



Spring 2012

Assessment Results

Reported by: Tom Sachse, Ph.D., Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Assessment

Tabulated and Displayed by: Kim Wells, Student Information Systems Tech.

August 9, 2012



2012 PAWS Assessment Results: An Introduction

The results that follow are best interpreted in context, by understanding the purpose and uses of these results as well as several important definitions. This brief introduction summarizes some of those background factors.

There are two major types of assessment information we rely on as a district and state to report students' achievement. These include the norm-referenced national test called Measures of Academic Programs (MAP) and the state's Proficiency Assessments of Wyoming Standards (PAWS). MAP gives results comparing students, schools, and districts to a national comparison group and to growth targets. PAWS gives results comparing students, schools, and districts to a state average of the percent of those scoring proficient or better, where proficiency is defined in terms of mastery of state standards.

The data portrayed below summarize the PAWS results for the 2012 academic year. For comparison purposes, this report uses the all students results. These are different than the results to determine AYP status. The PAWS results are represented as "percent proficient and above," so 55% percent means that 55% are proficient and advanced, the top two score bands and that 45% are basic and below basic, the bottom two score bands. Two types of group comparisons are shown: cross-sectional and longitudinal. Cross sectional graphs compare different groups of students, as in the third graders of 2010, the third graders of 2011, and the third graders of 2012. Longitudinal graphs compare the same group of students as they move through the grades. These are our preferred comparisons, since they are essentially the same group of students. It is important for the reader to recognize the cut-score defining proficiency varies from grade to grade. We also compare our schools with like schools in larger, more economically diverse settings in the state.

We color code these graphs to illustrate gains or losses by academic year. The color scheme we use is as follows: Wyoming Gold shows that scores remained the same from the previous year, yellow indicates a change in scores of either plus or minus two points in a year, green represents a positive growth of three to six points in a year, blue highlights a positive growth of seven or more points in a year, and red indicates a decline of three or more points from the previous year. Due to the "ceiling effect" we have not used negative color codes for those scores above 90%.

Any single indicator of achievement is fallible, so we try to discern patterns of scores over tests and grades. Is there generally a positive trend over all grades, district-wide? How are the math scores overall? How is a grade level span like intermediate grades 3, 4, & 5 doing? How is a school site performing? Such analyses are advisable before questions posed by test, teacher, or curriculum are possible. While the WDE discounts the 2010 results, we still report them as an accurate gauge of student achievement. Ultimately, no single score should have too much importance placed on it.

2010—2012 PAWS Results
 Sheridan County School District Two
 Percent Proficient and Above Comparison Chart

Elementary

	Reading				Mathematics			
	2010	2011	2012	State Average 2012	2010	2011	2012	State Average 2012
3rd Grade Proficient and Above								
	76%	79%	89%	70%	95%	96%	98%	90%
4th Grade Proficient and Above								
	88%	94%	95%	83%	93%	95%	96%	82%
5th Grade Proficient and Above								
	84%	90%	95%	79%	91%	95%	97%	82%

2010—2012 PAWS Results
 Sheridan County School District Two
 Percent Proficient and Above Comparison Chart

Junior High

	Reading				Mathematics			
	2010	2011	2012	State Average 2012	2010	2011	2012	State Average 2012
6th Grade Proficient and Above								
	84%	94%	93%	84%	92%	93%	96%	82%
7th Grade Proficient and Above								
	73%	86%	91%	75%	83%	87%	90%	76%
8th Grade Proficient and Above								
	83%	92%	88%	77%	85%	76%	85%	73%

2010—2012 PAWS Results
 Sheridan County School District Two
 Percent Proficient and Above Comparison Chart

High School

	Reading				Mathematics			
	2010	2011	2012	State Average 2012	2010	2011	2012	State Average 2012
11th Grade Proficient and Above								
	72%	85%	77%	77%	75%	79%	81%	66%

2010—2012 PAWS Results
 Sheridan County School District Two
 Percent Proficient and Above Comparison Chart

Coffeen

	Reading				Mathematics			
	2010	2011	2012	State Average 2012	2010	2011	2012	State Average 2012
3rd Grade Proficient and Above								
	73%	53%	100%	70%	98%	88%	100%	90%
4th Grade Proficient and Above								
	79%	83%	89%	83%	82%	91%	96%	82%
5th Grade Proficient and Above								
	74%	82%	86%	79%	80%	91%	93%	82%

2010—2012 PAWS Results
 Sheridan County School District Two
 Percent Proficient and Above Comparison Chart

Highland Park

	Reading				Mathematics			
	2010	2011	2012	State Average 2012	2010	2011	2012	State Average 2012
3rd Grade Proficient and Above								
	67%	88%	93%	70%	93%	93%	97%	90%
4th Grade Proficient and Above								
	87%	96%	92%	83%	98%	98%	92%	82%
5th Grade Proficient and Above								
	87%	89%	98%	79%	94%	96%	97%	82%

2010—2012 PAWS Results
 Sheridan County School District Two
 Percent Proficient and Above Comparison Chart

Meadowlark

	Reading				Mathematics			
	2010	2011	2012	State Average 2012	2010	2011	2012	State Average 2012
3rd Grade Proficient and Above								
	76%	84%	88%	70%	95%	100%	96%	90%
4th Grade Proficient and Above								
	95%	98%	100%	83%	98%	95%	97%	82%
5th Grade Proficient and Above								
	87%	97%	95%	79%	95%	98%	100%	82%

2010—2012 PAWS Results
 Sheridan County School District Two
 Percent Proficient and Above Comparison Chart

Sagebrush

	Reading				Mathematics			
	2010	2011	2012	State Average 2012	2010	2011	2012	State Average 2012
3rd Grade Proficient and Above								
	76%	71%	88%	70%	100%	98%	100%	90%
4th Grade Proficient and Above								
	84%	91%	92%	83%	93%	97%	96%	82%
5th Grade Proficient and Above								
	84%	90%	96%	79%	93%	97%	100%	82%

2010—2012 PAWS Results
 Sheridan County School District Two
 Percent Proficient and Above Comparison Chart

Woodland Park

	Reading				Mathematics			
	2010	2011	2012	State Average 2012	2010	2011	2012	State Average 2012
3rd Grade Proficient and Above								
	86%	91%	78%	70%	92%	97%	98%	90%
4th Grade Proficient and Above								
	95%	100%	100%	83%	88%	92%	100%	82%
5th Grade Proficient and Above								
	85%	86%	94%	79%	89%	86%	94%	82%

2010—2012 PAWS Results
 Sheridan County School District Two
 Percent Proficient and Above Comparison Chart

Sheridan Junior High

	Reading				Mathematics			
	2010	2011	2012	State Average 2012	2010	2011	2012	State Average 2012
6th Grade Proficient and Above								
	84%	94%	93%	84%	92%	94%	96%	82%
7th Grade Proficient and Above								
	72%	87%	91%	75%	83%	88%	90%	76%
8th Grade Proficient and Above								
	83%	93%	88%	77%	85%	76%	85%	73%

2010—2012 PAWS Results
 Sheridan County School District Two
 Percent Proficient and Above Comparison Chart

Sheridan High School

	Reading				Mathematics			
	2010	2011	2012	State Average 2012	2010	2011	2012	State Average 2012
11th Grade Proficient and Above								
	73%	84%	76%	77%	77%	80%	81%	66%

2010—2012 PAWS Results
 Sheridan County School District Two
 Percent Proficient and Above Comparison Chart

Ft. Mackenzie High School

	Reading				Mathematics			
	2010	2011	2012	State Average 2012	2010	2011	2012	State Average 2012
11th Grade Proficient and Above								
	70%	100%	91%	77%	50%	67%	91%	66%

2012 PAWS Results
Sheridan County School District Two
Percent Proficient and Above Comparison Chart
Large School District Comparisons

3rd Grade

	State Average	Albany #1	Campbell #1	Fremont #25	Laramie #1	Natrona #1	Park #6	Sheridan #2	Sweetwater #1	Sweetwater #2	Uinta #1
Reading	70	75 (3 rd)	71 (4 th)	60 (10 th)	65 (6 th)	70 (5 th)	81 (2 nd)	89 (1 st)	63 (9 th)	64 (7 th tie)	64 (7 th tie)
Mathematics	90	92 (3 rd tie)	92 (3 rd tie)	81 (10 th)	90 (7 th)	92 (3 rd tie)	93 (2 nd)	98 (1 st)	88 (8 th)	91 (6 th)	87 (9 th)

2012 PAWS Results
Sheridan County School District Two
Percent Proficient and Above Comparison Chart
Large School District Comparisons

4th Grade

	State Average	Albany #1	Campbell #1	Fremont #25	Laramie #1	Natrona #1	Park #6	Sheridan #2	Sweetwater #1	Sweetwater #2	Uinta #1
Reading	83	89 (3 rd)	80 (8 th tie)	57 (10 th)	83 (5 th)	86 (4 th)	92 (2 nd)	95 (1 st)	82 (6 th)	81 (7 th)	80 (8 th tie)
Mathematics	82	87 (3 rd)	79 (7 th tie)	61 (10 th)	81 (6 th)	84 (4 th)	93 (2 nd)	96 (1 st)	75 (9 th)	79 (7 th tie)	83 (5 th)

2012 PAWS Results
Sheridan County School District Two
Percent Proficient and Above Comparison Chart
Large School District Comparisons

5th Grade

	State Average	Albany #1	Campbell #1	Fremont #25	Laramie #1	Natrona #1	Park #6	Sheridan #2	Sweetwater #1	Sweetwater #2	Uinta #1
Reading	79	83 (3 rd)	82 (4 th tie)	80 (6 th tie)	76 (8 th)	80 (6 th tie)	82 (4 th tie)	95 (1 st)	71 (9 th)	69 (10 th)	84 (2 nd)
Mathematics	82	86 (4 th)	80 (6 th tie)	77 (10 th)	78 (8 th tie)	85 (5 th)	91 (2 nd)	97 (1 st)	78 (8 th tie)	80 (6 th tie)	88 (3 rd)

2012 PAWS Results
Sheridan County School District Two
Percent Proficient and Above Comparison Chart
Large School District Comparisons

6th Grade

	State Average	Albany #1	Campbell #1	Fremont #25	Laramie #1	Natrona #1	Park #6	Sheridan #2	Sweetwater #1	Sweetwater #2	Uinta #1
Reading	84	89 (2 nd tie)	84 (5 th)	81 (8 th)	86 (4 th)	82 (6 th tie)	89 (2 nd tie)	93 (1 st)	78 (9 th)	77 (10 th)	82 (6 th tie)
Mathematics	82	89 (2 nd)	86 (3 rd)	79 (7 th)	84 (5 th tie)	84 (5 th tie)	85 (4 th)	96 (1 st)	78 (8 th tie)	72 (10 th)	78 (8 th tie)

2012 PAWS Results
Sheridan County School District Two
Percent Proficient and Above Comparison Chart
Large School District Comparisons

7th Grade

	State Average	Albany #1	Campbell #1	Fremont #25	Laramie #1	Natrona #1	Park #6	Sheridan #2	Sweetwater #1	Sweetwater #2	Uinta #1
Reading	75	82 (2 nd)	70 (9 th)	76 (5 th)	72 (6 th tie)	72 (6 th tie)	81 (3 rd)	91 (1 st)	69 (10 th)	71 (8 th)	79 (4 th)
Mathematics	76	82 (3 rd)	71 (8 th)	78 (5 th)	70 (9 th)	72 (7 th)	84 (2 nd)	90 (1 st)	68 (10 th)	80 (4 th)	77 (6 th)

2012 PAWS Results
Sheridan County School District Two
Percent Proficient and Above Comparison Chart
Large School District Comparisons

8th Grade

	State Average	Albany #1	Campbell #1	Fremont #25	Laramie #1	Natrona #1	Park #6	Sheridan #2	Sweetwater #1	Sweetwater #2	Uinta #1
Reading	77	84 (2 nd)	74 (8 th)	76 (6 th)	73 (9 th tie)	73 (9 th tie)	83 (3 rd)	88 (1 st)	75 (7 th)	77 (5 th)	79 (4 th)
Mathematics	73	76 (5 th)	73 (6 th)	83 (2 nd)	64 (10 th)	68 (7 th tie)	82 (3 rd)	85 (1 st)	67 (9 th)	68 (7 th tie)	78 (4 th)

2012 PAWS Results
Sheridan County School District Two
Percent Proficient and Above Comparison Chart
Large School District Comparisons

11th Grade

	State Average	Albany #1	Campbell #1	Fremont #25	Laramie #1	Natrona #1	Park #6	Sheridan #2	Sweetwater #1	Sweetwater #2	Uinta #1
Reading	77	79 (3rd)	77 (4th tie)	85 (1st)	80 (2nd)	70 (9th)	73 (7th)	77 (4th tie)	65 (10th)	72 (8th)	74 (6th)
Mathematics	66	71 (3rd tie)	68 (6th)	76 (2nd)	67 (7th)	59 (8th)	71 (3rd tie)	81 (1st)	53 (10th)	58 (9th)	69 (5th)

2012 PAWS Results
Sheridan County School District Two
Percent Proficient and Above Comparison Chart
Sheridan Junior High School Compared with 4A Junior High Schools

6th Grade+

	State Average	Centennial Junior High School (Natrona #1)	Cody Middle School (Park #6)	Dean Morgan Junior High School (Natrona #1)	Riverton Middle School (Fremont #25)	Sheridan Junior High School
Reading	84	77 (5 th)	89 (2 nd)	82 (3 rd)	81 (4 th)	93 (1 st)
Mathematics	82	84 (3 rd tie)	85 (2 nd)	84 (3 rd tie)	79 (5 th)	96 (1 st)

+Several districts have K-6 elementary configuration

2012 PAWS Results
Sheridan County School District Two
Percent Proficient and Above Comparison Chart
Sheridan Junior High School Compared with 4A Junior High Schools

7th Grade

	State Average	Carey Junior High School (Laramie #1)	Cody Middle School (Park #6)	Centennial Junior High School (Natrona #1)	Dean Morgan Junior High School (Natrona #1)	Laramie Junior High School (Albany #1)	McCormick Junior High School (Laramie #1)	Rock Springs Junior High School (Sweetwater #1)	Riverton Middle School (Fremont #25)	Sage Valley Junior High School (Campbell County #1)	Sheridan Junior High School
Reading	75	82 (2 nd)	81 (3 rd tie)	70 (8 th tie)	78 (5 th)	81 (3 rd tie)	77 (6 th)	69 (10 th)	76 (7 th)	70 (8 th tie)	91 (1 st)
Mathematics	76	77 (6 th tie)	84 (2 nd)	77 (6 th tie)	70 (9 th)	81 (3 rd)	80 (4 th)	67 (10 th)	78 (5 th)	73 (8 th)	90 (1 st)

2012 PAWS Results
Sheridan County School District Two
Percent Proficient and Above Comparison Chart
Sheridan Junior High School Compared with 4A Junior High Schools

8th Grade

	State Average	Carey Junior High School (Laramie #1)	Cody Middle School (Park #6)	Centennial Junior High School (Natrona #1)	Dean Morgan Junior High School (Natrona #1)	Laramie Junior High School (Albany #1)	McCormick Junior High School (Laramie #1)	Rock Springs Junior High School (Sweetwater #1)	Riverton Middle School (Fremont #25)	Sage Valley Junior High School (Campbell County #1)	Sheridan Junior High School
Reading	77	75 (8 th)	83 (2 nd tie)	71 (9 th tie)	78 (5 th)	83 (2 nd tie)	80 (4 th)	76 (6 th tie)	76 (6 th tie)	71 (9 th tie)	88 (1 st)
Mathematics	73	63 (10 th)	82 (3 rd)	69 (8 th)	76 (4 th)	73 (6 th)	72 (7 th)	68 (9 th)	83 (2 nd)	74 (5 th)	85 (1 st)

2012 PAWS Results
Sheridan County School District Two
Percent Proficient and Above Comparison Chart
Sheridan High School Compared with 4A High Schools

11th Grade

	State Average	Campbell County High School (Campbell #1)	Central High School (Laramie #1)	Cody High School (Park #6)	East High School (Laramie #1)	Kelly Walsh High School (Natrona #1)	Laramie High School (Albany #1)	Natrona High School (Natrona #1)	Riverton High School (Fremont #25)	Rock Springs High School (Sweetwater #1)	Sheridan High School
Reading	77	81 (5th)	83 (3rd)	73 (7th)	85 (1st tie)	71 (8th)	82 (4th)	70 (9th)	85 (1st tie)	67 (10th)	76 (6th)
Mathematics	66	71 (5th tie)	74 (3rd)	71 (5th tie)	70 (7th)	61 (8th)	73 (4th)	58 (9th)	76 (2nd)	54 (10th)	81 (1st)

2010-2012 PAWS Results
Sheridan County School District Two
Three – Year Comparison Chart

Three – Year Longitudinal

	Reading			Math		
	2010	2011	2012	2010	2011	2012
Class of 2021 (2011-12 3 rd Graders)			89%			98%
Class of 2020 (2011-12 4 th Graders)		79%	95%		96%	96%
Class of 2019 (2011-12 5 th Graders)	76%	94%	95%	95%	95%	97%
Class of 2018 (2011-12 6 th Graders)	88%	90%	93%	93%	95%	96%
Class of 2017 (2011-12 7 th Graders)	84%	94%	91%	91%	93%	90%
Class of 2016 (2011-12 8 th Graders)	84%	86%	88%	92%	87%	85%
Class of 2015 (2011-12 9 th Graders)	73%	92%		83%	73%	
Class of 2014 (2011-12 10 th Graders)	83%			85%		
Class of 2013 (2011-12 11 th Graders)			77%			81%
Class of 2012 (2011-12 12 th Graders)		85%			79%	

2010-2012 MAP Results
Sheridan County School District Two
Three – Year % of Students At or Above the 50th Percentile

Three – Year Longitudinal

	Reading			Math		
	2010	2011	2012	2010	2011	2012
Class of 2023 (2011-12 1 st Graders)			58%			67%
Class of 2022 (2011-12 2 nd Graders)		73%	67%			77%
Class of 2021 (2011-12 3 rd Graders)		64%	76%		74%	77%
Class of 2020 (2011-12 4 th Graders)	59%	69%	72%	73%	80%	84%
Class of 2019 (2011-12 5 th Graders)	66%	74%	71%	84%	85%	84%
Class of 2018 (2011-12 6 th Graders)	72%	77%	68%	87%	81%	69%
Class of 2017 (2011-12 7 th Graders)	77%	75%	78%	82%	82%	73%
Class of 2016 (2011-12 8 th Graders)	72%	73%	71%	79%	78%	76%
Class of 2015 (2011-12 9 th Graders)	73%	73%	76%	77%	77%	73%
Class of 2014 (2011-12 10 th Graders)	76%	75%	71%	84%	82%	81%
Class of 2013 (2011-12 11 th Graders)	67%	65%	62%*	73%	78%	69%*
Class of 2012 (2011-12 12 th Graders)	62%			66%		

*At-Risk Only

Commentary:

By any measure, these are extremely positive results for the district. Teachers have demonstrated the caliber of their instructional talents; students have been motivated to show their true achievement; other staff and certainly parents have been supportive of the educational system at all grade levels and in all subjects. The school district consistently outperforms the state average in every grade, in every subject. Mathematics performance is a strength of the district and continues at a very high level of student achievement. Writing has been a major emphasis of the Professional Learning Communities in each building but these results don't reveal this achievement due to the legislative action to drop writing from state testing. Reading achievement is improving considerably and will likely become a growth target for many more of our schools in the next academic year. We are emphasizing the improvement of reading achievement in the areas of curriculum development, professional development, and administrator focus.

While these results show the district to be one of the top performing institutions in Wyoming, indeed the Rocky Mountains, there is still work to be done. The achievement targets established by the 2002 No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act rise dramatically in the next three years. It is essential that the district maintain achievement status in mathematics and writing and improve in the area of reading. In order to continue to meet the Adequate Yearly Progress targets of NCLB, we must rededicate ourselves to helping special populations including special needs students, alternative school students, and Title I students to achieve in basic skills acquisition.

We are fully committed to embracing and responding to the accountability demands established by federal and state agencies. More than that, we are committed to improvement of student achievement results because that is what is expected by our community and ourselves