Average Composite
Scores: 5 Years of
Testing

|  | School | State |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| $2013-2014$ | 21.1 | 22 |
| $2014-2015$ | 20.9 | 22 |
| $2015-2016$ | 20.1 | 22 |
| $2016-2017$ | 21.2 | 22 |
| $2017-2018$ | 17.7 | 20.3 |
| $2018-2019$ | 17.6 | 20 |


\% Meeting 3 or 4
Benchmarks: 5 Years of Testing

|  | School | State |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| $2013-2014$ | 39 | 47 |
| $2014-2015$ | 35 | 48 |
| $2015-2016$ | 30 | 47 |
| $2016-2017$ | 37 | 46 |
| $2017-2018$ | 17 | 36 |
| $2018-2019$ | 15 | 34 |



Average ACT Composite

- The 2013-2017 school year data is from students that chose to take the test. The 2017-2020 data now includes all students that are required to take the ACT their junior year.
- 2013-2017 we fell 1-2 points below the state average.
- 2017-2020 we fell 2-3 points below the state average.
\% Meeting 3 or 4 Benchmarks: 5 Years of Testing
- 2013-2017 school year data we were 8-17 percent below the state average.
- 2017-2020 school year data we were 19 percent below the state average

Action steps to improve these data points:

- To increase composite scores all staff and courses in the high school will need to focus on increasing reading comprehension, literacy strategies and reinforcing mathematical/scientific skills.
- Making connections with college and career readiness standards across all disciplines. This includes ACT Workkeys and ACT testing connections for all students. Workkeys testing is a graduation option and is a requirement for most industrial work forces.


## 5 Year Trend Average ACT Scores

|  |  | English |  | Mathematics |  | Reading |  | Science |  | Met All Four |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number Tested | School | State | School | State | School | State | School | State | School | State |
| 2016-2017 | 97 | 16.9 | 18.6 | 17.5 | 20 | 17.8 | 20.2 | 17.2 | 19.9 | 17.5 | 19.8 |
| 2017-2018 | 96 | 17.3 | 19.3 | 17.7 | 20.3 | 18 | 20.8 | 17.5 | 20.4 | 17.7 | 20.3 |
| 2018-2019 | 98 | 16.8 | 19 | 17.4 | 19.9 | 17.8 | 20.5 | 18 | 20.1 | 17.6 | 20 |

5 Year Trend Average ACT Scores


## 5 Year Trend Average ACT Scores

- This chart reviews the testing years with all students included.
- The English average ACT scores range from 1.7-2.2 points below the state average each year.
- The Mathematics average ACT scores range from 2.5-2.6 points below the state average each year.
- The Reading average ACT scores range from 2.4-2.8 points below the state average each year.
- The Science average ACT scores range from 2.1-2.9 points below the state average each year.
- The Met All Four average ACT scores range from 2.3-2.6 below the state average each year.

Action steps to improve these data points:

- To increase the content area scores we will focus on state standards and teaching to mastery. Staff can review ACT Curriculum Review worksheets to determine what grade level the standards are taught and what grade level the standards are expected mastery. This will help determine gaps years with concepts so that they can be included in the curriculum map for each year to continue to reinforce and sustain content mastery.

5 Year Trend Percent Met College and Career Readiness Benchmark

|  |  | English |  | Mathematics |  | Reading |  | Science |  | Met All Four |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number Tested | School | State | School | State | School | State | School | State | School | State |
| 2016-2017 | 97 | 37 | 51 | 15 | 36 | 26 | 40 | 18 | 32 | 9 | 22 |
| 2017-2018 | 96 | 44 | 55 | 17 | 38 | 27 | 43 | 17 | 35 | 8 | 25 |
| 2018-2019 | 98 | 36 | 53 | 14 | 35 | 20 | 41 | 17 | 33 | 9 | 23 |



5 Year Trend Percent: Met College and Career Readiness Benchmark

- Our school data in English is 11-17\% below the state average.
- Our school data in Mathematics is $16-21 \%$ below the state average.
- Our school data in Reading is 14-21\% below the state average.
- Our school data in Science is $14-18 \%$ below the state average.
- The Met all four data is $13-17 \%$ below the state average.
- Reviewing the data and comparing to our honors course class sizes, the students that are college ready correlates to the average number of students in each content area honors track.

Action steps to improve college and career readiness:

- Increasing rigor and exposure to grade level standards in the general track courses.
- Aligning our curriculum maps and vertically planning strands of standards to increase exposure for student retention.
- Enrolling $8^{\text {th }}$ graders in Algebra I will increase their opportunity to take advanced math courses for college readiness.
- As recommended by ACT: identifying standards teachers should focus on by accessing ACT's College Readiness Standards and aligning them in our curriculum maps.


## English Reporting Categories

Percent Met Readiness

|  | Production of Writing |  | Knowledge of Language |  | Conventions of Standard English |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | School | State | School | State | School | State |
| 2016-2017 | 66 | 65 | 81 | 68 | 66 | 65 |
| 2016-2017 | 31 | 50 | 42 | 52 | 35 | 48 |
| 2017-2018 | 34 | 54 | 41 | 57 | 44 | 52 |
| 2018-2019 | 32 | 52 | 45 | 53 | 33 | 50 |

## English Reporting Categories: \% Met Readiness



Indicates the students tested before state requirement for all juniors to take the test.

Indicates that we scored higher in that reporting category than the state average.

English Reporting Categories:

- The 2016-2017 school year we were higher than the state average in 3 reporting categories.
- After adding all students' data in 2017-2019 we fell below the state average from 7-29\% in the reporting categories.
- Our better scores in a reporting category are Knowledge of Language, our lowest performing reporting category is Production of Writing.
- Scores in Production of Writing and Knowledge of Language are consistent across the 3 years. Conventions of English had a 9-11\% higher reporting year in 2017-2018 over the other two years.

Action Plan to improve Reporting Categories:

- To improve the Production of Writing, the English department can align the writing process using a collective writing process and build upon it with grade level requirements listed in the standards.
- To improve the Knowledge of Language, the English department can use vocabulary embedded within texts they are reading and add in ACT vocabulary terms in context for better retention. The use of scientifically based literacy strategies will increase retention and comprehension.
- To improve Conventions of Standard English, the English department can focus on using No Red Ink with assignments at grade level standards.


## Reading Reporting Categories

## Percent Met Readiness

|  | Key Ideas and Details |  | Craft and Structure |  | Integration of Knowledge and Ideas |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | School | State | School | State | School | State |
| 2016-2017 | 50 | 50 | 44 | 55 | 50 | 49 |
| 2016-2017 | 25 | 40 | 27 | 43 | 37 | 46 |
| 2017-2018 | 27 | 43 | 31 | 47 | 39 | 46 |
| 2018-2019 | 22 | 42 | 30 | 45 | 32 | 44 |

Reading Reporting Categories: \% Met Readiness


Indicates that we scored higher in that reporting category than the state

Indicates the students tested before state requirement for all juniors to take the

Reading Reporting Categories: Percent Met Readiness

- Our school data was higher than the state average in 2016-2017 school year in two reporting categories.
- Since we began testing all students the school data has been below the state average from 7-20\%.
- The Key Ideas and Details reporting category is our lowest performing category for reading from 15-20\% below the state average.
- The Craft and Structure reporting category we were below the state average from 15-16\%.
- The Integration of Knowledge and Ideas reporting category was our closest to the state average from 7$12 \%$ below the state.

Action plan to improve Reading Reporting Categories:

- To improve Reading for Key Ideas and Details we can increase exposure for students in each content area of reading material. To be specific, social studies readings can focus on more factual and evidence based content. A strategy is familiarizing students with reading news articles from online scholarly journals and pulling key ideas and details.
- To improve Craft and Structure we can increase student exposure to different authors, types of reading materials and varying our scientifically based literacy strategies to engage in the material with.
- To improve in Integration of Knowledge and Ideas, we can continue to increase exposure to varying forms of text and strategies to manipulate the content students are reading.

Math Reporting Categories
Indicates the students tested before state requirement for all juniors to take the test.

## Percent Met Readiness

|  | Preparing for Higher Math |  | Number and Quantity |  | Algebra |  | Functions |  | Geometry |  | Statistics and Probability |  | Integrating Essential Skills |  | Modeling |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | School | State | School | State | School | State | School | State | School | State | School | State | School | State | School | State |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline 2016- \\ & 2017 \end{aligned}$ | 25 | 41 | 31 | 42 | 28 | 43 | 25 | 40 | 28 | 43 | 38 | 54 | 28 | 45 | 16 | 43 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline 2016- \\ & 2017 \end{aligned}$ | 14 | 33 | 19 | 28 | 14 | 40 | 23 | 34 | 21 | 34 | 12 | 38 | 14 | 33 | 18 | 35 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 2017- \\ & 2018 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 16 | 35 | 24 | 33 | 16 | 39 | 18 | 35 | 21 | 37 | 21 | 40 | 16 | 37 | 19 | 37 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline 2018- \\ & 2019 \end{aligned}$ | 13 | 33 | 17 | 35 | 18 | 37 | 18 | 38 | 24 | 40 | 13 | 41 | 17 | 35 | 14 | 37 |

Math Reporting Categories: \% Met Readiness


Math Reporting Categories: \% Met Readiness

- Reviewing the above data we have consistently fell below the state average in all reporting categories from $9 \%$ to under half of the state average.
- Preparing for Higher Math, Algebra, Functions, Statistics and Probability, Integrating Essential Skills and Modeling are over $20 \%$ below the state average in each reporting category.
- In the 2016-2017 school year we fell below the state average from 11-27\% with students that chose to take the ACT for college readiness and entrance.

Action Plan to improve Math College and Career Readiness:

- Staff will continue to make real world connections for students to understand the rationale for learning mathematical concepts and true application.
- We are continuing unpacking standards with ESC support to fully understand grade level standards and the depth of each standard at grade level.
- We are seeking to add Statistics and Probability as an elective or CCP course next school year to complete closing the standards gap in that reporting category.
- We are vertically aligning standards with our curriculum maps and need to work on pacing to ensure we are completing expected standards yearly to avoid further gaps in mathematical concepts.

Science Reporting Categories
Indicates the students tested before state
requirement for all juniors to take the test.

## Percent Met Readiness

|  | Interpretation of Data |  | Scientific Investigation |  | Evaluation of Models/Inferences |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | School | State | School | State | School | State |
| 2016-2017 | 34 | 44 | 31 | 41 | 34 | 41 |
| 2016-2017 | 13 | 33 | 18 | 36 | 19 | 30 |
| 2017-2018 | 16 | 36 | 16 | 37 | 20 | 34 |
| 2018-2019 | 16 | 34 | 22 | 33 | 16 | 32 |

Science Reporting Categories: \% Met Readiness


## Science Reporting Categories: Percent Met Readiness

- Interpretation of Data is our lowest scoring reporting category in comparison with the state average. We are $18-20 \%$ below the state average in this category.
- Scientific Investigation and Evaluation of Models/Inferences are 11-21\% below the state average in each category.
- In 2016-2017 we were 7-10\% below the state average with students choosing to take the ACT test that were preparing to attend college.

Action Plan to improve Science Reporting Categories:

- Staff can vertically align to assess where the gaps in each reporting category are occurring and include those standards in their curriculum maps.
- All staff will focus on state standards for their specific course and teaching those standards at grade level with focusing on DOK 3 and 4 (interpretation, evaluation).
- Course progression can be improved to ensure students are exposed to all standards required for ACT college and career readiness.

Percent College and Career Ready Standards Score Ranges

|  |  | $1-12$. | $13-15$ | $16-19$ | $20-23$ | $24-27$ | $28-32$ | $33-36$ |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 2012 | English | 2 | 8 | 25 | 33 | 20 | 10 | 2 |
|  | Math | 0 | 4 | 43 | 31 | 20 | 2 | 0 |
|  | Reading | 0 | 8 | 27 | 33 | 18 | 12 | 2 |
|  | Science | 0 | 10 | 24 | 41 | 24 | 2 | 0 |
| 2013 | English | 9 | 17 | 7 | 20 | 28 | 13 | 7 |
|  | Math | 0 | 11 | 41 | 28 | 17 | 2 | 0 |
|  | Reading | 4 | 9 | 15 | 30 | 24 | 13 | 4 |
|  | Science | 2 | 2 | 26 | 39 | 24 | 7 | 0 |
| 2014 | English | 5 | 15 | 21 | 25 | 21 | 8 | 5 |
|  | Math | 0 | 16 | 34 | 26 | 20 | 3 | 0 |
|  | Reading | 2 | 10 | 25 | 36 | 16 | 11 | 0 |
|  | Science | 0 | 7 | 25 | 41 | 18 | 8 | 2 |
| 2015 | English | 4 | 4 | 31 | 27 | 25 | 6 | 2 |
|  | Math | 0 | 15 | 44 | 23 | 17 | 2 | 0 |
|  | Reading | 4 | 6 | 21 | 33 | 23 | 8 | 4 |
|  | Science | 2 | 6 | 31 | 38 | 21 | 2 | 0 |

*Reporting categories had changed as ACT added STEM data

|  |  | $1-12$. | $13-15$ | $16-19$ | $20-23$ | $24-27$ | $28-32$ | $33-36$ |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $2017-2018$ | English | 17 | 22 | 24 | 17 | 9 | 7 | 4 |
|  | Math | 1 | 28 | 41 | 9 | 14 | 6 | 0 |
|  | Reading | 9 | 17 | 33 | 22 | 10 | 8 | 1 |
|  | Science | 8 | 14 | 38 | 24 | 11 | 6 | 0 |
| $2018-2019$ | English | 22 | 24 | 20 | 19 | 4 | 9 | 3 |
|  | Math | 1 | 31 | 43 | 14 | 6 | 4 | 1 |
|  | Reading | 18 | 21 | 25 | 19 | 8 | 8 | 1 |
|  | Science | 9 | 21 | 36 | 23 | 6 | 5 | 0 |
| $2019-2020$ | English | 21 | 21 | 26 | 16 | 6 | 4 | 5 |
|  | Math | 2 | 32 | 43 | 13 | 7 | 3 | 1 |
|  | Reading | 19 | 17 | 26 | 15 | 13 | 6 | 4 |
|  | Science | 12 | 18 | 29 | 29 | 11 | 0 | 2 |

- To utilize this chart the staff should look for the score range that has the highest $\%$ of students. They can review those standards on the ACT College and Career Readiness Standards Score Ranges Chart. This will help staff identify the standards in the score range and how to advance students to the next score range by extending the standard to the higher range. This works similar to the End of Course Exams Performance Level Descriptors chart and how to move students from a 1-2 etc.
- The staff can find the second highest reporting score range and again look at the standards and how to extend them to the next range.
- http://www.act.org/content/act/en/college-and-career-readiness/standards.html
*2017 97 students included in the report, 43\% reported taking courses that are considered 'Core or More'

Making sure students are taking the right courses: 8\% reported taking less than 3 years of math courses, of them $0 \%$ were college ready.
$14 \%$ reported taking a course sequence of ALG I, ALG II, Geometry; of them 0\% were college ready. In comparison $20 \%$ that took 3 or more years of math beyond ALG I, ALG II, and Geometry were college ready.

78\% of the cohort fell into the lowest 3 Mathematics score ranges.
$44 \%$ of students took less than 3 years of natural science courses, $9 \%$ of them were college ready.
$25 \%$ of students that took at least 3 years of science coursework were college ready.
*2018 96 students included in the report, 38\% reported taking courses that are considered 'Core or More'

Making sure students are taking the right courses: 8\% reported taking less than 3 years of math courses, of them $0 \%$ were college ready.
$15 \%$ reported taking a course sequence of ALG I, ALG II, Geometry; of them $0 \%$ were college ready. In comparison $22 \%$ that took 3 or more years of math beyond ALG I, ALG II, and Geometry were college ready.
$77 \%$ of the cohort fell into the lowest 3 Mathematics score ranges.
$50 \%$ of students took less than 3 years of natural science courses, $8 \%$ of them were college ready.
$26 \%$ of students that took at least 3 years of science coursework were college ready.
*2019 98 students included in the report, 43\% reported taking courses that are considered 'Core or More'

Making sure students are taking the right courses: $17 \%$ reported taking less than 3 years of math courses, of them 0\% were college ready.
$15 \%$ reported taking a course sequence of ALG I, ALG II, Geometry; of them $0 \%$ were college ready. In comparison $22 \%$ that took 3 or more years of math beyond ALG I, ALG II, and Geometry were college ready.
$81 \%$ of the cohort fell into the lowest 3 Mathematics score ranges.
$45 \%$ of students took less than 3 years of natural science courses, $5 \%$ of them were college ready.
$29 \%$ of students that took at least 3 years of science coursework were college ready.

