

YOUR CHILDREN, YOUR SCHOOLS, YOUR SCHOOL BOARD

Why We Are Running for School Board

(<https://ccsboardcandidates.com/news/why-we-are-running-for-school-board/>)

Volunteer at Polls

(<https://www.signupgenius.com/go/10c0e44a8a723a5f4c52-carmel>)



(<https://ccsboardcandidates.com>)

DATA

([HTTPS://CCSBOARDCANDIDATES.COM/](https://ccsboardcandidates.com/data/academic-decline/))

VIDEOS

NEWS

VOLUNTEER

DONATE

ACADEMIC DECLINE



Jim May, a Carmel citizen, has created a website called "nobbs4ccs" in opposition to the school board candidacy of Jenny Brake, Greg Brown and Adam Sharp. Why has he done this? One of the main areas of focus in this school board election has been on Academic Excellence, with a specific focus on iLEARN test scores. The Support CCS PAC and CCS themselves all want to compare CCS iLEARN scores to those of the state and insist that CCS is doing well. They go on to imply that we, as parents, should be happy with the status quo. What the BBS campaign is raising is that when you

look behind the curtain and dig deeper into iLEARN scores, there is quite a bit of opportunity for CCS to address so that ALL students can achieve to their fullest potential. This is not something that should be ignored by comparing our iLEARN scores to the state and touting our ranking within the state. CCS is doing well academically, but we can always do better.

In an attempt to dismiss the questions and concerns being raised by BBS on behalf of parents, Jim May has created this website, likely supported by the analyses of Jeff Boldt and Michael Gambrel, to try to create the illusion that nothing is wrong and that we need a school board that is going to support the status quo. CCS has used similar analyses in their “Fact or Fiction” e-mails to also support the status quo.

Mr. May creates 8 different analyses designed to debunk claims made by this campaign. It would be too exhaustive to pick apart every single one of them, both for us as a campaign as well as you as a reader. As such, we are going to focus on just one – “Academic Decline – part 2” – in order to show the flaws in their analysis, which should cause anyone to question whether anything on the site is trustworthy. Let’s begin.

Mr. May objects to analyzing and comparing the 2019-2022 iLEARN scores due to 3 reasons as listed below:

The Short Response

Comparing the 2019-2022 year-over-year performance of individual Carmel schools is uninformed at best, and lacks a critical understanding of the schools, redistricting and what iLEARN is measuring.

There are three reasons that our schools’ year-over-year scores are an invalid way to measure results:

1. **Incomplete 2019 data.** On each table in the 2021 data reports, the State of Indiana specifically notes: Data is not comparable to previous LEARN Spring 2019 spreadsheets that reflected only those students enrolled at least 162 days.’ That is, the state specifically excluded a subset of students in 2019 and explicitly says not to compare the data from that year to data from 2021 and beyond.
2. **The pandemic.** This was a global phenomenon that negatively affected schools and students around the world.
3. **Comparing 2021 vs 2022** on an individual school basis is inaccurate, as one elementary school was closed, a new one opened, and redistricting resulted in different sets of students attending each school. One would expect school board candidates to realize that this happened and the effects it had.

Let’s tackle them one by one.

2019 INCOMPLETE DATA:

Mr. May quotes a note from IDOE on the 2021 iLEARN data report spreadsheets that says “Data is not comparable to previous iLEARN Spring 2019 spreadsheets that reflected only those students enrolled at least 162 days.” He goes on to say “the state specifically excluded a subset of students in 2019 and explicitly says not to compare the data from that year to data from 2021 and beyond.”

The first issue with this is the statement “and beyond.” When one goes to the 2022 spreadsheets, they lack a similar statement cautioning the user against comparing 2022 data to 2019 data. This calls into question both the validity of his statement as well as whether the 2022 data can or cannot be compared to 2019 based on guidance from the IDOE. If they did not intend for 2022 to be compared to 2019, why would they not include the same statement on the 2022 data? However, as we move on, you will see that his point about not being able to compare data (but not Mr. May’s inaccurate interpretation) is moot as it applies to CCS.

What is meant by the IDOE statement is that there were likely school corporations where students moved schools during the 2018-2019 school year and thereby they were only accounted for in the school that they attended for at least 162 school days. What this would mean is that there could be significant variability in student counts in 2019 as compared to 2021. As such, it may be inappropriate to compare the 2019 iLEARN data from those schools demonstrating significant variability in student populations to their 2021 iLEARN data. However, this is not the case with CCS. You can see below from the IDOE data that the 3rd-8th grade student population data within CCS remains stable year over year, as does the number of test takers for iSTEP in 2018 and iLEARN in 2019 and 2021. There aren’t any significant changes or differences in any of the data points shown below. The most notable change is the decrease in percentage of test takers relative to the population when Indiana moved from iSTEP to iLEARN, but that is irrelevant to our discussion and focus.

CCS	2018	2019	2020	2021
Population	7644	7609	7660	7527

Test Takers	7608	7412	-	7382
--------------------	------	------	---	------

As such, not only would this seem to indicate that the IDOE statement on comparing 2021 and 2019 iLEARN scores was not intended to apply to all schools, it would also indicate that it should not apply to CCS given the stability in both school population and test scores. As such, Mr. May's objection to comparing CCS 2021 or 2022 iLEARN scores to those of 2019 seems invalid despite the statement from IDOE.

PANDEMIC:

2019 to 2021: By all accounts, the pandemic began in the US at the beginning of 2020. The first case in the US was documented on January 21, 2020. Students in Indiana did not take iLEARN in the spring of 2020, but they took the test in the Spring of 2021 beginning on April 21, 2021. So, one could make the argument that the pandemic had a significant impact on the scores between 2019 and 2021, right? Well, if that was the case, wouldn't we expect every single one of the CCS schools to demonstrate a substantial decline in the percentage of students meeting proficiency standards?

Oddly enough, West Clay Elementary was 1 of 14 schools in CCS to demonstrate an increase in proficiency between 2019 and 2021. WCE was one of the most proficient schools in the district in 2019 and GREW it's iLEARN proficiency from 71.3% in 2019 to 75.3% in 2021 in the midst of the pandemic. So, a skeptic might say West Clay is an outlier. Let's look more deeply at that.

College Wood Elementary and Towne Meadow Elementary had modest declines in proficiency of -0.8% and -1.5% respectively during this same time period. This would give more credence to the fact that the pandemic didn't impact schools as much as one might assume. Still think that these schools are outliers? Let's consider some other data.

Looking more broadly across CCS schools, another thing to consider is the variability in changes in proficiency across the schools. Unfortunately, schools such as Carmel Middle School and Forest Dale Elementary experienced some of the largest declines in proficiency, -17.5% and -17.2% respectively. That would mean that there was wide variability in terms of the changes in proficiency scores across schools (-17.5% to +4.0%).

	2019	2021	2021 vs 2019
Clay Middle School	62.2%	50.3%	-11.9%
Woodbrook	68.3%	55.5%	-12.8%
Cherry Tree	68.6%	59.6%	-9.0%
Carmel Elementary	66.8%	57.6%	-9.2%
College Wood	73.7%	72.9%	-0.8%
Carmel Middle School	58.8%	41.3%	-17.5%
Smoky Row	75.2%	65.8%	-9.4%
Orchard Park	48.3%	41.5%	-6.8%
Prairie Trace	69.7%	63.3%	-6.4%
Mohawk Trails	68.9%	55.4%	-13.5%
Forest Dale	62.3%	45.1%	-17.2%
Creekside	77.9%	64.2%	-13.7%

Towne Meadow	67.3%	65.8%	-1.5%
West Clay	71.3%	75.3%	+4.0%

We also should consider the severity of the impact of the pandemic during the time period between tests. One statistic that we can use to measure the severity of the pandemic is the number of COVID cases in Indiana during each time period. During the time period for the first case reported in Indiana in 2020 and April 21, 2021 when students began to take the 2021 iLEARN test, there were 713,907 confirmed cumulative cases of COVID in Indiana, which is one indicator of the severity of the impact of the pandemic. You can find the COVID data here by using the slider in the cumulative cases graph:

COVID cases in Hamilton County Indiana (<https://usafacts.org/visualizations/coronavirus-covid-19-spread-map/state/indiana/county/hamilton-county>)

Another indicator of the potential impact of the pandemic on iLEARN is the amount of time between testing periods where COVID was a factor. 2019 iLEARN testing began on April 19th, 2019. The first documented case of COVID in Indiana was on March 7th, 2020 which would indicate that COVID was a non-factor for 321 days of this testing period. 2021 iLEARN testing began on April 21st, 2021 which would indicate COVID was a factor for 411 days of this testing period. That would mean that COVID was a factor for 56% of this testing period.

To summarize, between 2019 and 2021, (1) 13 of 14 schools experienced declines in iLEARN proficiency, (2) there were 713,907 confirmed cumulative cases of COVID, (3) COVID was present for 56% of the time between testing periods, and (4) the range of change in iLEARN proficiency was -17.5% to +4.0%. Looking at just the COVID data in isolation relative to the fact that 13 of 14 schools experienced declines in proficiency could easily cause one to assume that COVID was the most influential factor here. But we have to ask ourselves the following questions:

1. Why was West Clay Elementary, one of our most proficient schools, able to grow iLEARN proficiency when all schools were impacted by COVID? Are schools able to grow iLEARN proficiency during the pandemic?
2. Why did two other schools show modest declines (-0.8% and -1.5%) whereas other schools showed large declines (-17.2% and -17.5%) when all schools were impacted by COVID? What does the variability in iLEARN scores across schools tell us?
3. What was the impact of COVID between 2021 and 2022? Were there any differences?

Let's move on to look at 2021 compared to 2022 and dive deeper into these questions.

2021 to 2022 This period's iLEARN scores show a little bit of a different story. Comparing 2021 to 2022, 10 of 13 schools had INCREASES in their proficiency in Math and ELA (Orchard Park was excluded due to closing after the 2020-2021). Similar to 19 vs 21, there was wide variability in the range of change in proficiency scores (-6.0% to +9.2%).

	2021	2022	2022 vs 2021
Clay Middle School	50.3%	52.6%	+2.3%
Woodbrook	55.5%	51.6%	-3.9%
Cherry Tree	59.6%	63.3%	+3.7%
Carmel Elementary	57.6%	51.7%	-5.9%
College Wood	72.9%	76.8%	+3.9%
Carmel Middle School	41.3%	45.1%	+3.8%
Smoky Row	65.8%	68.1%	+2.3%
Orchard Park	41.5%	-	-

Prairie Trace	63.3%	72.5%	+9.2%
Mohawk Trails	55.4%	49.4%	-6.0%
Forest Dale	45.1%	52.9%	+7.8%
Creekside	64.2%	65.2%	+1.0%
Towne Meadow	65.8%	69.1%	+3.3%
West Clay	75.3%	75.5%	+0.2%

Recall that the 2021 iLEARN testing began on April 21st, 2021 and there were 713,907 cumulative cases of COVID at that time. The 2022 iLEARN testing began on April 18th, 2022. At this time, Indiana had 1,694,955 COVID cumulative cases or 981,048 between the 2021 and 2022 testing periods. This is an increase of 267,141 cumulative cases versus the time frame leading up to the 2021 test. Further, while COVID was only present for 56% of the time between the 2019 and 2021 tests, COVID was present for 100% of the time between the 2021 and 2022 iLEARN tests AND was more severe as indicated by the number of cumulative cases in Indiana during that time period. This would seem to indicate that COVID should have a more severe impact on testing scores during this time period. But it did not!

So, thinking about the time period of 2021 to 2022, we know the following: (1) Only 3 of 13 schools experienced declines in iLEARN proficiency in spite of the fact that (2) there were 918,048 confirmed cumulative cases of COVID (more than 2019 to 2021), (3) COVID was present for 100% of the time between testing periods, and (4) the range of change in iLEARN proficiency was -6.0% to +9.2%. So let's compare 2019 to 2021 vs 2021 to 2022, revisit the questions posed earlier and ask some new ones.

	2019 vs 2021	2021 vs 2022
Schools with Decline	13	3
Indiana COVID Cases	713,907	981,048
COVID Presence	56%	100%
iLEARN Variability	-17.5% to +4.0%	-6.0% to +9.2%

If the pandemic had such an impact on iLEARN scores, why did we see schools improve in both periods where COVID was present? Why did we see more schools improve when the pandemic was more severe as indicated by the percent of time it was present as well as the number of cases in Indiana? Further, why do we see such wide variability in iLEARN proficiency changes in both time periods? All of this would indicate that while the pandemic may have had some impact, there are clearly other variables at play within each of these schools that is causing their iLEARN scores to change. As such, we should not, as Mr. May does, blame the test score changes on the pandemic. Rather, we should be seeking to understand what the schools are doing to impact their iLEARN scores and sharing those learnings across the district. This is EXACTLY what the Brake, Brown, and Sharp campaign have been suggesting all along.

So, now that we've debunked the objections over the incomplete 2019 iLEARN data and demonstrated that there are clearly other factors besides the pandemic that are impacting iLEARN proficiency, let's move on to Mr. May's last point.

RE-DISTRICTING:

In our previous discussion about the pandemic, we highlighted that there were only 3 schools within CCS that experienced decreases in iLEARN proficiency between 2021 and 2022. These 3 schools were Carmel Elementary, Woodbrook Elementary and Mohawk Trails Elementary. Mr. May makes the claim that re-districting is the cause:

As previously stated, there was significant redistricting within CCS schools that occurred between 2021 and 2022 LEARN testing. In fact, there were three schools in particular that absorbed significant amounts of students. They were the only Carmel schools to increase the number of LEARN tests administered by over 10% from 2021 – 2022.

- **Carmel Elementary** 40.2% more LEARN tests administered
- **Woodbrook Elementary** 20.8% more LEARN tests administered
- **Mohawk Trails Elementary** 14.2% more LEARN tests administered

Mr. May asserts that the 3 school's proficiency scores declined from '21 to '22 when all other schools proficiency scores increased due to lower performing students shifting to higher performing schools as a result of re-districting.

It's very easy to see that the Mohawk Trails, Woodbrook and Carmel elementary schools received the largest influx of students in the low-performing subgroups. As would be expected, they were the three schools to experience proficiency drops from 2021 – 2022.

In fact, he goes further and DISGUSTINGLY points the finger at some of our most disadvantaged students: Free Reduced Lunch recipients (FRL), Special Education Students (SE), and English Language Learners (ELL).

For each of these schools, we can also look at actual numbers to see how redistricting and shifting demographics increased the number of overall students taking LEARN, as well as the increases to each subcategory.

Mohawk Trails Elementary, from 2021 to 2022

- 43 more LEARN tests administered overall
- 19 more LEARN tests administered to FRL students
- 3 more LEARN tests administered to SE students
- 27 more LEARN tests administered to ELL students

Woodbrook Elementary, from 2021 to 2022

- 49 more LEARN tests administered overall
- 21 more LEARN tests administered to FRL students
- 17 more LEARN tests administered to SE students
- 1 more LEARN tests administered to ELL students

Carmel Elementary, from 2021 to 2022

- 85 more LEARN tests administered overall
- 21 more LEARN tests administered to FRL students
- 15 more LEARN tests administered to SE students
- 15 more LEARN tests administered to ELL students

It is entirely unsurprising that any school's overall proficiency rate would decline when redistricting assigns it with 14% – 40% more students and a large majority of them are in low-performing subgroups.

All the analysis done lulls you into believing it. However, a good analyst goes deeper to analyze the data and see if it can support his or her claims. So, the question is, why didn't they go deeper?

An elementary way is to find an example that disproves Mr. May's assertions. In this case, as it relates to re-districting, Prairie Trace is the best example. Prairie Trace Elementary had a Math/ELA proficiency score of 63.3% in 2021. The ONLY re-districting impact for Prairie Trace was taking on students from Mohawk Trails, whose overall Math/ELA proficiency scores were 55.4% in 2021. That claim (about Mohawk Trails) can be substantiated here via the preferred school re-districting plan shared in November 2021 and approved 5-0 by the school board in December of 2021:

Preferred Redistricting Plan (http://www.dejongrichter.com/carmelclayschools/wp-content/uploads/sites/41/2020/11/PreferredPlanBoundaries_20201113.pdf)

Prairie Trace enrollment increased by 18 students or 5.5% in 2022. Their FRL population grew by 4, their SE population grew by 3 and their ELL population grew by 9. So, based on the fact that students transitioned from a lower performing school AND a majority of those students were from these "traditionally lower performing groups", one would expect Prairie Trace's proficiency scores to decline in 2022, right? WRONG. Prairie Trace's scores GREW from 63.3% in 2021 to 72.5% in 2022 which represented the HIGHEST GROWTH of ANY SCHOOL in CCS.

	2021	2022
--	------	------

Clay Middle School	50.3%	52.6%
Woodbrook	55.5%	51.6%
Cherry Tree	59.6%	63.3%
Carmel Elementary	57.6%	51.7%
College Wood	72.9%	76.8%
Carmel Middle School	41.3%	45.1%
Smoky Row	65.8%	68.1%
Orchard Park	41.5%	-
Prairie Trace	63.3%	72.5%
Mohawk Trails	55.4%	49.4%
Forest Dale	45.1%	52.9%
Creekside	64.2%	65.2%
Towne Meadow	65.8%	69.1%
West Clay	75.3%	75.5%

Re-districting would NOT appear to have a substantial impact on Prairie Trace’s scores NOR does the fact that of the students that were re-districted to Prairie Trace, a large majority of them were from the FRL, SE and ELL groups. These data would prove Mr. May’s claim to be WRONG that re-districting and/or receipt of a significant number of FRL/SE/ELL students causes iLEARN proficiency scores to decline within a school. Not satisfied? Still skeptical? Too elementary of an example to accept? Okay, let’s move on to a more statistically sound method of analyzing the relationship between iLEARN scores and re-districting. We can do that by plotting the change in iLEARN scores as well as the change in student populations in each of the 3 groups that Mr. May highlights as a result of the re-districting that occurred between 2021 and 2022.

	iLEARN change	FRL Change	SE Change	ELL Change
Woodbrook	-3.9%	21	17	1
Cherry Tree	3.7%	-1	7	7
Carmel Elementary	-5.9%	21	15	15
College Wood	3.9%	-1	4	6
Smoky Row	2.3%	0	-10	-2
Prairie Trace	9.2%	4	9	3
Mohawk Trails	-6.0%	19	3	27
Forest Dale	7.8%	-7	-1	-4
Towne Meadow	3.3%	6	7	3
West Clay	0.2%	1	3	-8
Clay Middle School	2.3%	10	1	16
Carmel Middle	3.8%	-21	0	-1
Creekside	1.0%	23	26	-2

Next, we can run a multi-regression analysis to determine whether two things: (1) How much of the variability (change) in the change in iLEARN scores can be explained by the changes in student populations and (2) is there a linear relationship between the change in iLEARN scores and any of these student population changes? So, what do the data show?

SUMMARY OUTPUT								
Regression Statistics								
Multiple R	0.7179252							
R Square	0.5153899							
Adjusted R Square	0.4389286							
Standard Error	0.237657407							
Observations	13							
ANOVA								
	df	SS	MS	F	Significance F			
Regression	3	0.023458208	0.007819369	3.190219485	0.077025086			
Residual	9	0.032604641	0.003622826					
Total	12	0.056062849						
	Coefficients	Standard Error	t Stat	P-value	Lower 95%	Upper 95%	Lower 95.0%	Upper 95.0%
Intercept	0.211171773	0.024449959	8.64245266	0.000001793	0.082331828	0.340011719	0.082331828	0.340011719
Pop Change	-0.002424447	0.001395519	-1.731241217	0.111036266	-0.005088975	0.000174018	-0.005088975	0.000174018
St Change	0.00009414	0.001709729	0.549751248	0.592292111	-0.002284119	0.002468279	-0.002284119	0.002468279
St Change	-0.001033424	0.001818189	-0.568791241	0.581076111	-0.003945014	0.002000595	-0.003945014	0.002000595

We've highlighted a few key pieces of data above in yellow. First is the r-square value of (.515). What this means, in layperson's terms, is that 51.5% of the variability/change in iLEARN scores can be explained by the changes in the 3 student populations. Said another way, 48.5% of the iLEARN changes are NOT explained by the changes in student populations. One thing to keep in mind here, however, is that **we do not know how much of the change in each of these student populations are based upon re-districting shifts, movement from 2nd to 3rd grade within the same school and thereby being required to take iLEARN, nor new students moving into the district that would be in one of these categories.**

Second are the p-values highlighted for each of the changes in the student populations. Remember that in layman's terms, a p-value has to be LESS than 0.05 for us to ACCEPT that there is a linear relationship between two variables – in this case, a relationship between iLEARN test scores and the change in each of these student populations. What we see here is that the p values are nowhere close to 0.05 – they are much GREATER than 0.05. What this means is that we would REJECT the idea that there is a linear relationship between changes in iLEARN test scores and ANY of the changes in the student populations. So, now that we have proven that changes in iLEARN scores were NOT due to movement of students in these 3 groups based upon re-districting as Mr. May asserts, let's focus on his assertion that re-districting as a whole had an impact on iLEARN scores.

In this analysis, we'll utilize the changes in iLEARN scores again coupled with data from the re-districting plan that looks at the number of geographies where schools sent or received students to or from other schools. The data can be found on the website of the consulting company that worked with CCS on the re-districting plan. A link is provided below to the "preferred re-districting plan", which was the one presented in November of 2020 and officially approved by the school board in December of 2020.

Preferred Redistricting Plan (http://www.dejongrichter.com/carmelclayschools/wp-content/uploads/sites/41/2020/11/PreferredPlanBoundaries_20201113.pdf)

To begin, we'll plot the changes in iLEARN scores from 2021 to 2022 as well as the net number of re-districting changes for each school. This net number is defined by the taking the number of geographies from which a school received students and subtracting the number of geographies to which a school lost students based on re-districting. You'll note that we have done 2 analyses here – the first that does not include the middle schools and the second that does. The reason for this is based on the following statement on the preferred re-districting plan: "Students from the Orchard Park boundary being redistricted to either Creekside MS or Clay MS will be able to choose between Carmel MS and their newly assigned middle school." Given that middle school students had a choice in middle schools as opposed to elementary students being assigned a new elementary school, we felt this was important to note. In the first analysis, we leave the middle schools out to try to isolate the uncertainty of the impact of choice on net re-districting changes. In the second analysis, because we can observe from iLEARN data the population changes in each middle school (Clay and Creekside grew while Carmel declined), we assign a net change accordingly via assumptions made based on population change.

	iLEARN change	RD NET change
Woodbrook	-3.9%	3
Cherry Tree	3.7%	-1
Carmel Elementary	-5.9%	3
College Wood	3.9%	1
Smoky Row	2.3%	0
Prairie Trace	9.2%	1
Mohawk Trails	-6.0%	-1
Forest Dale	7.8%	0
Towne Meadow	3.3%	0
West Clay	0.2%	-2
Clay Middle School	2.3%	1
Carmel Middle	3.8%	-1
Creekside	1.0%	1

Now, let's look at the results, starting with the elementary only analysis:

SUMMARY OUTPUT								
Regression Statistics								
Multiple R	0.25449021							
R Square	0.06481392							
Adjusted R Square	-0.05127996							
Standard Error	0.054802513							
Observations	10							
ANOVA								
	df	SS	MS	F	Significance F			
Regression	1	0.001678925	0.001678925	0.56120421	0.474883086			
Residual	8	0.023851475	0.002981434					
Total	9	0.0255304						
	Coefficients	Standard Error	t Stat	P-value	Lower 95%	Upper 95%	Lower 95.0%	Upper 95.0%
Intercept	0.017918033	0.017823948	1.005277437	0.341197414	-0.021844111	0.059000177	-0.021844111	0.059000177
NET	-0.008292589	0.011063956	-0.750417518	0.46409268	-0.037985549	0.017195365	-0.037985549	0.017195365

You'll note that r-square can only 6.5% of the variability in iLEARN scores can be explained by the net effect of re-districting. Further, our p-value is 0.47 which means we would REJECT the assertion that there is a linear relationship between changes in iLEARN scores and the net effect of re-districting.

Let's move to the second analysis that includes middle schools:

SUMMARY OUTPUT						
Regression Statistics						
Multiple R	0.27655342					
R Square	0.07652706					
Adjusted R Square	-0.00738375					
Standard Error	0.54623687					
Observations	12					
ANOVA						
	df	SS	MS	F	Significance F	
Regression	1	0.001895735	0.001895735	0.93227060	0.340538289	
Residual	11	0.02117384	0.001924854			
Total	12	0.023069575				
Coefficients		Standard Error	t Stat	P-value	Lower 95%	Upper 95%
Intercept	0.00994812	0.00409614	1.48706022	0.16073728	-0.00899614	0.00994812
RD-NET change	-0.00492127	0.00899614	-0.54491213	0.59529188	-0.02089962	0.01105714

Again, the r-squared value tells us that only 7.6% of the variability in iLEARN scores can be explained by the net effect of re-districting changes. Further, our p-value of 0.36 causes us to REJECT that there is a linear relationship between changes in iLEARN scores and the net effect of re-districting.

So, why didn't Mr. May and his analyst friends conduct these statistical analyses? Why did they try to prove the relationship between changes in iLEARN scores and changes in student populations via a round-about analysis? Only you as a reader can answer that question for yourself.

What is clear here is that Mr. May's claim that re-districting OR the shift of lower performing groups of students has an impact on iLEARN test score changes is FALSE. What is really disappointing is that not only is Mr. May's analysis incorrect, he wrongfully blames some of our most disadvantaged students for decreases in iLEARN scores for which they clearly are not accountable.

SUMMARY:

So, what have we proven here today as it relates to Mr. May's 3 claims?

There are three reasons that our schools' year-over-year scores are an invalid way to measure results:

1. Incomplete 2019 data. On each table in the 2021 data reports, the State of Indiana specifically notes: 'Data is not comparable to previous LEARN Spring 2019 spreadsheets that reflected only those students enrolled at least 162 days. That is, the state specifically excluded a subset of students in 2019 and explicitly says not to compare the data from that year to data from 2021 and beyond.
2. The pandemic. This was a global phenomenon that negatively affected schools and students around the world.
3. Redistricting. Comparing 2021 vs 2022 on an individual school basis is inaccurate, as one elementary school was closed, a new one opened, and redistricting resulted in different sets of students attending each school. One would expect school board candidates to realize that this happened and the effects it had.

1) His claim that it is invalid to compare iLEARN test scores year over year is FALSE. CCS did NOT have a significant change in their student population nor the number of test takers as demonstrated across 2018-2021. As such, the statement made by IDOE only applies to those schools where significant changes in students taking iLEARN occurred due to student enrollment data, not to CCS.

2) The pandemic is certainly not the only factor nor the primary factor impacting the change in iLEARN proficiency across the schools within CCS. The fact that CCS iLEARN proficiency scores grew during arguably the most impactful pre-test period of the pandemic coupled with the wide variability of change in scores indicate that there are other factors at play within our schools that contribute to test score changes and variability in test score changes. Those factors need to be examined and understood so we can apply the learnings and accelerate growth in iLEARN proficiency across our schools.

3) Mr. May's assertions about the effect of re-districting in iLEARN scores are largely FALSE. When we looked at the impact of changes in FRL, SE and ELL population shifts on iLEARN score changes as a result of re-districting, we saw that there was NOT a linear relationship between changes in iLEARN scores and any of the changes in the 3 groups. While the r-squared value showed that a little over half of the variability could be explained based on changes in these student populations, remember that we cannot isolate those changes solely to re-districting – the changes could be impacted by students shifting grades and becoming iLEARN eligible or by new students moving into the district. We then looked at change in iLEARN scores relative to the net impact of re-districting. There, we showed that less than 10% of the variability in iLEARN scores can be explained by the net effect of re-districting. Further, we showed that there was NOT a linear relationship between changes in iLEARN scores and the net effect of re-districting. As such, Mr. May's assertions about re-districting have largely been proven to be FALSE.

The fact that there are significant issues with the validity and truthfulness of the claims that Mr. May makes here and the analysis provided as it relates to Academic Decline – part 2 call into question whether or not anything on his site can be trusted.

Finally and of the most importance, our most recent iLEARN test results from 2022 show that we have a range of children meeting proficiency standards across our schools between 45.1% and 76.8%. ILEARN scores continue to demonstrate both growth and decline within each school. That means that anywhere from 23.2% to 54.9% of our children within certain schools are not meeting minimum proficiency standards and not every school is on a positive trajectory. We all should be appalled by this, as well as the repeated efforts by community members such as Mr. May who distract from this important focus in an effort to defend the status quo within our schools and wrongfully criticize our campaign. Our campaign will continue to focus on these proficiency scores as well as other opportunities within CCS and ask tough questions as part of our undying efforts to advocate for and represent the best interests of ALL students living in this school district.

Get Involved

(<https://ccsboardcandidates.com/volunteer/>)



(<https://ccsboardcandidates.com>)

About

(<https://ccsboardcandidates.com>)

Participate

(<https://ccsboardcandidates.com/volunteer/>)

Donate

(<https://ccsboardcandidates.com/donate/>)

Site

(<https://ccsboardcandidates.com>)

Jenny Brake (<https://ccsboardcandidates.com/about/jenny-brake/>)

Yard Gates (<https://ccsboardcandidates.com/about/yard-gates/>)

Jerry Brake (<https://ccsboardcandidates.com/about/jerry-brake/>)

News (<https://ccsboardcandidates.com/news/>)

Greg Brown (<https://ccsboardcandidates.com/about/greg-brown/>)

Door- to-Door (<https://ccsboardcandidates.com/volunteer/>)

Greg Brown (<https://ccsboardcandidates.com/donate/greg-brown/>)

Sitemap (<https://ccsboardcandidates.com/sitemap/>)

Dr. Adam Sharp (<https://ccsboardcandidates.com/about/adam-sharp/>)

Door- to-Door (<https://ccsboardcandidates.com/volunteer/>)

Dr. Adam Sharp (<https://ccsboardcandidates.com/donate/adam-sharp/>)

