MATH GRADE 8 ELA/L

2016 ROXBURY PARCC ELA/L Grade 4	55%
2015 ROXBURY PARCC ELA/L Grade 4	52%
2016 NJ PARCC ELA/L Grade 4	54%
2015 NJ PARCC ELA/L Grade 4	51%
2015 NAEP Reading Grade 4*	43%
2016 ROXBURY PARCC Math Grade 4	49%
2015 ROXBURY PARCC Math Grade 4	35%
2016 NJ PARCC Math Grade 4	47%
2015 NJ PARCC Math Grade 4	41%
2015 NAEP Math Grade 4*	47%
2016 ROXBURY PARCC ELA/L Grade 8	58%
2015 ROXBURY PARCC ELA/L Grade 8	47%
2016 NJ PARCC ELA/L Grade 8	55%
2015 NJ PARCC ELA/L Grade 8	52%
2015 NAEP Reading Grade 8*	41%

\*Reflects National Average Scores

NAEP: National Assessment of Educational Progress: <https://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/>

# QUESTIONS TO GUIDE PARCC DATA REFLECTION

- How will we use PARCC data to identify strengths and gaps that exist in our curriculum and instruction?
- How will we use PARCC data as a tool to address areas in need of improvement or enhancement?
- How can we provide additional resources and support for our educators to meet the learning needs of all our students?

# RESOURCES FOR PARENTS

- Information on the new 2015-16 PARCC Student Reports: [www.state.nj.us/education/assessment/parcc/scores/](http://www.state.nj.us/education/assessment/parcc/scores/)
- Understanding the student score reports (with translations): [understandthescore.org/](http://understandthescore.org/)

