**APPENDIX I –** **SPECIAL EDUCATION AND**

**ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNER PROGRAM SELF EVALUATIONS**

**Special Education MCAS Data**

**Number of WDS:** 14

**Grade:** 5

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Score** | **ELA** | **Math** | **Science** |
| A/P | 2 | 1 | 5 |
| NI | 7 | 4 | 6 |
| W | 5 | 9 | 3 |

**2012-2013: Special Education and ELL program Review**

**Growth in math was comparable for students**

**with and without IEPs.**
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**ELL MCAS Data**

* *Our ELL population had higher growth than our non-ELL population but didn’t have the same success in math.*
* *ELA MCAS Results:*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Group | % Advanced | %Proficient | % Needs Improvement | %Warning/Failing |
| ELL | 2 | 29 | 55 | 14 |
| Non-ELL | 17 | 58 | 20 | 4 |

* *Math MCAS Results:*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Group | % Advanced | %Proficient | % Needs Improvement | %Warning/Failing |
| ELL | 7 | 24 | 38 | 31 |
| Non-ELL | 30 | 41 | 22 | 8 |

**2012-2013: Special Education and ELL program Review**

**ELL students had similar growth in ELA to their**

**non-ELL peers but not in math.**
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**MAP Data (SPED and ELL)**

**Table 1: Percent of students in each quartile making or exceeding quartile specific growth goals**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Quartile** | **Reading** | **Math** |
| **Bottom (2x typical)** | 74% | 42% |
| **2nd (1.75x)** | 59% | 68% |
| **3rd (1.5x)** | 42% | 70% |
| **Top (1.25x)** | 33% | 33% |
| ***Overall*** | *61%* | *55%* |

Reading matches the network-wide trend, but math does not. The logical next question seemed to be, “Why might the bottom quartile have had a lower performance in math?” Based on the data available, the primary difference between the group students in the bottom quartile that did not make their growth goals and those that did seems to relate to disability status. Having an IEP itself made a difference, as the percentage of students with an IEP in the group that did not meet these goals was 40% higher than the group that did, but there seems to be more to the story. The students with IEPs that did meet their goals all had a Specific Learning Disability. Students with this disability significantly outperformed students with other disabilities on the math MAP—71% met or exceeded the quartile specific goals, while no students with other disabilities did. Only one of the students with an IEP in the bottom quartile that did not achieve the quartile-specific goals in math had this type disability. The rest had communication, emotional, or neurological disabilities. This difference was not observed in Reading.

**Table 2: Sub-group comparison by median RIT growth**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Reading** | **Math** |
| **IEP** | 12 | 10.5 |
| Nature of Disability: |  |  |
| Intellectual (1 student) | 12 | N/A |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Communication (3) | 25 | 9 |
| Emotional (1) | 15 | 8 |
| Specific Learning Disabilities (7) | 12 | 18 |
| Neurological (1) | 9 | -1 |
| **Non-IEP** | 11.5 | 15 |
| **504 Plan (1)** | 6 | -7 |
| **ELL** | 12 | 12 |
| **Non-ELL** | 11.5 | 16 |
|  ***Overall***  | *12*  | *14.5*  |

Headlines:

* Differences in sub-groups were most pronounced in math – no significant differences between IEP/non-IEP and ELL/non-ELL could be observed in reading.
* The lowest performer in the testing group was the one student with a 504 plan
* Students had higher RIT growth in math, but more students met or exceeded their growth goals in Reading. One cause of this is that typical growth in reading is several points lower in math.
* Students with Specific Learning Disabilities had higher performance in math than reading, but students with other disability types had higher performance in reading.

# Lessons Learned and Next Steps

## Continue to improve the quantity and quality of coaching

*-All teachers have access to a coach to give them feedback*

*-Weekly instructional coaching meetings*

*-Hired an in house Director of Special Education and ELL*

* *Continue to use and refine our interims.*

*-Collect better data on students all year long*

*-Hired an on staff data analyst*

* *Continue to invest students and families in using data as a tool for growth.*
* *Increase the rigor of curriculum using Common Core resources.*
* *Collect and use data on a daily basis to drive flexible intervention.*
* *Extend the use of data from academics into character and behavioral progress.*