

To: Susan Bradley and John Freeman
From: EDC's DLSC Evaluation Team
Re: Common Indicator data tables
Date: June 21, 2018

We are pleased to share Common Indicator data for Pittsfield for 2016 and 2017. In this memo we have highlighted themes for Pittsfield identified through our analyses of the two years of Common Indicator data, based on our understanding of the priorities of the DLSC work in your school. Below the themes is information about the comprehensive display of Common Indicator data that accompanies this memo. If you spend more time examining the data in the Common Indicators, please feel free to contact me with questions about the display or to discuss your impressions of the findings.

Highlighted Themes for Pittsfield

- Student questionnaire indicators related to teacher support and adult guidance remained relatively flat at the whole school level between 2016 and 2017. There were, however, some notable differences by subgroup. For the “Teacher and Adult Support” composite, values rose moderately for both IEP students and FRPL students, suggesting that these groups perceived an increase in high expectations and attention to their learning needs (data presented in the worksheet for “CCR Indicators – Students”). Conversely, subgroup trends for the “Adult Guidance and Access” composite decreased for two grade levels—grade 9 and grade 12 (data presented the worksheet for “SCL Indicators – Students”). Have there been changes in grade nine or grade twelve advisory that might help explain the drop in values for these grades? Or, could some of the changes from 2016 to 2017 be attributed to factors unique to the student cohorts in those years?
- Data on teachers’ top three assessment strategies at the whole school level were relatively stable over the two years of data collection. One exception is seen in the change for “daily homework and daily check-ins”, which increased at the whole-school level (from 10% to 23%) and among grade 9, 10, and 11 teachers. While the importance placed on daily homework and check-ins is still relatively low in comparison to other assessment methods, such as extended projects, it’s possible that the greater emphasis on daily homework is related to concerns teachers have shared about the challenges associated with student self-pacing on longer-term projects. By incorporating daily assignments, teachers may be aiming to add more structure to course expectations while helping students make consistent progress toward competency.
- In comparing response patterns by gender in the “Systems-Level Change” student data, we noticed patterns across both years of data that suggest female students perceived their ELA classes as providing higher levels of personalization and rigor than male

students. Specifically, in both 2016 and 2017, females reported notably higher mean response values than males for the following items: *I move on to new work when I can show what I have learned*; *The teacher involves students in making decisions about their classwork*; *The teacher expects us to work through challenging tasks without giving up*; and, *The teacher assigns work that is appropriately challenging*. Moreover, female students also reported taking quizzes and tests in ELA less frequently than their male counterparts. These findings suggest that female students have responded differently than males to student-centered learning practices in their ELA classes.

- Differences by gender also appeared in the 2017 data for the item, *I get to choose how I show the teacher what I have learned*. These differences are notable for a few reasons. One, the differences in mean response value by gender were quite large in 2017, but were not present in the findings for 2016. Two, the differences varied by subject-area. For math, the mean response value for male students was substantially higher than for female students. This pattern was reversed for ELA and Science, where the mean values for females were greater than for males. With just one year of data, we are cautious to draw conclusions about the meaning of these differences. These findings may point to how gender influences student agency by subject area. In the next cycle of Common Indicator data, we will monitor these items for any sustained trends in gender differences.

About the Common Indicators Data Display

The Common Indicators are organized into two broad categories – College and Career Readiness (CCR) and Systems-Level Change (SLC). The CCR and SLC categories are further subdivided into domains and components.

Each of the data tables is an Excel workbook that contains three worksheets per school: 1) CCR – Student Data, 2) SLC – Student Data, 3) SLC – Teacher Data. The data tables include indicators organized by their corresponding component and domain. To the extent possible, student data were disaggregated by gender, race/ethnicity, grade, and subgroups (e.g., ELL, FRL). Teacher data were disaggregated by subject area and grade taught, when samples were large enough for analyses.

These CCR and SLC data tables are populated, primarily, with quantitative data collected for Year 1 (2015-16) and Year 2 (2016-17).

Sources for most data include the websites maintained by each state’s Department of Education, school or district websites, and EDC’s student and teacher questionnaires. Some data was provided directly from the district to EDC. We sought to present updated data from the most recent year available. While some indicators are based on data from the 2016-17 school year, in some instances the most recent year of state data available was 2015-16 or 2014-15. The year associated with each indicator’s data is noted in the data tables.

Most indicators were categorized as either a CCR or a SLC indicator, but some were determined to be relevant to both categories. In these cases, the indicators and their associated data appear twice.

Below are descriptions of terms used throughout the data tables:

- **Student Questionnaire Composite Data** – In instances where multiple student questionnaire items are related to a single indicator, composite mean scores are presented instead of providing data for each individual item. Composite mean scores were created by calculating each student’s average response to a set of items associated with a particular indicator (e.g., “Learning How to Learn” or “Developing Academic Mindsets”).
- **Teacher Questionnaire Composite Data** – In instances where multiple teacher questionnaire items are related to a single indicator, composite mean scores are presented instead of providing data for each individual item. Composite mean scores were created by calculating each teacher’s average response to a set of items associated with a particular indicator (e.g., “Use of Assessments” or “Professional Learning Infrastructure”).
- **Suppressed data** (denoted in the data tables as “*”)
 - **EDC student and teacher questionnaires:** Data were suppressed for groups (whole school, by gender, ELL, SPED/IEP, FRPL, by race, by grade, by subject) with a sample size less than 8. For student-level data, values were also suppressed if fewer than 8 students met a particular criterion (e.g., number of ELL students who indicated they took at least one online course).
 - **State-reported data:** Guidelines for data suppression vary by state. Whenever data was suppressed by a state department of education, it is also noted as suppressed (*) in the data table.
- **“Data unavailable”** (denoted in the tables as “—”) - Data not found online and/or not applicable to a particular site. Evaluators collected data from publicly available sources such as state Department of Education, district, and school websites. Evaluators identified data that were not available online and sent itemized data requests to each site. For some schools, certain indicators were not relevant. For example, not all schools offered high-level courses, such as AP or Honors designated courses. In these cases, we categorized the data as unavailable (—).
- **Change** (denoted in the data tables as   or )
Items that increased from Year 1 to Year 2 are noted with a blue upward-facing arrow (). Items that decreased from Year 1 to Year 2 are noted with an orange downward-

facing arrow (▼). Items that showed no change are noted with two black arrows facing left and right (◀ ▶).