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The Relationship between the Implementation of Readers’ Writers’ Workshop on MAP Test Results

Megan Khoury

ABSTRACT

This study examines the relationship between the implementation of the Reader’s Writer’s Workshop and Words Their Way and students’ results on the Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) test in reading comprehension and language usage over a two-year period at a private school in Beirut, Lebanon. Two research questions guided the study: How did the MAP results compare prior to and post implementation of the Reader’s Writer’s Workshop and Words Their Way? How can the relationship between these two programs and MAP testing be defined? This quantitative longitudinal study follows the same cohort of elementary students over a period of two years and examines their standardized testing scores pre, during, and post implementation of the programs. Results of data analysis using Microsoft Excel sheets were presented in graphs to indicate correlations. Results portrayed that 100% of student grades in the reading comprehension test increased from the first reporting period when compared to the last. The general trend for the language usage average is that there was a steady increase in the average from the period during Spring 2013 to Spring 2015. This signifies that the Reader’s Writer’s Workshop and Words their Way have a positive impact on MAP test results. The study provided feedback on school leadership decision to use these programs for improving teaching and learning. However, future studies are suggested to address the cultural bias of the test to deliver more credible conclusions.
Keyword: Measure of Academic Progress, Literacy, Reader’s Writer’s Workshop, School effectiveness, Differentiated instruction.
# Table of Contents

Chapter .............................................................................................................. Page  
Table of Figures ............................................................................................................. ix  
Appendices ................................................................................................................ 1  

**Introduction** .............................................................................................................. 1  
1.1 Background of the Study ......................................................................................... 1  
1.2 The Statement of the Study .................................................................................... 10  
1.3 Purpose of the Study .............................................................................................. 11  
1.4 Significance of the Study ......................................................................................... 13  
1.5 Thesis Division ...................................................................................................... 14  

**Literature Review** .................................................................................................. 15  
2.1 Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) ................................................................. 16  
2.2 Reader’s Writer’s Workshop .................................................................................... 19  
2.3 Words their Way .................................................................................................... 23  

**Methodology** ....................................................................................................... 31  
3.1 Research design .................................................................................................... 31  
3.2 Sampling ................................................................................................................ 33  
3.3 Instruments and data collection ............................................................................. 35  
3.4 Data analysis ......................................................................................................... 35  
3.5 Reliability and validity ......................................................................................... 37  
3.6 Ethics ..................................................................................................................... 38  

**Results** .................................................................................................................. 40  

**Discussion of Findings** ......................................................................................... 58  
5.1 Limitations .......................................................................................................... 62  

**Conclusion** .......................................................................................................... 64  
6.1 General Conclusion ............................................................................................... 64  
6.2 Limitations .......................................................................................................... 65  
6.3 Suggestions for further research ........................................................................... 65  

**References** ............................................................................................................. 67  

**Appendices** ......................................................................................................... 76  
Appendix A .............................................................................................................. 76  
Appendix B ............................................................................................................... 80
### List of Tables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Table 1</td>
<td>Individual student MAP reading scores by reporting period</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 2</td>
<td>Individual student MAP language usage scores by reporting period</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 3</td>
<td>Students 2, 3, and 16 language usage scores for 3 reporting terms</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 4</td>
<td>Students 2, 3, and 16 language usage scores for 3 reporting periods</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 5</td>
<td>Reading comprehension class average for 5 reporting terms</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 6</td>
<td>Language usage class average for 3 reporting terms</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table of Figures

Figure 1 Variation of reading grades from Spring 2013 to Spring 2015 for 17 students ................................................................. 43
Figure 2 Variation of language usage grades from Spring 2013 to Spring 2015 for 17 students ........................................................................................................ 50
Figure 3 Class average for reading comprehension scores ............................................................ 54
Figure 4 Class average for language usage score ............................................................................. 55
Chapter One

Introduction

1.1 Background of the Study

A school’s mission and vision are the driving forces behind its purpose and commitment to education. They embody crucial aspects of the school that, when you walk inside, should immediately be able to get a sense of what the school stands for and what all team members are working towards achieving; a school’s mission “provides a means by which organizational members can work together toward a common set of objectives” (Gurley, Peters, Collins, & Fifolt, 2015, p.218). Similarly, the school principal and leadership team, which includes middle managers, such as subject coordinators and administrators, are the driving forces behind carrying out the school’s mission and vision, and, together, they work in tandem towards making the small successive steps that will carry the school, its teachers, and its students towards the stated goal. Studies have shown that leadership is “second only to classroom instruction as an influence on student learning” (Louis, Leithwood, Whalstrom, & Anderson, 2010, p.9). If you think of a school as a ship, think of the principal as its captain and the faculty being the crew that work tirelessly around the clock to ensure that the school, or ship, is moving towards its destination. Just like any other company, a school needs to be effective and constantly on the look out to ensure that what is being offered at the
school is up to date and is successful in terms of teaching and learning. School effectiveness is measured quantitatively by student results and the progression of student progress and achievement over time, among other indicators. Hargreaves (2001) states two main pillars of school effectiveness. First, the institution is “committed to achieving high levels of intellectual and moral excellence” in its students, and second is the actual ability of the school’s community to achieve those high levels (p.491). Ensuring that teaching and learning are effective is a key pillar of school improvement. School improvement, rather, is studied qualitatively by examining school processes to identify areas that require focus and the plan needed for the school to reach its goals. Hopkins, Ainscow, and West (1994) echo this notion when they state “school improvement is about raising student achievement through focusing on the teaching-learning process and the conditions which support it” (p.3). Engaging in a cycle of self-improvement by regularly assessing its own implementation of new teaching methods, policies, and procedures, continuous improvement becomes integrated into the school’s daily practice (Bernhardt, 2002; Sagor, 2000; Zmuda, Kuklis, & Kline, 2004). Similarly, Teddlie and Reynolds (2000) state that “growth in student achievement over time is now seen as the most appropriate criterion” for assessing school effectiveness (p.10).

Here, it is crucial that the school staff and faculty are “on board” with whatever is happening at the leadership level, to ensure that all new programs and goals are clearly and explicitly stated, so that everyone is working towards the same goal. This process certifies that the school faculty and staff feel some degree of ownership towards the changes that in turn connects the change to personal “meaning” for the school faculty (Fullan, 1991). Working towards a common goal requires the school’s teaching and administrative bodies to do their individual parts while working towards the target. One
theoretical model of school achievement even found that collective teacher efficacy (CTE) was a stronger prediction of school achievement than school socioeconomic status (SES) (Hoy, Sweetland, & Smith, 2002). Sometimes, new programs are met with excitement and enthusiasm, and other times with apprehension, but it is up to the school leadership to encourage and work with the faculty and students to ensure the success of the school and organization. Being a successful school entails constantly striving to do better and achieve more, and an academically effective school would be likely to have “clear goals related to student achievement” and a structure “designed to maximize” student learning opportunities (Purkey & Smith, 1983, p.441). Providing opportunities for student achievement, as previously stated, is one of the key factors of school effectiveness, and one “essential” characteristic of effective schools is the belief that “all students can learn” (Murphy, 1992, p.94). To achieve this, Angus (1993) states that schools need to provide opportunities for student achievement by finding solutions and “dealing with” the social and cultural barriers to learning.

School improvement is the systematic, continued effort aimed at changing the learning conditions and other internal conditions, with the end target being to allow the school to accomplish their goals more effectively (van Velzen, Miles, Eckholm, Hameyer, & Robin, 1985, p.48). The school leadership, instructional methods, and curriculum development are all directly related to school effectiveness and thus have an effect on the school accomplishing its goals (Gurley et al., 2015). The degree to which the school is dedicated to improvement is directly reflected by the decisions that the school leadership makes. As Stoll and Fink (1996) point out, the ultimate aim of a school should be to enhance the progress of all students by focusing on teaching and learning, defining the direction of the school, enhancing student outcomes, and perhaps
most important of all, monitoring and evaluating the “process, progress, achievement, and development” of the institution (p.43). To enhance student progress, a school’s leadership should make decisions based on data. Teddlie and Reynolds (2000) support this notion and identified five factors of effective schools: strong instructional leadership from the principal, a pervasive and broadly understood instructional focus, a safe and orderly school learning environment, high expectations for achievement from all students, and the use of student achievement test data for evaluating programme and school success (p.10).

However, the school leadership must first ensure that the data they are looking at is worth the immense amount of effort that is required to analyze data, since the data has the potential to be extremely valuable and may lead to knowledge which in turn leads to action and improvement (Benjamin, 2014). Similarly, recent research suggests that “data-based decision making” may positively affect student achievement (Kerr, Marsh, & Ikemoto, 2006, p.500). Comparably, by systematically reviewing student work and relying on data from students themselves, teachers are able to better guide their practices (Marsh, Pane, & Hamilton, 2006).

Walking down the path of school improvement, the school in which I work decided to take control of below average student scores on our Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) test results. MAP tests are personalized assessments that work by adapting to the student’s learning level, thus being able to provide the school with individual results pertaining to student progress and growth (Northwest Evaluation Association, 2017 - a). Additionally, MAP tests have been adapted over the past thirty years and provide “the most stable scale and data in the assessment industry” as it employs benefits, such as engaging the student and family in academic goal setting, helping in evaluation of
programs and identifying professional development needs, and giving the school administration the ability to “compare and predict student achievement and growth over time” (Northwest Evaluation Association, 2017 - a). Furthermore, the MAP tests are untimed, which allows the student to complete the assessment without the added pressure of time, in addition to being self adaptive, which enables the student to work independently of their grade level and individual ability (Northwest Evaluation Association, 2017 - b). The MAP tests currently contain three parts, which are reading comprehension, language usage, and math. Schools utilize MAP tests to identify students who are “at risk”, and they may also be used to predict student performance on standardized tests (Hintze & Silberglitt, 2005). However, for the purposes of this study, I focused on reading comprehension and language usage. The availability of software that analyzes data on different levels has enabled the school to make evidence-based decisions regarding student achievement (Goldstein, 2003). MAP analyzes data by recording student scores on a vertical scale called the RIT that was created using the “Rasch model” and MAP’s parent company, the Northwest Evaluation Association (2017 - a), provides “extensive RIT growth norms by grade and score level for each test” (Pomplun, 2009, p.968). The RIT scale is a “stable equal-interval vertical scale” that allows the school to compare its students’ performance to state standards (including the Common Core State Standards), among others (Northwest Evaluation Association, 2017 - b). MAP tests are beneficial for students and schools in Lebanon because they allow students’ results to be compared to their peers in the United States, and they provide the school with information that may prove to be beneficial when the opportunity for changes to the curriculum arise. American standards are also important as the U.S. is a premier destination for higher education, and it attracts students all over the world.
Ensuring that a school meets American standards in turn ensures that students are on track and on par with what is being taught and learned in American educational institutions, thus ensuring a successful start to university life.

The proposed school works closely with and is accredited by AdvancEd, an American-based accreditation board. It recently passed its second round of a five-year accreditation term in the fall of 2015.

The school leadership took the first step to improve MAP test results by introducing two new approaches to teaching literacy, the implementation of the Reader’s Writer’s Workshop and the Words Their Way. The Reader’s Writer’s Workshop (RWW) is a model of teaching that addresses both the “whole group’s needs as well as differentiating for the needs of small groups and individuals” (Children’s Literacy Initiative, 2016) The RWW also includes leveled readers, whereby students read at their own pace and within their zone of proximal development, that is "the distance between the actual developmental level as determined by independent problem solving and the level of potential development as determined through problem solving under adult guidance, or in collaboration with more capable peers" (Vygotsky, 1978, p.86). Through this process, students are not frustrated by a difficult reading task or unchallenged by an easy reading one. The zone of proximal development ensures that the student is able to complete the task assigned independently while simultaneously being challenged by the task at hand.

Words Their Way is an approach to improving literacy, which provides students with strategies they need to learn to spell words correctly and on an individual basis. Beyond the idea of just spelling words correctly, Words Their Way is a word study program, whereby students actively engage in identifying patterns that justify why words are written the way they are and what the words actually mean. The reason the school
leadership decided to implement these two programs at the same time is a result of a common cause of reading problems faced by young learners and the difficulty they have in making “sound-letter associations” (Adams & Henry, 1997). By simultaneously introducing students to the sounds blended letters make, the way words are spelled, and to a word study program, and by providing individualized instruction for each student, the teacher is better able to understand the needs of the student, where their strengths lie, and which areas need improvement. By adopting this model, teachers are able to meet the grade level standard as well as provide “students the time and support they need to grow into fluent readers and writers” (Children’s Literacy Initiative, 2016).

Reader’s Writer’s Workshop and Words Their Way are both taught on the premise of differentiated and student centered instruction. The teacher therefore creates lessons plans accordingly. For each lesson, the teacher would highlight an evident problem present in a certain number of student writing pieces – for example, vague pronoun referencing. To begin, the teacher would put a list of statements on the board and theses statements would include vague pronoun referencing such as “Take the radio out of the car and fix it.” The students would then have time to think about the statements and then the teacher would ask them questions such as “Do you think that statement is incorrect?” If the students say yes, then the teacher would ask further questions such as what, specifically, is incorrect about this statement. As the students give their answers, the teacher prompts them to give more specific examples for further clarification. The teacher would then summarize the students’ observations and tell them that vague pronoun references are common mistakes in writing, and would then explain in further detail, what vague pronoun referencing entails. The students would then correct the statements on the board and the teacher may give them a sample paragraph
on how to identify vague pronoun references and correct them. A detailed lesson plan on vague pronoun referencing as part of the Reader’s Writer’s Workshop is available in Appendix A of this study.

Words Their Way encompasses teaching spelling, vocabulary and phonics through five different developmental stages. Just like the traditional spelling program, this approach to spelling incorporates a word list. However, the word list established is based on specified criteria: patterns in words and morphology. For example, the teacher plans a lesson to tackle how different prefixes affect the meaning of words and to identify the meaning of prefixes. The teacher would have a set of words that they dictate to the students. The teacher would then hand out the word sorts to students and the students would cut them out and then sort the words into their various categories. Should a student not know the meaning of the word, they may look it up. Students would then sort the words into categories based on the prefixes such as “in-,” “un-,” “dis-,” and so forth. The teacher would then walk around and ask students guiding questions such as why the student sorted the words in the way that they did and what they think the words have in common. Students are encouraged to give examples to support their answers. Then, the teacher initiates a discussion on what each prefix means and the students are encouraged to look for more words to add to their lists. A detailed lesson plan on Words Their Way is also available in Appendix A of this study.

The implementation of the aforementioned programs began in September 2013. At that time, the MAP tests were being administered twice a year in the school’s computer laboratory, typically in October and May. The school scheduler would schedule individual times for students to take the exam by grade level, and this process would typically take one month, taking into consideration unforeseen school closures and
Teacher, student, and faculty absences. Coupled with the poor Internet infrastructure available in Lebanon, having students sit for the MAP tests was sometimes tedious and frustrating. However, with time, the tests became administered in class on students’ own iPads.

Literacy skills are one of the most paramount, if not the most important skill, that children learn while in school, and there have been ample studies that found a relationship between teaching reading strategies and their positive effects on improving reading comprehension (Bereiter & Bird, 1985; Fuchs & Fuchs, 2005; King & Rosenshine, 1993; McNamara, 2007; Ozgungor & Guthrie, 2004; Palincsar & Brown, 1984). Teaching children to read begins at an early age, typically in Nursery, when students are introduced to the letters and how to identify them, and then moves into kindergarten, where they learn the sounds the letters make and how to blend letters to form words. Reading is the foundation for all other subjects that children are exposed to over time and without it they would not be able to solve math problems or read about the ancient history of Rome. Living in a country where English is often regarded as a second – if not third – language, developing literacy skills and a solid foundation is as crucial as ever. Working in a school that is more than forty years old has allowed me to experience first-hand the challenges and obstacles teachers face when literacy and the ability to read pose a problem for certain students; and conversely, when a student has a strong foundation in literacy, how much of a joy teaching and learning can be.

Tracking student progress over the course of the students’ academic careers provides valuable insights and provides the school with data that can be used to determine what factors and academic programs have had the most significant effect on a student learning. Analyzing data for students who are working at the grade level
standard, above the grade level standard, or are working below the grade level standard can provide answers, that a school leadership is looking for, to determine whether new programs or methods of instruction had any significant effect on student performance and whether the teaching methods or programs had any consequences on student achievement. By tracking student progress on MAP results, the school leadership will be able to determine and have concrete data to support their decision in implementing new literacy programs such as the Readers’ Writers’ Workshop and Words their Way. A longitudinal study is appropriate in this context because it allows for several data collection points. For example, pre and post implementation of new literacy programs and the MAP test results in the Fall and Spring enable the researcher to “capture correlations” and identify linkages between the aforementioned literacy programs by studying the test results (Eberhart, Hahn & Seybel, 2017).

For the purpose of this study, the term literacy was defined as a “unitary process with two complementary aspects, reading and writing” (Wray, 2002, p.1). To improve the literacy of elementary students at our school, the Reader’s Writer’s Workshop and Words Their Way were introduced at The Learning Academy in Beirut in September 2013.

1.2 The Statement of the Study

Prior to September 2013, the results of the school’s MAP tests were below average across all grade levels. Due to lack of research in the school about the effect that Readers’ Writers’ Workshop and Words Their Way have on MAP test results, this study aims to fill the gap in literature and to assist the school in evaluating their decision in implementing the two programs. Making decisions based on research is one of the keys
to school effectiveness, and this idea is supported by Renihan and Renihan (1989) when they state that by studying effective schools, researchers are able to use the data they find as a “catalyst for school improvement efforts” (p.365). School effectiveness is directly linked to the leadership styles and quality of teachers in a school and improving student achievement would be virtually impossible to do without a talented leadership team (Louis et al., 2010). Similarly, Hallinger and Heck (2010) found that a collaborative leadership model has a positive effect on student learning as it strengthens the school’s ability for academic improvement by fostering a culture of interaction between the teachers and staff. Ensuring effective teaching and learning is something that all schools strive to do and this is what distinguishes a mediocre school from an excellent one. Using data to build and make decisions is essential in ensuring that the school is moving forward and engaging in best practices and the latest pedagogies. Literacy is one of the key skills that a school is responsible for teaching, and high literacy affects the reading, writing, and speaking levels of its students. Here, the term “high literacy” would refer to students who have mastered the ability to “read and write accurately and effectively” and for the purposes of “developing the ability to use reading and writing to learn in other subjects” (Wray, 2002, p.23). Teaching children how to read depends on two main factors: the teacher’s understanding of the reading process and the teacher’s determination to “understand and respond to each child’s needs as a reader” (Keene & Zimmerman, 1997, p.xiv).

1.3 Purpose of the Study

The goal of MAP testing is to provide the educational establishment with the data needed to adequately identify the students’ level, regardless of the grade.
Undergoing MAP tests twice a year, in the fall and in the spring, allows the school to acquire data on each individual student and the progress they are making throughout the year. The purpose of this method allows teachers to identify those students who are at risk for not meeting the academic goals of their current grade level (Mellard, McKnight, & Woods, 2009). The earlier these risks are identified, the more likely the school is able to intervene and maximize the likelihood that students will benefit from the personalized intervention (January & Ardoin, 2015). Consequently, the introduction of the Reader’s Writer’s Workshop and Words Their Way is to ensure that the school is on the right track in terms of developing language and literacy skills in its students.

This is a longitudinal study that involves only one school. The study is going to determine two things:

1. How did the MAP results compare prior to and post implementation of the Reader’s Writer’s Workshop and Words Their Way?
2. How can the relationship between the Reader’s Writer’s Workshop, Words Their Way, and MAP testing be defined?

Accordingly, this is a quantitative causal comparative study that analyzes data in a Lebanese private school, where English is the main language of instruction. Specifically, it aims at answering the two aforementioned questions. Consequently, this study aims to find the relationship between the implementation of the Readers’ Writers’ Workshop and Words Their Way and student scores on their MAP test results in reading comprehension and language usage. Since the aforementioned programs were implemented in September 2013, this study compared the results of the MAP tests prior to September 2013 and compared them with the results of September 2014 to see
whether the implementation of the new literacy programs had any effect on student results.

1.4 Significance of the Study

This study is important for many different reasons; chief among them is to find out whether the implementation of the new program had any effects on student’s literacy and if so, to what extent. Another important question I would like to answer is if the implementation of the Reader’s Writer’s Workshop helped the students work toward the grade level standard and the average for MAP test results for their respective grade levels. The results would help the school have data to analyze when the time comes to assess the relevance and scope of the Reader’s Writer’s Workshop, and whether the model is working for the school and students.

This study is significant as, to my knowledge, it is the first such study done in a Lebanese school, and it sets the example for other schools to follow should they be having difficulty in improving the literary standards of their students. The school mentioned in this study is a pioneer in the area, being the first school to establish a full iPad school for all students from Grade 1 to Grade 12 and the first school in the region to offer academic support for students with mild learning difficulties. At The Learning Academy, academic support is provided to all students in all grade levels, whereas in other schools it is grade specific. In this regard, the school continues to be a pioneer in gathering evidence and conducting the study of the relationship between implementation of the Reader’s Writer’s Workshop and the Words their Way on MAP test results. This study also builds on previous research done by Mounla, Bahous, and Nabhani (2011) and Hachem, Nabhani, and Bahous (2008) that studies the effects of implementing the
Readers’ Workshop and Writers’ Workshop in two different grade levels in a private school in Beirut.

1.5 Thesis Division

This study incorporates six chapters. The first chapter is the introduction to the study and includes the background, purpose, and significance of the study. Chapter two consists of the literature review and draws on prior research to support student literacy with the introduction of the new literacy programs: Reader’s Writer’s Workshop and Words Their Way. Chapter three is the methodology section and includes information such as the method used, sample used, instruments, and limitations to the study. Chapter four states the study’s findings followed by a discussion of the findings in chapter five. Chapter six states the conclusion, limitations, and suggestions for further research.

This chapter states the definitions of school effectiveness and school improvement and lists specific criteria that a school should meet if they wish to be deemed effective and on the path to improvement. The importance of having a shared vision between the school leadership and faculty and staff help set clear goals that everyone works towards. Student achievement over time was also established as being an indicator of school effectiveness. Therefore, in order for a school to be effective, an emphasis must be placed on having effective teaching and learning strategies implemented inside the classroom with the goal being to improve student achievement.

Chapter two looks at, in further detail, the relevant literature that supports the study and aims to establish a connection between the implementation of new literacy programs and higher scores on standardized tests.
Chapter Two

Literature Review

This section examines the related literature that discusses the role of MAP tests, Readers’ Writers’ Workshop, and Words their Way in student literacy. This study is significant for a number of different reasons. Primarily, it aims to find out whether the implementation of the two new literacy programs had any effect on student literacy and if so, how much of an effect did it have? This study also aims to answer whether the implementation of Reader’s Writer’s Workshop helped students work toward the grade level standard and average of the MAP test results. Additionally, the study can be used to guide future decision making for the leadership team at The Learning Academy and to rely more heavily on data when making decisions on teaching and learning. Finally, this study is significant as, to my knowledge, it is the first such study done in a Lebanese school, and it sets the example for other schools to follow should they be having difficulty in improving the literary standards of their students.

Chapter two is organized into three main parts. First is a description of what the MAP tests are and how they can help schools use data to make decisions on differentiated instruction to meet the needs of all of their students. The second part discusses the components of a Reader’s Writer’s Workshop and what this entails inside the classroom both for the teacher and for the student. Finally, Words Their Way is examined in the third section, as a tool used to also help improve student spelling through a program that also uses differentiated instruction as a core component of the strategies used.
2.1 Measures of Academic Progress (MAP)

From a school leadership perspective, academic progress can mean a wide array of different things, which all depend on the mission and vision of the school. One particular school can view academic progress as a deduction in the number of students, who fail their grade level, and for other educational establishments it could be taking low achieving students and providing them with the support and environment they need to strive. It all depends on what the school’s ultimate goal is and what kind of progress they are looking for and working towards.

Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) Tests are personalized assessments designed to measure the progress and growth of each individual student. They are adaptable to each student and are untimed, giving the student the time to complete the assessment without the added pressure of time. MAP tests are currently offered for the following areas reading comprehension, language usage, science, and mathematics, and are available for students from grades two to twelve. Additionally, MAP tests are computer based and adaptive so that it is independent of grade level and meets the students’ ability in the test subjects (Northwest Evaluation Association, 2017). Utilizing MAP tests allows schools and teachers to be able to identify, in detail, students’ areas of strengths and weaknesses thereby allowing teachers to more easily differentiate instruction for each individual student. It challenges those students who are performing at a high level while adapting to meet the level of those students whose skills are below grade level, thereby moving at the students’ own pace. By providing teachers with precise details about the learning journey of each student, educators are able to easily identify areas that require supplemental instruction instead of playing a guessing game.
MAP tests are based on the American Common Core standards, which are in turn based on “what every student should know and be able to do in math and English language arts from kindergarten through to twelfth grade” (Common Core, 2017). These standards focus on developing the “critical thinking, problem-solving, and analytical skills” students need to be successful in their future careers (Common Core, 2017). By including the common core in its tests, MAP test results are able to provide schools and teachers with an evaluation of their programs, guidelines for differentiated instruction, student goal setting, and can also be used as a screener to identify students falling below grade level standards.

Differentiated instruction is a useful method to incorporate into lesson planning and instruction as it allows the student to work at their own pace and level. Essentially, differentiated instruction could be used as a tool to improve the teaching culture by “allowing instructors to better adapt to heterogeneous student groups” (Smit & Hupery, 2012, p. 1152). By integrating differentiated instruction into lesson planning, teachers are able to accommodate diverse learners in the classroom, providing more challenging work for the high achievers and giving middle achievers work that meets their level, while also allowing time and resources to be directed towards students who are struggling with meeting the lesson’s objectives. In other words, differentiated instruction allows all students to access the same classroom curriculum by providing entry points, learning tasks, and outcomes tailored to the learning needs of the student (Hall, Strangman, & Meyer, 2003).

For the purposes of school leadership, MAP test results can provide the data necessary to plan for school improvement, changes in the curriculum, or changes in teaching and learning, all of which have an influence on school effectiveness. Being
computer based and adaptive, the MAP assessments are able to “reveal precisely which academic skills and concepts the student has acquired and what they’re ready to learn” making classroom and lesson planning much more targeted to the individual needs of the learner, thereby creating evidence based instructional practices (Northwest Evaluation Association, 2017). Furthermore, and since the tests are computer adaptive, student’s scores are displayed on the screen upon completion of the test, and teachers and the school leadership are able to obtain a series of “customized reports” within a twenty four hour period (Cordray, Tony, Molefe, Brandt, & Pion, 2012).

Since MAP tests are based on the American Common Core standards, it is not surprising that they have the tendency to be culturally biased. For example, in the math assessment, students may be given a problem that uses quarters, nickels, and dimes – a concept foreign to anyone living outside the United States. Again, since the MAP test is computer based and is downloaded as it is, questions that can be culturally biased cannot be modified or skipped without having an effect on the student’s score. The choice behind using American standards is personal to the school, however this choice becomes clear when school leaders and educators are able to collect data and compare it to the standards of the millions of students studying in the United States. Another important limitation to note is that the MAP tests are all multiple choice and do not include any open ended questions.

The move towards having students take standardized tests has stemmed from the difficulty that teachers have when the time comes for them to “equate performance on classroom measures” with the students’ performance on “external measures”, such as standardized tests (Cordray et al., 2012, p.1). Having internal students scores and comparing them to their results on standardized tests can be useful to teachers when they
are preparing lessons and differentiating instruction. Differentiating instruction directs teachers to “make choices about the specific content” of their lessons, the “instructional strategies” that are being used inside the classroom, and the way in which students “demonstrate their proficiency” (Cordray et al., 2012, p.3). Differentiating instruction may lead to gains in student learning, which in turn leads to higher scores on standardized tests, which are both related to improving school wide achievement (Baenen, Ives, Lynn, Warren, Gilewicz, & Yaman, 2006; Baker & Linn, 2003). School wide achievement and an increase in individual student achievement are indicators that a school is an effective one. In sum, MAP tests are able to provide teachers and the school leadership with individual learning reports for each student that accurately pinpoint where their strengths and weaknesses lie and where the student lies in comparison with grade level standards. Studying the MAP test results also provides teachers with valuable information they may need when the time comes to differentiate instruction for certain students in order to help close their academic gaps and bring them closer to the grade level standard.

2.2 Reader’s Writer’s Workshop

Research on school effectiveness suggests that students’ literary performance could be related to three things: the effect of the school as a whole, the teacher, and the materials being used to teach (Wray, 2002). Having said that, the majority of research that has been done about effective teaching is rather general and is not specified to teaching literacy. However, further research states that the students who were able to get help when they needed it and knew what they could do once they had completed their work were those who were more likely to achieve (Wray, 2002). Bus and van Ijzendoorn
(1999) conducted eight studies which examined the long term effects of early gains in literacy found that after eighteen months, there were no significant effects on reading but there were small yet significant effects on spelling and comprehension (Hurry & Sylva, 2007). Here, it becomes crucial for teachers to match students with books that challenge them during independent reading time (Taberski, 2000; Tankersley, 2003). Similarly, when “students are not given the right books to read, their reading time will be less effective” (Mounla et al., 2011, p.12). It has also been confirmed by reading experts such as Krashen (1998), Allington and Cunningham (2002), and Routman (2003) that the only way to learn to read is by using “real literature” and by helping children to select books that are “just right” for them (Knowles, 2009).

Knowing this, the Readers’ Writers’ Workshop appeals to schools and educators because it provides the opportunity for both group and individual instruction, tailoring the needs and abilities of students to their own individual ability. In order for differentiated instruction to be successful and to meet the needs of each student, the teacher must possess a “deep knowledge of the reading process” and a deep understanding of the individual strengths and needs of each one of their students (International Reading Association, 2000). Here, the same attention should be given to the low and average achieving students and to the high achieving ones. If this does not occur, then it is likely that the low and average achieving students will suffer and that the high achieving students will make modest improvement (McGill-Franzen, Zmach, Solic, & Zeig, 2006; Schumm, Moody, & Vaughn, 2000). The Readers’ Writers’ Workshop is structured in a way that time is made available to students who require individual conferencing with the teacher to guide their reading and writing skills and provide feedback to the students. The Readers’ Workshop provides students with the
opportunity to learn the different techniques that the teacher has modeled and then to apply the techniques learned to work towards reaching their reading goals (Mounla et al., 2011). Similar to MAP testing, the Readers’ Writers’ Workshop provides opportunities for students to work at their own pace while also providing the classroom structure necessary for individualized instruction and reinforcement, should the need present itself. The Readers’ Writers’ Workshop model is an efficient way of teaching reading and writing because it allows the teachers to not only work with their students towards meeting the grade level standard but also provides them with the time that is necessary for their students to grow and become fluent readers and writers (Children’s Literacy Initiative, 2016). During a workshop lesson, teachers are able to:

1. Model reading and writing in front of students
2. Have students spend time engaging in independent reading
3. Have students share their writing by helping their peers write, edit, or revise a piece of writing
4. Have students share their comprehension about a piece of writing by utilizing partner reading strategies and
5. Confer with students on an individual basis and guide their reading and writing by teaching them skills and strategies (Children’s Literacy Initiative, 2016).

The Readers’ and Writers’ Workshops are broken down into small tasks that the student can work on independently and begin by checking what the student is able to do, what they are trying to do, and what they like to do.

In the Writers’ Workshop, and as the teacher collects the writing tasks, they would highlight an evident problem present in a certain number of student writing pieces
– for example, vague pronoun referencing. Consequently, the teacher seats the students in a group and delivers a mini-lesson plan on how to properly reference pronouns. They can start by giving them a short paragraph or a series of sentences that contain the aforementioned error and have students’ identify them, therefore, using an exploratory approach. After student identification, the teacher elicits answers on how to fix this problem. The idea of the workshop is to have it student-centered and engaging. When the teacher makes sure that their students understand the lesson and are able to apply it, they ask the students to jot down their notes on their copybook. The student will refer to these notes when they embark on a future writing task. The rubric that the teacher uses to assess student reading and writing are developed by the teacher but are specific to the particular group of students who are being taught and are derived from the “original expectations of the study for that genre in the classroom” (Lattimer & Diller, 2003). For example, if a teacher is delivering a lesson where the objective is for students to use appropriate punctuation in their writing, then the rubric may include asking whether capital letters and periods were used correctly, whether exclamation marks were used correctly, and so on. The feedback given by the teacher to the student is then based on explicit criteria, and the student is aware of what is needed to improve. Developing a rubric with student input is also essential, as this explicitly shows them what is expected of them as writers and gives them guidelines by which to edit and peer edit their work. Calkins (2001) echoes this by writing that any task done in a writer’s workshop should be kept “predictable and simple” so students have a clear idea about what the expectations for their work are (p.183).

A Readers’ Workshop involves using a similar format to Writers’ Workshop and its aim is to emphasize the “interaction between readers and text” (Reader’s Workshop,
2016). The Reader’s Workshop involves using a mini lesson to learn about some properties of literature or aims to teach the student a particular strategy that would help them read more effectively and once the mini lesson is complete, students are required to engage in independent reading time where they use a journal to respond to the piece they are reading about how it makes them feel or what thoughts it provoked in their minds. Here, the reader’s workshop aims to build on “connections between students’ experiences” while providing them with a “structured community” where they can share what they’re reading as they learn about the text, themselves, and their peers (Taylor & Nesheim, 2001, p.48). After the mini lesson and the journaling sessions, students are then encouraged to share their findings with their peers, and their classmates can also provide the student with feedback on their journal entries. Independent reading time also allows the teacher to provide one on one instruction to students who require the extra support (Reader’s Workshop, 2016).

2.3 Words their Way

Words their Way was introduced as part of the Reading Recovery Program, a short-term intervention for students who have difficulty reading and writing (Reading Recovery Council of America, 2015). Although this program was originally designed to help struggling first graders, the program was later expanded to help identify students who require longer-term support and whose needs could not be met by the short-term intervention of the Reading Recovery Program (Reading Recovery Council of America, 2015). Word boxes and word sorts are two techniques that have been embedded within the Reading Recovery Program and incorporate spelling and phonemic awareness with the use of concrete manipulatives (Stahl, Duffy-Hester, & Stahl, 1998).
Word sort activities aim to teach the student to recognize words that have similar sounds, are spelled the same, and can be sorted into similar categories (Bear, Invernizzi, Templeton, & Johnston, 1996). This technique also allows students to develop phonemic awareness (Joseph, 2002). Phonemic awareness is a “cover term” that refers to “capabilities that require people to consciously analyze and manipulate the sound structure of spoken words” (Ehri, 1989, p. 356). By sounding out the sounds of letters, the student is able to make connections between what they see and what they hear. As such, students are able to make sense of the world around them. By becoming phonemically aware, young children are able to translate their understanding of their surroundings into thoughts, words, and stories. Phonemic awareness is so paramount that Every Child Reading: An Action Plan of Learning First Alliance (1998) states that it is “one of the most important foundations of reading success” and they recommend that phonemic development begin as early as in prekindergarten. The National Reading Panel (2000) supports this idea and recommends that phonemic awareness and the letter-sound correspondence be “systematically and explicitly taught through second grade.” Additionally, studies have shown that along with knowledge of the letters, phonemic awareness is one of the prime predictors of reading achievement (Share, Jorm, Maclean, & Matthews, 1984).

By incorporating word sort activities into the classroom setting, learners are able to analyze, examine, and differentiate patterns in words, which in turn helps them to more easily identify word patterns throughout their future learning journeys. Similar to the Readers’ Writers’ Workshop, the Reading Recovery Program provides individualized instruction for students as well as provides detailed feedback for teachers,
which enables them to plan lessons and instruction (Reading Recovery Council of America, 2015).

Essentially, Words Their Way encompasses teaching spelling, vocabulary and phonics through five different developmental stages. Just like the traditional spelling program, this approach to spelling incorporates a word list. However, the word list established is based on specified criteria: patterns in words and morphology.

Initially, students are pre-assessed. The teacher would have a set of words that they dictate to the students, and the teacher might give them sentences that contain those words for some extra support. Later, the teacher evaluates those words based on itemized criteria. Accordingly, students are grouped into the different stages highlighted in the Words their Way Program. The developmental stages are: Emergent Spelling Stage, Letter Name Alphabetic, Within Word Pattern, Syllables and Affixes, and Derivational Relations (Bear, Invernizzi, Templeton, & Johnston, 2015). Afterwards, the teacher would distribute the word lists to the students. Students cut the word lists and physically sort the words into their respective categories. For example, if I were to take a sort in the Syllables and Affixes Stage titled Syllable Juncture in VCV and VCCV Patterns, words are grouped based on three categories VCV (as in silent or fever), VCCV (where the consonants are different as in winter or after), and VCCV (where the consonants are the same as in follow or funny). Over a period of one week, students would be sorting, speed sorting, or blind sorting the words they have into categories while saying them out loud. Speed sorting is a strategy where students set timers and sort the words repeatedly; they would always try to beat their highest score. Blind sorting is when someone reads the words out for them, and they would know which pattern the word belongs to. This procedure should happen for at least twenty minutes.
every day. By the end of the week, the teacher administers the spelling assessment to assess students’ mastery of words (Bear et al., 2015).

One crucial point of strength is that this program is personalized; it is individualized in a way that caters to students’ needs and ability levels. Keesey, Konrad, and Joseph (2015) found that the introduction of a word box instruction for letter-sound correspondence in two of the three students approached the 50th percentile and resulted in a “rapid increase” in their performance; this was a pleasant occurrence since these students were previously performing below the average of their peers. Consequently, students with high-ability levels are not bored due to unchallenging instruction, and students with low-ability levels are not frustrated due to the relatively difficult tasks that they are being assigned to (Adelson & Carpenter, 2011). Described ability grouping is working with students in their zone of proximal development (ZPD), which is itself defined by Vygotsky (1978) to be the distance “between the actual developmental level as determined by independent problem solving and the level of potential development as determined through problem solving under adult guidance or in collaboration with more capable peers” (p.86).

This is what we seek to promote by finding the precise level where the student can work independently while maintaining a level whereby they are being challenged and taught to thinking outside the box and of different strategies that can be used to solve a particular problem. Working within the ZPD has proven to be an effective approach to disseminate positive achievement results. As Lou, Abrami, Spence, Poulsen, Chambers, and d’Apollonia (1996) put it, it is the goal of the teacher to ensure that every student learns effectively and with a sense of satisfaction. The Words their Way program really enables the teacher to do so. In fact, it even facilitates the process of
differentiation by having the sorts already laid out according to ability levels. All the teacher has to do is retrieve them and provide mini-lessons about the patterns to the different ability groups in her classroom.

Another point of strength that this program displays lies within the word grouping. Words are grouped based on similarities and differences between their patterns. Students are to sort the words according to the pattern they detect in order to understand why this word is spelled in this particular manner. Hence, words are not grouped haphazardly and word pattern – morphology -- is highly regarded. So how efficient is it to teach spelling through an understanding of the words’ morphological aspect?

Kolne, Hill, and Gonnerman (2013) conducted a study with the aim of comparing the effectiveness of two spelling interventions: one is focused on the morphological structure, and the other is focused on word meanings. Results portrayed that both approaches increase spelling accuracy. However, the group of children who received morphological instructions retained more spelling knowledge than those who received the vocabulary instruction. Consequently, Kolne et al. (2013) concluded that teaching children about the structure of complex words supports their spelling ability in the long-term. Therefore, morphological knowledge is very crucial in literacy development. Deacon and Kirby (2004) support this notion by emphasizing that metalinguistic awareness of morphological structures helps students in spelling more words correctly. Students who acquire this aspect of language are able to score better on their spelling tests. In other words, and according to documented meta-analyses, morphological instruction improves children’s spelling (Goodwin & Ahn, 2013). Additionally, Bowers, Kirby and Deacon (2010) also elaborate on this spelling
acquisition by claiming that when students are explicitly taught morphological relationships between words, their reading and writing skills subsequently improve.

McCutchen and Stull (2015) also support the idea that morphological knowledge aids in accurate spelling. It enhances students’ spelling in different contexts. This enhancement is reflected through the major contributions of morphological knowledge for writers of English (Fayol, 2012).

Because morphological insights can elucidate or interpret many peculiarities in the English spelling (Moats, 2000), Nunes and Bryant (2006) argued that teaching spelling from a morphological approach yields positive results where students can retain words on a long-term basis and can apply morphological rules to spell out new words that they have not been exposed to before.

As a result, teaching spelling through a morphological lens has proven to be efficient. Students are able to retain the words learnt on the long run and are able to apply morphological rules to new words that they haven’t been exposed to before, thus spelling them correctly. The Words their Way program applies this approach to teaching spelling.

The Readers’ and Writers’ Workshop and the Words their Way program both aim to strengthen the root of the English language to make reading and writing more accessible and easier for children to learn and comprehend. Similarly, it provides teachers with a list of step by step instructions and guidelines that they can follow to break up a seemingly daunting task into easy to follow and easier to teach chunks and lessons. All three aforementioned strategies aim to work with the student on an individualized level so that the student’s areas of strength and weakness can be identified and a plan can be set to help them improve. Consequently, the two programs...
provide the school leadership team and the teachers with valuable information pertaining to students’ needs and ability levels and to developing relevant lesson plans. Teaching literacy is no easy task, especially when classrooms are full of a wide array of diverse learners, coming from different backgrounds with different experiences and various abilities. Individualized interventions and differentiated instruction are two crucial tools needed in every classroom and every school across the world. While there has been little research on the effectiveness of differentiated instruction, Edyburn (2004) argues that evidence does exist that “concepts such as readiness, individualization, and the zone of proximal development and the principles of differentiation are effective for enhancing student achievement.” All of the aforementioned programs aim to get students to work in their zone of proximal development thus being one step closer to having students work to the best of their capabilities.

Chapter two discusses, at length, the components of each of the new literacy programs and their benefits to student learning and outcomes. MAP tests are useful for school leadership because they provide individualized reports per student so their progress is easy to track. Similarly, MAP test results can provide the data necessary to plan for school improvement, changes in the curriculum, or changes in teaching and learning, all of which have an influence on school effectiveness. The Reader’s Writer’s Workshop is another program that stresses the importance of differentiated instruction and appeals to schools and educators because it provides the opportunity for both group and individual instruction, tailoring the needs and abilities of students to their own individual ability. The Reader’s Writer’s Workshop provides opportunities for students to work at their own pace while also providing the classroom structure necessary for individualized instruction and reinforcement, should the need present itself. Following
suit with differentiated instruction, Words Their Way also provides individualized instruction for students as well as provides detailed feedback for teachers, which enables them to plan lessons and instruction more effectively.

Chapter three discusses the methodology behind the study; how the data will be used and studied in order to establish relationship between the new literacy programs and also aims to provide the answers to the following two research questions:

1. How did the MAP results compare prior to and post implementation of the Reader’s Writer’s Workshop and Words Their Way?
2. How can the relationship between the Reader’s Writer’s Workshop, Words Their Way, and MAP testing be defined?
Chapter Three

Methodology

Chapter three includes the methodology of the study that aims to find a relationship between the introduction of two new literacy programs and student scores on the MAP test. This chapter presents the design of a quantitative longitudinal study that aims at answering the following two questions:

1. How did the MAP results compare prior to and post implementation of the Reader’s Writer’s Workshop and Words Their Way?
2. How can the relationship between the Reader’s Writer’s Workshop, Words Their Way, and MAP testing be defined?

3.1 Research design

This study is a quantitative study because it is the “systematic investigation” of the implementation of a new program and uses “statistical or numerical data” that can be analyzed and conclusions can be drawn from the data (Watson, 2015, p.44). It is a causal comparative study because it will seek to “find relationships between independent and dependent variables after an action or event has already occurred” (Salkind, 2010, p.124).

Consequently, the proposed study is a quantitative, longitudinal study that uses MAP test scores in reading comprehension and language usage from a group of seventeen students over a period of two years; pre, during, and post implementation of the Reader’s Writer’s Workshop and Words Their Way programs. The study analyzes the data using Microsoft Excel sheets. The data is then used to create graphs to further
investigate to determine if any correlations exist between the implementation of Reader’s Writer’s Workshop and Words Their Way and MAP test results.

By examining the MAP test scores pre and post implementation of the literacy programs, I hoped to establish some sort of relationship between the implementation of these programs and the results of the MAP tests. Once the relationship between them had been identified, the results could be used “with caution, in the search of cause and effect” (Fraenkel, Wallen, & Hyun, 2012, p.364). Another reason why a causal comparative study fits my study purpose is that I hoped to find a “link between the intervention or stimulus and realized outcomes” (Schenker & Rumrill, 2004, p.165). Here, the intervention would be the implementation of the literacy programs clearly defined by a set date (September 2013), and the realized outcomes would be the results of the MAP tests.

This study looked into the MAP test results of the 2013/2014, 2014/2015, and 2015/2016 academic years to see if there is a correlation between higher MAP test scores and the implementation of the Readers’ Writers’ Workshop and Words Their Way for individual students in addition to studying the class average. This study analyzed the results from the three aforementioned academic years and involved students who were enrolled in Grade 3 for the 2013-2014 and those same students who were in Grade 5 during the 2015-2016 academic year.

The Reader’s Writer’s Workshop can be seen as a collective package that addresses reading, reading comprehension, writing, grammar, and vocabulary. Therefore, this program impacts both MAP test score results, the one pertaining to reading comprehension and the one pertaining to language usage. The Words their Way program has a greater role in language usage, as in grammar and vocabulary.
Consequently, it shapes a greater impact on language usage MAP test scores. For the purposes of this study, the two programs are not individually studied in their effects on MAP test scores. In fact, they are considered as a joint bundle because, together, the two programs are thought to make a stronger impact on the scores.

### 3.2 Sampling

This study collected and studied data from three cohorts: students in Grade 3 in September 2013, students in Grade 4 in September 2014, and students in Grade 5 in September 2015. Results were gathered in the fall and spring of each academic year. Here, a causal comparative study works, as the dependent variable is the students’ MAP test results and the independent variables are the implementation of Words Their Way and the Readers’ Writers’ Workshop. The defining event that occurred was the implementation of the literacy programs.

Furthermore, causal comparative research designs involve the use of “pre-existing or derived groups to explore differences between or among those groups on dependent variables” (Schenker & Rumrill, 2004, p.363). For this case, the pre-existing groups were the grade levels as “the most common method of selecting participants” for causal comparative research is to choose participants who “already belong to the groups” that are being studied (Schenker & Rumrill, 2004, p.363). However, it is important to note here that although some relationships might have become apparent, causation cannot be fully determined.

The research site was based on convenience and the fact that the researcher worked as an administrator in the school, data was relatively easy to obtain. Convenience sampling is defined as the selection of participants based on “time, money,
location, availability of sites and respondents” and so on (Merriam, 2009, p.79). The researcher chose the particular grade levels, as they are the ones who have the largest number of students who have been students at The Learning Academy for the longest period of time, with the majority of students in the respective grade levels beginning their education at The Learning Academy. They are thus considered to be a somewhat stable sample. In this regard, choosing the sample class followed a purposive sampling approach because its participants can provide the information needed for this study.

The sample class included thirteen boys and four girls in which two students were above average students, ten were meeting the grade level standard and were average students, and five were not meeting grade level standards. All five students who were not meeting the grade levels standards were males.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th># Students in Class</th>
<th># Students who sat for MAP test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013-2014</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-2015</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-2016</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Learning Academy caters to a diverse student body and the grade levels consist of a wide array of academic capabilities. However, students with learning difficulties are not included in the sample and these students do not sit for the MAP tests as their learning difficulties prevent them from doing so. Therefore, the results are only studied for those students who
3.3 Instruments and data collection

The instruments employed in this session of study are the MAP tests results over a course of three years for the same cohort – students who were enrolled in Grade 3 for the 2013-2014 academic year, Grade 4 for the 2014-2015 academic year, and Grade 5 during the 2015-2016 academic year. Retrieving data was facilitated through its presence on the Learning Academy database. In this regard, access to the database was obtained through the help of the Academy’s IT department and scores of the aforementioned grade levels and academic years were extracted.

3.4 Data analysis

The study is divided into three main time frames. First, the results of the 2013-2014 MAP tests were analyzed to garner an idea about student’s MAP test results pre-implementation of the Readers’ Writers’ Workshop and Words Their Way. The second phase focused on the MAP test results of the 2014-2015 year when implementation of the Readers’ Writers’ Workshop and Words Their Way started to establish whether the MAP test results moved more towards the average after the implementation of the Readers’ Writers’ Workshop and the Words their Way programs. The third phase included the MAP test results of the 2015-2016 academic year to see whether the literacy programs that were introduced were still having an effect on the MAP test results, be it positive or negative. We examined the grade average by class in addition to studying individual student progress.

This study analyzed data using Microsoft Excel sheets that detailed all of the students’ scores for reading comprehension and language usage during the Measures of Academic Progress tests. This data was then used to create graphs and the grades were
analyzed to see if any correlations existed between the implementation of Readers’ Writers’ Workshop and Words their Way and MAP test results. Analyzing the grades pre, during, and post implementation of the different programs allowed the school leadership and the teachers to determine whether the introduction of these programs was beneficial in raising the average MAP test scores. The aim of studying the data was to find correlations between the implementation of the Reader’s Writer’s Workshop and Words Their Way and higher student MAP test results for reading comprehension and language usage by aiming to answer the study’s two main research questions:

1. How did the MAP results compare prior to and post implementation of the Reader’s Writer’s Workshop and Words Their Way?
2. How can the relationship between the Reader’s Writer’s Workshop, Words Their Way, and MAP testing be defined?

Once the data was entered into the Excel sheets, the graphs were used to analyze MAP test results as follows. The first set of data included the MAP test results pre-implementation, and those were done in the fall of 2013. These results are per student and reflect student scores pre and post implementation of the literacy programs. The second data set looked at the results during implementation of Readers’ Writers’ Workshop and Words Their Way, in fall of 2014 for each individual student. The final set of data included the scores of the students two years post implementation on the MAP test results done in the fall of 2015. The mean scores of the MAP test results were also analyzed to be used by the school leadership in future decision making situations. The data set followed the progress of students who were in Grade 3 during the 2013-2014 academic year and those same students who were in Grade 5 during the 2015-2016 academic year.
The primary source of data was the individual student reports as they appeared when downloaded from the MAP test website. After consultation with the school’s leadership team and upon the study’s approval by the Institutional Review Board, the school’s I.T. manager helped provide the researcher with the required data. The data was then manually entered into a Microsoft Excel table and divided into lines and columns. Once the data was entered and the table complete, the researcher used a tool inside of Microsoft Excel to display the student’s scores in a line graph. In order to find the percentage of students whose scores increased or decreased, simple math formulas were used; for example, to find the percentage of students whose scores increased, their number was divided by the total number of students and multiplied by hundred. Both the table and graph are shown in chapter four of this study.

3.5 Reliability and validity

Traditional research states that a study’s validity may be guaranteed when researchers describe and analyze the results of a study objectively (McNiff, Lomax, & Whitehead, 1996). Similarly, Burns (2000) states that the researcher should make special attention to the reliability and validity of their research studies because it leads to an enhancement of their professional practices. Merriam (2009) also writes that in order to ensure validity and reliability, the data must be collected in an ethical way. Quantitative research helps objectivity as using numbers and noticing general trends that either increase or decrease becomes very clear. Merriam (2009) also writes that validity and reliability can be addressed through the way that the results are “collected, analyzed, and interpreted” (p.209).
Additionally, validity and reliability are ensured through the research design employed. In this regard, the quantitative study looked at the analysis of scores and did not elicit socially construct opinions. Moreover, the selection process of participants was vividly justified, where the sole interest of the study relies on student scores in the regular education program.

In this study, data was gathered from the primary source that was the student’s individual progress reports from the Northwest Evaluation Association, parent company of the MAP test. Furthermore, copies of the individual student scores are included in Appendix B of this study.

3.6 Ethics

I followed all the rules and guidelines of the Institutional Review Board and their approval and consent was granted before data collection commenced. I also took the online course and received my certificate prior to collecting any data or interacting with anyone for the purposes of this study.

Chapter three explained the methodology of the study and how qualitative data was collected, studied, and analyzed in order to establish a possible correlation between the implementation of two new literacy programs, the Reader’s Writer’s Workshop and Words Their Way, and student standardized testing scores in reading comprehension and language usage. Chapter three also details the sample of this study; seventeen students in all; thirteen males and four females. The main instruments used are student scores on the reading comprehension and language uses portions of the MAP test and Microsoft Excel, which was the program used by the researcher to input data and generate graphs. Limitations are also discussed.
Chapter four takes a more in-depth look at the data and identifies which students saw improvement in their scores versus those whose scores stayed the same or regressed. Chapter four displays the data both in table form and in graph form, to make trends and relationships easier to identify and discuss. Individual student scores as well as the class average are explored and examined. Graphs and tables are analyzed for convenience purposes.
Chapter Four

Results

This chapter explores, in detail, individual student grades in reading comprehension and language usage for the 17 students who sat for MAP testing at The Learning Academy during the period from Spring 2013 to Spring 2015. Reading comprehension targets texts and questions to ensure understanding, whereas language use deals with syntax, as in grammatical rules and structures, and lexical categories, as in vocabulary. Language usage also considers the communicative meaning to language or the rules of making language. The data results are used to answer the following research questions by analyzing data pre and post implementation of two new literacy programs and to determine the effect, if any, they had on standardized testing administered by the school administration in the fall and spring of every year. The two research questions are as follows:

1. How did the MAP results compare prior to and post implementation of the Reader’s Writer’s Workshop and Words Their Way?

2. How can the relationship between the Reader’s Writer’s Workshop, Words Their Way, and MAP testing be defined?

Table 1 Individual student MAP reading scores by reporting period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Reading Spring 2013</th>
<th>Reading Fall 2013</th>
<th>Reading Spring 2014</th>
<th>Reading Fall 2014</th>
<th>Reading Spring 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student 1</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 2</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 3</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>Data unavailable</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 5</td>
<td>Data unavailable</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 6</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 7</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 8</td>
<td>Data unavailable</td>
<td>Data unavailable</td>
<td>Data unavailable</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 9</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>Data unavailable</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 10</td>
<td>Data unavailable</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 11</td>
<td>Data unavailable</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 12</td>
<td>Data unavailable</td>
<td>Data unavailable</td>
<td>Data unavailable</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 13</td>
<td>Data unavailable</td>
<td>Data unavailable</td>
<td>Data unavailable</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 14</td>
<td>Data unavailable</td>
<td>Data unavailable</td>
<td>Data unavailable</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 15</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 16</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>Data unavailable</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 17</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 shows student reading comprehension scores per reporting term from Spring 2013 to Spring 2015 in table format. The data in Table 1 compiles individual student scores in the reading comprehension sub-category of the standardized test, Measures of Academic Progress (MAP). Upon closer inspection and analysis of the grades, ten out of the seventeen students demonstrated increased scores in the reading comprehension part of the standardized test when we compare their results from the Spring of 2013 to their results from the Spring of 2015. Therefore, 59% of students saw an increase in their reading scores from the Spring of 2013 to the Spring of 2015. All of the seven remaining students showed improvement from their first reported set of scores.
compared to their final results reported in the Spring of 2015. As a result, 41% of students saw an improvement in their reading scores when the first reporting term is available when compared to their results in the Spring of 2015. Therefore, all seventeen students showed a varying increase in their scores in the reading comprehension component of the MAP test from their original reporting date when compared to those of Spring 2015, which translates to 100% of students having higher scores in Spring of 2015 when compared to Spring 2013 or the first available reporting term.

However, the data for the seven students is available at different reporting intervals throughout the aforementioned reporting period. This could be due to a number of different factors. One reason could be that the students were not enrolled at The Learning Academy during that time. As previously mentioned, The Learning Academy caters to a diverse group of learners, and therefore one or more of the seven students for whom data is unavailable may have been enrolled in one or more of the school’s support programs; students could have been receiving English reinforcement or attending pull out classes as part of their enrolment in the learning support department of the school. In both cases, it is school policy that the students do not sit for MAP tests if they are part of a pull out program that simultaneously occurs at a time during which the rest of the class are studying literacy. The students are eligible to sit for their MAP tests upon their rejoining the main classroom for English language or math. In the case of students three and sixteen, it is most likely that they were not physically present in school at the time of testing which resulted in their scores being unavailable.
In correlation with the data in Table 1, the display of grades on a line graph makes the data easier to read and also simpler and clearer to see the improvement in student reading comprehension scores for the period between Spring 2013 and Spring 2015 for the seventeen students for which data is available. The fluctuations in student grades on the reading comprehension portion of the MAP test becomes more apparent in Figure 1, and this data shows opportunities for further research as to the reasons behind these fluctuations in student grades. This could be related either to challenges in the school or to challenges in their personal lives. Nevertheless, the data shows that 100% of student grades increased from the first reporting period when compared to the results in
Spring 2015. It is also worth mentioning that while there are significant fluctuations in student grades within the time period between Spring 2013 and Spring 2015, thirteen out of the seventeen, or 76% of students, saw an increase in their scores from the Fall of 2014 to the Spring of 2015, while their grades in the reading comprehension component of the test were fluctuating in the period prior to Fall 2014.

Individual fluctuations, as previously mentioned, could be due to a number of different reasons, either personal reasons relating to the student and their family which may have an effect on their grades, or the student may have been facing academic difficulties as a result of the introduction of new academic programs and standards that the school leadership team decided to implement. The fluctuations in student grades could also be related to the adaptation period required whenever a new program is implemented, and this is mentioned by Fullan (2001) when he discusses the term “implementation dip” to describe the period of time that is defined by a lapse in performance and confidence when a new program is being introduced and new skills are being developed to support the new program. As previously mentioned, the gaps in student data are as a result of different factors; either the student was physically absent from school during the testing period, or they were enrolled in one of the school’s support programs that exempted them from sitting for the MAP tests.

Upon inspection of the data in Figure 1, it is clear that there are certain results that fall outside of the trend norm, namely results for students 16, 4, and 13. Student 16’s results of the reading portion of the MAP test fall below the average for the class’s initial scores, pre implementation of the literacy programs. While there was a slight improvement in Student 16’s grades from Spring 2013 to the Fall of 2013 and the Spring of 2014 with Student 16’s grades as follows 149, 152, and 153, his grades in the Spring
of 2015 witnessed an impressive increase of 20 points to 173 even though his grade for the Fall of 2014 was unavailable due to travel. Remarkable increase is also noticed for students who are working below the class average such as Students 10 and 4. Student 4’s performance is also worth mentioning as there was a rather large improvement in their grades from the Fall of 2013 to the Spring of 2014 and their grade increasing by approximately 17%. This could be the fact that the literacy programs that were introduced are all based on the premise of differentiated instruction whereby the teacher works with the individual student according to their own level. Differentiated instruction has been researched at length as a way of meeting the different needs of diverse learners in classrooms around the world today (Carolan & Guinn, 2007; Ding & Sherman, 2006; Dunn & Dunn, 2008; Good, 2006; Heck, 2009; Rakow, 2007; Santamaria, 2009; Stronge, Ward, Tucker, & Hindman, 2008; Tieso, 2003; Tomlinson, 2006; Tomlinson, Brimijoin, & Narvaez, 2008). For student 13, their grades were not available for the first 3 testing times most probably as a result of them not being enrolled at The Learning Academy for Spring 2013 and then, upon enrolment in the Fall of 2014, they entered the additional English language reinforcement classes offered at the school and were thus exempted from taking the MAP tests. However, what is also remarkable is that, upon reintroduction to the mainstream class, the student scored a 153 on the reading portion of their MAP test which although is below the class average, the progress made in the classroom and upon exposure to the new literacy programs, the student increased their score by approximately 5% in one academic year.
Table 2 Individual student MAP language usage scores by reporting period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Language Usage; Spring 2013</th>
<th>Language Usage; Spring 2014</th>
<th>Language Usage; Spring 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student 1</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 2</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 3</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 4</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>Data unavailable</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 5</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 6</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 7</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 8</td>
<td>Data unavailable</td>
<td>Data unavailable</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 9</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 10</td>
<td>Data unavailable</td>
<td></td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 11</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 12</td>
<td>Data unavailable</td>
<td>Data unavailable</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 13</td>
<td>Data unavailable</td>
<td>Data unavailable</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 14</td>
<td>Data unavailable</td>
<td>Data unavailable</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 15</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 16</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 17</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 shows the variation of language usage grades from Spring 2013 to Spring 2015 for 17 students. The data in the table above displays students’ grades in the language usage portion of the MAP tests in the Spring of the 2013, 2014, and 2015 years respectively. Here, and for reasons mentioned above, some data is missing for a total of 6 students. What is also worthy of mentioning is while the results did not fluctuate as much in the Spring of 2014, the data does not provide as much of a comprehensive idea as the data for reading does. Out of 17 students, 11 students’ scores increased from the
Spring of 2013 to the Spring of 2014, equating 69%. Of the six remaining students, four of them do not have available data for the Spring 2013 and 2014 MAP tests, so it is impossible to determine whether there was improvement or not. Of the final two students, Student 4 does not have the score for their Spring 2014 test and Student 10 does not have results for Spring 2013. We can therefore conclude that Student 4 was absent during the testing window and Student 10 was most probably not enrolled at The Learning Academy at the time of testing since their data is not available. Of the seventeen students, eleven out of them, so approximately 69% of students, saw an increase in their grades from the Spring of 2013 to the Spring of 2015. When we compare their reading comprehension results from the same time period, eight out of the seventeen students, or 47% show an increase in their reading comprehension scores.

Student 16 is an outlier and does not fit the trend that is applicable to the remaining 69% whose scores increased from the Spring of 2013 to the Spring of 2015. Rather, Student 16 initially increased their total score on language usage from 165 in the Spring of 2013 to 177 in the Spring of 2014, before dropping back down to 165 in the Spring of 2015. Student 16 was identified with a learning difficulty in the Spring of 2015 and was subsequently moved to the school’s learning support department. Student 2 shows a similar pattern to Student 16 because they started with a score of 194 in the Spring of 2013 and then increased to a score of 203 in the Spring of 2014, before dropping down to a 197 in the Spring of 2015, which is only a 3 point increase from their original scores and in the Spring of 2013. The class average for language usage for the Spring of 2013 was 193.5, and Student 2’s score in the Spring of 2013 was 194 as previously mentioned. It could then be inferred that Student 2 represents the “average”
student grades and whose slight progress can be a result of the differentiated learning happening inside the classroom during literacy instruction.

Similar to Students 16 and 2, Student 3 was performing close to the class average in the Spring of 2013 with a score of 190 compared to the class average of 193.5. In the Spring of 2014, student three’s scores declined by 3 points to reach 187, which was further below the class average of 196.25 for the Spring of 2014. What is interesting to note, however, is the jump from the Spring of 2014 with 187 points to the Spring of 2015 with 198 points, which also happens to be the class average for the same time frame. Here, the student was performing close to the class average in the Spring of 2013, then was working below class average in the Spring of 2014, only to having the same exact score as the class average in the Spring of 2015.
### Table 3 Students 2, 3, and 16 language usage scores for 3 reporting terms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Language Usage; Spring 2013</th>
<th>Language Usage; Spring 2014</th>
<th>Language Usage; Spring 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student 2</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 3</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 16</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 4 Students 2, 3, and 16 language usage scores for 3 reporting periods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Reading Comprehension; Spring 2013</th>
<th>Reading Comprehension; Spring 2014</th>
<th>Reading Spring 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student 2</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 3</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>Data unavailable</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 16</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 2 shows the variation of language grades from Spring 2013 to Spring 2015 for 17 students. In correlation with the data in Table 2, Figure 2 shows the variation of student grades in the language usage portion of the MAP tests for the following three reporting terms: Spring 2013, Spring 2014, and Spring 2015. The data in chart form makes it easier to establish trends in student grades. Furthermore, upon further inspection of language usage grades from Spring 2013 to Spring 2014 six out of the seventeen students, or 35%, saw an increase in their grades, five out of 17 students, or 29%, saw a decrease in their grades, and for the remaining six students, or 35%, data was not available. In the period from Spring 2014 to Spring 2015, 9 out of the seventeen students, or 53%, saw an increase in their grades, 3 out of 17, or 18%, saw a decrease in their grades, and data is not available for 5 of the students, or 29%. Since 35% of the data from Spring 2013 to Spring 2014 and 29% of the data from Spring 2014 to Spring
2015 is not available, it makes it a bit more difficult to establish solid trends in student data. What is clear, however, is that eleven out of the seventeen students, or 65%, witnessed an increase in their language usage grades from the Spring of 2013 when compared to their grades in the Spring of 2015.

In terms of individual student grades, Student 16 is definitely an outlier in the results of the language usage portion of the MAP test during the testing window from Spring in 2013, 2014, and 2015. To begin with, Student 16’s results were below the class average, as we can see from their individual line graph in Figure 2. Student 16 is part of the 35% of students whose grades increased from Spring 2013 to Spring 2014, only to have them drop again and for Student 16 to be part of the 18% of students whose grades decreased from Spring 2014 to Spring 2015. Nevertheless, the student was still working below the class average. According to internal school records, it was later established that Student 16 was diagnosed with a learning difficulty and transferred to the school’s learning support department.

Student 2 shows a similar pattern to Student 16 since their original score in the Spring of 2014 was higher than their scores in the Spring of 2013, only to drop again in the Spring of 2015. What differentiates Student 2 from Student 16 is that Student 2 was performing closer to the class average in the Spring of 2013, with the class average being 193.5 and Student 2’s score was a 194. Similarly, in the Spring of 2015, Student 2’s grade in the language usage portion of the MAP test was 197 and the class average was 198. It could then be inferred that Student 2 represents the “average” student grades and whose slight progress can be as a result of the differentiated learning happening inside the classroom during literacy instruction. Student 2 is also part of the 35% of
students whose grades increased from Spring 2013 to Spring 2014, only to have them drop again and for Student 2 to be part of the 18% of students whose grades decreased from Spring 2014 to Spring 2015.

Student 3 was also performing close to the class average with a grade of 190 in the language usage portion of the MAP test in the Spring of 2013 which then decreased to 187 for the Spring of 2014. Student 3 is therefore part of the 29% of students whose grades decreased from Spring 2013 to Spring 2014. However, what differentiates Student 3 from Student 16 is that while Student 16’s scores increased from Spring 2013 to Spring 2014, Student 3’s grades did the opposite and decreased in the same time period. Also, Student 16’s grades then decreased again from Spring 2014 to Spring 2015 whereas Student 3’s grades increased in the same time period. Student 3 was working below the class average in Spring 2013 and Spring 2014, only to then meet the class average in Spring 2015.
Table 5 Reading comprehension class average for 5 reporting terms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Reading Comprehension Spring 2013</th>
<th>Reading Comprehension Fall 2013</th>
<th>Reading Comprehension Spring 2014</th>
<th>Reading Comprehension Fall 2014</th>
<th>Reading Comprehension Spring 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class Average</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>181.08</td>
<td>184.42</td>
<td>183.67</td>
<td>194.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5 shows the reading comprehension class average of the MAP test from Spring 2013 to Spring 2015. In the Spring of 2013, 35% of students received reading comprehension scores above the class average, compared to 53% in the Fall of 2013 and Spring of 2014, 47% in the Fall of 2014, and 70.5% in the Spring of 2015. In the Spring and Fall of 2013, 23.5% of students received scores below the class average, in the Spring of 2014, 35% of students received scores below the class average, in the Fall of 2014, 41% of students received scores that were below the average of the class and for Spring 2015, 29% of students received scores below the class average. In terms of unavailable data, in the Spring of 2013 it was 41% of students, in the Fall of 2013 it was 23.5%, in the Spring of 2014 it was 29%, in the Fall of 2014 it was 12% and then in the Spring of 2015 it was zero percent. The general trend of the reading comprehension class average is that they are generally stable in the period between the Spring of 2013 and the Fall of 2014 despite the two month summer holiday, with the average being 183 and then a sharp increase to 194.7 in the Spring of 2015. This becomes clearer in Figure 3.
Figure 3 shows the class average for reading scores on the MAP test for seventeen students from Spring 2013 to Spring 2015.

Table 6 Language usage class average for 3 reporting terms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class Average</th>
<th>Language Usage Spring 2013</th>
<th>Language Usage Spring 2014</th>
<th>Language Usage Spring 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>193.5</td>
<td>196.25</td>
<td>198</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6 shows the class average scores for language usage from Spring 2013 to Spring 2015. In the Spring of 2013 and 2014, 47% of students received scores that were above the class average. In Spring 2015, however, 70.5% of students received scores that were above the class average. In terms of students acquiring scores below the class average, this number was at 23.5% for Spring 2013 and 2014, and 29% for the Spring of 2015. However, in Spring 2013 and 2014, 29% of student scores were unavailable, compared to 0% in Spring 2015. The general trend for the language usage average is that there was a steady increase in the average from the period during Spring 2013 to Spring 2015.
Figure 4 Class average for language usage score

Figure 4 shows the class average scores for language usage from Spring 2013 to Spring 2015.

In sum and after analyzing, in depths, the individual grades of students in the reading comprehension and language usage parts of the MAP test during the testing interval, it becomes a bit clearer to answer the research questions posed in chapter one of this study and also at the beginning of Chapter 4. To recap, the two research questions are:

1. How did the MAP results compare prior to and post implementation of the Reader’s Writer’s Workshop and Words Their Way?
2. How can the relationship between the Reader’s Writer’s Workshop, Words Their Way, and MAP testing be defined?

I begin by answering question one, and the answer here is relatively clear and straightforward. We have already established that 65% of student reading
comprehension scores increased from Fall 2013 to Spring 2015 and similarly, for language usage 69% of student scores increased in the period from Spring 2013 to Spring 2015. MAP testing scores in both reading comprehension and language usage were higher one-year post implementation of the Reader’s Writer’s Workshop (RWW) and Words Their Way. To answer question two, the relationship between Reader’s Writer’s Workshop and Words their Way can be described as a positive one based primarily on student scores pre and post implementation of the new literacy programs and on the fact that the Reader’s Writer’s Workshop is a model of teaching that addresses both the “whole group’s needs as well as differentiating for the needs of small groups and individuals” (Children’s Literacy Initiative, 2016). The RWW also includes leveled readers, whereby students read at their own pace and within their zone of proximal development that is "the distance between the actual developmental level as determined by independent problem solving and the level of potential development as determined through problem solving under adult guidance, or in collaboration with more capable peers" (Vygotsky, 1978, p.86). As a result of this literacy initiative, student grades in both reading comprehension and language usage increased, thus solidifying the positive relationship explicitly between MAP test results and the Reader’s Writer’s Workshop. What is also noticed is that not all students benefitted from the two new literacy programs that were implemented at The Learning Academy. This could be as a result of the differentiated instruction happening inside the classrooms, which is inherently part of the RWW and Words their Way. In order for differentiated instruction to be successful and to meet the needs of each student, the teacher must possess a “deep knowledge of the reading process” and a deep understanding of the individual strengths and needs of each one of their students (International Reading Association, 2000). Here,
the same attention should be given to the low and average achieving students and to the high achieving ones. If this does not occur, then it is likely that the low and average achieving students will suffer and that the high achieving students will make modest improvement (McGill-Franze et al. 2006; Schumm et al., 2000). Furthermore, Words Their Way, was initially introduced as a short term intervention to help struggling students in the first grade however it was then expanded to include long term interventions for those students. Programs designed to be used as short-term interventions have better results in the short term.

In conclusion, Chapter 4 presented a summary of some of the individual student scores in addition to studying the class average for both reading comprehension and language usage for the seventeen students in the class during the period from Fall 2013 to Spring 2015; 65% of student reading comprehension scores increased from Fall 2013 to Spring 2015 and similarly, for language usage 69% of student scores increased in the period from Spring 2013 to Spring 2015. The relationship can overall be described as a positive one, with Reader’s Writer’s Workshop and Words their Way having a positive effect on MAP test results as MAP test results were higher in the Spring of 2015 than in the Fall of 2013. The data shows that although there were fluctuations in student grades throughout the time period, the majority of student grades increased from the Fall of 2013 to the Spring of 2015. We can also infer that the implementation of the literacy programs had a greater effect on the reading scores than on the comprehension scores for the same period.

The next chapter presents the discussion of findings.
Chapter Five

Discussion of Findings

Chapter five explores the study’s findings and links them to the literature on school effectiveness and school improvement discussed in chapter two. The limitations of the study are also discussed in this chapter and include the cultural bias of the MAP test as well as the diverse learner profiles of the students in the class.

This research study analyzes the effects of the implementation of two new literacy programs – Reader’s Writer’s Workshop and Words Their Way – on student MAP test results in reading comprehension and language usage. The purpose was to determine whether the implementation of these new programs had an effect on student results on a standardized test. Improving student scores is one indicator of school effectiveness. When discussing the issue of school effectiveness, my studies are in accordance with Hopkins et al. (1994) because they demonstrated that in order for a school to be deemed effective there should be a focus on increasing student achievement by focusing on the process of teaching and learning. By implementing the new literacy programs, the school leadership realized that there was a need to improve student scores through the addition of the new programs, which focus on the teaching and learning process. Essentially, the new programs changed the way teachers teach and therefore the way that learners learn as well.

Additionally, Teddlie and Reynolds (2000) found that the most appropriate criteria to determine school effectiveness is the growth in student achievement over time. As such, the study demonstrated that there was clear improvement in student
scores in reading comprehension and language usage during the Spring of 2013 and the Fall of 2015. Since there was a growth in student achievement over time, this may be one indicator that the school in this study is an effective one. The growth in student achievement over time may be attributed to the school leadership focusing on teaching and learning by realizing the need for an intervention and introducing new literacy programs with the goal being to increase student achievement. Again, if there is student growth in learning, then the school is on the right path to being an effective one; a trait which all successful schools strive to be.

Similarly, Stoll and Fink (1996) state that a school’s ultimate goal should be to enhance student progress by once again focusing on teaching and learning and enhancing student outcomes, which are both related to the direction in which the school is moving, which is again related to school effectiveness and the processes, progress, and development that drive the school towards its goal. Here, a successful school will use data to be the driving force behind the decisions it makes, which is what The Learning Academy’s leadership did in this study. By identifying the need to improve student literacy, the school leadership was able to introduce new programs and train its teachers on the implementation of these programs, and translate this need into one that is practical and able to be adapted for us in the classroom. Studies have shown that leadership is “second only to classroom instruction as an influence on student learning” (Louis, Leithwood, Whalstrom, & Anderson, 2010, p.9).

The school leadership, instructional methods, and curriculum development are all directly related to school effectiveness and have an effect on the school accomplishing its goals (Gurley et al., 2015). Accomplishing goals and enhancing the progress of
students with a focus on teaching and learning is what every school should set as goals and should be the ultimate aim of a school (Stoll & Fink, 1996).

The reasons behind the varied student grades differ for each student; as previously mentioned, the school caters to diverse learners within the classroom. In order for the teacher to cater to the needs of the diverse learners, differentiated instruction should be one of the tools used for lesson planning. Tomlinson (1999) and Tomlinson (2000) proposed differentiated instruction be implemented in classrooms to meet the needs, interests and learning profiles of all students in the classroom. The school and new literacy programs introduced are strongly built on the premise of differentiated instruction, which may have also been a factor in improved student results. It is important to mention, however, that students who were enrolled in pull out programs such as intensive English language classes or were receiving accommodations and/or modifications to the curriculum may have rejoined the regular classroom, thus also affecting their scores and a possible reason for the fluctuation in student grades.

Additionally, students may have been undergoing changes in their personal lives that may also have had an effect on the grades; Egalite (2016) echoes this notion when she writes that a student’s family situation is “strongly correlated” with their performance in school. Furthermore, there has been plenty of other research that has found correlations between the role of parents and the educational outcomes of students (Blanden, Katz, & Redmond, 2012; Erikson, Goldthorpe, Jackson, Yaish, & Cox, 2005; Schnabel, Alfeld, Eccles, Kölker, & Baumert, 2002; Stocké, Blossfeld, Hoenig, & Sixt, 2011).

There is a clear pattern of increase in scores in the class averages for both reading comprehension and language usage, and these increases have systematically
occurred in the Spring of the academic year 2014-2015, leading to a possible correlation between the beginning of the academic year and the introduction of the new programs or new word sorts. It is possible that during this time, both students and teachers may require a certain period of adaptation that becomes observable after a certain period of time has elapsed in the school year, Fullan (2001) coined the term “implementation dip” to describe the period of time that is defined by a lapse in performance and confidence when a new program is being introduced and new skills are being developed to support the new program. Moreover, the lower student scores in the Fall could be as a result of the three summer months when students are out of school and may need to be reintroduced to certain concepts and themes. According to McCombs, Augustine, Schwartz, Bodilly, McInnis, Lichter, and Cross (2011), The RAND Corporation studied this notion of the regression of student grades over the summer in 2011 and they found that elementary student performance falls by approximately one month during the summer and that this learning gap is cumulative over time.

Another possible reason for the fluctuation in student grades could be the fact that the literacy programs that were introduced are all based on the premise of differentiated instruction whereby the teacher works with the individual student according to their own level. Differentiated instruction has been researched at length as a way of meeting the different needs of diverse learners in classrooms around the world today (Carolan & Guinn, 2007; Ding & Sherman, 2006; Dunn & Dunn, 2008; Good, 2006; Heck, 2009; Rakow, 2007; Santamaria, 2009; Stronge et al., 2008; Tieso, 2003; Tomlinson, 2006; Tomlinson et al., 2008). Furthermore, the programs introduced such as Words Their Way, was initially introduced as a short term intervention to help
struggling students in the first grade however it was then expanded to include long term interventions for those students who required longer term intervention.

### 5.1 Limitations

While this study aims to quantify whether the introduction of the Readers’ Writers’ Workshop and Words their Way had any significant effect on MAP test scores, there are limitations to this study. Primarily, the MAP tests are based on the American Common Core standards and therefore may be culturally biased to students taking the test who are not living in the United States and exposed to the culture. Another limitation to the study is that the school where the study took place caters to students of various nationalities, some of whom are non-native English speakers. Since the MAP tests are administered in English, some of the non-native English speakers may struggle to read and comprehend the questions being asked. Another limitations of the study is that the school caters to a diverse student body and the grade levels consist of a wide array of academic capabilities. However, students with learning difficulties were not included in the sample and these students do not sit for the MAP tests as their learning difficulties prevent them from doing so. Therefore, the results will only be studied for those students who are not receiving accommodations and/or modifications to the curriculum.
Chapter three explained the methodology of the study and how qualitative data was collected, studied, and analyzed in order to establish a possible correlation between

Chapter five discussed the findings of the study and their correlation to school effectiveness and improvement. Limitations of the study were also discussed. Since there is an increase in student grades in both the reading comprehension and language usage portions of the MAP tests and since the school leadership was able to identify the need for the introduction of new programs, it could be argued that the school in this study, the Learning Academy, is a school that is focused on the improvement of student achievement over time. It also proves that the school uses data to assess its needs, which is also a factor of effective schools discussed by Tedlie and Reynolds (2000).
Chapter Six

Conclusion

This chapter concludes the study and presents suggestions, limitations, and implications for future practices. The study analyzes results pre, during, and post implementation of the new literacy programs, the Reader’s Writer’s Workshop and the Words their Way. The study found that there is a clear improvement in student scores in both reading comprehension and language usage between Spring 2013 and Fall 2015.

6.1 General Conclusion

The purpose of this study was to determine, if any, the relationship between the implementation of new literacy programs, namely the Reader’s Writer’s Workshop and Words their Way, on student scores on MAP tests. The study aimed to determine two things:

1. How did the MAP results compare prior to and post implementation of the Reader’s Writer’s Workshop and Words Their Way?

2. How can the relationship between the Reader’s Writer’s Workshop, Words Their Way, and MAP testing be defined?

The aforementioned literacy programs were implemented in September 2013 and this study looks at the results of the MAP tests prior to September 2013 and compares them with the results of September 2014 to determine whether the implementation of these new literacy programs had any effect on student results. This study collected and studied data from the same cohort: students in Grade 3 in September 2013, the same students in Grade 4 in September 2014, and the same students in Grade 5 in September
2015. The data showed clear improvement in student scores between the Spring of 2013 and the Fall of 2015 in both reading comprehension and language usage. As previously mentioned, there is a clear improvement in student scores in both literacy and comprehension between Spring 2013 and Fall 2015. The class averages for reading during this time period increase from a 184 to a 194 and the class average for comprehension improved, albeit less than reading, from 193.5 to 198. However, upon closer inspection, individual student grades fluctuated and not all students improved steadily and throughout the aforementioned time frame.

### 6.2 Limitations

Some of the limitations of this study include the fact that the school caters to a diverse student body that has a variety of learning styles and the student body comes from a wide array of countries where English is not the primary language of communication or instruction. Additionally, the MAP tests are based on the American Common Core and thus may be culturally biased.

### 6.3 Suggestions for further research

In order to establish whether the implementation of the new literacy programs have an affect on all students, regardless of whether they are receiving accommodations or modifications to the curriculum, one of the recommendations would be to have students with learning difficulties take the MAP test after having the literacy programs integrated into their classroom to see whether the literacy programs have an effect on students with learning difficulties. Similarly, it would also be beneficial to determine whether the new literacy programs have an effect on non-native English speakers and to see whether the Reader’s Writer’s Workshop and Word Sorts can be integrated into the
English as a Foreign Language program offered at The Learning Academy to determine whether student scores would see any changes for reading and comprehension.

The importance of literacy is as crucial as ever and teaching students to read and write cannot be undermined. Literacy is the building block upon which all future learning depends, and it is critical to stress the importance of literacy in young children and in school’s around the world. Teaching literacy of second language in a third world country as a second language doesn’t come without its challenges, but thanks to new techniques and in keeping with best practices, this seemingly daunting challenge is now being broken up into smaller chunks and the focus has become on incorporating workshop like techniques into the classroom. Having workshops inside the class when teaching literacy enables students to work within their Zone of Proximal Development and also gives teachers the ability to work on an individual or group basis with particular students who require the extra support while guiding those who are able to work independently and giving them the opportunity to challenge themselves. While there is still much debate as to the best techniques for teaching are, it is clear that some methods work better than others, and the attitude of the teacher and students plays a big role in teaching and learning. If we look at teaching as an art, then teachers need to do more than “compile materials and methods” and school leadership needs to “infuse them with a sense of priority and vision, passion and grace” (Calkins, 2001, p.4). The Readers’ Writers’ Workshop and the Words their Way put the teacher in control and provides them with all of the resources necessary to succeed at teaching literacy. Breaking down the seemingly daunting task into smaller, more manageable steps that empower both the teacher and the learner and emphasize the importance of self-reflection and collaboration.
References


McCombs, J. S., Augustine, C. H., Schwartz, H. L., Bodilly, S. J., McInnis, B., Lichter,


NY: Routlege.


Appendices

Appendix A

The Readers’ Writers’ Workshop and the Words their Way Program function on the basis of differentiated, student-centered instruction and scaffolding. Lesson plans are, thus, created accordingly.

**Lesson Plan 1:** Writers’ Workshop

**Grade level:** Grade 5  
**Lesson title:** Vague Pronoun Reference  
**Lesson duration:** 35 minutes

**Objectives:**

By the end of this lesson, students should be able to:

- Identify vague pronouns in a piece of writing  
- Develop pieces of writing without vague pronoun references

**Materials:**

- Board  
- Student Writing Journals

**Introduction:**

- Teacher puts a list of statements on the board. *Statements are as follows:*
  
  o Take the radio out of the car and fix it.  
  o Elizabeth told Sarah she had a problem.  
  o After putting the disk in the cabinet, Mark sold it.  
  o The supervisors told the workers they would get a bonus.  
- Teacher gives students some time to think about the statements

**Development:**

- Teacher asks students about statements  
  - Possible questions:
    - Do you think that those statements are incorrect? *Anticipated answer:* Yes (if students answers are no, teacher would ask students to explain the sentence)
What do you think is incorrect about those statements?
Anticipated answers: They are confusing – We are not clear on whom the pronoun is referring to…

As students give their answers, teacher prompts them to give specific examples from the statements for further clarification.

- Teacher introduces that those are “Vague Pronoun References” and are very common mistakes in writing
- Teacher explains that references are called antecedents
- Students correct the statements on the board through identifying proper antecedents. Example: Take the radio out of the car and fix it. ➔ Take the radio out of the car and fix the radio. OR Take the radio out of the car and fix the car.
- Teacher gives students a sample paragraph to identify vague pronoun references and correct them (It is preferred that students work in pairs or groups of three).

Paragraph:

We ate McDonald’s for breakfast; it was delicious. I got a breakfast biscuit, brownies, and orange juice. It looked beautiful; it had a picture. That had dolphins and sharks and fish. It was really nice inside McDonald’s.

- Paragraph is corrected as a class

Conclusion:

- Students reflect on the lesson on their writing journals:
  o Students write their own notes about the lesson
  o Students continue the following sentence prompts:
    - One thing I learned today is….
    - One thing I have a question about is….
    - I am going to employ this lesson in my future writing through….

Student assessment:

- Students are assessed based on the information that they have written up in their writing journals.
- Ongoing assessment is maintained throughout the lesson through teacher observations.

Lesson Plan 2: Words their Way Program

Grade level: Grade 5
Lesson title: Derivational Relations – Prefixes (in-, un-, dis-, mis-)
Lesson duration: 35 minutes

Objectives:
By the end of this lesson, students will be able to:
- Identify meaning of prefixes
- Examine how different prefixes affect meaning of words
- Explain meaning of words in their sorts

**Materials:**
- Word sorts (found at end of lesson plan)
- Scissors

**Introduction:**
- Teacher hands out the word sorts to students
- Students cut the handouts

**Development:**
- Students start sorting words into their respective categories
- Students look up meaning of words that they find difficult

Students should sort the words as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In-</th>
<th>Un-</th>
<th>Dis-</th>
<th>Mis-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Insincere</td>
<td>Uneasy</td>
<td>Dishonest</td>
<td>Misspell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal</td>
<td>Unaware</td>
<td>Disbelief</td>
<td>Mistake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrequent</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Disorder</td>
<td>Misfortune</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inhumane</td>
<td>Undress</td>
<td>Disconnect</td>
<td>Misleading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inexpensive</td>
<td>Unfasten</td>
<td>Disease</td>
<td>Mischief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insane</td>
<td>Untidy</td>
<td>Disrespect</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Discourage</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Teacher walks around and asks students guiding questions:
  - Possible questions:
    - Why are you sorting them like this?
    - What do you think the words have in common?
    - How do those prefixes affect the meaning of the words?

Students are encouraged to give examples to support their answers.

- Teacher initiates discussion on what each prefix means:
  - In- means not
  - Un- means not
  - Mis- means wrong
  - Dis- means not and opposite of
- Students are encouraged to look for more words to add to their lists

**Conclusion:**
- Students take time to play “Speed Sorting” and “Blind Sorting” with a partner
- Students take the sorts home for a week for extra practice and preparation for assessment

Student assessment:

- Ongoing assessment is maintained throughout the lesson through teacher observations.

Word sort

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SORT 1 Prefixes (in-, un-, dis-, mis-)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>in-</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uneasy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>infrequent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>misleading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>insane</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **un-**                               |
| insincere                             |
| unaware                               |
| misfortune                            |
| inhuman                               |
| disrespect                           |

| **dis-**                              |
| dishonest                             |
| disorder                              |
| misfortune                            |
| inhuman                               |
| respect                               |

| **mis-**                              |
| dishonest                             |
| mistake                              |
| disconnect                            |
| inexpensive                          |
| discourage                           |
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**Appendix B**

### Student Progress Report for Student 1

**Growth is measured from Spring to Spring**

#### Mathematics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Season/Year</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Student Score Range</th>
<th>Dist. Avg</th>
<th>RIT</th>
<th>Norm Group Avg</th>
<th>Student Growth</th>
<th>Typical Growth</th>
<th>Student % Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>259-312-215</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40-48-57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>196-290-255</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>32-41-50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>197-290-253</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>32-41-50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>183-186-189</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>30-38-47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Reading

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Season/Year</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Student Score Range</th>
<th>Dist. Avg</th>
<th>RIT</th>
<th>Norm Group Avg</th>
<th>Student Growth</th>
<th>Typical Growth</th>
<th>Student % Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>196-290-255</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>32-41-50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>196-290-255</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>32-41-50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>197-290-253</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>32-41-50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>183-186-189</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>30-38-47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Language Usage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Season/Year</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Student Score Range</th>
<th>Dist. Avg</th>
<th>RIT</th>
<th>Norm Group Avg</th>
<th>Student Growth</th>
<th>Typical Growth</th>
<th>Student % Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>259-312-215</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40-48-57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>196-290-255</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>32-41-50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>197-290-253</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>32-41-50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>183-186-189</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>30-38-47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Numbers & Operations**
- Numbers & Operations
- Measurement
- Geometry
- Data Analysis & Probability

**Language Goals Performance - Spring 2015**

**Reading Goals Performance - Spring 2015**

**Lexile Range:** 616-649

**Explanatory Notes:**
- **Student Score Range:** The middle number is the RIT score your child received. The numbers on either side of the RIT score define the score range. If retested, your child would score within this range most of the time.
- **District Average RIT:** The average score for all students in the school district in the grade who were tested at the same time as your child.
- **Norm Group Avg:** The average score observed for students in the most recent NWEA RIT Scale Norms study, who were in the same grade and tested in the same portion of the instructional year (e.g., fall or spring).
- **Student Growth:** Presents the growth in RITs your child made from the previous spring to the spring of the year in which growth is reported.
- **Typical Growth:** The average growth of students in the most recent NWEA RIT Scale Norms study, who were in the same grade and began the growth comparison period at a similar achievement level.
- **Student % Range:** The number in the middle is your child’s percentile rank - the percentage of students in the most recent NWEA RIT Scale Norms study that had a RIT score less than or equal to your child’s score. The numbers on either side of the percentile rank define the range within which your child’s performance would fall. If retested, your child’s percentile rank would be within this range most of the time.
- **Goal Performance:** Each goal articulated in the test is listed along with a descriptive adjective of your child’s score. The possible descriptors are: Not yet mastered (less than 15% mastery), Below average (16-39 percent), Average (40-60 percent), or High (61-80 percent). If retested, your child’s percentile rank would be within this range most of the time.

**Lesile Range:** The difficulty range of text that can be understood by the student 75% of the time. Lesile is a trademark of Metallatrics. Inc., and is registered in the United States and abroad.
Student Progress Report for Student 1

Mathematics Goals Performance - Spring 2015

- Numbers & Operations: Average
- Measurement: Average
- Patterns & Algebra: Average
- Geometry: Average
- Data Analysis & Probability: Average

Reading Goals Performance - Spring 2015

- Librarians: Average
- Informational Text: Average
- Vocabulary: Average

Explanatory Notes:

Season/Year
The test below each vertical line on the graph represents the season (fall, winter, spring) and the year the test was administered.

Grade
The test above each vertical line on the graph represents the student's grade at the time the test event occurred.

Event Date
The date along the vertical lines represent the date the test event occurred.

Time Line
Test events are plotted on the X axis of the graph using the time interval between test event dates to reflect the elapsed time between test events accurately.

Student RT Score Line
The RT score your child received on each test. This line will contain a dashed portion following the most recent test event to represent projected growth over the next instructional year. This is the mean fall to fall, spring to spring, or fail to fall RT growth that was observed in the most recent norming study for students who had the same starting instructional term RT score.

Dist. Avg RT
This line represents the average score for all students in the school district in the grade who were tested at the same time as your child.

Norm Group Avg
This line represents the average score observed for students in the most recent NWEA RT-Scale norming study who were in the same grade and tested in the same portion of the instructional year (e.g., fall or spring).

Goal Performance
Each goal area included in the test is listed along with a descriptive adjective of your child's score. The possible descriptors are Low (<21 percentile), Low Avg (21-40 percentile), Avg (41-60 percentile), High Avg (61-80 percentile), and High (81-100 percentile).

Lexile Range
The difficulty range of text that can be understood by the student 75% of the time. Lexile is a trademark of MetaMetrics, Inc., and is registered in the United States and abroad.
# Student Progress Report for Student 2

## Growth is measured from Spring to Spring

### Student ID:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mathematics</th>
<th>Reading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goals Performance - Spring 2015</strong></td>
<td><strong>Goals Performance - Spring 2015</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numbers &amp; Operations</td>
<td>Literacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measurement</td>
<td>Informational Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patterns &amp; Algebra</td>
<td>Vocabulary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geometry</td>
<td>Avg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Analysis &amp; Probability</td>
<td>Avg</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Language Usage

| **Goals Performance - Spring 2015** |
| Plan / Organize / Research |
| Understand Grammar / Usage |
| Punctuate / Spell Correctly |
| Avg |

---

**Explanatory Notes:**

- **Student Score Range:** The middle number in the RIT score range for your child received. The number on either side of the RIT score define the score range. If retested, your child would score within this range most of the time.

- **District Average RIT:** The average score for all students in the school district in the grade who were tested at the same time as your child.

- **Norm Group Avg:** The average score observed for students in the most recent NWEA RIT Scale Norms study, who were in the same grade and tested in the same portion of the instructional year (e.g., fall or spring).

- **Student Growth:** Presents the growth in RITs your child made from the previous spring to the spring of the year in which growth is reported.

- **Typical Growth:** The average growth of students in the most recent NWEA RIT Scale Norms study, who were in the same grade and began the growth comparison period at a similar achievement level.

- **Student RIT Range:** The number in the middle is your child's percentile rank. The percentage of students in the most recent NWEA RIT Scale Norms study that had a RIT score less than or equal to your child's score. The numbers on either side of the percentile rank define the percentile range. If retested, your child's percentile rank would be within this range most of the time.

- **Goal Performance:** Each goal area included in the test is listed along with a descriptive adjective of your child's score.

- **Lexile Range:** Lexile is a trademark of MetaMetrics, Inc., and is registered in the United States and abroad.
Student Progress Report for Student 2

Mathematics Goals Performance - Spring 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Numbers &amp; Operations</th>
<th>Avg</th>
<th>Low Avg</th>
<th>Avg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Measurement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patterns &amp; Algebra</td>
<td>Avg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geometry</td>
<td>Avg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Analysis &amp; Probability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reading Goals Performance - Spring 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Literature</th>
<th>Avg</th>
<th>Avg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Informational Text</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary</td>
<td>Avg</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Explanatory Notes:

Season/Year
The test below each vertical line on the graph represents the season (Fall, Winter, Spring) and the year the test was administered.

Gx
The Gx above each vertical line on the graph represents the student's grade at the time the test event occurred.

Event Date
The date along the vertical lines represent the date the test event occurred.

TimeLine
Test events are plotted on the X-axis of the graph using the time interval between test event dates to reflect elapsed time between test events accurately.

Student RIT Score Line
The RIT score your child received on each test. This line will contain a dashed portion following the most recent test event to represent projected growth over the next instructional year.
This is the mean fall-to-fall or spring-to-spring RIT growth that was observed in the most recent norming study for students who had the same starting instructional term RIT score.

Dist. Avg RIT
This line represents the average score for all students in the school district in the grade who were tested at the same time as your child.

Norm Group Avg
This line represents the average score observed for students in the most recent NWEA RIT Scale norms study, who were in the same grade and tested in the same portion of the instructional year (e.g., fall or spring).

Goal Performance
Each goal area included in the test is listed along with a descriptive adjective of your child's score. These descriptors are Low (<21 percentile), Low Avg (21-40 percentile), Avg (41-59 percentile), High Avg (61-80 percentile), and High (>80 percentile).

Level Range
The difficulty range of text that can be understood by the student 75% of the time. Level is a trademark of MetaMetrics, Inc. and is registered in the United States and abroad.
# Student Progress Report for Student 3

## Growth is measured from Spring to Spring

### Student ID:

#### Mathematics Goals Performance - Spring 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Season/Year</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Student Score Range</th>
<th>Dist. Avg.</th>
<th>Norm Group Avg.</th>
<th>Student Growth</th>
<th>Typical Growth</th>
<th>Student Yr. Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>189 - 196 - 198</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5 - 13 - 17</td>
<td>10 - 12 - 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>177 - 188 - 193</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>5 - .4 - 2</td>
<td>10 - 11 - 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>165 - 168 - 190</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20 - 22 - 40</td>
<td>10 - 10 - 12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Language Usage Goals Performance - Spring 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Season/Year</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Student Score Range</th>
<th>Dist. Avg.</th>
<th>Norm Group Avg.</th>
<th>Student Growth</th>
<th>Typical Growth</th>
<th>Student Yr. Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>184 - 188 - 193</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12 - 22 - 22</td>
<td>10 - 12 - 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>177 - 188 - 193</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>5 - .4 - 2</td>
<td>10 - 11 - 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>165 - 168 - 190</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20 - 22 - 40</td>
<td>10 - 10 - 12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Reading Goals Performance - Spring 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Season/Year</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Student Score Range</th>
<th>Dist. Avg.</th>
<th>Norm Group Avg.</th>
<th>Student Growth</th>
<th>Typical Growth</th>
<th>Student Yr. Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>189 - 193 - 202</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10 - 12 - 15</td>
<td>10 - 12 - 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>176 - 181 - 196</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19 - 22 - 40</td>
<td>10 - 10 - 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>165 - 168 - 190</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25 - 33 - 46</td>
<td>10 - 10 - 12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Explanatory Notes:

- **Student Score Range**: The middle number is the RIT score your child received. The numbers on either side of the RIT score define the score range. If retested, your child would score within this range most of the time.
- **District Average RIT**: The average score for all students in the school district in the grade who were tested at the same time as your child.
- **Norm Group Avg**: The average score observed for students in the most recent NWEA RIT Scale Norms study, who were in the same grade and tested in the same portion of the instructional year (e.g., fall or spring).
- **Student Growth**: Presents the growth in RITs your child made from the previous spring to the spring of the year in which growth is reported.
- **Typical Growth**: The average growth of students in the most recent NWEA RIT Scale Norms study who were in the same grade and began the growth comparison period at a similar achievement level.
- **Student Yr. Range**: The middle number in the range is your child's percentile rank - the percentage of students in the most recent NWEA RIT Scale Norms study that had a RIT score less than or equal to your child's score. The numbers on either side of the percentile rank define this percentile range. If retested, your child's percentile rank would be within this range most of the time.
- **Goal Performance**: Each goal area included in the test is listed along with a descriptive adjective of your child's score. The goal descriptors are: Not yet at the 10th percentile, Low (10-25th percentile), Low Average (26-40th percentile), Average (41-60th percentile), High Average (61-80th percentile), and High (81-100th percentile).
- **Leskeli Range**: The difficulty range of text that can be understood by the student 75% of the time. Leskeli is a trademark of Metallitics, Inc. and is registered in the United States and abroad.
Explanatory Notes:

Season/Year
The test below each vertical line on the graph represents the season (Fall, Winter, Spring, Summer) and the year the test was administered.

Gx
The test above each vertical line on the graph represents the student’s grade at the time the test event occurred.

Event Date
The date along the vertical lines represent the date the test event occurred.

Time Line
Test events are plotted on the X axis of the graph using the time interval between test-event dates to reflect elapsed time between test events accurately.

Student RT Score Line
The RT score your child received on each test. This line will contain a dashed portion following the most recent test event to represent projected growth over the next instructional year. This is the mean fall to fall, spring to spring, or fall to spring RT growth that was observed in the most recent norming study for students who had the same starting instructional term RT score.

Dist. Avg RT
This line represents the average score for all students in the school district in the grade who were tested at the same time as your child.

Norm Group Avg
This line represents the average score observed for students in the most recent NWEA RTI Scale norms study who were in the same grade and tested in the same portion of the instructional year (e.g., Fall or Spring).

Goal Performance
Each goal area included in the test is listed along with a descriptive adjective of your child’s score. The possible descriptors are Low (<21 percentile), Low Avg (21-40 percentile), Avg (41-60 percentile), High Avg (61-80 percentile), and High (>80 percentile).

Lexile Range
The difficulty range of text that can be understood by the student 75% of the time. Lexile is a trademark of MetaMetrics, Inc., and is registered in the United States and abroad.
### Mathematics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Season/Year</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Student Score Range</th>
<th>Dist. Avg</th>
<th>Norm Group Avg</th>
<th>Student Growth</th>
<th>Typical Growth</th>
<th>Student NWEA Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>133.48-219.56</td>
<td>192.02</td>
<td>212.17</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>49.67 - 53.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>203.03-238.05</td>
<td>252.38</td>
<td>231.23</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>50.98 - 54.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>234.35-274.49</td>
<td>285.24</td>
<td>263.54</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>52.15 - 55.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Reading

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Season/Year</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Student Score Range</th>
<th>Dist. Avg</th>
<th>Norm Group Avg</th>
<th>Student Growth</th>
<th>Typical Growth</th>
<th>Student NWEA Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>179.56-219.56</td>
<td>202.02</td>
<td>195.03</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>50.98 - 54.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>200.03-238.05</td>
<td>252.38</td>
<td>231.23</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>52.15 - 55.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>234.35-274.49</td>
<td>285.24</td>
<td>263.54</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>52.15 - 55.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Language Usage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Season/Year</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Student Score Range</th>
<th>Dist. Avg</th>
<th>Norm Group Avg</th>
<th>Student Growth</th>
<th>Typical Growth</th>
<th>Student NWEA Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>133.48-219.56</td>
<td>192.02</td>
<td>212.17</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>49.67 - 53.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>203.03-238.05</td>
<td>252.38</td>
<td>231.23</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>50.98 - 54.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>234.35-274.49</td>
<td>285.24</td>
<td>263.54</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>52.15 - 55.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Mathematics Goals Performance - Spring 2015
- Numbers & Operations: HAaug
- Measurement: Avg
- Patterns & Algebra: Avg
- Geometry: HAaug
- Data Analysis & Probability: Avg

### Reading Goals Performance - Spring 2015
- Literature: HAaug
- Informational Text: HAaug
- Vocabulary: LAaug

### Explanatory Notes:

- **Student Score Range**
  - The middle number is the NWEA RIT score your child received. The numbers on either side of the RIT score define the score range. If retested, your child would score within this range most of the time.

- **District Average RIT**
  - The average score for all students in the school district in the grade who were tested at the same time as your child.

- **Norm Group Avg**
  - The average score observed for students in the most recent NWEA RIT Scale Norm study, who were in the same grade and tested in the same portion of the instructional year (e.g., fall or spring).

- **Student Growth**
  - Presents the growth in RITs your child made from the previous spring to the spring of the year in which growth is reported.

- **Typical Growth**
  - The average growth of students in the most recent NWEA RIT Scale Norm study who were in the same grade and began the growth comparison period at a similar achievement level.

- **Student %ile Range**
  - The number in the middle is your child's percentile rank - the percentage of students in the most recent NWEA RIT Scale Norm study that had a RIT score less than or equal to your child's score. The numbers on either side of the percentile rank define the percentile range. If retested, your child's percentile rank would be within this range most of the time.

- **Goal Performance**
  - Each goal area is listed along with a descriptive adjective of your child's score. The possible descriptors are (Low <21 percentile), (Low 21-40 percentile), (Low 41-60 percentile), (High 61-80 percentile), and (High >80 percentile).

- **Lexile Range**
  - The difficulty range of text that can be understood by the student 75% of the time. Lexile is a trademark of MetaMetrics, Inc., and is registered in the United States and abroad.
# Student Progress Report for Student 5

**Growth is measured from Spring to Spring**

## Mathematics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Season/ Year</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Student Score Range</th>
<th>Dist. Avg.</th>
<th>Group Avg.</th>
<th>Student Growth</th>
<th>Typical Growth</th>
<th>Student Scale Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>195-199 - 202</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>184-187 - 200</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>160-161 - 183</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>40-44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mathematics Goals Performance - Spring 2015**

- Numbers & Operations: Low Avg
- Measurement: Low
- Patterns & Algebra: Low
- Geometry: Low
- Data Analysis & Probability: Low

## Reading

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Season/ Year</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Student Score Range</th>
<th>Dist. Avg.</th>
<th>Group Avg.</th>
<th>Student Growth</th>
<th>Typical Growth</th>
<th>Student Scale Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>199-202 - 206</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>190-193 - 196</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100-103 - 107</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20-24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Reading Goals Performance - Spring 2015**

- Literature: Avg
- Informational Text: Low Avg
- Vocabulary: Low Avg

**Lexile Range:** 657-687

**Explanatory Notes:**

- Student Score Range: The middle number is the RIT score your child received. The numbers on either side of the RIT score define the score range. If retested, your child would score within this range most of the time.
- District Average RIT: The average score for all students in the school district in the grade who were tested at the same time as your child.
- Norm Group Avg: The average score observed for students in the most recent NWEA RIT Scale Norms study, who were in the same grade and tested in the same month of the instructional year (e.g., fall or spring).
- Student Growth: Presents the growth in RITs your child made from the previous spring to the spring of the year in which growth is reported.
- Typical Growth: The average growth of students in the most recent NWEA RIT Scale Norms study who were in the same grade and began the growth comparison period at a similar achievement level.
- Student Scale Range: The number in the middle is your child’s percentile rank – the percentage of students in the most recent NWEA RIT Scale Norms study that had a RIT score less than or equal to your child’s score. The numbers on either side of the percentile rank define the percentile range. If retested, your child’s percentile rank would be within this range most of the time.
- Goal Performance: Each goal area is listed along with a descriptive adjective of your child’s score. The goal descriptors are: below (14 percentile), low (15-49 percentile), low average (50-69 percentile), average (70-89 percentile), and high (90 percentile).
- Lexile Range: The difficulty level of text that can be understood by the student 75% of the time. Lexile is a trademark of MetaMetrics, Inc., and is registered in the United States and abroad.
Student Progress Report for Student 5

Mathematics

Reading

Language Usage

Explanatory Notes:

Season/Year
The test below each vertical line on the graph represents the season (Fall, Winter, Spring, Summer) and the year the test was administered.

Goal:
The test above each vertical line on the graph represents the student's grade at the time the test event occurred.

Event Date
The date along the vertical lines represent the date the test event occurred.

TimeLine
Test events are plotted on the 'X' axis of the graph using the time interval between test event dates to reflect elapsed time between test events accurately.

Student RIT Score Line
The RIT score your child received on each test. This line will contain a dashed portion following the most recent test event to represent projected growth over the next instructional year. This is the mean fall to fall, spring to spring, or fall to spring RIT growth that was observed in the most recent norming study for students who had the same starting instructional term RIT score.

Dist. Avg RIT
This line represents the average score for all students in the school district in the grade who were tested at the same time as your child.

Norm Group Avg
This line represents the average score observed for students in the most recent NWEA RIT Scale norm study, who were in the same grade and tested in the same portion of the instructional year (e.g., fall or spring).

Goal Performance
Each goal area included in the test is listed along with a descriptive adjective of your child's score. The possible descriptors are Low (<21 percentile), Low Avg (21-40 percentile), Avg (41-60 percentile), High Avg (61-80 percentile), and High (>80 percentile).

Lexile Range
The difficulty range of text that can be understood by the student 75% of the time. Lexile is a trademark of MetaMetrics, Inc. and is registered in the United States and abroad.
# Student Progress Report for Student 6

**Student ID:**

## Mathematics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Season/Year</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Score Range</th>
<th>Dist. Avg</th>
<th>Norm Group Avg</th>
<th>Student Growth</th>
<th>Typical Growth</th>
<th>Student %</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>208-211</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>-5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>180-189</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18.34-34</td>
<td>-11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>163-166</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25.34-34</td>
<td>-13.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Mathematics Goals Performance - Spring 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Numbers &amp; Operations</th>
<th>Measurement</th>
<th>Patterns &amp; Algebra</th>
<th>Geometry</th>
<th>Data Analysis &amp; Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Avg</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Avg</td>
<td>Avg</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Reading

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Season/Year</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Score Range</th>
<th>Dist. Avg</th>
<th>Norm Group Avg</th>
<th>Student Growth</th>
<th>Typical Growth</th>
<th>Student %</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>191-200</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>29.52</td>
<td>-4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>176-179</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.9-11</td>
<td>-11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>153-156</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21.84-34</td>
<td>-13.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Reading Goals Performance - Spring 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Literacy</th>
<th>Informational Text</th>
<th>Vocabulary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Explanatory Notes:

#### Lesseil Range: 611-651

**Student Score Range:**

The minimum or the RIT score your child received. The score on one side of the RIT score define the score range. If retested, your child would score within this range most of the time.

**District Average RIT:**

The average score for all students in the school district in the grade who were tested at the same time as your child.

**Norm Group Avg:**

The average score observed for students in the most recent NWEA RIT Scale Norms study, who were in the same grade and tested in the same portion of the instructional year (e.g., fall or spring).

**Student Growth:**

The student's gain on NWEA test scores. The numbers on either side of the percentile rank define the percentile range. If retested, your child's percentile rank would be within this range most of the time.

### Language Usage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Season/Year</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Score Range</th>
<th>Dist. Avg</th>
<th>Norm Group Avg</th>
<th>Student Growth</th>
<th>Typical Growth</th>
<th>Student %</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>160-166</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>23.15-19</td>
<td>-4.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>135-138</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18.34-34</td>
<td>-6.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Language Usage Goals Performance - Spring 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan / Organize / Research</th>
<th>Understand Grammar / Usage</th>
<th>Punctuate / Spell Correctly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L2Avg</td>
<td>L2Avg</td>
<td>L2Avg</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Mathematics

Reading

Language Usage

Explanatory Notes:

Season/Year

The text below each vertical line on the graph represents the season (Fall, Winter, Spring, Summer) and the year the test was administered.

Gx

The text above each vertical line on the graph represents the student’s grade at the time the test event occurred.

Event Date

The date along the vertical lines represent the date the test event occurred.

TimeLine

Test events are plotted on the 'X' axis of the graph using the time interval between test event dates to reflect elapsed time between test events accurately.

Student RT Score Line

The RT score your child received on each test. This line will contain a dashed portion following the most recent test event to represent projected growth over the next instructional year. This is the mean fall to fall, spring to spring, or fall to spring RT growth that was observed in the most recent norming study for students who had the same starting instructional term RT score.

Dist. Avg RT

This line represents the average score for all students in the school district in the grade who were tested at the same time as your child.

Norm Group Avg

This line represents the average score observed for students in the most recent NWEA RTI Scale norms study, who were in the same grade and tested in the same portion of the instructional year (e.g., fall or spring).

Goal Performance

Each goal area included in the test is listed along with a descriptive adjective of your child’s score. These descriptors are Low (<21 percentile), Low Avg (21-40 percentiles), Avg (41-60 percentiles), High Avg (61-80 percentiles), and High (>80 percentiles).

Lexile® Range

The difficulty range of text that can be understood by the student 75% of the time. Lexile® is a trademark of MetaMetrics, Inc. and is registered in the United States and abroad.

Lexile® Range: 601-651
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## Student Progress Report for Student 7

**Growth is measured from Spring to Spring**

### Student ID:

#### Mathematics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Season/Year</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Student Score Range</th>
<th>Dist. Avg</th>
<th>Group Avg</th>
<th>Student Growth</th>
<th>Typical Growth</th>
<th>Student %ile Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SS5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>205-209</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50-54-56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>170-173</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>171</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>163-166</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>163</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>154-157</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>156</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Mathematics Goals Performance - Spring 2015

- Numbers & Operations: Low
- Measurement: Low
- Patterns & Algebra: Avg
- Geometry: Avg
- Data Analysis & Probability: Avg

#### Language Usage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Season/Year</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Student Score Range</th>
<th>Dist. Avg</th>
<th>Group Avg</th>
<th>Student Growth</th>
<th>Typical Growth</th>
<th>Student %ile Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SS5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>178-183</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50-54-56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>159-162</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>161</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>153-156</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>155</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>145-148</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>146</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Reading

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Season/Year</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Student Score Range</th>
<th>Dist. Avg</th>
<th>Group Avg</th>
<th>Student Growth</th>
<th>Typical Growth</th>
<th>Student %ile Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SS5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>205-209</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50-54-56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>170-173</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>171</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>163-166</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>163</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>154-157</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>156</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Reading Goals Performance - Spring 2015

- Literature: LAug
- Informational Text: LAug
- Vocabulary: HAug

#### Explanatory Notes:

- **Leskile Range:** 666-795

**Goal Performance**

- Each goal area includes a test list graphed with a descriptive adjective of your child's score. The possible descriptors are: Poor (<20th percentile), Low (21-40), Medium (41-60), Good (61-80), Excellent (81-100).

**Leskile Range**

- The difficulty range of text that can be understood by the student 75% of the time. Leskile is a trademark of MetaMetrics, Inc., and is registered in the United States and abroad.
# Student Progress Report for Student 8

Growth is measured from Spring to Spring

## Student ID:

### Mathematics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Season/Year</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Student Score Range</th>
<th>Dist. Avg</th>
<th>Norm Group Avg</th>
<th>Student Growth</th>
<th>Typical Growth</th>
<th>Student Scale Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>199-202-209</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>17-23-25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mathematics Goals Performance - Spring 2015**

- Numbers & Operations: Low/Low
- Measurement: Low/High
- Patterns & Algebra: Low/Low
- Geometry: Low
- Data Analysis & Probability: Low

### Reading

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Season/Year</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Student Score Range</th>
<th>Dist. Avg</th>
<th>Norm Group Avg</th>
<th>Student Growth</th>
<th>Typical Growth</th>
<th>Student Scale Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>187-190-193</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>11-22-25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Reading Goals Performance - Spring 2015**

- Literature: Low
- Informational Text: Low/Low
- Vocabulary: Low
- Student Score Range:
  - The middle number is the RIT score your child received. The numbers on either side of the RIT score define the score range. If retested, your child would score within this range most of the time.

- District Average RIT:
  - The average score for all students in the school district in the grade who were tested at the same time as your child.

- Norm Group Avg:
  - The average score observed for students in the most recent NWEA RIT Scale Norms study, who were in the same grade and tested in the same portion of the instructional year (e.g., fall or spring).

- Student Growth:
  - Presents the growth in RITs your child made from the previous spring to the spring of the year in which growth is reported.

- Typical Growth:
  - The average growth of students in the most recent NWEA RIT Scale Norms study who were in the same grade and began the growth comparison period at a similar achievement level.

- Student Scale Range:
  - The numbers in the middle is your child's percentile rank - the percentage of students in the most recent NWEA RIT Scale Norms study that had a RIT score less than or equal to your child's score. The numbers on either side of the percentile rank define the percentile range. If retested, your child's percentile rank would be within this range most of the time.

### Language Usage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Season/Year</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Student Score Range</th>
<th>Dist. Avg</th>
<th>Norm Group Avg</th>
<th>Student Growth</th>
<th>Typical Growth</th>
<th>Student Scale Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>200-203-206</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>30-38-47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Language Usage Goals Performance - Spring 2015**

- Plan / Organize / Research: Aug/Low
- Understand Grammar / Usage: Aug/Low
- Punctuate / Spell Correctly: Aug

---

**Explanatory Notes:**

- The season (Fall, Spring, Winter, Unsummer) and the year the test was administered.

- Student Score Range:
  - The middle number is the RIT score your child received. The numbers on either side of the RIT score define the score range. If retested, your child would score within this range most of the time.

- District Average RIT:
  - The average score for all students in the school district in the grade who were tested at the same time as your child.

- Norm Group Avg:
  - The average score observed for students in the most recent NWEA RIT Scale Norms study, who were in the same grade and tested in the same portion of the instructional year (e.g., fall or spring).

- Student Growth:
  - Presents the growth in RITs your child made from the previous spring to the spring of the year in which growth is reported.

- Typical Growth:
  - The average growth of students in the most recent NWEA RIT Scale Norms study who were in the same grade and began the growth comparison period at a similar achievement level.

- Student Scale Range:
  - The numbers in the middle is your child's percentile rank - the percentage of students in the most recent NWEA RIT Scale Norms study that had a RIT score less than or equal to your child's score. The numbers on either side of the percentile rank define the percentile range. If retested, your child's percentile rank would be within this range most of the time.

- Goal Performance:
  - Each goal area included in the test is listed along with a descriptive adjective of your child's score. The possible descriptors are: Below (15-24 percentage), Low (25-40 percentage), Average (41-60 percentage), High (61-80 percent), and Excellent (81-100 percent).

- Lexile Range:
  - The difficulty range of text that can be understood by the student 75% of the time. Lexile is a trademark of MetaMetrics Inc., and is registered in the United States and abroad.
Student Progress Report for Student 8

Mathematics

Two or more test events are required for graphical representation.

Language Usage

Two or more test events are required for graphical representation.

Reading

Explanatory Notes:

Season/Year
The text below each vertical line on the graph represents the season (Fall, Spring, Winter, Summer) and the year the test was administered.

Graph
The line above each vertical line on the graph represents the student's grade at the time the test event occurred.

Event Date
The date along each vertical line represents the date the test event occurred.

Time Line
These events are plotted on the X-axis of the graph using the time interval between test-event dates to reflect the elapsed time between test events accurately.

Student RIT Score Line
The RIT score your child received on each test. This line will contain a dashed portion following the most recent test event to represent projected growth over the next instructional year. This is the mean fall to fall, spring to spring, or fall to spring RIT growth that was observed in the most recent national study for students who had the same starting instructional term RIT score.

Dist. Avg RIT
This line represents the average score for all students in the school district in the grade who were tested at the same time as your child.

Norm Group Avg
This line represents the average score observed for students in the most recent NWEA RIT Scale norms study, who were in the same grade and tested in the same portion of the instructional year (e.g., fall or spring).

Goal Performance
Each goal area included in the test is listed along with a descriptive adjective of your child's score. The possible descriptors are Low (<21 percentile), Low Avg (21-40 percentile), Avg (41-60 percentile), High Avg (61-80 percentile), and High (>80 percentile).

Lexile Range
The difficulty range of text that can be understood by the student 75% of the time. Lexile is a trademark of MetaMetrics, Inc., and is registered in the United States and abroad.
# Student Progress Report for Student 9

**Student ID:**

**Mathematics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Season/Year</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Score Range</th>
<th>Dist. Avg</th>
<th>Group Avg</th>
<th>Student Growth</th>
<th>Typical Growth</th>
<th>Student Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>172-219</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>48-87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>160-198</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>44-87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>153-193</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>44-87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Reading**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Season/Year</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Score Range</th>
<th>Dist. Avg</th>
<th>Group Avg</th>
<th>Student Growth</th>
<th>Typical Growth</th>
<th>Student Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>196-202</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>49-87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>180-186</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>46-84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>166-164</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>41-84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Language Usage**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Season/Year</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Score Range</th>
<th>Dist. Avg</th>
<th>Group Avg</th>
<th>Student Growth</th>
<th>Typical Growth</th>
<th>Student Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>153-193</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>44-87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>140-186</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>46-84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>128-164</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>41-84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mathematics Goals Performance - Spring 2015**

- Numbers & Operations: Avg
- Measurement: High
- Patterns & Algebra: High Avg
- Geometry: Avg
- Data Analysis & Probability: Low Avg

**Reading Goals Performance - Spring 2015**

- Literature: Low Avg
- Informational Text: Low Avg
- Vocabulary: High Avg

**Explanatory Notes:**

- **Student Score Range:** The middle number is the RIT score your child received. The score range on either side of the RIT score define the score range. If retested, your child would score within this range most of the time.

- **District Average RIT:** The average score for all students in the school district in the grade who were tested at the same time as your child.

- **Norm Group Avg:** The average score observed for students in the most recent NWEA RIT Scale Norm study, who were in the same grade and tested in the same portion of the instructional year (e.g., fall or spring).

- **Student Growth:** Presents the growth in RITs your child made from the previous spring to the spring of the year in which growth is reported.

- **Typical Growth:** The average growth of students in the most recent NWEA RIT Scale Norms study who were in the same grade and began the growth comparison period at a similar achievement level.

- **Student Scale Range:** The number in this section is your child's percentile rank - the percentage of students in the most recent NWEA RIT Scale Norms study that had a RIT score less than or equal to your child's score. This number on either side of the percentile rank define the percentile range. If retested, your child's percentile rank would be within this range most of the time.

- **Goal Performance:** Each goal area included in the test is listed along with a descriptive adjective of your child’s score. The possible descriptors are Low (25-40 percentile), Low Avg (25-40 percentile), Avg (41-60 percentile), High Avg (61-80 percentile), and High (81+ percentile).

- **Lexile Range:** The difficulty range of text that can be understood by the student 75% of the time. Lexile is a trademark of MetaMetrics, Inc., and is registered in the United States and abroad.
### Mathematics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Season Year</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Student Score Range</th>
<th>Dist. Avg</th>
<th>Norm Group Avg</th>
<th>Student Growth</th>
<th>Typical Growth</th>
<th>Student % Ranged</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>132 - 116 - 108</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11 - 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>178 - 161 - 154</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4 - 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>181 - 169 - 164</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14 - 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>173 - 170 - 163</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15 - 15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Reading

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Season Year</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Student Score Range</th>
<th>Dist. Avg</th>
<th>Norm Group Avg</th>
<th>Student Growth</th>
<th>Typical Growth</th>
<th>Student % Ranged</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>171 - 157 - 150</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15 - 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>171 - 157 - 177</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5 - 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>176 - 179 - 172</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5 - 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>166 - 160 - 172</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6 - 9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Language Usage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Season Year</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Student Score Range</th>
<th>Dist. Avg</th>
<th>Norm Group Avg</th>
<th>Student Growth</th>
<th>Typical Growth</th>
<th>Student % Ranged</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>156 - 201 - 104</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25 - 41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>197 - 200 - 203</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>41 - 48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Explanatory Notes:

- **Student Score Range**
  - The number on the right is the IRT score your child received. The numbers on the right side of the IRT score define the score range. If retested, your child would score within the same range most of the time.

- **District Average IRT**
  - The average score for all students in the school district in the grade who were tested at the same time as your child.

- **Norm Group Avg**
  - The average score observed for students in the most recent NWEA RIT Scale Norms study, who were in the same grade and tested in the same portion of the instructional year (e.g., fall or spring).

- **Student Growth**
  - The average growth of students in the most recent NWEA RIT Scale Norms study who were in the same grade and began the growth comparison period at a similar achievement level.

- **Student % Ranged**
  - The number in the middle is your child’s percentile rank - the percentage of students in the most recent NWEA RIT Scale Norms study that had a RIT score less than or equal to your child’s score. The number on the right side of the percentile range defines the percentile range. If retested, your child’s percentile rank would be within this range most of the time.

- **Goal Performance**
  - Each goal area included in the test is listed along with a descriptive adjective of your child’s score. The possible descriptors are: Very Low (0-10 percentile), Low (11-40 percentile), Avg (41-60 percentile), High (61-80 percentile), and Very High (81-100 percentile).

- **Lexile Range**
  - The number in the middle is your child’s Lexile range. The number on the right side of the Lexile range defines the Lexile range. If retested, your child’s Lexile range would be within this range most of the time.

- **Language Usage Goals Performance - Spring 2015**
  - **Plan / Organize / Research**
    - Low Avg
  - **Understand Grammar / Usage**
    - Low Avg
  - **Punctuate / Spell Correctly**
    - Low Avg

---

NWEA Student Progress Report
Version 2.09.09
Created on: Monday, June 29, 2015
Page 1 of 2
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Growth</th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Typical</th>
<th>Percentile</th>
<th>Growth Condition</th>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language Usage</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Student Progress Report for Student 11

Mathematics

- Numbers & Operations: High
- Measurement: Avg
- Patterns & Algebra: Avg
- Geometry: Avg
- Data Analysis & Probability: Low

Reading

- Literature: Avg
- Informational Text: Low
- Vocabulary: Avg

Language Usage

- Plan / Organize / Research: High
- Understand Grammar / Usage: Avg
- Punctuate / Spell Correctly: High

Explanatory Notes:

Season/Year
The test below each vertical line on the graph represents the season (Fall, Spring, Winter, Summer) and the year the test was administered.

Ex.
The test above each vertical line on the graph represents the student's grade at the time the test event occurred.

Event Date
The date along the vertical lines represent the date the test event occurred.

Time Line
Test events are plotted on the 'X' axis of the graph using the time interval between test event dates to reflect elapsed time between test events accurately.

Student RIT Score Line
The RIT score represents the score a student received on each test. This line will contain a dashed portion following the most recent test event to represent projected growth over the next instructional year. This is the mean fall-to-spring or fall-to-spring RIT growth that was observed in the most recent norming study for students who had the same starting instructional term RIT score.

Dist. Avg RIT
This line represents the average scores for all students in the school district in the grade who were tested at the same time as your child.

Norm Group Avg
This line represents the average scores observed for students in the most recent NWEA RIT Scale norms study, who were in the same grade and tested in the same portion of the instructional year (e.g., Fall or Spring).

Goal Performance
Each goal area included in the test is listed along with a descriptive adjective of your child's score. The possible descriptors are Low (<21 percentile), Low Avg (21-40 percentile), Avg (41-60 percentile), High Avg (61-80 percentile), and High (>80 percentile).

Lexile® Range
The difficulty range of text that can be understood by the student 75% of the time. Lexile® is a trademark of MetaMetrics, Inc. and is registered in the United States and abroad.
### Mathematics Goals Performance - Spring 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Season/Year</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Student Score Range</th>
<th>Dist. Avg.</th>
<th>Norm Group Avg.</th>
<th>Student Growth</th>
<th>Typical Growth</th>
<th>Student % Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5ºS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>186-189</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>6-9</td>
<td>6-9-15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Reading Goals Performance - Spring 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Season/Year</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Student Score Range</th>
<th>Dist. Avg.</th>
<th>Norm Group Avg.</th>
<th>Student Growth</th>
<th>Typical Growth</th>
<th>Student % Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5ºS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>185-198</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>6-9</td>
<td>6-9-15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Language Usage Goals Performance - Spring 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Season/Year</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Student Score Range</th>
<th>Dist. Avg.</th>
<th>Norm Group Avg.</th>
<th>Student Growth</th>
<th>Typical Growth</th>
<th>Student % Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5ºS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>186-189</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>6-9</td>
<td>6-9-15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Explanatory Notes:

- **Student Score Range**: The student's score on the NWEA assessment is the number of test questions answered correctly. The score is based on the number of questions answered correctly within the time limit.

- **District Average RIT**: The average score for all students in the district is the average score for all students who took the same test in the same grade and year.

- **Student Growth**: The student's growth is measured by comparing their score to the district average for students in the same grade and year. Positive growth indicates that the student scored higher than the district average, while negative growth indicates that the student scored lower.

- **Student RIT Range**: The student's RIT range is the range of scores that the student scored within. This range indicates the difficulty level of the test questions the student answered correctly.

- **Goal Performance**: Each goal area includes a description of the student's performance on the test. The goal areas include: Reading, Language Usage, and Mathematical Reasoning. Each goal area is divided into three proficiency levels: Beginning, Developing, and Proficient.

- **Lesinski Range**: The Lesinski range is based on the student's performance on the test. The Lesinski range indicates the percentage of students in the district who scored within the same range as the student.
Student Progress Report for Student 12

Mathematics

- Numbers & Operations: Low
- Measurement: Low
- Patterns & Algebra: Low
- Geometry: Low
- Data Analysis & Probability: Low

Language Usage

Two or more test events are required for graphical representation.

Reading

- Literature: Low
- Informational Text: Low
- Vocabulary: Low

Lexile Range: 215-05

Explanatory Notes:

Season/Year
The test below each vertical line on the graph represents the season (Fall, Winter, Spring, Summer) and the year the test was administered.

GRT
The test above each vertical line on the graph represents the student’s grade at the time the test event occurred.

Event Date
The date along the vertical lines represent the date the test event occurred.

Time Line
Test events are plotted on the ’X’ axis of the graph using the time interval between test event dates to reflect observed time between test events accurately.

Student RT Score Line
The RT score your child received on each test. This line will contain a dashed portion following the most recent test event to represent projected growth over the next instructional year. This is the mean fall to fall, spring to spring, or fall to spring RT growth that was observed in the most recent norming study for students who had the same starting instructional term RT score.

Dist. Avg RT
This line represents the average score for all students in the school district in the grade who were tested at the same time as your child.

Norm Group Avg
This line represents the average score observed for students in the most recent NWEA RTI Scale norms study, who were in the same grade and tested in the same portion of the instructional year (e.g., fall or spring).

Goal Performance
Each goal area included in the test is listed along with a descriptive adjective of your child’s score. The possible descriptors are Low (<25 percentile), Low Avg (26-49 percentile), Avg (50-84 percentile), High Avg (85-90 percentile), and High (>90 percentile).

Lexile Range
The difficulty range of text that can be understood by the student 75% of the time. Lexile is a trademark of MetaMetrics, Inc., and is registered in the United States and abroad.
## Mathematics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Season/Year</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Student Score Range</th>
<th>Dist. Avg.</th>
<th>Norm Group Avg.</th>
<th>Student Growth</th>
<th>Typical Growth</th>
<th>Student %ile Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>515</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>179 - 181 - 184</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>1 - 3 -2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Mathematics Goals Performance - Spring 2015

- Numbers & Operations: Low
- Measurement: Low
- Algebra & Functions: Low
- Geometry: Low
- Data Analysis & Probability: Low

## Reading

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Season/Year</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Student Score Range</th>
<th>Dist. Avg.</th>
<th>Norm Group Avg.</th>
<th>Student Growth</th>
<th>Typical Growth</th>
<th>Student %ile Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>515</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>156 - 161 - 164</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1 - 5 -1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Reading Goals Performance - Spring 2015

- Literature: Low
- Informational Text: Low
- Vocabulary: Low

### Explanatory Notes:

#### Student Score Range

The middle number is the RT score your child received. The number on either side of the RT score defines the score range. If retested, your child would score within this range most of the time.

#### District Average RT

The average score for all students in the school district in the grade who were tested at the same time as your child.

#### Norm Group Avg

The average score observed for students in the most recent NWEA RT Scale Norms study, who were in the same grade and tested in the same month of the instructional year (e.g., fall or spring).

#### Student Growth

Presents the growth in RT's your child made from the previous spring to the spring of the year in which growth is reported.

#### Typical Growth

The average growth of students in the most recent NWEA RT Scale Norms study who were in the same grade and began the growth comparison period at a similar achievement level.

#### Student %ile Range

The numbers in the middle is your child's percentile rank - the percentage of students in the most recent NWEA RT Scale Norms study that had a RT score less than or equal to your child's score. The numbers on either side of the percentile rank define the percentile range. If retested, your child's percentile rank would be within this range most of the time.

#### Goal Performance

Each goal area included in the test is listed along with a descriptive adjective of your child's score. The possible descriptors are: Disadvantaged (G15-25; percentile rank), Average (25-40 percentile rank), Above Average (41-60 percentile), Highly ranked (61-90 percentile), and High (91-100 percentile).

#### Lexile Range

The difficulty range of text that can be understood by the student 75% of the time. Lexile is a trademark of MetaMetrics, Inc. and is registered in the United States and abroad.
Student Progress Report for Student 13

Mathematics

Language Usage

Two or more test events are required for graphical representation.

Two or more test events are required for graphical representation.

Reading

Explanatory Notes:

Season/Year
The text below each vertical line on the graph represents the season (Fall, Winter, Spring, Summer) and the year the test was administered.

Exam
The text above each vertical line on the graph represents the student's grade at the time the test event occurred.

Event Date
The date along the vertical lines represent the date the test event occurred.

TimeLine
The dates are plotted on the 'X' axis of the graph using the time interval between test event dates to reflect elapsed time between test events accurately.

Student RIT Score Line
The RIT score your child received on each test. This line will contain a dashed portion following the most recent test event to represent projected growth over the next instructional year. This is the mean fall to fall, spring to spring, or fall to spring RIT growth that was observed in the most recent norming study for students who had the same starting instructional term RIT score.

Dist. Avg RIT
This line represents the average score for all students in the school district in the grade who were tested at the same time as your child.

Norm Group Avg
This line represents the average score observed for students in the most recent NWEA RIT Scale norms study who were in the same grade and tested in the same portion of the instructional year (e.g., Fall or Spring).

Goal Performance
Each goal area included in the test is listed along with a descriptive adjective of your child's score. The possible descriptors are Low (<21 percentile), Low Avg (21-49 percentile), Avg (41-69 percentile), High Avg (71-90 percentile), and High (>90 percentile).

Lexile Range
The difficulty range of text that can be understood by the student 75% of the time. Lexile is a trademark of MetaMetrics, Inc., and is registered in the United States and abroad.
### Student Progress Report for Student 14

**Mathematics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Season/Year</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Student Score Range</th>
<th>Dist. Avg</th>
<th>Norm Group Avg</th>
<th>Student Growth</th>
<th>Typical Growth</th>
<th>Student %ile Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>515</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>176 - 197 - 182</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>1 - 5 - 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Reading**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Season/Year</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Student Score Range</th>
<th>Dist. Avg</th>
<th>Norm Group Avg</th>
<th>Student Growth</th>
<th>Typical Growth</th>
<th>Student %ile Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>515</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>156 - 176 - 177</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 - 4 - 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Mathematics Goals Performance - Spring 2015

- Numbers & Operations: Low
- Measurement: Low
- Patterns & Algebra: Low
- Geometry: Low
- Data Analysis & Probability: Low

#### Reading Goals Performance - Spring 2015

- Literature: Low
- Informational Text: Low
- Vocabulary: Low

#### Explanatory Notes:

- **Student Score Range**
  - The middle number is the RT score your child received. The numbers on either side of the RT score define the score range. If retested, your child would score within this range most of the time.

- **District Average RT**
  - The average score for all students in the school district in the grade who were tested at the same time as your child.

- **Norm Group Avg**
  - The average score observed for students in the most recent NWEA RT Scale Norms study, who were in the same grade and tested in the same portion of the instructional year (e.g., fall or spring).

- **Student Growth**
  - Presents the growth in RTs of your child made from the previous spring to the spring of the year in which growth is reported.

- **Typical Growth**
  - The average growth of students in the most recent NWEA RT Scale Norms study who were in the same grade and began the growth comparison period at a similar achievement level.

- **Student %ile Range**
  - The number on the middle is your child’s percentile rank - the percentage of students in the most recent NWEA RT Scale Norms study that had a RT score less than or equal to your child's score. The numbers on either side of the percentile rank define the percentile range. If retested, your child’s percentile rank would be within this range most of the time.

- **Goal Performance**
  - Each goal area included in the test is listed along with a descriptive adjective of your child's score. For example, scores in the range of 96-100 (top 10 percent), 81-95 (top 20 percent), 66-80 (top 40 percent), 51-65 (top 60 percent), 26-50 (top 80 percent), 11-25 (top 90 percent), and 0-10 (top 100 percent).

- **Lexile Range**
  - The difficulty range of text that can be understood by the student 75% of the time. Lexile is a trademark of MetaMetrics, Inc., and is registered in the United States and abroad.
## Mathematics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Season/Year</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Score Range</th>
<th>Dist. Avg</th>
<th>Norm Group Avg</th>
<th>Growth</th>
<th>Typical Growth</th>
<th>Student Scale Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>106.2 - 119.2</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>36.46 - 52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>102.2 - 105.2</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>47.46 - 62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100.2 - 109.2</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>58.34 - 72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Reading

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Season/Year</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Score Range</th>
<th>Dist. Avg</th>
<th>Norm Group Avg</th>
<th>Growth</th>
<th>Typical Growth</th>
<th>Student Scale Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>106.2 - 119.2</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>36.46 - 52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>102.2 - 105.2</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>47.46 - 62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100.2 - 109.2</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>58.34 - 72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Language Usage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Season/Year</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Score Range</th>
<th>Dist. Avg</th>
<th>Norm Group Avg</th>
<th>Growth</th>
<th>Typical Growth</th>
<th>Student Scale Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>106.2 - 119.2</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>36.46 - 52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>102.2 - 105.2</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>47.46 - 62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100.2 - 109.2</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>58.34 - 72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Mathematics Goals Performance - Spring 2015

- Numbers & Operations: Avg
- Measurement: Low Avg
- Patterns & Algebra: Low Avg
- Geometry: High Avg
- Data Analysis & Probability: Low Avg

## Reading Goals Performance - Spring 2015

- Literacy: Avg
- Informational Text: Low Avg
- Vocabulary: Low Avg

## Leveled Range: 619-669

### Explanatory Notes:

- **Student Score Range**: The range of scores that your child scored within.
- **Norm Group Avg**: The average score observed for students in the most recent NWEA RIT Scale Norms study who were in the same grade and tested in the same month or school district during the school year (e.g., fall or spring).
- **Student Growth**: The average gain in RIT score for students in the most recent NWEA RIT Scale Norms study who were in the same grade and began the growth comparison period at a similar achievement level.
- **Student Scale Range**: The range of scores that your child scored within.
- **Goal Performance**: Each goal area included in the test is listed along with a descriptive adjective of your child's score. The possible descriptors are High (91-100 percentile), High (81-90 percentile), Medium (71-80 percentile), Low (61-70 percentile), and Low (51-60 percentile).
- **Lexile Range**: The difficulty range of text that can be understood by the student 75% of the time. Lexile is a trademark of MetaMetrics, Inc., and is registered in the United States and abroad.
Student Progress Report for Student 15

Student ID: [Redacted]

Mathematics

Reading

Language Usage

Mathematics Goals Performance - Spring 2015

Reading Goals Performance - Spring 2015

Language Usage Goals Performance - Spring 2015

Literature

Informational Text

Vocabulary

Numbers & Operations

Measurement

Patterns & Algebra

Geometry

Data Analysis & Probability

Avg

Low Avg

High Avg

Leslie: Range: 019-059

Explanatory Notes:

Explanatory Notes:

Season/Year

The text below each vertical line on the graph represents the season (Fall, Winter, Spring, Summer) and the year the test was administered.

Gain

The text above each vertical line on the graph represents the student's grade at the time the test event occurred.

Event Date

The date along the vertical line shows the date the test event occurred.

TimeLine

Test events are plotted on the X axis of the graph using the time interval between test event dates to reflect the actual time between test events accurately.

Student RIT Score Line

The RIT score your child received on each test. This line will contain a dashed portion following the most recent test event to represent projected growth over the next instructional year. This is the mean fall-to-spring RIT growth that was observed in the most recent norming study for students who had the same starting instructional term RIT score.

Dist. Avg RIT

This line represents the average score for all students in the school district in the grade who were tested at the same time as your child.

Norm Group Avg

This line represents the average score for students in the most recent NWEA RIT Scale norm study, who were in the same grade and tested in the same portion of the instructional year (e.g., fall or spring).

Goal Performance

Each goal area included in the test is listed along with a descriptive adjective of your child's score. The possible descriptors are Low (<21 percentile), Low Avg (21-40 percentile), Avg (41-60 percentile), High Avg (61-80 percentile), and High (>80 percentile).

Leslie: Range: [Redacted]

The difficulty range of text that can be understood by the student 75% of the time. Leslie is a trademark of MetaMetrics, Inc., and is registered in the United States and abroad.
### Student Progress Report for Student 16

#### Mathematics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Season/Year</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Student Score Range</th>
<th>Dist. Avg</th>
<th>Norm Group Avg</th>
<th>Student Growth</th>
<th>Typical Growth</th>
<th>Student NYPD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>159 - 172</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>158 - 161</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>142 - 145</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Reading

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Season/Year</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Student Score Range</th>
<th>Dist. Avg</th>
<th>Norm Group Avg</th>
<th>Student Growth</th>
<th>Typical Growth</th>
<th>Student NYPD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>170 - 172</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>149 - 162</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>145 - 148</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Language Usage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Season/Year</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Student Score Range</th>
<th>Dist. Avg</th>
<th>Norm Group Avg</th>
<th>Student Growth</th>
<th>Typical Growth</th>
<th>Student NYPD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>159 - 172</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>158 - 161</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>142 - 145</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Mathematics Goals Performance - Spring 2015

- Numbers & Operations: Low
- Measurement: Low
- Patterns & Algebra: Low
- Geometry: Low
- Data Analysis & Probability: Low

### Reading Goals Performance - Spring 2015

- Literature: Low
- Informational Text: Low
- Vocabulary: Low

### Explanatory Notes:

**Student Score Range**

The middle number is the RT score your child received. The numbers on either side of the RT score define the score range. If retested, your child would score within this range most of the time.

**District Average RT**

The average score for all students in the school district in the grade who were tested at the same time as your child.

**Norm Group Avg**

The average score observed for students in the most recent NWEA RT Scale Norms study, who were in the same grade and tested in the same portion of the instructional year (e.g., fall or spring).

**Student Growth**

Presents the growth in RTs your child made from the previous spring to the spring of the year in which growth is reported.

**Typical Growth**

The average growth of students in the most recent NWEA RT Scale Norms study who were in the same grade and began the growth comparison period at a similar achievement level.

**Student NYPD**

The number in this middle is your child's percentile rank - the percentage of students in the most recent NWEA RT Scale Norms study that had a RT score less than or equal to your child's score. The numbers on either side of the percentile rank define the percentile range. If retested, your child's percentile rank would be within this range most of the time.

**Goal Performance**

Each goal area included in the test is listed along with a descriptive adjective of your child's score. The possible descriptors are 3 (low), 4 (33%), 5 (50%), 6 (66%), 7 (80%) and 8 (90%).

**Lexile Range**

The difficulty range of text that can be understood by the student 75% of the time. Lexile is a trademark of MetaMetrics, Inc. and is registered in the United States and abroad.
Student Progress Report for Student 16

Mathematics Goals Performance - Spring 2015

- Numbers & Operations: Low
- Measurement: Low
- Patterns & Algebra: Low
- Geometry: Low
- Data Analysis & Probability: Low

Reading Goals Performance - Spring 2015

- Literature: Low
- Informational Text: Low
- Vocabulary: Low

Lexile Range: 151-165

Explanatory Notes:

Season/Year
The text below each vertical line on the graph represents the season (Fall, Winter, Spring, Summer) and the year the test was administered.

G1
The points above each vertical line on the graph represents the student's grade at the time the test event occurred.

Event Date
The date along the vertical lines represents the date the test event occurred.

TimeLine
Test events are plotted on the X-axis of the graph using the time interval between test event dates to reflect elapsed time between test events accurately.

Student RT Score Line
The RT score your child received on each test. This line will contain a dashed portion following the most recent test event to represent projected growth over the next instructional year. This is the mean fall to fall spring to spring, or fall to spring RT growth that was observed in the most recent norming study for students who had the same starting instructional term RT score.

Dist. Avg RT
This line represents the average score for all students in the school district in the grade who were tested at the same time as your child.

Norm Group Avg
This line represents the average score observed for students in the most recent NWEA RTI Scale norm study, who were in the same grade and tested at the same point in the instructional year (e.g., fall or spring).

Goal Performance
Each goal area included in the test is listed along with a descriptive adjective of your child's score. The possible descriptors are Low (<21 percentile), Medium (21-40 percentile), Average (41-60 percentile), High (61-80 percentile), and High (81-100 percentile).

Lexile Range
The difficulty range of text that can be understood by the student 75% of the time. Lexile is a trademark of MetaMetrics, Inc. and is registered in the United States and abroad.
## Student Progress Report for Student 17

**Growth is measured from Spring to Spring**

### Student ID:

#### Mathematics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Season/Year</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Score Range</th>
<th>Dist. Avg</th>
<th>Norm Group Avg</th>
<th>Student Growth</th>
<th>Typical Growth</th>
<th>Student Score Range</th>
<th>Dist. Avg</th>
<th>Norm Group Avg</th>
<th>Growth</th>
<th>Typical Growth</th>
<th>Student Score Range</th>
<th>Dist. Avg</th>
<th>Norm Group Avg</th>
<th>Growth</th>
<th>Typical Growth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100-104</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>105-107</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>103-105</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>101-103</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Reading

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Season/Year</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Score Range</th>
<th>Dist. Avg</th>
<th>Norm Group Avg</th>
<th>Growth</th>
<th>Typical Growth</th>
<th>Score Range</th>
<th>Dist. Avg</th>
<th>Norm Group Avg</th>
<th>Growth</th>
<th>Typical Growth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100-104</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>105-107</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>103-105</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>101-103</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Mathematics Goals Performance - Spring 2015

- Numbers & Operations: Low
- Measurement: Low
- Patterns & Algebra: Low
- Geometry: Low
- Data Analysis & Probability: Low

#### Reading Goals Performance - Spring 2015

- Literacy: Low
- Informational Text: Low
- Vocabulary: Low

### Explanatory Notes:

- **Lesinski Range:** 611-661

- **Student Score Range:** The middle number in the RIT score is the child's score. The score on the other side of the RIT score is the score range. If retested, your child's score will be within this range most of the time.

- **District Average RIT:** The average score for all students in the district in the grade who were tested at the same time as your child.

- **Norm Group Avg:** The average score for students in the most recent NWEA RIT Scale Norm study, who were in the same grade and tested in the same month of the instructional year (e.g., fall or spring).

- **Student Growth:** The average growth of students in the most recent NWEA RIT Scale Norm study who were in the same grade and began the growth comparison period at a similar level.

- **Student Yule Range:** The number in the middle is your child's percentile rank - the percentage of students in the most recent NWEA RIT Scale Norm study that had a RIT score less than or equal to your child's score. The number on either side of the percentile rank define the percentile range. If retested, your child's percentile rank will be within this range most of the time.

- **Goal Performance:** Each area included in the test is listed along with a descriptive adjective of your child's score. The percentage of students who scored below 20th percentile, 20th to 40th percentile, 40th to 60th percentile, and above 60th percentile.

- **Lesinski Range:** The difficulty range of text that can be understood by the student 75% of the time. Lesinski is a trademark of MetaMetrics, Inc. and is registered in the United States and abroad.

---
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