Impact of Crescendo Ed Group Grading PD

In 2016-17 one of our partnerships was with _____ school district (Northern CA). We compared the A rate and D/F rate of the teachers in the grading PD cohort in 16-17 (the year of the PD) vs those rates of grades among those teachers in 2015-16 (year prior to the PD):

	15-16 S1 A Rate	16-17 S1 A Rate	% Pt Change	% Difference	15-16 S1 D/F Rate	16-17 S1 D/F Rate	% Pt Change	% Difference
HS Teachers	32%	33%	+1.5	+5%	20%	17%	-3.3	-16%
MS Teachers	43%	36%	-7.3	-17%	16%	12%	-4.5	-27%

Notes:

- You'll notice that there was a decrease of A's at the MS and increase of A's at the HS as well as a decrease in D/F's in the MS and HS, which suggests that traditional grading inflates grades (at least at the MS level) as well as deflates grades.
- Of course, there are many different variables in this comparison, but when I ask teachers to explain the difference in outcomes, they almost always attribute it to changes in their grading.
- Although some of the changes seem small (a slight decrease in D/F rate), the number of grades assigned is around 2500 each year for the MS teacher cohort and 1700 for the HS teacher cohort. That means that a decrease of 3% pts in the D/F rate among the HS teachers in the cohort translates into 56 fewer D/F's assigned, and a decrease of 7.3 % pts in the D/F rate among the MS teachers equals 182 fewer D/F's. That translates into a significant savings of funds that otherwise would be spent on remediation, summer school, tutoring, etc.

What's more interesting is when the students are disaggregated. For example, among the HS teachers…

	15-16 S1 A Rate	16-17 S1 A Rate	% Pt Change	% Difference	15-16 S1 D/F Rate	16-17 S1 D/F Rate	% Pt Change	% Difference
Students qualifying for Free/Reduced Price Lunch	28%	31%	+3.5	+12%	24%	18%	-5.7	-24%
Students **NOT** qualifying for Free/Reduced Price Lunch Teachers	37%	36%	-0.6	-2%	15%	14%	-0.6	--4%

Notes:

- You'll see that impact (an increase in A's and a decrease in D/F's) was more pronounced among students who qualified for FRPL, significantly reducing the achievement gap between the two groups.

joe@crescendoedgroup.org *650.793.9393*

Here's another example from the MS:

	15-16 S1 A Rate	16-17 S1 A Rate	% Pt Change	% Difference	15-16 S1 D/F Rate	16-17 S1 D/F Rate	% Pt Change	% Difference
Special Education Students	29%	25%	-3.7	-13%	27%	14%	-13.0	-48%
General Education Students	45%	37%	-7.7	-17%	15%	12%	-3.4	--23%

Notes:

- You'll see that A's were reduced much more for general education students (who get points for completion of tasks, not necessarily content mastery) than for special education students (who often get penalized for non-academic performance, like not having an organized notebook). Also, the D/F's rates were reduced more significantly for the special education students. In this case as well, the achievement gap was reduced.

One more stat: the correlation between standardized tests and grades. Presumably, we'd want there to be a stronger correlation rather than a weaker one, even if we're skeptical of the validity of the standardized test. We don't have the final data synthesis completed for the Spr 2017 tests, but here are stats for a school I worked with in 2015-16:

_____ Charter School (a middle school in Los Angeles): SBAC Test Score Results (Spr 2016) correlated with S2 grades assigned

	2014-15	2015-16	% Pt Difference	% Change
SBAC Score Matches Grade (ex: 3 = B)	26%	40%	+14	53% increase
Variance of 1 (ex: SBAC = 3 and Grade = A or C)	49%	51%	+2	4% increase
Variance of 2 (ex: SBAC = 3 and Grade = D)	23%	8%	-15	65% decrease
Variance of 3 (ex: SBAC = 3 and Grade = F)	2%	0%	-2	100% decrease

Notes:

- Grades increased their correlation with standardized test scores