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## Introduction

The Student Performance Diagnostic provides an institution with a process to report summative student assessments. This diagnostic is significant to the accreditation and continuous improvement process as it serves as a resource for schools to view content area assessment results required by the state, district, or other entities, determine the quality and reliability of the given assessments, and show the alignment of the assessments to the school's curriculum. The performance level computed at the completion of the diagnostic is used by the external review team as a comprehensive report to understand fully the institution's assessment program; the diagnostic should be used in the same manner by the institution as it engages in improvement planning.

## Student Performance Data

| Label | Assurance | Response | Comment | Attachment |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. | Did you complete the Student Performance Data document offline and upload below? | Yes | Attached you will find documents that support our explanations. Please note that our 2014-15 Science have not been posted by the Dept of Education. We are currently in the midst of appealing this issue and expect the data will be provided in the near future. | Nassau County School's AMO ELL STAR Reading Standards Mastery iReady Math Growth iReady Reading Growth <br> ELL STAR Math Standards Mastery FCAT Science 2014-2015 <br> NCSD Assessment 2015 <br> FSA Teacher Results 2014-2015 FSA County Wide Comparison 201415 <br> School Wide Levels By Grade |

## Evaluative Criteria and Rubrics

Overall Rating: 3.25

|  | Statement or Question | Response | Rating |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1. | Assessment Quality | The array of assessment devices used by the <br> institution to determine students' performances <br> is sufficiently aligned so that valid inferences <br> can be reached regarding students' status with <br> respect to the entire set of curricular aims <br> regarded as high-priority, "must accomplish," <br> instructional targets. The documentation <br> provided in support of this alignment is <br> persuasive. All of the assessments used are <br> accompanied by evidence demonstrating that <br> they satisfy accepted technical requirements <br> such as validity, reliability, absence of bias, and <br> instructional sensitivity. |  |
|  |  |  |  |


|  | Statement or Question | Response | Rating |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2. | Test Administration | All the assessments used by the institution to <br> determine students' performances, whether <br> externally acquired or internally developed, <br> have been administered with complete fidelity <br> to the administrative procedures appropriate for <br> each assessment. In every instance, the <br> students to whom these assessments were <br> administered are accurately representative of <br> the students served by the institution. <br> Appropriate accommodations have been <br> provided for all assessments so that valid <br> inferences can be made about all students' <br> status with respect to all of the institution's <br> targeted curricular outcomes. | Level 4 |


|  | Statement or Question | Response | Rating |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 3. | Quality of Learning | Evidence of student learning promoted by the <br> institution is acceptably analyzed and presented <br> with reasonable clarity. In comparison to <br> institutions functioning in a similar educational <br> context, students' status, improvement, and/or <br> growth evidence indicates that the level of <br> student learning is at or above what would <br> otherwise be expected. | Level 3 |


|  | Statement or Question | Response | Rating |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 4. | Equity of Learning | Evidence of student learning indicates <br> achievement gaps exist among subpopulations <br> of students, and these achievement gaps <br> demonstrate a modest decline. | Level 2 |

## Areas of Notable Achievement

## Which area(s) are above the expected levels of performance?

iReady Mathematics data shows that $78 \%$ of our students in grades three through five, and $98 \%$ in Reading are on track to reach targeted growth.

## Describe the area(s) that show a positive trend in performance.

Our total school populations achievement, according to iReady school data and previous year's standardized testing results, show that students are making growth and gains in Math and Reading.

## Which area(s) indicate the overall highest performance?

According to iReady our 4th grade students are our highest achieving grade level with the percent of students being on target to meet their expected growth in Math and Reading by the end of the year.

## Which subgroup(s) show a trend toward increasing performance?

Although data has fluctuated in the past, our White, Hispanic, Black/African American, ELL, and Economically Disadvantaged have increased from 2013 to 2014 in the percent scoring satisfactory in Reading. Our Black/African American, White, and Economically Disadvantaged have also increased in the percent scoring satisfactory in Math.

## Between which subgroups is the achievement gap closing?

Our achievement gap is closing with our economically disadvantaged students, White, Hispanic, and African American based on students scoring satisfactory from 2013-2014 in Reading. In Math, our economically disadvantaged students, African American, and White students increased in percent of students scoring satisfactory from 2013-2014.

## Which of the above reported findings are consistent with findings from other data sources?

Using Scale Scores from Renaissance Learning (STAR Reading and Math) it is apparent that all three grade levels are achieving above the state levels of achievement at this time. For example, Third grade students have an average scale score of approximately 100 points above the state scale score threshold of 385 to be at grade level performance.

## Areas in Need of Improvement

## Which area(s) are below the expected levels of performance?

In terms of our total school population according to iReady 2\% of our students in Reading are not showing progress towards meeting targeted growth. In Math, 32\% of our students are not showing progress towards meeting targeted growth.

## Describe the area(s) that show a negative trend in performance.

When comparing window 1 to window 2 in iReady Reading grades 3 and 5 show $13 \%$, and $7 \%$ of students who are not on target towards meeting yearly proficiency targets. In iReady Math grades 3 and 5 show $30 \%$ and $35 \%$ of students who are not on target towards meeting yearly proficiency targets

## Which area(s) indicate the overall lowest performance?

In terms of our Reading and Math proficiency iReady data demonstrates that our student performance in Math is an area of concern compared to Reading. More specifically data indicates our third grade is the lowest performing grade level in Reading, where $13 \%$ are not meeting target growth levels. In addition our fifth grade is the lowest performing grade level in Math, where $35 \%$ of students are not meeting targeted growth levels.

## Which subgroup(s) show a trend toward decreasing performance?

After analyzing two years of student data, it is apparent that subgroup Students with Disabilities is demonstrating decreasing performance levels. Specifically, the percent scoring satisfactorily from 2013-2014 has dropped from $43 \%$ to $38 \%$ in Reading. In addition, subgroups Hispanic, English Language Learners (ELL) and Students with Disabilities are also demonstrating decreasing performance. During the year 2013-2014, Hispanic achievement levels dropped from 58 to $51 \%$, ELLs dropped from 38 to $20 \%$, and Students with Disabilities dropped from 38 to $37 \%$ in Math.

## Between which subgroups is the achievement gap becoming greater?

In Reading, Students with Disabilities scores indicated that the number of these students who are not scoring satisfactorily continues to increase, ie., from $43 \%$ to $38 \%$. In Math, our English Language Learners also continue to experience less student achievement, ie., $38 \%$ to 20\%.

## Which of the above reported findings are consistent with findings from other data sources?

According to the Renaissance Place (STAR Reading and Math Tests) Mastery of State Standards Report, many of our ELL students are
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currently below estimated mastery levels of the FL. State Standards in Reading and Math.
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