

# 2016 Grades 3-8 English Language Arts and Mathematics Results



September 12, 2016



# Heard From Parents, Teachers, Students & Administrators

- Traveled approximately 35,000 miles by car to speak with parents, teachers, students, administrators, and school board members
- Visited more than
  - 30 counties
  - 33 school districts
  - 105 different schools
- What I heard was things needed to change; so we have done just that

# Made Sensible Changes to Improve Testing Experience

- Started with a new test vendor; even greater teacher involvement
- Reduced the number of questions on every grade 3-8 assessment
- Allowed students working productively to complete their exams
- Released more test questions than ever before and earlier to support instruction

# Changes Made As a Result of a Deliberate Process

- Started multi-year process with the Board of Regents report in June 2015
- Listened to feedback from parents, teachers, administrators and students
- Made recommendations as part of Governor's Task Force
- Presented changes to the Board of Regents in December 2015
- Implemented the changes in time for the spring 2016 exams

# 2016 Test Different Than Previous Years

- The content of the 2016 Tests and 2015 Tests is comparable.
- The items used on the 2016 Tests and 2015 Tests is similarly rigorous
- However, because of the changes made to the 2016 exam and testing environment, the 2016 tests scores are not an “apples-to-apples” comparison with previous years

# 2016 Summary - Statewide

- In ELA this year, the percentage of all test takers in grades 3-8 who scored at the proficient level (Levels 3 and 4) went up by 6.6 percentage points to 37.9, up from 31.3 in 2015.
- In math, the percentage of all test takers who scored at the proficient level increased this year to 39.1, up one percentage point from 38.1 in 2015.
- Given the numerous changes in the tests, we cannot pinpoint exactly why the test scores increased

<b>% of Students Proficient in Grades 3-8</b>			
	<b>2015</b>	<b>2016*</b>	<b>Percentage Point Change</b>
<b>Statewide Combined Grades ELA</b>	31.3	37.9	6.6
<b>Statewide Combined Grades Math</b>	38.1	39.1	1

\*Due to changes in the 2016 exams, the proficiency rates from exams prior to 2016 are not directly comparable to the 2016 proficiency rates

# 2016 Summary – NYC

The percentage of NYC students who scored at the proficient level increased in both ELA and math and NYC now meets the rest of the State in proficiency in ELA.

<b>% of Students Proficient in Grades 3-8</b>			
	2015	2016*	Percentage Point Change
<b>Statewide Combined Grades ELA</b>	31.3	37.9	6.6
<b>NYC Combined Grades ELA</b>	30.4	38	7.6
<b>Statewide Combined Grades Math</b>	38.1	39.1	1
<b>NYC Combined Grades Math</b>	35.2	36.4	1.2

# 2016 Summary – Big 5 School Districts

Most Big 5 schools saw increases in ELA with smaller increases in math

<b>% of Students Proficient in ELA in Grades 3-8</b>			
	2015	2016*	Percentage Point Change
New York City	30.4	38	7.6
Buffalo	11.9	16.4	4.5
Rochester	4.7	6.7	2
Syracuse	8.1	10.9	2.8
Yonkers	20.3	26	5.7
<b>% of Students Proficient in Math in Grades 3-8</b>			
	2015	2016*	Percentage Point Change
New York City	35.2	36.4	1.2
Buffalo	15.1	16.1	1
Rochester	7.4	7.2	-0.2
Syracuse	9.4	10.4	1
Yonkers	24	24.6	0.6

\*Due to changes in the 2016 exams, the proficiency rates from exams prior to 2016 are not directly comparable to the 2016 proficiency rates



# 2016 Summary – Proficiency by Race/Ethnicity

- Black and Hispanic student proficiency went up in 2016 on the ELA exam and more modestly in math.
- Overall, black and Hispanic statewide proficiency saw a larger percentage-point increase than their white peers.
- As a result, the achievement gap between black and Hispanic student proficiency from the proficiency of their white peers closed slightly.

<b>% of Students Proficient in Grades 3-8</b>			
	2015	2016*	Percentage Point Change
<b>Black ELA</b>	18.5	26.2	7.7
<b>Hispanic ELA</b>	19.7	26.8	7.1
<b>White ELA</b>	40.4	46.0	5.6
<b>Math</b>			
<b>Black Math</b>	21.3	23.0	1.7
<b>Hispanic Math</b>	24.5	25.7	1.2
<b>White Math</b>	49.7	50.0	0.3

\*Due to changes in the 2016 exams, the proficiency rates from exams prior to 2016 are not directly comparable to the 2016 proficiency rates

# 2016 Summary – Charter Schools

- Charter school students' proficiency on the ELA exam across grades 3-8 went up this year, more so for students attending charter schools in New York City.
- In math, student proficiency went up less.

<b>% of Students Proficient in Grades 3-8</b>			
	2015	2016*	Percentage Point Change
<b>Charter Schools Combined Grades ELA</b>	27.5	40.3	12.8
<b>NYC Charter Combined Grades ELA</b>	29.3	43	13.7
<b>Charter Schools Combined Grades Math</b>	41.5	45.4	3.9
<b>NYC Charter Combined Grades Math</b>	44.2	48.7	4.5

\*Due to changes in the 2016 exams, the proficiency rates from exams prior to 2016 are not directly comparable to the 2016 proficiency rates

# Early Grade ELA Proficiency

- Grades 3 and 4 saw the biggest change in student proficiency on the ELA exam this year was in.
- Statewide, the percentage of third graders who scored at the proficient level increased by 10.9 percentage points; the percentage of fourth graders increased 8.1 percentage points.

% of Students Proficient in ELA in Grades 3 & 4			
	2015	2016*	Percentage Point Change
<b>Statewide Combined Grade 3 ELA</b>	31	41.9	10.9
<b>Statewide Combined Grade 4 ELA</b>	32.7	40.8	8.1

# Variety of Factors May Have Contributed:

These differences may be the result of a number of factors, including the following:

- Reduced number of test questions on every assessment
- Allowed students who are productively working to complete their exams
- Students in grades 3 & 4 have received instruction in the new learning standards since kindergarten and first grade
- Teachers have had an additional year of experience with the State's higher learning standards


# Test Refusal Remains Flat

- The test refusal rate was approximately 21% in 2016
- This remains relatively flat compared to the previous year

**2016**  
**Grades 3-8**  
**English Language Arts Test**  
**Results**


# Students Scoring at Proficiency Level Statewide Increased in ELA

The percentage of students who met or exceeded the ELA proficiency standard (Levels 3 and 4) increased to 37.9 in 2016 from 31.3 in 2015, an increase of 6.6 percent.



Percentage of All Test Takers Statewide in 2013, 2014, 2015, and 2016 who scored at Level 2 & Above and Level 3 & Above by Grade Level


# 2016 Statewide Proficiency in ELA






# NYC Students Parallel the State's Increase in ELA

The percentage of students who met or exceeded the ELA proficiency standard increased to 38.0 in 2016 from 30.4 in 2015, an increase of 7.6 percentage points. NYC now meets the proficiency of Statewide Public Schools.




Percentage of All NYC Test Takers in 2013, 2014, 2015, and 2016 who scored at Level 2 & Above and Level 3 & Above by Grade Level

# 2016 NYC Proficiency in ELA



# Big 5 City District Proficiency in ELA

ELA proficiency increased in each Big 5 City School District




Percentage of All Test Takers in 2013, 2014, 2015, and 2016 who scored at Level 2 & Above and Level 3 & Above by Combined Grades

\*Due to changes in the 2016 exams, the proficiency rates from exams prior to 2016 are not directly comparable to the 2016 proficiency rates

# Statewide Proficiency in ELA by Need/Resource Group

ELA proficiency remained consistent for most Need/Resource Groups, with low-need districts continuing to outperform other groups. In addition, Charter Schools demonstrated the largest increase while NYC now meets the proficiency of statewide public schools.




Percentage of All Test Takers in 2013, 2014, 2015, and 2016 who scored at Level 3 & Above by Combined Grades

\*Due to changes in the 2016 exams, the proficiency rates from exams prior to 2016 are not directly comparable to the 2016 proficiency rates

# Statewide Proficiency in ELA by Race/Ethnicity

Increases were seen overall within all Race/Ethnicity groups, with black students showing the largest increase overall and white students showing the least increase. Asian/Pacific Islander students continue to outperform all Race/Ethnicity groups. This year, black and Hispanic Race/Ethnicity groups made the largest increase statewide to continue to close the achievement gap.




Percentage of All Test Takers in 2013, 2014, 2015, and 2016 who scored at Level 2 & Above and Level 3 & Above by Combined Grades

\*Due to changes in the 2016 exams, the proficiency rates from exams prior to 2016 are not directly comparable to the 2016 proficiency rates 21


# NYC Proficiency in ELA by Race/Ethnicity

NYC's proficiency by Race/Ethnicity parallels statewide public school proficiency




Percentage of All Test Takers in 2013, 2014, 2015, and 2016 who scored at Level 2 & Above and Level 3 & Above by Combined Grades

# Girls Continued to Outperform Boys Statewide in ELA in 2016



Percentage of All Test Takers Scoring at Level 2 & Above and Level 3 & Above for 2013, 2014, 2015, and 2016 Combined Grades

# Across all Race/Ethnicity groups, girls performed better than boys statewide




Percentage of All Test Takers Scoring at Level 2 & Above and Level 3 & Above for 2016 by Gender and Race/Ethnicity



# Charter School Proficiency in ELA

NYC Charters saw the largest increase, 13.7 percentage points, while the Rest of Charters saw an 8.3 increase




Percentage of All Test Takers in 2013, 2014, 2015, and 2016 who scored at Level 2 & Above and Level 3 & Above by Combined Grades

\*Due to changes in the 2016 exams, the proficiency rates from exams prior to 2016 are not directly comparable to the 2016 proficiency rates


# Statewide English Language Learner Proficiency in ELA

ELL students statewide continued to see increases in ELA scores with a higher percentage of students scoring at Level 2 & above. Ever ELLs have experienced a significant increase, with a higher percentage scoring above proficient than the total public student population.



<sup>1</sup> Students identified as ELL during the reported year.  
<sup>2</sup> Students identified as ELL any year prior to the reported year but not including the reported year.  
<sup>3</sup> Students never reported to have received ELL services.  
 Ever and Never ELLs data are only available for 2014, 2015, and 2016.

# NYC English Language Learners Proficiency in ELA



<sup>1</sup> Students identified as ELL during the reported year.


<sup>2</sup> Students identified as ELL any year prior to the reported year but not including the reported year.

<sup>3</sup> Students never reported to have received ELL services.

Ever and Never ELLs data are only available for 2014, 2015, and 2016.

# Students with Disabilities Proficiency in ELA


7.9 percent of students with disabilities met or exceeded the ELA proficiency standard (Level 3 and 4) in 2016, and the percentage scoring at Level 2 & above increased to 33.8 percent



**2016**  
**Grades 3-8**  
**Math Test Results**

# Students Scoring at Proficiency Level Statewide Went Up Slightly in Math

*A USED waiver eliminated unnecessary double testing and allowed accelerated math students to participate in high school math Regents Exams instead of the Grade 8 Math Test, which may cause a decrease in the percentage proficient in Grade 8 as compared to other grades.*




The Percentage of All Test Takers Statewide in 2013, 2014, 2015, and 2016 who scored at Level 2 & Above and Level 3 & Above by Grade Level

\*Due to changes in the 2016 exams, the proficiency rates from exams prior to 2016 are not directly comparable to the 2016 proficiency rates

# 2016 Statewide Proficiency in Math

The percentage of students scoring at each proficiency level by grade level


*A USED waiver eliminated unnecessary double testing and allowed accelerated math students to participate in high school math Regents Exams instead of the Grade 8 Math Test, which may cause a decrease in the percentage proficient in Grade 8 as compared to other grades.*



# NYC Students Scores in Math

The percentage of students who met or exceeded the proficiency standard increased to 36.4 in 2016 from 35.2 in 2015, an increase of 1.2

*A USED waiver eliminated unnecessary double testing and allowed accelerated math students to participate in high school math Regents Exams instead of the Grade 8 Math Test, which may cause a decrease in the percentage proficient in Grade 8 as compared to other grades.*




Percentage of All NYC Test Takers in 2013, 2014, 2015, and 2016 who scored at Level 2 & Above and Level 3 & Above by Grade Level

\*Due to changes in the 2016 exams, the proficiency rates from exams prior to 2016 are not directly comparable to the 2016 proficiency rates 32




# 2016 NYC Proficiency in Math

*A USED waiver eliminated unnecessary double testing and allowed accelerated math students to participate in high school math Regents Exams instead of the Grade 8 Math Test, which may cause a decrease in the percentage proficient in Grade 8 as compared to other grades.*



# Big 5 City District Proficiency in Math

Most Big 5 city districts had minor increases of students scoring at Level 3 & Above in 2016




Percentage of All Test Takers in 2013, 2014, 2015, and 2016 who scored at Level 2 & Above and Level 3 & Above by Combined Grades

\*Due to changes in the 2016 exams, the proficiency rates from exams prior to 2016 are not directly comparable to the 2016 proficiency rates

# Statewide Proficiency in Math by Need/Resource Group

In 2016, all Need/Resource Groups saw increases in math, with low-need districts continuing to outperform other groups. Charter schools saw the largest increase of 3.9.




Percentage of All Test Takers in 2013, 2014, 2015, and 2016 who scored at Level 3 & Above by Combined Grades

\*Due to changes in the 2016 exams, the proficiency rates from exams prior to 2016 are not directly comparable to the 2016 proficiency rates

# Statewide Proficiency in Math by Race/Ethnicity

All Race/Ethnicity groups had a greater percentage of students meeting or exceeding the math proficiency standard (Levels 3 and 4) in 2016, with the exception of American Indian/Alaska Native students who had a small decrease.


The achievement gap closed slightly but persists statewide.



Percentage of All Test Takers in 2013, 2014, 2015, and 2016 who scored at Level 2 & Above and Level 3 & Above by Combined Grades

\*Due to changes in the 2016 exams, the proficiency rates from exams prior to 2016 are not directly comparable to the 2016 proficiency rates


# NYC Proficiency in Math by Race/Ethnicity



Percentage of All NYC Test Takers Scoring at Level 2 and Above and Level 3 and Above for 2013, 2014, 2015, and 2016

by Combined Grades


# Girls and Boys Performed Similarly Statewide in Math in 2016



Percentage of All Test Takers Scoring at Level 2 and Above and Level 3 and Above for 2013, 2014, 2015, and 2016 by Combined Grades

\*Due to changes in the 2016 exams, the proficiency rates from exams prior to 2016 are not directly comparable to the 2016 proficiency rates

# Across all Race/Ethnicity groups, girls and boys performed similarly in math




Percentage of All Test Takers Scoring at Level 2 & Above and Level 3 & Above for 2016 by Gender and Race/Ethnicity

# Charter School Proficiency in Math

NYC Charters saw the largest increase of students scoring at the proficient level, 4.5 percentage points, while the Rest of State Charters saw a 0.7 increase

2013 2014 2015 2016




The Percentage of All Test Takers in 2013, 2014, 2015, and 2016 who scored at Level 2 & Above and Level 3 & Above Combined Grades

\*Due to changes in the 2016 exams, the proficiency rates from exams prior to 2016 are not directly comparable to the 2016 proficiency rates



# Statewide English Language Learner Proficiency in Math



<sup>1</sup> Students identified as ELL during the reported year.


<sup>2</sup> Students identified as ELL any year prior to the reported year but not including the reported year.

<sup>3</sup> Students never reported to have received ELL services.

Ever and Never ELLs data are only available for 2014, 2015, and 2016.

\*Due to changes in the 2016 exams, the proficiency rates from exams prior to 2016 are not directly comparable to the 2016 proficiency rates

# NYC English Language Learner Proficiency in Math



<sup>1</sup> Students identified as ELL during the reported year.

<sup>2</sup> Students identified as ELL any year prior to the reported year but not including the reported year.


<sup>3</sup> Students never reported to have received ELL services.

Ever and Never ELLs data are only available for 2014, 2015, and 2016.

\*Due to changes in the 2016 exams, the proficiency rates from exams prior to 2016 are not directly comparable to the 2016 proficiency rates

# Students with Disabilities Proficiency in Math

10.9 percent of students with disabilities met or exceeded the math proficiency standard (Level 3 and 4) in 2016; the percentage scoring at Level 2 & Above increased to 35.3 percent



Percentage of All Test Takers Scoring at Level 2 & Above and Level 3 & Above for 2013, 2014, 2015, and 2016 by Combined Grades

\*Due to changes in the 2016 exams, the proficiency rates from exams prior to 2016 are not directly comparable to the 2016 proficiency rates

**2016  
Not Tested  
and Test Refusal Data**

# Not Tested Data


- SED historically only tracked the number of students not tested for an invalid, unknown reason. These students are categorized as “not tested” students.
- The not tested count includes students who were absent during the test administration period as well as students who refused the test. The count does not include students who were medically excused.
- NYSED is able to provide additional analysis this year on Test Refusal data through collaboration with our regional information centers. A Test Refusal file is available online at: <http://www.nysed.gov/irs>.
- Approximately 78% of eligible test takers participated in the 2016 Grades 3-8 ELA and Math tests; about 22% percent of eligible test takers did not participate in these tests and did not have a recognized, valid reason for not participating.

2015 Not Tested	2016 Not Tested	2016 Test Refusal
20%	22%	21%

# Test Refusal Data

- The test refusal rate was approximately 21% in 2016.
- This remains relatively flat compared to the previous year.
- About 50 percent of those who did not participate this year also did not participate in 2015 if they took the tests.
- 2016 Test Refusal Students were:
  - Much more likely to be from low-need or average-need districts
  - More likely to have scored at Level 1 and Level 2 in 2015
  - Less likely to be economically disadvantaged
  - Less likely to be a student with a disability
  - Much less likely to be English Language Learners

# 2016 Test Refusals by Need/Resource Group



\*Please note that NYC's data represents the percent of NYC students out of students statewide who refused tests in 2016. NYC's specific test refusal data can be found in the district test refusal file.

# Conclusion

- Overall, students scoring at the proficiency level increased, especially in ELA
- Work remains to improve scores across the board
- Multi-year process to make improvements to standards, curriculum and testing will continue





# Big Issues

## Areas of Instructional Need & Future Focus


1. Support for Performance of English Language Learners
2. Support for Students with Disabilities
3. Performance Gaps by Race
4. Support for Big Five Academic Performance
5. Performance Statewide in the area of Mathematics

# Future Focus Areas

## Area #1: Support for Performance of ELLs

### Statewide English Language Learner Proficiency in ELA


ELL students statewide continued to see increases in ELA scores with a higher percentage of students scoring at Level 2 & above. Ever ELLs have experienced a significant increase, with a higher percentage scoring above proficient than the total public student population.



<sup>1</sup> Students identified as ELL during the reported year.  
<sup>2</sup> Students identified as ELL any year prior to the reported year but not including the reported year.  
<sup>3</sup> Students never reported to have received ELL services.

Ever and Never ELLs data are only available for 2014, 2015, and 2016.

### Statewide English Language Learner Proficiency in Math



<sup>1</sup> Students identified as ELL during the reported year.  
<sup>2</sup> Students identified as ELL any year prior to the reported year but not including the reported year.  
<sup>3</sup> Students never reported to have received ELL services.

Ever and Never ELLs data are only available for 2014, 2015, and 2016.

\*Due to changes in the 2016 exams, the proficiency rates from exams prior to 2016 are not directly comparable to the 2016 proficiency rates 26


\*Due to changes in the 2016 exams, the proficiency rates from exams prior to 2016 are not directly comparable to the 2016 proficiency rates

# Future Focus Areas

## Area #2: Support for Students with Disabilities


### Students with Disabilities Proficiency in ELA

7.9 percent of students with disabilities met or exceeded the ELA proficiency standard (Level 3 and 4) in 2016, and the percentage scoring at Level 2 & above increased to 33.8 percent



### Students with Disabilities Proficiency in Math

10.9 percent of students with disabilities met or exceeded the math proficiency standard (Level 3 and 4) in 2016; the percentage scoring at Level 2 & Above increased to 35.3 percent



Percentage of All Test Takers Scoring at Level 2 & Above and Level 3 & Above for 2013, 2014, 2015, and 2016 by Combined Grades

\*Due to changes in the 2016 exams, the proficiency rates from exams prior to 2016 are not directly comparable to the 2016 proficiency rates

1

\*Due to changes in the 2016 exams, the proficiency rates from exams prior to 2016 are not directly comparable to the 2016 proficiency rates

1

# Future Focus Areas

## Area #3: Gaps by Race

### 2016 Summary – Proficiency by Race/Ethnicity

- Black and Hispanic student proficiency went up in 2016 on the ELA exam and more modestly in math.
- Overall, black and Hispanic statewide proficiency saw a larger percentage-point increase than their white peers.
- As a result, the achievement gap between black and Hispanic student proficiency from the proficiency of their white peers closed slightly.

% of Students Proficient in Grades 3-8			
	2015	2016*	Percentage Point Change
<b>Black ELA</b>	18.5	26.2	7.7
<b>Hispanic ELA</b>	19.7	26.8	7.1
<b>White ELA</b>	40.4	46.0	5.6
<b>Black Math</b>	21.3	23.0	1.7
<b>Hispanic Math</b>	24.5	25.7	1.2
<b>White Math</b>	49.7	50.0	0.3

\*Due to changes in the 2016 exams, the proficiency rates from exams prior to 2016 are not directly comparable to the 2016 proficiency rates 1

# Future Focus Areas

## Area #4: Big Five Academic Performance

### 2016 Summary – Big 5 School Districts

Most Big 5 schools saw increases in ELA with smaller increases in math

% of Students Proficient in ELA in Grades 3-8			
	2015	2016*	Percentage Point Change
New York City	30.4	38	7.6
Buffalo	11.9	16.4	4.5
Rochester	4.7	6.7	2
Syracuse	8.1	10.9	2.8
Yonkers	20.3	26	5.7
% of Students Proficient in Math in Grades 3-8			
	2015	2016*	Percentage Point Change
New York City	35.2	36.4	1.2
Buffalo	15.1	16.1	1
Rochester	7.4	7.2	-0.2
Syracuse	9.4	10.4	1
Yonkers	24	24.6	0.6



\*Due to changes in the 2016 exams, the proficiency rates from exams prior to 2016 are not directly comparable to the 2016 proficiency rates


# Future Focus Areas

## Area #5: Statewide performance in Math

### 2016 Statewide Proficiency in Math

The percentage of students scoring at each proficiency level by grade level

*A USED waiver eliminated unnecessary double testing and allowed accelerated math students to participate in high school math Regents Exams instead of the Grade 8 Math Test, which may cause a decrease in the percentage proficient in Grade 8 as compared to other grades.*





**September 12, 2016**

