

Fall 2018 MAP Targets

Prepared By: District 833 staff & Brian Boothe
Director of Professional Development & Accountability
South Washington County Schools

What has been updated?

Description: For a number of years, the Department of Research, Evaluation, and Assessment has produced cut scores for the NWEA MAP assessment aligned with the Minnesota Comprehensive Assessments (MCAs). Prior to 2013-14, this process involved the use of equipercentile methods, starting in 2014-15 we chose to use logistic regression (67% probability), a procedure used by TIES in their previous major linking study in this area. We decided to discontinue this approach after the introduction of the new 2015 MAP norms where there is not enough datapoints to make a reliable prediction. So starting in 2015-16, we decided to use the NWEA Minnesota MCA linkage study from Spring 2014. **The primary advantage** of the change is that the tools will be available on Viewpoint. The study uses the equipercentile method, which matches the percentile rank of achieving proficiency level on the MCA and mapping the same ranking to NWEA (determines the RIT Score). The proficiency boundary cutoff (bolded text) indicates 50% probability of achieving the respective proficiency level. For example, suppose a 5th grader received a RIT score of 219 (boundary point) on Math, then the student has a 50% probability of achieving Meet Proficiency on the MCA. Suppose the score was instead 232, in this case the student has greater than 50% probability to achieve Meet Proficiency, however the student is less than 50% probable to achieve Exceed proficiency. Finally, the rank column indicates the national percentile that is aligned to the respective MAP scores for the respective study. Thus the national percentile rank will vary slightly from MAP to MCA versus MAP to ACT. NWEA has since published a new Minnesota MCA linkage study in 2016 and the cut scores detailed below are based on this study.

What has been added?

In an aesthetic standpoint, we wanted to expand on the 2014-15 document. The bolded text indicates the minimum cutoff scores, which mirrors the previous format. The ranges were added to provide more insight on what the RIT scores indicate. From the data standpoint, we have added MAP to ACT linkage metrics. In June 2015, NWEA published a study linking MAP scores with the ACT's college readiness (CR) benchmarks. The study follows the same procedure (equipercentile method) as the MCA linkage study. Unlike the MCA, the participation rate for the ACT is low, because ACT participation is voluntary. However, MAP performance is correlated with taking the ACT. Thus the CR proficiency boundary includes both students that took the exam and did not take the exam. For example, at the boundary cutoff there is 50% probability that the student is college ready and the sample includes students that did not take the exam. In addition, our report includes two CR benchmarks: score of 22 and 24 for both Reading and Math. The smaller benchmark is the typical recommendation from collegeboard. The larger benchmark is recommended by the NWEA linkage study, which is based on the ACT scores needed for admission to more competitive schools. Finally, the study found strong correlation between MAP and ACT score, with increasing correlation in the later years.

What additional resources available to learn more about your students?

- [MCA Predictors] On Viewpoint, you can select MAP Fall 2018 and, for scale, select MN Predictors.
- [CR Predictors] On Viewpoint, you can select MAP Fall 2018 and, for scale, select CCR (>22) or CCR (>24).
- Given the tight scoring range for the ACT, CR probabilities vary quite a bit at the boundary point (via rounding). The Appendix tables (on website) from the NWEA-ACT linkage study indicate the CR probability for both scales given an observed RIT score [not limited to boundary scores].

Remember to take into account multiple data points when making decisions using test scores.

		Fall MAP 2018 Linkage: MCA Proficiency Prediction Range								Fall MAP 2018 Linkage: ACT CR Prediction Range			
Subject	Grade	Does Not Meet		Partially Meet		Meet		Exceed		CR Ready(>22)		CR Ready(>24)	
		RIT	Rank	RIT**	Rank	RIT**	Rank	RIT**	Rank	RIT**	Rank	RIT**	Rank
Math	2*	<= 165	<= 19%	166 -- 175	20% -- 58%	176 -- 190	59% -- 84%	>= 191	>= 85%				
	3	<= 179	<= 20%	180 -- 188	21% -- 44%	189 -- 203	45% -- 84%	>= 204	>= 85%				
	4	<= 192	<= 24%	193 -- 200	25% -- 45%	201 -- 215	46% -- 83%	>= 216	>= 84%				
	5	<= 204	<= 31%	205 -- 217	32% -- 66%	218 -- 233	67% -- 93%	>= 234	>= 94%	>= 217	>= 65%	>= 221	>= 74%
	6	<= 213	<= 39%	214 -- 223	40% -- 64%	224 -- 237	65% -- 89%	>= 238	>= 90%	>= 225	>= 68%	>= 230	>= 79%
	7	<= 216	<= 35%	217 -- 230	36% -- 68%	231 -- 244	69% -- 90%	>= 245	>= 91%	>= 232	>= 71%	>= 237	>= 81%
	8	<= 219	<= 35%	220 -- 233	36% -- 65%	234 -- 247	66% -- 88%	>= 248	>= 89%	>= 238	>= 74%	>= 243	>= 83%
Read	2*	<= 169	<= 37%	170 -- 177	38% -- 57%	178 -- 195	58% -- 89%	>= 196	>= 91%				
	3	<= 183	<= 38%	184 -- 190	39% -- 55%	191 -- 209	56% -- 90%	>= 210	>= 91%				
	4	<= 191	<= 33%	192 -- 202	34% -- 60%	203 -- 217	61% -- 89%	>= 218	>= 90%				
	5	<= 193	<= 21%	194 -- 206	22% -- 52%	207 -- 225	53% -- 90%	>= 226	>= 91%	>= 209	>= 59%	>= 213	>= 69%
	6	<= 203	<= 30%	204 -- 211	31% -- 51%	212 -- 225	52% -- 83%	>= 226	>= 84%	>= 215	>= 61%	>= 218	>= 68%
	7	<= 211	<= 42%	212 -- 220	43% -- 65%	221 -- 234	66% -- 90%	>= 235	>= 91%	>= 220	>= 64%	>= 223	>= 71%
	8	<= 216	<= 48%	217 -- 224	49% -- 67%	225 -- 236	68% -- 88%	>= 237	>= 89%	>= 224	>= 67%	>= 227	>= 73%

* Extrapolated from the equipercentile method

** The bolded text indicates the RIT cutoff score where 50% probability to achieve that proficiency level

Note: Due to rounding, the CR probability can be off +/- 5%. See additional resources to link individual scores to probability