

**PARCC Results:  
Spring 2018  
Administration**

**TEANECK PUBLIC SCHOOLS**

**October 10, 2018**

**Measuring  
College  
and  
Career  
Readiness**

# NEW JERSEY'S STATEWIDE ASSESSMENT PROGRAM

- The 2017-2018 school year marks the fourth administration of the Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers (PARCC). This presentation will compare trends over a three-year period, 2016-2018.
- Students took PARCC English Language Arts and Literacy Assessments (ELA/L) in grades 3 – 11.
- Students took PARCC Mathematics Assessments in grades 3 – 8 and End-of-Course Assessments in Algebra I, Geometry, and Algebra II.
- Students took science assessments at grades 4, 8, and 11. These scores have not been released, as they were a pilot of the new assessment.

# PARCC PERFORMANCE LEVELS

- Level 1: Not yet meeting grade-level expectations
- Level 2: Partially meeting grade-level expectations
- Level 3: Approaching grade-level expectations
- **Level 4: Meeting grade-level expectations**
- **Level 5: Exceeding grade-level expectations**

*The  
goal  
for all  
students*

**ENGLISH LANGUAGE  
ARTS/LITERACY**

**2  
0  
1  
8**

# COMPARISON OF TEANECK PUBLIC SCHOOLS' SPRING 2016, SPRING 2017, SPRING 2018 PARCC ADMINISTRATION ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS/LITERACY - PERCENTAGES

Grade	Not Yet Meeting Expectations (Level 1)			Partially Meeting Expectations (Level 2)			Approaching Expectations (Level 3)			Meeting Expectations (Level 4)			Exceeding Expectations (Level 5)		
	2016	2017	2018	2016	2017	2018	2016	2017	2018	2016	2017	2018	2016	2017	2018
3	8%	8%	6.6%	15%	13%	14.6%	27%	25%	23.9%	42%	43%	45.6%	7%	11%	9.3%
4	3%	5%	2.8%	16%	15%	13.3%	24%	27%	18%	39%	40%	47.4%	17%	12%	18.5%
5	5%	6%	6.1%	15%	15%	13.4%	32%	28%	30.5%	45%	44%	45.5%	3%	8%	4.5%
6	8%	5%	8.9%	12%	16%	14.6%	21%	29%	21.1%	46%	43%	41.5%	13%	8%	13.8%
7	8%	8%	6.6%	12%	9%	8.4%	26%	23%	22%	37%	42%	40.7%	18%	18%	22.3%
8	8%	8%	5.3%	12%	12%	5.7%	23%	19%	18.7%	50%	43%	52.7%	7%	18%	17.6%
9	14%	10%	8.5%	13%	8%	11.2%	22%	22%	20%	37%	47%	48.1%	14%	12%	12.2%
10	31%	16%	13.8%	16%	11%	12.3%	16%	16%	16.4%	26%	38%	39.8%	11%	19%	17.8%
11*	29%	12%	14.6%	16%	13%	10.6%	21%	16%	21.9%	27%	45%	33.6%	6%	14%	19.3%

\*Grade 11 does not include students who took an AP/IB test. \*\*Level 4 and Level 5 is an indication a student is on pace to be college and career ready.

Notes: Percentages may not total 100 due to rounding.

# COMPARISON OF TEANECK PUBLIC SCHOOLS' SPRING 2018 PARCC ADMINISTRATION TO NEW JERSEY ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS/LITERACY - PERCENTAGES

	Not Yet Meeting Expectations (Level 1)		Partially Meeting Expectations (Level 2)		Approaching Expectations (Level 3)		Meeting Expectations (Level 4)		Exceeding Expectations (Level 5)	
	District	State	District	State	District	State	District	State	District	State
	2018	2018	2018	2018	2018	2018	2018	2018	2018	2018
Grade 3	6.6%	13.5%	14.6%	13.5%	23.9%	21.4%	45.6%	43.5%	9.3%	8.1%
Grade 4	2.8%	7.6%	13.3%	12.3%	18%	22.1%	47.4%	39.1%	18.5%	18.9%
Grade 5	6.1%	6.9%	13.4%	12.6%	30.5%	22.4%	45.5%	47.2%	4.5%	10.8%
Grade 6	8.9%	6.2%	14.6%	13.6%	21.1%	24%	41.5%	41.3%	13.8%	14.9%
Grade 7	6.6%	8.6%	8.4%	10.2%	22.0%	18.5%	40.7%	34.1%	22.3%	28.6%
Grade 8	5.3%	8.7%	5.7%	11.1%	18.7%	19.8%	52.7%	39.9%	17.6%	20.4%
Grade 9	8.5%	12.3%	11.2%	12.5%	20%	21.1%	48.1%	38%	12.2%	16.1%
Grade 10	13.8%	18.3%	12.3%	12.8%	16.4%	19.0%	39.8%	31.8%	17.8%	18.1%
Grade 11*	14.6%	23.1%	10.6%	16.6%	21.9%	22.2%	33.6%	29.1%	19.3%	9.0%

\*Grade 11 does not include students who took an AP/IB test.

Notes: Percentages may not total 100 due to rounding.

# ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS/LITERACY DISTRICT'S COMBINED PROFICIENCY COMPARED TO STATE'S COMBINED PROFICIENCY

Grade	2018 Levels 4s and 5s	
	District	State
Grade 3	54.9%	51.7%
Grade 4	65.9%	58%
Grade 5	50%	58%
Grade 6	55.3%	56.2%
Grade 7	63%	62.7%
Grade 8	70.2%	60.4%
Grade 9	60.3%	54.1%
Grade 10	57.6%	49.9%
Grade 11	59%	39%

**TEANECK PUBLIC SCHOOLS'  
COHORT ANALYSIS  
ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS/LITERACY  
2016-2018**

2016		2017		2018		Cohort Increase/Decrease
Grade 3	49%	Grade 4	52%	Grade 5	50%	+1
Grade 4	56%	Grade 5	52%	Grade 6	55.3%	-.7
Grade 5	48%	Grade 6	51%	Grade 7	40.7%	-7.3
Grade 6	59%	Grade 7	60%	Grade 8	63%	+4
Grade 7	55%	Grade 8	61%	Grade 9	60.3%	+5.3
Grade 8	57%	Grade 9	59%	Grade 10	57.6%	+1.6
Grade 9	51%	Grade 10	57%	Grade 11	52.9%	+1.9
Grade 10	37%	Grade 11	59%			

# PARCC COMPARISON BY SCHOOL ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS/LITERACY 2016-2018

Schools	Grade	School/State Percentage Meeting and Exceeding Expectations					
		2016	2016 State	2017	2017 State	2018	2018 State
Hawthorne	3	55%	47%	55%	50%	54.3%	51.7%
Lowell		51%		65%		63.5%	
Whittier		43%		43%		46.5%	

Schools	Grade	School/State Percentage Meeting and Exceeding Expectations					
		2016	2016 State	2017	2017 State	2018	2018 State
Hawthorne	4	54%	54%	58%	56%	60%	58%
Lowell		39%		52%		77.5%	
Whittier		56%		49%		60%	

# PARCC COMPARISON BY SCHOOL ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS/LITERACY 2016-2018

Schools	Grade	School/State Percentage Meeting and Exceeding Expectations					
		2016	2016 State	2017	2017 State	2018	2018 State
BFMS	5	45%	53%	54%	52%	44.2%	58%
TJMS		52%		50%		56.4%	

Schools	Grade	School/State Percentage Meeting and Exceeding Expectations					
		2016	2016 State	2017	2017 State	2018	2018 State
BFMS	6	48%	52%	42%	53%	50.9%	56.2%
TJMS		62%		59%		59%	

# PARCC COMPARISON BY SCHOOL ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS/LITERACY 2016-2018

Schools	Grade	School/State Percentage Meeting and Exceeding Expectations					
		2016	2016 State	2017	2017 State	2018	2018 State
BFMS	7	48%	52%	54%	59%	58%	62.7%
TJMS		58%		66%		68.1%	

Schools	Grade	School/State Percentage Meeting and Exceeding Expectations					
		2016	2016 State	2017	2017 State	2018	2018 State
BFMS	8	56%	51%	59%	59%	66.9%	60.4%
TJMS		61%		63%		73.2%	

# PARCC COMPARISON OF HIGH SCHOOL TO STATE ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS/LITERACY 2017-2018

Grade	School/State Comparison Percentage Meeting and Exceeding Expectations			
	2017	2017 State	2018	2018 State
9	59%	51%	60.3%	54.1%
10	57%	45%	57.6%	49.9%
11	59%	37%	52.9%	38.1%

**COMPARISON OF TEANECK PUBLIC SCHOOLS' SUBGROUP  
 SPRING 2016, SPRING 2017 & SPRING 2018 PARCC ADMINISTRATION  
 ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS GRADE 3 - PERCENTAGES**

	2016	2017	2018
<i>Performance Level</i>	<b>Levels 4-5</b>	<b>Levels 4-5</b>	<b>Levels 4-5</b>
WHITE	45.5%	59.3%	64%
AFRICAN AMERICAN	40.7%	56.7%	47.4%
ASIAN	83.3%	64%	63%
HISPANIC	46%	45.5%	54.5%
MALE	45%	45.6%	56.8%
FEMALE	53.8%	63%	53.4%
STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES IEP- Yes	28.3%	23.8%	28.8%
STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES IEP-No	54.4%	62.1%	62.6%
ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED	46.5%	40.8%	50%
NON ECON. DISADVANTAGED	51.2%	62.2%	57.9%

**COMPARISON OF TEANECK PUBLIC SCHOOLS' SUBGROUP  
 SPRING 2016, SPRING 2017 & SPRING 2018 PARCC ADMINISTRATION  
 ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS GRADE 4 - PERCENTAGES**

	<b>2016</b>	<b>2017</b>	<b>2018</b>
<i>Performance Level</i>	<b>Levels 4-5</b>	<b>Levels 4-5</b>	<b>Levels 4-5</b>
WHITE	67.6%	65.4%	72.7%
AFRICAN AMERICAN	45.9%	42.9%	65.7%
ASIAN	82.1%	85.2%	80%
HISPANIC	50.6%	50%	59.1%
MALE	45.2%	46%	58.1%
FEMALE	66.4%	59.8%	73.6%
STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES IEP-Yes	17%	26.9%	31.4%
STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES IEP-No	67.4%	59.8%	76.9%
ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED	46.9%	38.1%	54.9%
NON ECON. DISADVANTAGED	60.9%	62.5%	72.9%

**COMPARISON OF TEANECK PUBLIC SCHOOLS' SUBGROUP  
 SPRING 2016, SPRING 2017 & SPRING 2018 PARCC ADMINISTRATION  
 ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS GRADE 5 - PERCENTAGES**

	2016	2017	2018
<i>Performance Level</i>	<b>Levels 4-5</b>	<b>Levels 4-5</b>	<b>Levels 4-5</b>
WHITE	76.9%	68.4%	61.5%
AFRICAN AMERICAN	41.2%	40%	42.2%
ASIAN	61.8%	79.2%	73.1%
HISPANIC	41.5%	46.5%	49.5%
MALE	43.4%	34.8%	40.9%
FEMALE	52.2%	66.1%	59.7%
STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES IEP- Yes	21.1%	14.8%	22.0%
STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES IEP-No	55.7%	62.2%	58.8%
ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED	40%	37.4%	48.1%
NON ECON. DISADVANTAGED	55%	61.4%	51.4%

**COMPARISON OF TEANECK PUBLIC SCHOOLS' SUBGROUP  
 SPRING 2016, SPRING 2017 & SPRING 2018 PARCC ADMINISTRATION  
 ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS GRADE 6 - PERCENTAGES**

	2016	2017	2018
<i>Performance Level</i>	<b>Levels 4-5</b>	<b>Levels 4-5</b>	<b>Levels 4-5</b>
WHITE	84%	60.9%	73.5%
AFRICAN AMERICAN	55.1%	46.5%	41.9%
ASIAN	67.5%	75%	83.3%
HISPANIC	51.7%	43.8%	52.3%
MALE	48.3%	43.5%	37.5%
FEMALE	69.5%	56.8%	72.2%
STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES IEP- Yes	22.1%	15%	14.3%
STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES IEP-No	73.3%	61.1%	67.4%
ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED	48.4%	43.5%	37.5%
NON ECON. DISADVANTAGED	63.3%	55.5%	68.3%

**COMPARISON OF TEANECK PUBLIC SCHOOLS' SUBGROUP  
 SPRING 2016, SPRING 2017 & SPRING 2018 PARCC ADMINISTRATION  
 ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS GRADE 7 - PERCENTAGES**

	2016	2017	2018
<i>Performance Level</i>	<b>Levels 4-5</b>	<b>Levels 4-5</b>	<b>Levels 4-5</b>
WHITE	60.9%	69.%	71.4%
AFRICAN AMERICAN	51.4%	66.3%	51.9%
ASIAN	92.3%	66.7%	83.8%
HISPANIC	47.5%	48.9%	64.6%
MALE	44.5%	52.5%	47.8%
FEMALE	65.3%	67.9%	78.1%
STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES IEP- Yes	8.3%	29.6%	24.2%
STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES IEP-No	70.6%	72.5%	75.4%
ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED	39%	50.5%	62.3%
NON ECON. DISADVANTAGED	63.3%	66.3%	63.5%

**COMPARISON OF TEANECK PUBLIC SCHOOLS' SUBGROUP  
 SPRING 2016, SPRING 2017 & SPRING 2018 PARCC ADMINISTRATION  
 ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS GRADE 8 - PERCENTAGES**

	<b>2016</b>	<b>2017</b>	<b>2018</b>
<i>Performance Level</i>	Levels 4-5	Levels 4-5	<b>Levels 4-5</b>
WHITE	75%	68.2%	85.7%
AFRICAN AMERICAN	51%	66.3%	71.1%
ASIAN	64.3%	85.2%	78%
HISPANIC	47.5%	63.9%	61.9%
MALE	50.7%	50.4%	59.2%
FEMALE	66.3%	72.2%	80.3%
STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES IEP- Yes	13.3%	13.8%	29.4%
STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES IEP-No	71.5%	78.3%	84.5%
ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED	45.8%	57%	66.7%
NON ECON. DISADVANTAGED	63.2%	63.5%	72.5%

## COMPARISON OF TEANECK PUBLIC SCHOOLS' SUBGROUP SPRING 2016, SPRING 2017 & SPRING 2018 PARCC ADMINISTRATION ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS GRADE 9 - PERCENTAGES

	2016	2017	2018
<i>Performance Level</i>	<b>Levels 4-5</b>	<b>Levels 4-5</b>	<b>Levels 4-5</b>
WHITE	56.4%	68.2%	83.3%
AFRICAN AMERICAN	40.9%	66.3%	47.5%
ASIAN	80%	85.2%	88.6%
HISPANIC	46.7%	63.9%	61%
MALE	40.4%	50.4%	52.1%
FEMALE	63.4%	72.2%	68.2%
STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES IEP- Yes	13.3%	13.8%	17.8%
STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES IEP-No	71.5%	78.3%	74.3%
ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED	45.8%	57%	42.7%
NON ECON. DISADVANTAGED	63.2%	63.5%	68%

**COMPARISON OF TEANECK PUBLIC SCHOOLS' SUBGROUP  
 SPRING 2016, SPRING 2017 & SPRING 2018 PARCC ADMINISTRATION  
 ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS GRADE 10 - PERCENTAGES**

	2016	2017	2018
<i>Performance Level</i>	<b>Levels 4-5</b>	<b>Levels 4-5</b>	<b>Levels 4-5</b>
WHITE	51.4%	66.7%	67.9%
AFRICAN AMERICAN	27.1%	51.9%	46.6%
ASIAN	56.5%	73.2%	77.3%
HISPANIC	42.5%	53.3%	59.8%
MALE	28.5%	48.2%	52.3%
FEMALE	46.9%	65.7%	64.2%
STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES IEP- Yes	14.3%	23.6%	24.2%
STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES IEP-No	44.8%	65.1%	68.5%
ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED	28.3%	45.2%	39.4%
NON ECON. DISADVANTAGED	41.7%	62.8%	64.1%

## COMPARISON OF TEANECK PUBLIC SCHOOLS' SUBGROUP SPRING 2016 AND SPRING 2017 PARCC ADMINISTRATION ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS GRADE 11 - PERCENTAGES

	2016	2017	2018
<i>Performance Level</i>	<b>Levels 4-5</b>	<b>Levels 4-5</b>	<b>Levels 4-5</b>
WHITE	34.6%	74.2%	67.9%
AFRICAN AMERICAN	31.5%	49.6%	45%
ASIAN	44.4%	76.5%	71.8%
HISPANIC	30.4%	60%	50.6%
MALE	22.4%	9.7%	41.8%
FEMALE	44.2%	18.8%	63.6%
STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES IEP- Yes	10%	27.7%	14.5%
STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES IEP-No	44.8%	68%	62.6%
ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED	38.5%	64.7%	39.2%
NON ECON. DISADVANTAGED	36.7%	46.7%	58.5%

# SUMMARY: LANGUAGE ARTS

## ■ What worked well

- Implementation of new reading curricula in grades three and four
- Differentiated reading instruction in grades seven and eight
- Implementation of revised Measure of Academic Progress (MAP) assessments, which included detailed projected PARCC proficiency reports and student achievement data

## ■ Areas of focus

- District-wide focus on academic writing

## ■ Steps for moving forward

- Department meetings focused on strategies for teaching adolescent writers
- Implementation of new third and fourth grade reading resources
- Strengthening the process of identifying and responding to students who may be struggling with reading or writing
- Increased collaborative discussions between administrators and teachers regarding student engagement, questioning and discussions

# NEXT STEPS: LANGUAGE ARTS

## ■ Grades K through 2

- Teachers will participate in monthly data team meetings to review classroom assessments, Developmental Reading Assessment (DRA), benchmark assessments, and Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) testing to identify areas of student strength and areas needing remediation.
- Kindergarten teachers will participate in a yearlong training on encouraging and supporting primary students' writing.

## ■ Grades 3 and 4

- Teachers will utilize the Benchmark Online platform for administering PARCC-like unit assessments in order to prepare students for the assessments they will take in the spring 2019.
- Based on multiple data-sources, teachers will create strategic teaching groups to ensure that all students are meeting grade level standards.
- Literacy Enrichment Teachers (LETs) will work with grade-level teams to analyze current data and provide instructional strategies for responding to students' needs.
- Parent outreach through PTO to highlight the importance of a home-school partnership for effectively motivating students and improving learning outcomes

# NEXT STEPS: LANGUAGE ARTS

## ■ Grades 5 through 8

- Teachers will focus on improving writing by conferring with students and providing meaningful, timely feedback.
- Faculty meeting time will be used to analyze data and plan for differentiated instruction.
- School-level administrators will monitor progress of students enrolled in reading and basic skills intervention programs.
- Teachers will plan instruction that includes flexible student grouping and learning centers based on data from Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) and benchmark assessments

## ■ Grades 9 through 11

- Social studies and English teachers will analyze PARCC data for trends and patterns.
- Content areas will utilize common strategies to ensure that students meet grade level expectations.

# MATHEMATICS

2  
0  
1  
8

# COMPARISON OF TEANECK PUBLIC SCHOOLS' SPRING 2016, SPRING 2017 & SPRING 2018 PARCC ADMINISTRATION MATHEMATICS - PERCENTAGES

Grade	Not Yet Meeting Expectations (Level 1)			Partially Meeting Expectations (Level 2)			Approaching Expectations (Level 3)			Meeting Expectations (Level 4)			Exceeding Expectations (Level 5)		
	2016	2017	2018	2016	2017	2018	2016	2017	2018	2016	2017	2018	2016	2017	2018
3	6%	4%	4.4%	14%	9%	15%	28%	28%	27.4%	37%	43%	37.2%	15%	16%	15.9%
4	8%	7%	6.2%	21%	19%	15.6%	28%	32%	30.8%	37%	37%	42.7%	5%	5%	4.7%
5	5%	5%	3.2%	23%	21%	21.6%	31%	37%	28.8%	33%	31%	33.6%	7%	6%	12.8%
6	8%	8%	8.4%	18%	33%	26.5%	31%	26%	33%	34%	25%	24.5%	9%	8%	7.2%
7	10%	10%	9.7%	21%	20%	23.5%	32%	35%	30.3%	34%	31%	29.6%	3%	5%	6.9%
8*	17%	20%	17.5%	18%	18%	15.5%	31%	26%	26.2%	33%	34%	39.8%	1%	2%	1%
ALG I	15%	7%	10.3%	17%	19%	16.7%	28%	24%	20.9%	38%	43%	42.1%	3%	7%	10%
GEO	15%	14%	7.5%	36%	27%	38.7%	34%	38%	35.2%	15%	20%	17.8%	0%	1%	0.8%
ALG II	42%	39%	36.9%	26%	28%	24.7%	16%	18%	16.6%	16%	15%	19.2%	0%	0%	2.6%

\*Approximately 30,000 New Jersey students in grade 8 participated in the PARCC Algebra I assessment. Thus, PARCC Math 8 outcomes are not representative of grade 8 performance as a whole. \*\*Level 4 and Level 5 is an indication a student is on pace to be college and career ready.

Notes: Percentages may not total 100 due to rounding.

# COMPARISON OF TEANECK PUBLIC SCHOOLS' SPRING 2018 PARCC ADMINISTRATION TO NEW JERSEY MATHEMATICS TO NEW JERSEY- PERCENTAGES

	Not Yet Meeting Expectations (Level 1)		Partially Meeting Expectations (Level 2)		Approaching Expectations (Level 3)		Meeting Expectations (Level 4)		Exceeding Expectations (Level 5)	
	District	State	District	State	District	State	District	State	District	State
	2018	2018	2018	2018	2018	2018	2018	2018	2018	2018
Grade 3	4.4%	8%	15%	15.3%	27.4%	23.7%	37.2%	37.8%	15.9%	15.2%
Grade 4	6.2%	7.5%	15.6%	16.8%	30.8%	26.3%	42.7%	41.8%	4.7%	7.6%
Grade 5	3.2%	7.5%	21.6%	17%	28.8%	26.7%	33.6%	38.5%	12.8%	10.4%
Grade 6	8.4%	8.5%	26.5%	20.1%	33.3%	27.9%	24.5%	36.6%	7.2%	8%
Grade 7	9.7%	7.7%	23.5%	20.3%	30.3%	28.6%	29.6%	36%	6.9%	7.4%
Grade 8*	17.5%	22%	15.5%	22.7%	26.2%	27.1%	39.8%	27.2%	1%	1%
Algebra I	10.3%	11.3%	16.7%	18.6%	20.9%	24.3%	42.1%	39.3%	10%	6.5%
Geometry	7.5%	9.4%	38.7%	31.5%	35.2%	29.6%	17.8%	24.6%	0.8%	4.9%
Algebra II	36.9%	31%	24.7%	22.4%	16.6%	18%	19.2%	24.6%	2.6%	4%

\*Some students in grade 8 participated in the PARCC Algebra I assessment in place of the 8<sup>th</sup> grade Math assessment. Thus, PARCC Math 8 outcomes are not representative of grade 8 performance as a whole.

Notes: Percentages may not total 100 due to rounding.

# MATHEMATICS

## DISTRICT'S COMBINED PROFICIENCY COMPARED TO STATE'S COMBINED PROFICIENCY

Grade	2017 & 2018 Level 4 and 5 District vs. State			
	District 2017	State 2017	District 2018	State 2018
Grade 3	59%	53%	53.1%	53%
Grade 4	42%	48%	<b>47.9%</b>	<b>49.4%</b>
Grade 5	37%	46%	<b>46.4%</b>	<b>48.4%</b>
Grade 6	33%	44%	31.7%	43.5%
Grade 7	36%	40%	<b>36.5%</b>	<b>43.4%</b>
Grade 8	36%	28%	<b>40.8%</b>	<b>28.2%</b>
Algebra I	50%	42%	<b>52.1%</b>	<b>45.8%</b>
Geometry	21%	30%	18.6%	29.5%
Algebra II	15%	27%	<b>21.8%</b>	<b>28.6%</b>

*Bold indicates an increase from 2017; Green indicates higher than state*

# MATHEMATICS DISTRICT'S COHORT ANALYSIS 2016 - 2018

2016		2017		2018		Cohort Increase/ Decline
Grade 3	52%	Grade 4	42%	Grade 5	46.4%	-5.6
Grade 4	42%	Grade 5	37%	Grade 6	31.7%	-10.3
Grade 5	40%	Grade 6	33%	Grade 7	36.5%	-3.5
Grade 6	43%	Grade 7	36%	Grade 8	40.8%	-2.2
Grade 7	37%	Grade 8	36%	Algebra I *	52.1%	+15.1

**Assumes Students Followed Normal Course Sequence**

2016		2017		2018		Cohort Increase/ Decline
Grade 8	34%	Algebra I *	40%	Geometry	18.6%	-15.4
Algebra I*	31.5%	Geometry	21%	Algebra II	21.8%	-19.2
Geometry	15%	Algebra II	15%			0

*\*This data reflects students who took Algebra I as freshman at Teaneck High School*

# MATHEMATICS

## PARCC COMPARISON BY SCHOOL

### 2016 - 2018

Schools	Grade	School/State Percentage Meeting and Exceeding Expectations					
		2016	2016 State	2017	2017 State	2018	2018 State
	3						
Hawthorne		57%	52%	61%	53%	50.6%	53%
Lowell		57%		62%		63.5%	
Whittier		45%		54%		45.1%	

Schools	Grade	School/State Percentage Meeting and Exceeding Expectations					
		2016	2016 State	2017	2017 State	2018	2018 State
	4						
Hawthorne		48%	46%	49%	48%	43.1%	49.4%
Lowell		39%		43%		49.3%	
Whittier		41%		35%		49.3%	

# MATHEMATICS

## PARCC COMPARISON BY SCHOOL

### 2016 - 2018

Schools	Grade	School/State Percentage Meeting and Exceeding Expectations					
		2016	2016 State	2017	2017 State	2018	2018 State
	5						
BFMS		33%	47%	33%	46%	37.1%	48.8%
TJMS		48%		39%		56.8%	

Schools	Grade	School/State Percentage Meeting and Exceeding Expectations					
		2016	2016 State	2017	2017 State	2018	2018 State
	6						
BFMS		38%	43%	26%	44%	31%	43.5%
TJMS		47%		40%		32.4%	

# MATHEMATICS

## PARCC COMPARISON BY SCHOOL

### 2016 - 2018

Schools	Grade	School/State Percentage Meeting and Exceeding Expectations					
		2016	2016 State	2017	2017 State	2018	2018 State
	7						
BFMS		38%	38%	32%	40%	33.6%	43.4%
TJMS		37%		40%		39.4%	

Schools	Grade	School/State Percentage Meeting and Exceeding Expectations					
		2016	2016 State	2017	2017 State	2018	2018 State
	8						
BFMS		39%	26%	44%	28%	33.7%	28.2%
TJMS		29%		28%		47.6%	

# MATHEMATICS

## PARCC COMPARISON OF HIGH SCHOOL TO STATE

### 2016 - 2018

### ALGEBRA I

Schools	School/State Percentage Meeting and Exceeding Expectations					
	2016	2016 State	2017	2017 State	2018	2018 State
<b>BFMS</b>	94%	26%	100%	42%	<b>100%</b>	45.8%
<b>TJMS</b>	93%		100%		<b>97%</b>	
<b>THS</b>	32%		40%		41.5%	
<b>District</b>	41%		50%		<b>52.1%</b>	

# MATHEMATICS

## PARCC COMPARISON OF HIGH SCHOOL TO STATE

### 2016 - 2018

### GEOMETRY

School	School/State Percentage Meeting and Exceeding Expectations					
	2016	2016 State	2017	2017 State	2018	2018 State
THS	15%	21%	21%	30%	18.6%	29.5%

# MATHEMATICS

## PARCC COMPARISON OF HIGH SCHOOL TO STATE

### 2016 - 2018

### ALGEBRA II

School	School/State Percentage Meeting and Exceeding Expectations					
	2016	2016 State	2017	2017 State	2018	2018 State
THS	16%	25%	15%	27%	21.8%	28.6%

# COMPARISON OF TEANECK PUBLIC SCHOOLS' SUBGROUP SPRING 2016, SPRING 2017 & SPRING 2018 PARCC GRADE 3 MATHEMATICS

	2016	2017	2018
<i>Performance Level</i>	<b>Levels 4-5</b>	<b>Levels 4-5</b>	<b>Levels 4-5</b>
WHITE	41.7%	70.4%	60%
AFRICAN AMERICAN	42%	53.7%	47.4%
ASIAN	80%	80.8%	74.1%
HISPANIC	54.5%	50%	50%
MALE	47.7%	57.7%	<b>67.4%</b>
FEMALE	55.7%	60%	42.7%
STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES IEP-Yes	36.2%	28.6%	<b>36.5%</b>
STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES IEP-No	54.4%	66.7%	58%
ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED	55.9%	46.1%	45.3%
NON ECON. DISADVANTAGED	47.1%	66.4%	57.9%

# COMPARISON OF TEANECK PUBLIC SCHOOLS' SUBGROUP SPRING 2016, SPRING 2017 & SPRING 2018 PARCC GRADE 4 MATHEMATICS

	2016	2017	2018
<i>Performance Level</i>	Levels 4-5	Levels 4-5	Levels 4-5
WHITE	62.2%	53.6%	59.1%
AFRICAN AMERICAN	32.9%	28.9%	44.3%
ASIAN	72.4%	85.2%	68%
HISPANIC	34.2%	39.2%	40.9%
MALE	37.1%	46.8%	46.7%
FEMALE	48.4%	37%	48.1%
STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES IEP-Yes	13.2%	23.1%	21.6%
STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES IEP-No	51.4	47.1%	55.6%
ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED	34.1%	32.2%	32.9%
NON ECON. DISADVANTAGED	47.4%	48.3%	56.6%

# COMPARISON OF TEANECK PUBLIC SCHOOLS' SUBGROUP SPRING 2016, SPRING 2017 & SPRING 2018 PARCC GRADE 5 MATHEMATICS

	2016	2017	2018
<i>Performance Level</i>	<b>Levels 4-5</b>	<b>Levels 4-5</b>	<b>Levels 4-5</b>
WHITE	69.2%	52.6%	<b>74.1%</b>
AFRICAN AMERICAN	26%	34.1%	30%
ASIAN	62.9%	62.5%	<b>84.6%</b>
HISPANIC	37.9%	24.7%	<b>45.5%</b>
MALE	45.1%	29.2%	<b>47.7%</b>
FEMALE	36.7%	42.6%	<b>45.1%</b>
STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES-IEP Yes	21.1%	9.3%	<b>21.7%</b>
STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES IEP-No	46.1%	44.1%	<b>54.2%</b>
ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED	30.6%	21%	<b>36%</b>
NON ECON. DISADVANTAGED	49.3%	45.1%	<b>54.2%</b>

# COMPARISON OF TEANECK PUBLIC SCHOOLS' SUBGROUP SPRING 2016, SPRING 2017 & SPRING 2018 PARCC GRADE 6 MATHEMATICS

	2016	2017	2018
<i>Performance Level</i>	Levels 4-5	Levels 4-5	Levels 4-5
WHITE	60%	56%	50%
AFRICAN AMERICAN	33.7%	25.3%	23.7%
ASIAN	63.4%	47.2%	<b>60%</b>
HISPANIC	37.1%	28.9%	24.4%
MALE	40.5%	33.9%	27.9%
FEMALE	44.5%	31.7%	<b>35.4%</b>
STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES IEP-Yes	13.2%	15%	10.7%
STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES IEP-No	53.6%	37.9%	37.8%
ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED	31.5%	22.7%	18.9%
NON ECON. DISADVANTAGED	49%	39.7%	<b>41.3%</b>

# COMPARISON OF TEANECK PUBLIC SCHOOLS' SUBGROUP SPRING 2016, SPRING 2017 & SPRING 2018 PARCC GRADE 7 MATHEMATICS

	2016	2017	2018
<i>Performance Level</i>	<b>Levels 4-5</b>	<b>Levels 4-5</b>	<b>Levels 4-5</b>
WHITE	59.1%	41.4%	<b>60.7%</b>
AFRICAN AMERICAN	32.7%	31%	25%
ASIAN	65.4%	62.8%	53.8%
HISPANIC	29.6%	25.3%	<b>34.7%</b>
MALE	29.4%	37.1%	<b>38.1%</b>
FEMALE	44.6%	34.8%	34.8%
STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES IEP-Yes	5.1%	9.7%	<b>12.1%</b>
STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES IEP-No	47.5%	46.2%	44.1%
ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED	22%	21.1%	<b>31.3%</b>
NON ECON. DISADVANTAGED	44.9%	44.7%	40%

# COMPARISON OF TEANECK PUBLIC SCHOOLS' SUBGROUP SPRING 2016, SPRING 2017 & SPRING 2018 PARCC GRADE 8 MATHEMATICS

	2016	2017	2018
<i>Performance Level</i>	<b>Levels 4-5</b>	<b>Levels 4-5</b>	<b>Levels 4-5</b>
WHITE	54.5%	42.9%	<b>57.9%</b>
AFRICAN AMERICAN	28.3%	25.5%	<b>40%</b>
ASIAN	43.5%	71.4%	52.2%
HISPANIC	35.3%	40.3%	35.3%
MALE	33.1%	32%	31.6%
FEMALE	34.5%	39.8%	<b>49.1%</b>
STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES IEP-Yes	14%	9.2%	<b>13.6%</b>
STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES IEP-No	41.2%	48.5%	<b>53.6%</b>
ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED	23.1%	36.5%	<b>44%</b>
NON ECON. DISADVANTAGED	40.2%	35.4%	<b>38.3%</b>

# COMPARISON OF TEANECK PUBLIC SCHOOLS' SUBGROUP SPRING 2016, SPRING 2017 & SPRING 2018 PARCC ALGEBRA I

	2016	2017	2018
<i>Performance Level</i>	Levels 4-5	Levels 4-5	Levels 4-5
WHITE	50%	60.7%	<b>69%</b>
AFRICAN AMERICAN	30.4%	42.5%	37.9%
ASIAN	71.4%	74.2%	<b>87.5%</b>
HISPANIC	36.4%	49.1%	<b>50.9%</b>
MALE	38.4%	50.9%	45.9%
FEMALE	43%	49.3%	<b>58.4%</b>
STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES IEP-Yes	15.4%	23.2%	11.5%
STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES IEP-No	46.9	56.3%	<b>65.7%</b>
ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED	29.6%	32%	<b>44.9%</b>
NON ECON. DISADVANTAGED	46.6%	59.2%	55.9%

# COMPARISON OF TEANECK PUBLIC SCHOOLS' SUBGROUP SPRING 2016, SPRING 2017 & SPRING 2018 PARCC GEOMETRY

	2016	2017	2018
<i>Performance Level</i>	<b>Levels 4-5</b>	<b>Levels 4-5</b>	<b>Levels 4-5</b>
WHITE	27.5%	44.8%	33.3%
AFRICAN AMERICAN	7.4%	9.6%	<b>10.3%</b>
ASIAN	45.5%	37%	<b>48.1%</b>
HISPANIC	14.9%	22.5%	16.5%
MALE	17.1%	21.1%	17.9%
FEMALE	13.3%	21.4%	19.3%
STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES IEP-Yes	3.9%	7.8%	4.5%
STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES IEP-No	19.1%	25.1%	23.7%
ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED	7.9%	14.1%	13.2%
NON ECON. DISADVANTAGED	18.3%	24.6%	20.5%

# COMPARISON OF TEANECK PUBLIC SCHOOLS' SUBGROUP SPRING 2016, SPRING 2017 & SPRING 2018 PARCC ALGEBRA II

	2016	2017	2018
<i>Performance Level</i>	Levels 4-5	Levels 4-5	Levels 4-5
WHITE	37.5%	31.3%	34.5%
AFRICAN AMERICAN	6.6%	3.5%	15.7%
ASIAN	40.7%	42.9%	39.3%
HISPANIC	11.3%	16.1%	19.2%
MALE	15.7%	13.8%	21.8%
FEMALE	16.2%	16.2%	21.7%
STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES IEP-Yes	2.2%	0%	2.1%
STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES IEP-No	18.8%	19.1%	25.9%
ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED	12.3%	10.1%	7.8%
NON ECON. DISADVANTAGED	17.4%	17.1%	27.3%

# SUMMARY: MATHEMATICS

## ■ What worked well

- Unit revision and professional development on pedagogy for Number and Operation with Fractions in grades 3 and 4 yielded improved student performance on these content standards.
- The focus on mathematical reasoning skills at the middle school resulted in higher student performance in this area on the PARCC Math in grades 5 – 8.
- The implementation of revised Measure of Academic Progress (MAP) assessments, which included detailed projected PARCC proficiency reports and student achievement data, provided teachers with useful data.
- Algebra I class every day at Teaneck High School has continued to support student achievement.

## ■ Areas of focus

- Primary grades focus on strengthening number sense and place value to improve student understanding
- Strengthening middle school mathematics instruction
- Continued focus on freshman students who are taking Algebra I
- Continued focus on Geometry and Algebra II

# SUMMARY: MATHEMATICS

- **Steps moving forward**
  - Department meetings focused on differentiation and student centered-classrooms
  - Strengthening the process of identifying and responding to students who may be struggling in mathematics
  - Personalized learning paths for all middle school students via adaptive instructional software
  - Implementation of the Illustrative Mathematics Tasks in grades 6 – Algebra II to strengthen mathematical reasoning, mathematical modeling and problem-solving skills
  - Increased collaborative discussions between administrators and teachers regarding content-specific best practices to foster student engagement and formative assessment to drive instructional decision-making

# NEXT STEPS: MATHEMATICS

## ■ K-2

- Implementation of the Go Math! New Jersey Student Learning Standards edition
- Use of student learning center activities to develop number sense and reinforce place value concepts
- Continued focus on subtraction with regrouping

## ■ Grade 3 and Grade 4

- Implementation of the Go Math! New Jersey Student Learning Standards edition
- Math Enrichment Teachers (METs) will continue to provide support and guidance on content specific pedagogical practices and on effective implementation of the math workshop model to maximize differentiation opportunities for students

# NEXT STEPS: MATHEMATICS

## ■ Grades 5 -8

- Implementation of the Go Math! New Jersey Student Learning Standards edition for grade grades 5 -6
- Strategic implementation of the online learning platform designed to assess student understanding and create personalized learning paths targeting areas in which student struggle
- Analysis of domain-specific learning progressions to identify and remediate areas of need, and to determine if curricular adjustments are necessary
- Department meetings focused on differentiation, student-centered learning and problem-solving for struggling learners
- Integration of the Illustrative Mathematics Tasks to strengthen mathematical reasoning and problem-solving skills

## ■ Algebra I, Geometry and Algebra II

- Department meetings focused on differentiation, student-centered learning and problem-solving for struggling learners
- Integration of the Illustrative Mathematics Tasks to strengthen mathematical reasoning and problem-solving skills

**LOOKING AHEAD**

**2  
0  
1  
9**

## SPRING 2019 STATE ASSESSMENT NAME, LENGTH AND TIME CHANGES

- The state's English Language Arts (ELA) and Mathematics assessments will no longer be called *Partnership for Assessment of College and Career Readiness (PARCC)*. Effective in the Spring 2019, the statewide assessments for ELA and mathematics will be called:
  - New Jersey Student Learning Assessment - ELA (NJSLA-ELA)
  - New Jersey Student Learning Assessment - Mathematics (NJSLA-M)
- There will be a reduction in the number of testing items and a reduction in testing time.

# ELA UNITS AND TESTING TIME

## 2018 PARCC ELA Assessments – ELA Grade 3

Unit	Unit Testing Time (Minutes)
Unit 1	75
Unit 2	75
Unit 3	75
<b>Total: 3 Units</b>	<b>Total: 225 Minutes</b>

## 2019 NJSLA-ELA – ELA Grade 3

Unit	Unit Testing Time (Minutes)
Unit 1	75
Unit 2	75
<b>Total: 2 Units</b>	<b>Total: 150 Minutes</b>

## 2018 PARCC ELA Assessments – ELA Grades 4 and 5

Unit	Unit Testing Time (Minutes)
Unit 1	90
Unit 2	90
Unit 3	90
<b>Total: 3 Units</b>	<b>Total: 270 Minutes</b>

## 2019 NJSLA-ELA – ELA Grades 4 and 5

Unit	Unit Testing Time (Minutes)
Unit 1	90
Unit 2	90
<b>Total: 2 Units</b>	<b>Total: 180 Minutes</b>

## 2018 PARCC ELA Assessments – ELA Grades 6-8 and Grades 9-11

Unit	Unit Testing Time (Minutes)
Unit 1	90
Unit 2	90
Unit 3	90
<b>Total: 3 Units</b>	<b>Total: 270 Minutes</b>

## 2019 NJSLA-ELA – ELA Grades 6-8 and Grade 10

Unit	Unit Testing Time (Minutes)
Unit 1	90
Unit 2	90
<b>Total: 2 Units</b>	<b>Total: 180 Minutes</b>

# MATHEMATICS UNITS AND TESTING TIME

## 2018 PARCC Mathematics Assessments Grades 3-5

Subject(s)	Unit	Unit Testing Time (Minutes)
Math Grades 3-5	Unit 1	60
	Unit 2	60
	Unit 3	60
	Unit 4	60
<b>Total</b>	<b>4 Units</b>	<b>240 Minutes</b>

## 2018 PARCC Mathematics Assessments Grades 6-8

Subject(s)	Unit	Unit Testing Time (Minutes)
Math Grades 6-8	Unit 1	80
	Unit 2	80
	Unit 3	80
<b>Total</b>	<b>3 Units</b>	<b>240 Minutes</b>

## 2018 PARCC Algebra and Geometry Assessments

Subject(s)	Unit	Unit Testing Time (Minutes)
Algebra I, Geometry, Algebra II	Unit 1	90
	Unit 2	90
	Unit 3	90
<b>Total</b>	<b>3 Units</b>	<b>270 Minutes</b>

## 2019 NJSLA-Mathematics Grades 3-5

Subject	Unit	Unit Testing Time (Minutes)
Math Grades 3-5	Unit 1	60
	Unit 2	60
	Unit 3	60
<b>Total</b>	<b>3 Units</b>	<b>180 Minutes</b>

## 2019 NJSLA-Mathematics Grades 6-8

Subject(s)	Unit	Unit Testing Time (Minutes)
Math Grades 6-8	Unit 1	60
	Unit 2	60
	Unit 3	60
<b>Total</b>	<b>3 Units</b>	<b>180 Minutes</b>

## 2019 PARCC Algebra Assessment

Subject(s)	Unit	Unit Testing Time (Minutes)
Algebra I	Unit 1	90
	Unit 2	90
<b>Total</b>	<b>2 Units</b>	<b>180 Minutes</b>

