

Student Performance Question



Jessica Anderson <admin@allthingsappleton.com>

7/12/2022 1:28 PM



To: BUNNOWNANETTE@aasd.k12.wi.us

Hi Nan,

I watched the AGR report that was given during the 06/27/2022 Board of Education meeting. I was hoping you could clarify something for me.

The AGR Performance Objective for the 2021-2022 school year was that 90% of the students enrolled for the full academic year would reach their targeted growth in reading and in math. Was that goal met and, if not, by how far was it missed?

When I look at the charts further on in the presentation, it appears that that goal was not met. For example, the chart regarding Kindergarten Reading seems to show that less than 50% of students reached 100% of their targeted growth for the year.

Am I understanding the charts correctly or am I not interpreting them correctly?

Thanks,

Jessica Anderson
All Things Appleton

From: BUNNOW, NANETTE
Sent: Wednesday, July 13, 2022 8:37 AM
To: 'Jessica Anderson'
Subject: RE: Student Performance Question

Good morning, Jessica.

Here is the data reflected on the charts used in the presentation:

Grade	% of AGR students who met targeted growth in reading
Kindergarten	48%
Grade 1	41%
Grade 2	55%
Grade 3	58%

Grade	% of AGR students who met targeted growth in math
Kindergarten	60%
Grade 1	42%
Grade 2	50%
Grade 3	53%

You are correct that the performance objective set by the AGR schools of 90% was not met.

Nan Bunnow, Ed.D.
Assistant Superintendent/School Services
Appleton Area School District
Thomas G. Scullen Leadership Center
131 East Washington Street, Suite 1A
Appleton, WI 54911
(920) 832-6301; FAX (920) 832-1725



RE: Student Performance Question



Jessica Menn Anderson <admin@allthingsappleton.com>

7/13/2022 9:17 AM



To: BUNNOW, NANETTE

Hi Nan,

Thanks for getting back to me.

These seem like very low numbers. 40-60% of students not reaching their targeted growth seems like a serious problem that is only going to compound over future years. I watched the meeting but didn't see that discussed or even really touched upon.

Is there a reason why that high rate of children falling behind was not explicitly discussed with the Board?

Also is it even possible to get that many kids caught up, and if so what is the plan and the timeline for doing that?

Thanks,

Jessica Anderson
All Things Appleton

From: BUNNOW, NANETTE
Sent: Monday, July 18, 2022 5:19 PM
To: 'Jessica Menn Anderson'
Subject: RE: RE: Student Performance Question

Jessica,

The AGR performance objectives support the key measures/targets on the AASD scorecard related to iReady. The [2021-2022 AASD Scorecard](#) results were shared and discussed with the board at their June 30, 2022, work session. The [2022-2023 AASD scorecards](#) will reflect the prioritized action steps that the district, departments, and buildings will take to get kids caught up and, in turn, achieve the key measure/target related to iReady on the scorecard.

This was the first year we used iReady as our AGR data point. As we did not have a baseline, we selected 90% as the target, knowing it was a reach but wanted to set the bar high. Now that we have the baseline this year, each of the AGR building will have a personalized Kindergarten, grade 1, grade 2, and grade 3 goal of increasing the percent of students who reached their targeted growth by 1% next year, which mirrors the district scorecard. We also will be tracking the % of students at or above grade level by grade (example- K to K) and cohort (example- K to grade 1), seeking a 1% increase from 2022 to 2023.

Nan Bunnow, Ed.D.
Assistant Superintendent/School Services
Appleton Area School District
Thomas G. Scullen Leadership Center
131 East Washington Street, Suite 1A
Appleton, WI 54911
(920) 832-6301; FAX (920) 832-1725



From: Jessica Anderson
Sent: Tuesday, July 19, 2022 9:43 AM
To: BUNNOW, NANETTE
Subject: RE: RE: Student Performance Question

Hi Nan,

Thank you for getting back to me. The baseline that's been established is that 42% of 3rd graders and 45% of 2nd graders can't read proficiently and 47% of 3rd graders and 50% of 2nd graders are not proficient at math. It seems very serious that 40-50% of students at these lower elementary levels are not achieving proficiency. How are these students going to be able to competently learn in the higher grade levels when they haven't even mastered the lower grade skills?

I also don't understand how a 1% improvement per year on these numbers is going to be enough to help these specific students. It may help students 40 years down the road, but it looks like these students right now have already fallen so far behind at such an early stage that they will struggle for the rest of their time in school. Is it even possible to get this many students back on track?

Finally, is a baseline of 40-50% of students not competently mastering the early grade level building blocks of basic reading and math normal? Has the number of AASD students achieving proficiency at elementary level skills always been this low?

Thanks,

Jessica Anderson
All Things Appleton

RE: RE: Student Performance Question



BUNNOW, NANETTE <BUNNOWNANETTE@aasd.k12.wi.us>

7/26/2022 6:25 PM



To: 'Jessica Anderson'

Jessica,

The iReady data used for the AGR report does not reflect grade level attainment of literacy and math skills, as is suggested below. Instead, the iReady data used for the AGR report was the percentage of students who achieved their targeted growth from fall to spring. Each individual student's growth goal is determined by iReady using normed data from each grade level.

The 1% goal was selected based on the findings that school districts who establish goals that seek incremental improvement experience greater student growth than those that do not.

We share your concern related to student achievement gaps and have systems in place to identify each student needs (academic, behavioral, social, and emotional) so that instruction can be differentiated to meet them. Student progress is monitored and adjustments are made across the school year. Funding sources at the elementary level such as AGR, Title 1, and ESSER, are being used to provide additional staffing and resources to help each student achieve proficiency.

Nan Bunnow, Ed.D.

Assistant Superintendent/School Services

Appleton Area School District

Thomas G. Scullen Leadership Center

131 East Washington Street, Suite 1A

Appleton, WI 54911

(920) 832-6301; FAX (920) 832-1725



RE: RE: Student Performance Question



Jessica Menn Anderson <admin@allthingsappleton.com>

7/27/2022 8:45 AM



To: BUNNOW, NANETTE

Hi Nan,

Thank you for getting back to me.

During the presentation to the Board of Education on 06/27/2022, Karen Brice indicated that proficiency was at the 100% column. She told the board, "At the midpoint of the year, we'd like to see our students moving toward the right side of that graph. So, moving over to the proficiency where there's 100% is on the right side." She equated a student reaching the 100% column on the right hand side with achieving proficiency. Was her explanation of what it meant for a student to reach 100% of their targeted growth inaccurate?

At this point my question is what percentage of kindergartens, 1st graders, 2nd graders, and 3rd graders attained proficiency in math and reading by the end of the 2021-22 school year? Also is it possible to separate out those percentages the same way the i-Ready results were separated out-by AGR, non-AGR/Title 1, and non-AGR/non-Title 1 schools?

Regarding the scorecard target of 1% growth per year, does the District just plan to measure from one year to another, or are you planning to also measure long term so you can see what your growth is 5 or 10 years out as compared to today and be able to tell if you're actually achieving long-term improvement?

Thanks,

Jessica Anderson
All Things Appleton

RE: RE: Student Performance Question



Jessica Menn Anderson <admin@allthingsappleton.com>

8/1/2022 6:43 AM



To: BUNNOW, NANETTE

Hi Nan,

I just wanted to check in. I had a few questions that I am still waiting to hear back on. I have included my previous email below.

Thank you,

Jessica Anderson
All Things Appleton

RE: RE: RE: Student Performance Question



BUNNOW, NANETTE <BUNNOWNANETTE@aasd.k12.wi.us>

8/1/2022 9:54 AM



To: 'Jessica Menn Anderson'

Good morning, Jessica.

I was out of the office Wednesday-Friday last week; I hope you received my automatic out of office message.

In reviewing your questions, I will need to connect with Dr. Harrison in our Assessment, Curriculum, and Instruction Department before responding. I will get back to you before the end of the week.

Nan Bunnow, Ed.D.
Assistant Superintendent/School Services
Appleton Area School District
Thomas G. Scullen Leadership Center
131 East Washington Street, Suite 1A
Appleton, WI 54911
(920) 832-6301; FAX (920) 832-1725



RE: Student Performance Question



Jessica Menn Anderson <admin@allthingsappleton.com>

8/2/2022 7:20 AM



To: BUNNOW, NANETTE

Hi Nan,

Thank you for getting back to me. I look forward to hearing what information Assistant Superintendent Harrison provides.

Jessica Anderson
All Things Appleton

Subject **RE: Student Performance Question**
 From BUNNOW, NANETTE <BUNNOWNANETTE@asds.k12.wi.us>
 To 'Jessica Menn Anderson' <admin@allthingsappleton.com>
 Date 2022-08-04 14:47

Jessica,

1. The graphs utilized in the AGR presentation represented the percentage of progress students have made toward their spring targeted growth goal on the i-Ready diagnostic assessment. Reaching 100% would mean the student met or exceeded their targeted growth goal, which Karen Brice was referring to as being "proficient".
2. Here is the i-Ready Spring 2022 Placement Distribution for Kindergarten, Grade 1, Grade 2, and Grade 3 in Mathematics and Reading:

Mathematics	Kindergarten		Grade 1		Grade 2		Grade 3	
	National	AASD	National	AASD	National	AASD	National	AASD
At or Above Grade Level	64%	70%	48%	61%	46%	54%	48%	54%

Reading	Kindergarten		Grade 1		Grade 2		Grade 3	
	National	AASD	National	AASD	National	AASD	National	AASD
At or Above Grade Level	77%	81%	54%	60%	52%	55%	62%	68%

This data has not been broken down by Title 1/AGR, Title 1/Non-AGR, and non-Title 1. This breakdown was done only for the AGR report to monitor how the program is closing achievement gaps for low socioeconomic students—the program's goal.

3. Although the scorecard key measure/target is based on the concept of incremental growth, we analyze the data over time and take this information into consideration when developing our district, department, and building prioritized action steps.

Nan Bunnow, Ed.D.
 Assistant Superintendent/School Services
 Appleton Area School District
 Thomas G. Scullen Leadership Center
 131 East Washington Street, Suite 1A
 Appleton, WI 54911
 (920) 832-6301; FAX (920) 832-1725



RE: Student Performance Question



Jessica Menn Anderson <admin@allthingsappleton.com>

8/4/2022 11:37 PM



To: BUNNOW, NANETTE

Hi Nan,

Thank you for that follow up.

Was Karen Brice's statement equating attaining proficiency with achieving 100% targeted growth inaccurate? If it wasn't accurate, what would have been a better way to have described the charts?

Given that the proficiency numbers you provided are higher than the percentage of students who achieved their targeted growth, it looks like students don't actually have to reach their targeted growth in order to achieve mastery of grade-level skills. That leaves me wondering what percentage of targeted growth does a student need to reach in order to gain proficiency?

I'm also confused by this statement, "This data has not been broken down by Title 1/AGR, Title 1/Non-AGR, and non-Title 1. This breakdown was done only for the AGR report to monitor how the program is closing achievement gaps for low socioeconomic students—the program's goal." I don't understand why comparing the percentage of students who reached their targeted growth is a better way of monitoring achievement gaps between schools than measuring the percentage of students who achieved proficiency would be. The percentage of students who achieve grade level mastery of academic subjects seems like it would be the gold standard for comparing schools to each other. Why did AASD opt to not do that and use this other measure instead?

Thanks,

Jessica Anderson
All Things Appleton

From: BUNNOW, NANETTE
Sent: Monday, August 8, 2022 12:18 PM
To: 'Jessica Menn Anderson'
Subject: RE: RE: Student Performance Question

Jessica,

Regarding your first question, I believe this was already addressed in #1 below.

Regarding the other questions-- we take into consideration multiple data points when planning for day-to-day instruction and continuous school improvement. For i-Ready in particular, we utilize the diagnostic assessment as data points related to student growth and achievement. Both are important, as we want every student to be at our above grade level by the end of the school year but we also want every student to make at least a year's growth from where they entered the school year.

As I mentioned in the AGR presentation, since we now have baseline data from the 21-22 school year-- the AGR performance objectives will be revised for 22-23 to include both iReady data points of targeted growth and grade level attainment.

2022-2023 AGR Performance Objectives

2022-2023 District Scorecard i-Ready Key Measures/Targets for those students enrolled for the full academic year:

- We will increase the number of students that **reach their targeted growth in reading and mathematics** (one or more years of growth) on the spring i-Ready assessment by 1% from 2022 to 2023 (x% to x%).
- We will increase the number of students scoring **at or above grade level in reading and mathematics (program level analysis)** on the spring i-Ready assessment by 1% from 2022 to 2023 (x% to x%).
- We will increase the number of students scoring **at or above grade level in reading and mathematics (cohort level analysis)** on the spring i-Ready assessment by 1% from Kindergarten/1st Grade/2nd Grade in 2022 to 1st Grade/2nd Grade/3rd Grade in 2023 (x% to x%).

Nan Bunnow, Ed.D.
Assistant Superintendent/School Services
Appleton Area School District
Thomas G. Scullen Leadership Center
131 East Washington Street, Suite 1A
Appleton, WI 54911
(920) 832-6301; FAX (920) 832-1725



RE: RE: Student Performance Question



Jessica Anderson <admin@allthingsappleton.com>

8/8/2022 7:14 PM



To: BUNNOW, NANETTE

Hi Nan,

I'm having difficulty understanding how much of their targeted growth a student has to reach in order to attain proficiency. The proficiency rates you provided to me do not align with the rates of students who reached 100% of their targeted growth, which seems to indicate that a student doesn't have to achieve 100% of their targeted growth in order to achieve proficiency. How much of their targeted growth does a student need to reach in order to attain proficiency? 90% 80% 75%? Or does it vary from student to student?

Thanks,

Jessica Anderson
All Things Appleton

RE: RE: Student Performance Question



BUNNOW, NANETTE <BUNNOWNANETTE@asd.k12.wi.us>

8/8/2022 8:05 PM



To: 'Jessica Anderson'

Jessica,

Here is a link for additional information on targeted and stretch growth goals:

<https://www.curriculumassociates.com/access-and-equity/providing-a-path-to-proficiency-for-every-student>. Both goals are determined for the student by iReady based on their assessment placement in fall. Typical growth is not focused on grade level proficiency; stretch growth is more closely aligned to this.

Nan Bunnow, Ed.D.

Assistant Superintendent/School Services

Appleton Area School District

Thomas G. Scullen Leadership Center

131 East Washington Street, Suite 1A

Appleton, WI 54911

(920) 832-6301; FAX (920) 832-1725



From: Jessica Anderson
Sent: Tuesday, August 9, 2022 12:15 PM
To: BUNNOW, NANETTE
Subject: RE: RE: Student Performance Question

Hi Nan,

I understand typical growth is one year's worth of growth regardless of where that student started at. If there was a 3rd grader who started out with the reading level of a student entering 2nd grade, they would have reached their targeted growth if they ended the year having reached the level of a student entering 3rd grade. If a 3rd grader started out with the reading level of a student entering 4th grade, they would have reached their targeted growth by gaining the knowledge of a student entering 5th grade. Is that an accurate understanding?

I have multiple areas of confusion...

1. Karen Brice described reaching your targeted growth as reaching proficiency, but it sounds like that isn't true. A 3rd grader who was a grade behind wouldn't be proficient even if they reached their targeted growth goal because they would still end the year a grade behind. They would actually need to reach their stretch goal and gain 2 years of growth in order to attain proficiency. Attaining proficiency and reaching the targeted growth goal don't necessarily seem to be connected. Was Karen Brice correct to conflate the two or was she incorrect?
2. The percentage of students who achieve at least one year of growth (as shown on the slides in the presentation to the Board) is lower than the percentage of students you indicated achieved proficiency. It looks like even though 40-60% of students aren't achieving 1 year of academic growth, only 20-45% aren't achieving proficiency. How is it that a large number of students are not achieving at least one year of academic growth, but many of them are still achieving proficiency?
3. I don't understand how using i-Ready targeted growth scores is a useful measure of achievement gaps between schools. The scores seem to be subjectively based on individual students and do not measure a steady and unmoving goal. It sounds like you could have a situation where one student started out half a grade ahead and only reached 3/4ths of his targeted growth, ending the year 1/4th of a grade ahead while another student started out two years behind and reached his targeted growth but not any stretch growth meaning he would end the year still two years behind. On paper, however, by simply measuring whether they reached their targeted growth, the first student who was 1/4 of a grade ahead would look like he was doing worse than the student that was still 2 grades behind. How is presenting information in this way to the Board beneficial in illustrating the achievement gaps between schools when it doesn't show where AGR and non-AGR schools are performing in relation to each other against an objective standard?

Thanks,
Jessica Anderson
All Things Appleton

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows

RE: RE: Student Performance Question



BUNNOW, NANETTE <BUNNOWNANETTE@aasd.k12.wi.us>

8/10/2022 9:50 AM



To: 'Jessica Anderson'

Jessica,

I believe it would be better to speak over the phone rather than respond via email considering the number of exchanges to date. Please feel free to contact Kimm Smith at [920-832-6301](tel:920-832-6301) to schedule an appointment.

Nan Bunnow, Ed.D.
Assistant Superintendent/School Services
Appleton Area School District
Thomas G. Scullen Leadership Center
[131 East Washington Street, Suite 1A
Appleton, WI 54911](https://www.appletonschools.org/131-East-Washington-Street-Suite-1A-Appleton-WI-54911)
[\(920\) 832-6301](tel:920-832-6301); [FAX \(920\) 832-1725](tel:920-832-1725)

