PARCC Score Reports
The objective for today is to understand how PARCC score reporting will be different from both NJASK and HSPA. And how those changes will:

- Support student learning
- Help parents know how their children are doing.
- Inform curricular and instructional improvements.

Today's presentation will illustrate how PARCC assessments will inform student learning.
The next few slides show language that has been included in the NJASK Score Interpretation Manual posted on the NJDOE website.

This slide shows the guidance for interpreting the scale scores from NJASK. There are three performance levels in NJASK: Advanced proficient, Proficient, and Partially proficient. And statements about student supports are also included and are underlined in red. The manual says that “It is rare for students” who are Advanced Proficient to need instructional improvement; that it is “typically true” that Proficient students do not need instructional improvements; and that students are Partially Proficient are “most likely” to be in need of instructional supports.
But this slide illustrates one of the key limitations of NJASK. As the test itself was short, there were fewer test questions at the lower range and students who were partially proficient were likely to have more incorrect responses overall. Thus, for partially proficient students who were most likely to need instructional supports, NJASK wasn’t informative as to what the student’s strengths and weaknesses were.

So, the recommendation above in the second paragraph is to use an additional assessment to formulate an instructional plan.
This slide illustrates another important weakness of NJASK: the test sample standards within clusters each year rather than test the full range of grade level standards. Thus, it was not possible to compare cluster means year to year as the difficulty of the cluster could change each year depending on what part of the standards were selected to be assessed. This made it inappropriate to track improvements or declines in clusters, preventing schools and districts from using cluster scores to demonstrate growth or effectiveness of instructional programs and/or supports.
This slide shows the sample NJASK parent letter, which describes the performance levels.
This is an example of a NJASK Individual Student report (ISR). It shows the scale score of the student in each of the three subjects and which performance level the scale score falls into.

NOTE: This is not real student data.
This is a HSPA Individual Student Report (ISR). In addition to showing the scale score and the performance level, it also indicates whether the student ‘passed’ the section of the exam and met state statutory requirements for a demonstration of minimum competency required for graduation.

NOTE: This is not real student data.
This is the second page of the HSPA ISR which shows cluster outcomes for the student. It shows how many points in each cluster a student earned compared to the total possible points.

**NOTE:** This is not real student data.
This is an example of the report that schools and districts were able to download that contained all students tested, their scale and cluster scores.

NOTE: This is not real student data.
So using NJASK and HSPA, schools and districts could engage in conversations that were about comparing their performance to other schools, could determine which students needed additional testing and how various subgroups were performing. It was not possible to reflect on the success of particular instructional and curricular programs.
PARCC data can be used to drive more meaningful conversations around students, standards, instructional improvements, and family engagement.
As with NJASK and HSPA, two copies of a student’s score report will be mailed to the district for distribution to families and to be placed in the student’s educational record.

This is an example of the PARCC student score report. This page addresses the question: “How did my student perform on the English Language Arts/Literacy assessment?” This student received a score of 176 and demonstrated partial command of the standards associated with grade 7 ELA/L. The chart allows parents to understand this student’s performance relative to the school average, the district’s average, the state’s average and the PARCC consortium average.

NOTE: This is not real student data.
This page continues the student report.

Two additional scores are present – one in reading and one in writing. These are sub-scale scores that can be used longitudinally to track progress of a student in both reading and writing. Again, the student’s score is placed in context with scores from the school, district, state and PARCC consortium.

But also, the major categories of both the reading and writing sections are displayed. A green arrow indicates that the student is demonstrating strong command of that category. A blue arrow indicates that the student’s performance in near a strong command. A red arrow indicates that the student’s performance is below a strong command of that category.

This student is demonstrating a strong command of Literary Text, near a strong command of vocabulary and knowledge of conventions, and below a strong command of informational text and writing expressions.

NOTE: This is not real student data.
And the student’s report will – beginning in 2016 – also show how a student grew relative to their academic peer group in New Jersey and also across the PARCC consortium. As we know that students do not begin each academic year in the same place, measuring a student’s growth year over year is a really important measure.

NOTE: This is not real student data.
A second part of the student’s report will show the student’s performance in math.

NOTE: This is not real student data.
... and the student’s performance in all of the categories that make up the math assessment.

NOTE: This is not real student data.
... and a student’s growth in math as well.

NOTE: This is not real student data.
# PARCC by State Summary Report

## Performance Distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
<th>STUDENTS</th>
<th>PERFORMANCE DISTRIBUTION</th>
<th>≥ LVL 4</th>
<th>AVG OVERALL</th>
<th>AVG READING</th>
<th>AVG WRITING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PARCC AVG 13 States</td>
<td>985,414</td>
<td>8% 21% 26% 28% 17%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>2040</td>
<td>13% 19% 28% 18% 22%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>10% 13% 42% 26% 9%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
<td>1770</td>
<td>8% 21% 26% 28% 17%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Performance Levels:**

1. **Minimal Command (150-171)**
2. **Partial Command (172-184)**
3. **Moderate Command (185-199)**
4. **Strong Command (200-212)**
5. **Distinguished Command (213-230)**
## Massachusetts

### 327 Districts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
<th>STUDENTS</th>
<th>PERFORMANCE DISTRIBUTION</th>
<th>≥ LVL 4</th>
<th>AVG OVERALL</th>
<th>AVG READING</th>
<th>AVG WRITING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STATE AVERAGE</td>
<td>81,664</td>
<td>8% 21% 26% 28% 17%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abington School</td>
<td>2040</td>
<td>13% 19% 28% 18% 22%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acton School</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>10% 13% 42% 26% 9%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acushnet School</td>
<td>1770</td>
<td>8% 21% 26% 28% 17%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Performance Levels:**

1. **Minimal Command (150-171)**
2. **Partial Command (172-184)**
3. **Moderate Command (185-199)**
4. **Strong Command (200-212)**
5. **Distinguished Command (213-230)**
# District by School Summary Report

## East Bridgewater School District

### Subject: ELA  
### Grade: 7  
### Results: Summative (Overall)

#### 32 SCHOOLS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
<th>STUDENTS</th>
<th>PERFORMANCE DISTRIBUTION</th>
<th>≥ LVL 4</th>
<th>AVG OVERALL</th>
<th>AVG READING</th>
<th>AVG WRITING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District Avg</td>
<td>5,664</td>
<td>8% 21% 26% 28% 17%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Bridgewater School Dist</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>13% 19% 28% 18% 22%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bongo Cormorant El Sch</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>10% 13% 42% 26% 9%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardinal Basil Sch</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>8% 21% 26% 28% 17%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaur Lagartija Community</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>13% 19% 28% 18% 22%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gibbon Palmcreeper MS</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>10% 13% 42% 26% 9%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Performance Levels:

1. MINIMAL COMMAND (150-171)
2. PARTIAL COMMAND (172-184)
3. MODERATE COMMAND (185-199)
4. STRONG COMMAND (200-212)
5. DISTINGUISHED COMMAND (213-230)
# School by Grade Summary Report

## George Washington Middle School

**Subject:** Math  
**Results:** Summative (Overall)

### Grade 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GRADE/COURSE</th>
<th>PERFORMANCE DISTRIBUTION</th>
<th>STUDENTS</th>
<th>≥ LVL 4</th>
<th>AVG</th>
<th>GROWTH VS STATE</th>
<th>GROWTH VS PARCC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCHOOL</td>
<td>13% 19% 28% 18% 22%</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>45 %ile</td>
<td>39 %ile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISTRICT</td>
<td>10% 13% 42% 26% 9%</td>
<td>6,368</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>33 %ile</td>
<td>31 %ile</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Grade 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GRADE/COURSE</th>
<th>PERFORMANCE DISTRIBUTION</th>
<th>STUDENTS</th>
<th>≥ LVL 4</th>
<th>AVG</th>
<th>GROWTH VS STATE</th>
<th>GROWTH VS PARCC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCHOOL</td>
<td>13% 19% 28% 18% 22%</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>45 %ile</td>
<td>39 %ile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISTRICT</td>
<td>10% 13% 42% 26% 9%</td>
<td>6,368</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>33 %ile</td>
<td>31 %ile</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Performance Levels:**

1. **MINIMAL COMMAND (150-171)**
2. **PARTIAL COMMAND (172-184)**
3. **MODERATE COMMAND (185-199)**
4. **STRONG COMMAND (200-212)**
5. **DISTINGUISHED COMMAND (213-230)**

---

[Image of the PARCC assessment results for George Washington Middle School, detailing school performance by grade and subject, with specific focus on Grade 7 and Grade 8 results.]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STUDENT</th>
<th>OVERALL</th>
<th>MAJOR CONTENT</th>
<th>ADDITIONAL &amp; SUPPORTING</th>
<th>EXPRESSING REASONING</th>
<th>MODELING &amp; APPLICATION</th>
<th>GROWTH VS STATE</th>
<th>GROWTH VS PARCC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ahrens, Manuel</td>
<td>204</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40 %ile</td>
<td>38 %ile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berlin, Hannah</td>
<td>176</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31 %ile</td>
<td>33 %ile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge, Beatrice</td>
<td>217</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>91 %ile</td>
<td>87 %ile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cebrian, Colleen</td>
<td>221</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>72 %ile</td>
<td>60 %ile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colvin, Kenneth</td>
<td>175</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>63 %ile</td>
<td>54 %ile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combs, Kevin</td>
<td>161</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>39 %ile</td>
<td>33 %ile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crittenden, Deanna</td>
<td>189</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>68 %ile</td>
<td>57 %ile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croft, Sheryl</td>
<td>203</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31 %ile</td>
<td>28 %ile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dillingham, Marvin</td>
<td>222</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>54 %ile</td>
<td>48 %ile</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Student Roster – Item Scores

**PARCC**
Assessment Results: 2014 - 2015

Home > Massachusetts > East Bridgewater School District > George Washington Middle School > Grade 8

Grade 8

Subject: **Math**
Results: **Summative (Overall)**

79 STUDENTS

**STUDENT**
**OVERALL** | **ITEM 1 5 PTS** | **ITEM 2 6 PTS** | **ITEM 3 4 PTS** | **ITEM 4 5 PTS** | **ITEM 5 6 PTS** | **ITEM 6 4 PTS** | **ITEM 7 5 PTS**
---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---
SCHOOL AVG
George Washington Middle School
183 | 3.6 | 5.2 | 3.2 | 3.6 | 5.2 | 3.2 | 3.6

Ahrens, Manuel
204 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 5

Berlin, Hannah
176 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3
This is a list of supports that PARCC and NJDOE is developing to support the use of these reports.
The PARCC partnership resource center will have the following:

- Released test questions, tech-enabled
- Student responses/exemplars
- Build/Edit your own test questions
- Digital library/courses, identified by standards
- Diagnostic/Non-Summative tests
  - Provided in 2015-2016 at no costs to districts

Finally, the resource center will also contain PARCC’s diagnostic and non-summative tests, provided next year at no-cost to the districts. These tools will allow teachers to select assessment modules to use in classroom instruction, as both a pre- or post-test.