CHARLOTTE-MECKLENBURG SCHOOLS
ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS – PERFORMANCE SUMMARY (SEPTEMBER 2021)
BOARD OVERVIEW

Introduction – What is Being Monitored

An aim of our strategic plan is to increase college and career ready (CCR) rates for all subgroups while reducing achievement gaps. In the area of English Language Arts (ELA), the Board approved the metric *percent of students scoring Level 4 or 5 (college and career ready) on the Grade 3, Grade 5, and Grade 8 End-of-Grade (EOG) ELA exams*. Five-year targets and annual milestones were identified for students overall and for students in our four largest racial subgroups: Asian, Black, Hispanic, and White students. Each of these items – EOG scores, targets and milestones – are presented here.

Performance Overview

In 2020-21, reading EOG exams were re-normed by the NC Department of Public Instruction. Due to these changes in the assessments, CCR rates from prior years should not be compared to the 2020-21 results. However, due to the extraordinary circumstances experienced nationally in the 2020-21 school year, two prior year's results are provided as a point of comparison. Still the above changes in the assessments should be acknowledged and remembered in discussing these results.

In 2020-21, we experienced deep declines in CCR rates in the aggregate and for all racial subgroups (see tables 1-3 below). These declines place district performance far beneath the annual milestones for SY2020-21, and make it highly unlikely future milestones will be reached. Racial achievement gaps between White and Black and Hispanic students persisted, but did not widen. The cumulative impact of the pandemic, changes in the assessment, and prior performance trends impacted our largest racial subgroups in comparable ways. Statewide CCR rates for 2020-21 are also included to provide additional context. Statewide results indicate that our performance in Grade 3 reading lags behind the state in the aggregate. Grade 5 and Grade 8 reading results in CMS exceed statewide averages.

Neither school nor district EVAAS ratings were calculated for the 2019-20 or 2020-21 school years. However, in 2018-19, the last year these ratings were calculated, CMS in the aggregate *Did Not Meet Expected Growth* in Grade 3 or Grade 5 reading. However, CMS *Exceeded Expected Growth* in Grade 8 reading. These aggregate growth ratings matched the ratings for Black and Hispanic subgroups.

In acknowledgement of one of the Board's draft goals, *the percent of Black and Hispanic 3rd grade students who score at the CCR level -- a 4 or 5 -- in English Language Arts*, we take a closer look at Grade 3 ELA performance. Results disaggregated by race and gender show that pre-pandemic trends in performance continued (see Table 4). Black and Hispanic students continued to lag behind their White and Asian peers, with male third graders trailing their female peers in the aggregate and in every racial subgroup.

Table 1 Grade 3 English Language Arts – Percent College and Career Ready (CCR)

	2018 (Actual)	2019 (Actual)	2019 (Y1)	2020 (Actual)	2020 (Y2)	2021 (State)	2021 (Actual)	2021 (Y3)	2022 (Y4)	2023 (Y5)	2024 (Y6)
All	45.9	46.1	48.5	------	50.5	33.7	29.3	52.5	61.7	70.8	80
Asian	62.3	65.2	69.6	------	71.3	56.4	48.9	73.1	77	80.9	84.9
Black	33.7	35.3	35.7	------	38.3	17.7	17.8	40.8	53.3	65.7	78.1
Hispanic	31.3	28.5	33.3	------	35.8	20.1	13.8	38.2	51.1	63.9	76.8
White	72.2	72.3	75.5	------	75.5	46.7	57.1	78.7	81.7	84.7	87.7

Table 2 Grade 5 English Language Arts – Percent College and Career Ready (CCR)

	2018 (Actual)	2019 (Actual)	2019 (Y1)	2020 (Actual)	2020 (Y2)	State (2021)	2021 (Actual)	2021 (Y3)	2022 (Y4)	2023 (Y5)	2024 (Y6)
All	38.7	39.0	45.7	------	51.5	28.8	29.3	56.4	61.4	66.3	72.0
Asian	58.6	61.9	67.7	------	70.7	55.1	54.2	73.7	76.8	79.8	82.9
Black	24.8	25.0	31.5	------	37.9	13.7	17.1	44.3	50.7	57.1	63.5
Hispanic	26.1	25.8	29.8	------	36.3	16.7	15.1	42.7	49.2	55.6	62.0
White	65.8	66.9	74.4	------	76.7	40.6	56.0	79.1	81.4	83.8	86.1

Table 3 Grade 8 English Language Arts – Percent College and Career Ready (CCR)

	2018 (Actual)	2019 (Actual)	2019 (Y1)	2020 (Actual)	2020 (Y2)	2021 (State)	2021 (Actual)	2021 (Y3)	2022 (Y4)	2023 (Y5)	2024 (Y6)
All	40.9	43.9	44.2	------	46.2	27.3	29.3	50.2	56.2	63.2	71.1
Asian	58.2	63.5	62.4	------	64.1	57.2	59.4	67.1	71.1	75.1	80.3
Black	26.1	31.0	29.6	------	32.2	13.4	15.6	38.2	45.2	53.2	63.6
Hispanic	25.4	28.8	30.5	------	33.0	17.2	16.6	39.0	46.0	54.0	64.1
White	68.8	72.5	70.7	------	72.3	37.1	55.3	75.3	78.3	81.3	84.5

Table 4 Grade 3 English Language Arts Performance (SY2020 21) – by Race & Gender

				Not Proficient		Level 3		Level 4		Level 5		GLP (Levels 3,4,5)		CCR (Levels 4&5)	
Subgroup	Gender	% Tested	# Tested	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
All Students	All	93.0	9,972	6,027	60.4	1,024	10.3	2,233	22.4	688	6.9	3,945	39.6	2,921	29.3
	Male	92.7	5,039	3,148	62.5	514	10.2	1,061	21.1	316	6.3	1,891	37.5	1,377	27.3
	Female	93.2	4,933	2,879	58.4	510	10.3	1,172	23.8	372	7.5	2,054	41.6	1,544	31.3
Black	All	89.8	3,349	2,425	72.4	329	9.8	508	15.2	87	2.6	924	27.6	595	17.8
	Male	89.6	1,658	1,228	74.1	157	9.5	236	14.2	37	2.2	430	25.9	273	16.5
	Female	89.9	1,691	1,197	70.8	172	10.2	272	16.1	50	3.0	494	29.2	322	19
White	All	96.0	2,406	718	29.8	313	13	976	40.6	399	16.6	1,688	70.2	1,375	57.1
	Male	95.8	1,221	385	31.5	177	14.5	476	39	183	15.0	836	68.5	659	54
	Female	96.2	1,185	333	28.1	136	11.5	500	42.2	216	18.2	852	71.9	716	60.4
Hispanic	All	94.7	3,047	2,403	78.9	225	7.4	362	11.9	57	1.9	644	21.1	419	13.8
	Male	94.2	1,575	1,282	81.4	96	6.1	168	10.7	29	1.8	293	18.6	197	12.5
	Female	95.3	1,472	1,121	76.2	129	8.8	194	13.2	28	1.9	351	23.8	222	15.1
Asian	All	92.1	830	318	38.3	106	12.8	294	35.4	112	13.5	512	61.7	406	48.9
	Male	92.7	417	173	41.5	56	13.4	136	32.6	52	12.5	244	58.5	188	45.1
	Female	91.6	413	145	35.1	50	12.1	158	38.3	60	14.5	268	64.9	218	52.8

In examining our reading performance for low, moderate and high poverty schools, we saw continued disparities. Specifically, as the concentration of poverty increased, the percent of students college and

career ready (CCR) in reading decreased. In Grade 3, 49.6% of students in low poverty schools were CCR, compared to 18.5% and 9.1% in our moderate and high poverty schools, respectively. Similarly, in Grade 5, 47.6% of students in low poverty schools were CCR, compared to 19.0% and 9.3% in our moderate and high poverty schools, respectively. In Grade 8, 46.2% of students in low poverty schools were CCR, compared to 15.1%and 6.5% in our moderate and high poverty schools, respectively.

Across our district, a greater number of our schools have at least half of their students not (yet) proficient. When looking at the percent of students "not proficient" pre-pandemic (2018-19) and post-pandemic (2020-21), increases at all three grade levels are evident (see figures 1-6 below). In Grade 3, the number of schools with at least half of their students not (yet) proficient increased from 48 to 77. In Grade 5 we increased from 63 to 73. In Grade 8, we were nearly flat, increasing only 2 schools from 27 to 29. The number of schools with at least 80% of their students "not proficient" also grew. In Grade 3, the number of schools grew dramatically, from 5 to 27. In Grade 5, the number of schools grew from 8 to 23. However, in Grade 8 the number of schools declined from 4 to 3.

The instructional modality students experienced last year had an impact on student performance in English Language Arts as well, albeit limited. When comparing the CCR rates of students that stayed in Full Remote Academy throughout the school year with those that returned to in-person instruction (Hybrid), there were slight differences. In Grade 3, 26.3% of students that remained in the Full Remote Academy were CCR, compared to 30.4% of students that experienced a Hybrid Instructional model, a 4.1 percentage point difference. In Grade 5, 27.3% of students that remained in the Full Remote Academy were CCR, compared to 30.3% of students that experienced a Hybrid Instructional model, a 3.0 percentage point difference. In Grade 8, 28.5% of students that remained in the Full Remote Academy were CCR, compared to 29.8% of students that experienced a Hybrid Instructional model, a 1.3 percentage point difference.

Needed Next Steps

The devastating impact of pandemic on learning conditions and outcomes requires every district in the nation to begin a multi-year recovery effort. The first phase of our efforts have already begun. Though much of our work will be funded through the strategic use of existing funds, several of our first phase recovery efforts are only possible with the addition of recovery funds from the federal government. If the recovery efforts planned prove effective, we will need to consider how to sustain them after those funds are no longer available (Fall 2024). The following are specific actions planned for our first semester to begin our recovery in English Language Arts:

Get Students Back for Face-to-Face Instruction Safely

- Improve ventilation and air quality.
- Continue providing PPE & sanitation supplies.
- Continue school health support with nurse extenders.
- Establish a mask mandate.
- Hire COVID-19 response coordinators (one in each learning community).

Understand and Quantify Student Needs, individually and district-wide

- Administer universal screener in grades K-8 in ELA, complemented by curriculum embedded assessments.
- Administer the state required assessment, Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS), in grades K-3.

- Administer universal screener of social-emotional learning (SEL) in grades K-12.

Strengthen Our Core Instruction: Strong Standards Aligned Teaching

- Move forward with our ELA curriculum adoption and implementation.
- Embed just-in-time support within core instruction for acceleration.
- Emphasize foundational reading skills in the early grades.
- Systematically include at least forty-five (45) minutes of additional reading instruction daily in grades K-3 *(Skills Block)*, now and moving forward.
- Provide all K-3 teachers with professional development on the use of multi-sensory instructional strategies (Orton-Gillingham) in the teaching of reading.

Invest in Student Academic Supports in Out-of-School Time

- We will allocate up to $50 million over three years from our federal American Rescue Plan (ARP) funds to form partnerships with local and national academic service providers to offer students extra help in ELA and mathematics in our 42 "low performing schools."

Broaden Social-Emotional Supports for Students

- Adopt a new social-emotional learning (SEL) curriculum in grades K-12.
- Hire & deploy 20 additional school counselors, social workers & psychologists to add to the 35 previously deployed using CARES Act funds.
- Sustain school-based mental health centers at 130 campuses.

Increase Supports to our Families that Don't Speak English

- Deploy bilingual school advocates in 34 targeted language diverse schools.
- Provide full-time translators at 5 targeted language diverse schools.
- Create a CMS Language Assistance Line.

Implement a Continuous Improvement Approach

- Review and respond to results during the year to adjust course as needed to accelerate improvement.
- Align that work from schools to the Board to foster improvement throughout the system.
- Place an added emphasis on monitoring ELA instruction to provide supports for schools and teachers, and to identify tangible examples of high quality teaching in action for both new and veteran teachers to view and learn from to accelerate the improvement of their professional practice.

Conclusion

It is our assertion that the above actions will yield short and long term results. We will know if these collective efforts are working by monitoring and reporting on the percent of students projected to a score a Level 4 or 5 on the Grade 3, 5, or 8 English Language Arts End-of-Grade exams. These projections are available in the Fall, Winter and Spring after the administration of our academic screener, the Measure of Academic Progress (MAP). More frequent monitoring of a variety of other metrics will occur by school-based staff and administrators, learning community staff, central office departments and district leaders. If these "leading indicators" reveal that our efforts aren't yielding the desired pace of improvement, or that our implementation has faltered, corrective actions and alternatives will be explored and taken.

Figures 1-6 Percent of Students “Not Proficient” in Reading, Grades 3, 5 and 8 (SY2018-19 and SY2020-21)