

The 2-year “Test Drive” of PARCC

- During the first year of the state’s “test drive” of PARCC, Massachusetts districts were given the choice to administer either MCAS or PARCC to grades 3-8.
- Worcester, along with Boston and Springfield, were allowed to use a hybrid model, with the decision of which test to use being made at the school level.
- 22 schools chose to administer PARCC. 6 of these schools chose the computer-based version of the test.
- 3 high schools opted to participate in a field test of high school subject-based PARCC assessments.
- In 2015-16, PARCC is being administered in 26 schools. Those that administered PARCC last year are required to participate in PARCC this year, and an additional 4 schools opted to administer the PARCC assessment for the first time this year.

PARCC v. MCAS

- The PARCC was designed by a consortium. All decisions, from item types to accommodations, were made by a group of 22 states. (The PARCC consortium is now considerably smaller, with only 8 fully-participating member states). This differs from MCAS, which is a locally designed assessment.
- The PARCC assessment includes new Accessibility Features and Administration Accommodations that are available to *all* students (e.g., frequent breaks, small testing group, test directions clarified). This UDL style of test administration was not a part of the MCAS.
- Unlike MCAS, the PARCC assessment is timed, with an extended time accommodation available to students with disabilities and ELLs. The timing for the assessment is research-based and includes a buffer for students who may work at a slower pace.
- The PARCC was designed as a computer-based assessment. The paper-based version was made available as an alternative for students or schools who are not capable of participating in the technology enhanced version. With MCAS being a paper only test, this was an adjustment for some of our schools that chose to administer PARCC on the computer.

PARCC v. MCAS (continued)

- In contrast to the MCAS (aligned to the “old” Massachusetts Frameworks), the PARCC is aligned with the Common Core State Standards. Because of this, the assessment is more rigorous than MCAS.
- Scores for the PARCC assessment are reported out using a scaled system which is converted into categories, or performance levels, with 1 being the lowest and 5 being the highest. These levels do not correlate to MCAS proficiency levels (F/W, NI, P, A).
- Student growth percentiles (SGPs) continue to be reported with MCAS. Transitional SGPs are reported for PARCC and are computed using equipercentile linking.

Student Performance on MCAS: ELA - 2015

Grade	Number of Students	% Advanced or Proficient	% Advanced	% Proficient	% Needs Improvement	% Warning/Failing	Median SGP
All	5758	59	15	44	28	12	52.0
3	922	38	5	33	44	18	.
4	852	46	8	38	37	17	53.0
5	803	54	14	40	32	14	56.0
6	791	63	14	49	25	12	60.0
7	381	51	3	48	35	14	30.0
8	377	61	15	46	24	14	48.5
10	1632	81	30	51	14	5	52.0

Student Performance on MCAS: Mathematics - 2015

Grade	Number of Students	% Advanced or Proficient	% Advanced	% Proficient	% Needs Improvement	% Warning/Failing	Median SGP
All	5773	46	20	26	29	24	50.0
3	924	50	15	35	27	24	.
4	856	31	10	21	48	21	44.0
5	806	46	19	27	33	21	60.0
6	787	54	21	33	28	18	63.0
7	386	26	7	19	25	48	23.0
8	379	28	12	16	22	50	37.0
10	1635	58	35	23	23	18	53.0

Student Performance on MCAS: Science - 2015

Grade	Number of Students	% Advanced or Proficient	% Advanced	% Proficient	% Needs Improvement	% Warning/Failing
All	4793	33	7	26	42	25
5	1713	32	8	24	43	24
8	1622	20	1	19	42	38
10	1458	49	12	37	41	10

Student Performance on PARCC: ELA/L - 2015

Grade Level	Number of Students	Level 5 – Exceeded Expectations	Level 4 – Met Expectations	Level 3 – Approached Expectations	Level 2 – Partially Met Expectations	Level 1 – Did Not Meet Expectations	Median SGP
3-8	5,823	6	34	28	19	12	51.0
3	967	3	28	22	25	22	
4	885	5	29	32	21	12	40.0
5	843	2	33	30	23	11	49.0
6	829	5	35	34	18	9	57.0
7	1,172	12	37	25	15	11	49.0
8	1,127	9	41	27	16	8	57.0

Student Performance on PARCC: Mathematics - 2015

Grade Level	Number of Students	Level 5 – Exceeded Expectations	Level 4 – Met Expectations	Level 3 – Approached Expectations	Level 2 – Partially Met Expectations	Level 1 – Did Not Meet Expectations	Median SGP
3-8	5,810	4	25	28	28	15	47.0
3	972	4	25	25	27	19	.
4	884	3	25	27	31	15	44.0
5	844	3	20	26	32	18	42.0
6	829	2	23	33	28	14	49.0
7	1,158	3	28	33	29	7	50.0
8	1,064	6	28	22	23	21	50.0

Using Summative Assessment in the WPS

- State test data is used by the administration and by schools to evaluate performance in specific content area strands and response types at the school, classroom and individual student level.
- Edwin analytics, a state data tool, allows schools to generate various MCAS and PARCC reports
 - Most frequently, schools use the Test Item Analysis and Results by Standard reports

All Students (901) Standards: MA 2011 Standards

Item No.	Item Type	Standard	Average Item Score			Percentage of Student Responses					Correct MC Answer	Strand	Topic
			District	State	Diff.	Blank/0	A/1	B/2	C/3	D/4			
20	MC	CCRA.L.1	82%	76%	14	1	20	7	10	62	D	Language Anchor Standard	Conventions of Standard English
8	MC	CCRA.L.2	88%	93%	5	0	3	5	3	88	D	Language Anchor Standard	Conventions of Standard English
34	MC	CCRA.L.2	67%	81%	14							Language Anchor Standard	Conventions of Standard English
10	MC	CCRA.L.4	75%	87%	12	0	5	5	75	14	C	Language Anchor Standard	Vocabulary Acquisition and Use
18	MC	CCRA.L.4	83%	87%	4	1	83	8	4	4	A	Language Anchor Standard	Vocabulary Acquisition and Use
21	MC	CCRA.L.4	69%	85%	16	0	14	2	69	14	C	Language Anchor Standard	Vocabulary Acquisition and Use
28	MC	CCRA.L.4	70%	85%	15							Language Anchor Standard	Vocabulary Acquisition and Use
35	MC	CCRA.L.4	82%	90%	8							Language Anchor Standard	Vocabulary Acquisition and Use
41	MC	CCRA.L.4	61%	75%	14							Language Anchor Standard	Vocabulary Acquisition and Use
1	MC	CCRA.R.1	90%	94%	4	0	9	1	90	1	C	Reading Anchor Standard	Key Ideas and Details
12	MC	CCRA.R.1	68%	78%	10	0	16	68	3	13	B	Reading Anchor Standard	Key Ideas and Details
17	MC	CCRA.R.1	83%	91%	8	1	11	3	2	83	D	Reading Anchor Standard	Key Ideas and Details
31	MC	CCRA.R.1	70%	81%	11							Reading Anchor Standard	Key Ideas and Details
33	MC	CCRA.R.1	67%	76%	9							Reading Anchor Standard	Key Ideas and Details
39	MC	CCRA.R.1	60%	71%	11							Reading Anchor Standard	Key Ideas and Details

The Item Analysis Summary can be generated at the district or school level. Here the report is sorted by Strand and Topic. This report allows us to see gaps in mastery by strand, topic, and even item type compared to the district and state.

All Students (901)

Standards: MA 2011 Standards

	Possible Points	District % Correct	State % Correct	District/State Diff
English Language Arts				
All Items	48	66%	75%	9
Question Type				
Multiple Choice	36	72%	82%	10
Open Response	4	36%	40%	4
Short Response	8	56%	63%	7
Strand / Topic				
Language Anchor Standard	9	73%	84%	11
Conventions of Standard English	3	72%	83%	11
Vocabulary Acquisition and Use	6	73%	85%	12
Reading Anchor Standard	39	65%	73%	8
Craft and Structure	3	67%	77%	10
Integration of Knowledge and Ideas	3	64%	73%	9
Key Ideas and Details	33	65%	73%	8

The Results by Standard report shows a quick glance at student performance at the school, district and state level, organized by standard and strand. Schools use this report to identify areas for improvement in instruction and is particularly powerful when paired with data from previous years (trends).