

***Loess Hills AEA 13***  
***Iowa Collaborative Assessment Modules (ICAM) Aggregate Data for***  
***Participating Districts***  
***Spring, 2002 and Spring, 2003***

The Iowa Collaborative Assessment Modules (ICAM) have been administered within AEA 13 starting in March-April, 2002. In 2002 there were 16 participating districts and this increased to 20 districts in 2003. Each module includes multiple choice and open-ended responses. The open-ended items are scored collaboratively by teachers in AEA staff each June using a systematic process that includes double scoring to check reliability.

The charts in the document show aggregate results for students who took the individual modules in AEA 13. The data show the percentage of students who achieved at level 1 (low), level 2 and level 3 (high). For each module, results are shown for all students and also broken down in terms of gender and socio-economic status (coded using free or reduced lunch eligibility). Note that there are some available modules that were not administered by any AEA 13 school. Furthermore, there were some modules chosen and administered by *only one* district. In these cases, results are not shown because of confidentiality issues. Results are only shown where two or more schools administered a module.

**Important!** ICAM was designed to be a set of criterion-referenced assessments. Please do not attempt to use the aggregate results in a norm-reference way. The numbers below are provided for your review, as they may give some perspective on how students in AEA 13 performed on particular modules. Please pay particular attention to the columns labeled number of districts and number of students. Some aggregates represent a *very small sample of students* and so interpretation is limited. Note also that in some instances, subgroup information is not available. Some districts did not code in subgroups (such as free and reduced lunch status) and so meaningful interpretation is difficult. In a number of cases, the number of students represented as "not eligible" may be inflated. The coding system for this category was "mark if applies," and therefore, if no coding was done, the scanner reads the protocol as "not eligible." For gender, the coding required male or female and if left blank, the report indicated this. We will continue to encourage districts to fully complete coding for each student in order to make the aggregate data more accurate and meaningful. *An additional caution:* As you compare the charts below, which are two year trends, please remember that in some situations, the 2003 group will be different from the 2002 group (some districts changed modules, new districts participated, etc.).

To better understand how cut-points were determined for each performance level, please refer to the technical evidence portion of your ICAM User's Guide.

What does each module cover in terms of skills? Please refer to the content specifications for each module for a breakdown of point values by benchmark. This is linked in the ICAM section of the [AEA 13 Assessment Resources Page](#)

**Note:** In 2002, ICAM Form X was used and in 2003, ICAM Form Y was used. The two forms are considered equivalent. For more information, refer to your ICAM User's Guide.

## Grade 4 Reading

<b>Reading Grade 4 - Comprehending Literature</b>										
	Number of Districts		Number of Students		Level 1 (Low)		Level 2		Level 3 (High)	
	2002	2003	2002	2003	2002	2003	2002	2003	2002	2003
All Students Tested	3	4	67	49	31.3%	28.6%	58.2%	61.2%	10.4%	10.2%
Male	3	4	32	24	31.3%	29.2%	65.6%	62.5%	3.1%	8.3%
Female	3	4	35	25	31.4%	28.0%	51.4%	60.0%	17.1%	12.0%
F/R lunch Elig.	3	4	15	19	40.0%	36.8%	60.0%	47.4%	0%	15.8%
Not F/R lunch Elig.	3	4	52	30	28.8%	23.3%	57.7%	70.0%	13.5%	6.7%

<b>Reading Grade 4 - Comprehending Academic Texts</b>										
	Number of Districts		Number of Students		Level 1 (Low)		Level 2		Level 3 (High)	
	2002	2003	2002	2003	2002	2003	2002	2003	2002	2003
All Students Tested	2	2	59	36	35.6%	41.7%	54.2%	44.4%	10.2%	13.9%
Male	2	2	30	17	36.7%	52.9%	56.7%	35.3%	6.7%	11.8%
Female	2	2	29	19	34.5%	31.6%	51.7%	52.6%	13.8%	15.8%
F/R lunch Elig.	2	2	<10	<10	-	-	-	-	-	-
Not F/R lunch Elig.	2	2	51	29	35.3%	41.4%	54.9%	41.4%	9.8%	17.2%

<b>Reading Grade 4 - Comprehending Functional Text</b>										
	Number of Districts		Number of Students		Level 1 (Low)		Level 2		Level 3 (High)	
	2002	2003	2002	2003	2002	2003	2002	2003	2002	2003
All Students Tested	2	4	59	112	30.5%	27.7%	64.4%	61.6%	5.1%	10.7%
Male	2	4	35	54	34.3%	33.3%	60.0%	63.0%	5.7%	3.7%
Female	2	4	24	58	25.0%	22.4%	70.8%	60.3%	4.2%	17.2%
F/R lunch Elig.	2	4	25	27	28.0%	33.3%	72.0%	59.3%	0%	7.4%
Not F/R lunch Elig.	2	4	34	85	32.4%	25.9%	58.8%	62.4%	8.8%	11.8%

## Grade 8 Reading

<b>Reading Grade 8 - Comprehending Literature</b>										
	Number of Districts		Number of Students		Level 1 (Low)		Level 2		Level 3 (High)	
	2002	2003	2002	2003	2002	2003	2002	2003	2002	2003
All Students Tested	3	4	64	106	35.9%	23.6%	59.4%	49.1%	4.7%	27.4%
Male	3	4	29	62	41.4%	30.6%	51.7%	56.5%	6.9%	12.9%
Female	3	4	35	44	31.4%	13.6%	65.7%	38.6%	2.9%	47.7%
F/R lunch Elig.	3	4	14	32	50.0%	40.6%	42.9%	46.9%	7.1%	12.5%
Not F/R lunch Elig.	3	4	50	74	32.0%	16.2%	64.0%	50.0%	4.0%	33.8%

**Reading *Grade 8* - Comprehending Academic Texts**

	Number of Districts		Number of Students		Level 1 (Low)		Level 2		Level 3 (High)	
	2002	2003	2002	2003	2002	2003	2002	2003	2002	2003
All Students Tested	3	4	106	134	25.5%	28.4%	58.5%	52.2%	16.0%	19.4%
Male	3	4	49	66	28.6%	37.9%	65.3%	51.5%	6.1%	10.6%
Female	3	4	56	68	21.4%	19.1%	53.6%	52.9%	25.0%	27.9%
F/R lunch Elig	3	4	19	22	21.1%	36.4%	78.9%	59.1%	0%	4.5%
Not F/R lunch Elig.	3	4	87	112	26.4%	26.8%	54.0%	50.9%	19.5%	22.3%

**Reading *Grade 8* - Comprehending Functional Texts**

	Number of Districts		Number of Students		Level 1 (Low)		Level 2		Level 3 (High)	
	2002	2003	2002	2003	2002	2003	2002	2003	2002	2003
All Students Tested	6	9	275	328	23.6%	25.3%	56.7%	63.4%	19.6%	11.3%
Male	6	9	135	173	28.1%	28.9%	60.7%	63.0%	11.1%	8.1%
Female	6	9	140	155	19.3%	21.3%	52.9%	63.9%	27.9%	14.8%
F/R lunch Elig	6	9	71	69	43.7%	29.0%	40.8%	62.3%	15.5%	8.7%
Not F/R lunch Elig.	6	9	204	259	16.7%	24.3%	62.3%	63.7%	21.1%	12.0%

## Grade 11 Reading

**Reading *Grade 11* - Comprehending Literature**

	Number of Districts		Number of Students		Level 1 (Low)		Level 2		Level 3 (High)	
	2002	2003	2002	2003	2002	2003	2002	2003	2002	2003
All Students Tested	4	6	144	303	15.3%	18.8%	66.0%	57.4%	18.8%	23.8%
Male	4	6	70	165	15.7%	24.2%	65.7%	56.4%	18.6%	19.4%
Female	4	6	74	138	14.9%	12.3%	66.2%	58.7%	18.9%	29.0%
F/R lunch Elig	4	6	26	56	19.2%	28.6%	65.4%	62.5%	15.4%	8.9%
Not F/R lunch Elig.	4	6	118	247	14.4%	16.6%	66.1%	56.3%	19.5%	27.1%

**Reading *Grade 11* - Comprehending Academic Texts**

	Number of Districts		Number of Students		Level 1 (Low)		Level 2		Level 3 (High)	
	2002	2003	2002	2003	2002	2003	2002	2003	2002	2003
All Students Tested	4	4	139	103	24.5%	12.6%	54.0%	68.0%	21.6%	19.4%
Male	4	4	63	50	28.6%	16.0%	55.6%	66.0%	15.9%	18.0%
Female	4	4	76	53	21.1%	9.4%	52.6%	69.8%	26.3%	20.8%
F/R lunch Elig	4	4	24	11	41.7%	0%	41.7%	90.9%	16.7%	9.1%
Not F/R lunch Elig.	4	4	115	92	20.9%	14.1%	56.5%	65.2%	22.6%	20.7%

<b>Reading <i>Grade 11 - Comprehending Functional Text</i></b>										
	<b>Number of Districts</b>		<b>Number of Students</b>		<b>Level 1 (Low)</b>		<b>Level 2</b>		<b>Level 3 (High)</b>	
	2002	2003	2002	2003	2002	2003	2002	2003	2002	2003
All Students Tested	4	6	107	146	25.2%	21.2%	58.9%	65.8%	15.9%	13.0%
Male	4	6	44	79	36.4%	25.3%	52.3%	68.4%	11.4%	6.3%
Female	4	6	63	67	17.5%	16.4%	63.5%	62.7%	19.0%	20.9%
F/R lunch Elig	4	6	21	14	38.1%	21.4%	57.1%	71.4%	4.8%	7.1%
Not F/R lunch Elig.	4	6	86	132	22.1%	21.2%	59.3%	65.2%	18.6%	13.6%

<b>Reading <i>Grade 11 - Literary Elements &amp; Techniques</i></b>										
	<b>Number of Districts</b>		<b>Number of Students</b>		<b>Level 1 (Low)</b>		<b>Level 2</b>		<b>Level 3 (High)</b>	
	2002	2003	2002	2003	2002	2003	2002	2003	2002	2003
All Students Tested	2	1	75	29	45.3%	-	49.3%	-	5.3%	-
Male	2	1	32	16	56.3%	-	34.4%	-	9.4%	-
Female	2	1	43	13	37.2%	-	60.5%	-	2.3%	-
F/R lunch Elig	2	1	-	14	-	-	-	-	-	-
Not F/R lunch Elig.	2	1	-	15	-	-	-	-	-	-

Note: F/R lunch status not reported in 2002 - coding errors by a district. No data reported in 2003 because only one district chose this module.

## Grade 4 Mathematics

<b>Mathematics <i>Grade 4 - Problem Solving Strategies &amp; Process</i></b>										
	<b>Number of Districts</b>		<b>Number of Students</b>		<b>Level 1 (Low)</b>		<b>Level 2</b>		<b>Level 3 (High)</b>	
	2002	2003	2002	2003	2002	2003	2002	2003	2002	2003
All Students Tested	4	6	93	117	15.1%	13.7%	64.5%	59.8%	20.4%	26.5%
Male	4	6	52	63	13.5%	14.3%	65.4%	60.3%	21.2%	25.4%
Female	4	6	41	54	17.1%	13.0%	63.4%	59.3%	19.5%	27.8%
F/R lunch Elig	4	6	<10	22	-	27.3%	-	63.6%	-	9.1%
Not F/R lunch Elig.	4	6	85	95	14.1%	10.5%	63.5%	58.9%	22.4%	30.5%

<b>Mathematics <i>Grade 4 - Number Concepts &amp; Operations</i></b>										
	<b>Number of Districts</b>		<b>Number of Students</b>		<b>Level 1 (Low)</b>		<b>Level 2</b>		<b>Level 3 (High)</b>	
	2002	2003	2002	2003	2002	2003	2002	2003	2002	2003
All Students Tested	1	3	23	39	-	10.3%	-	66.7%	-	23.1%
Male	1	3	10	17	-	17.6%	-	52.9%	-	29.4%
Female	1	3	13	22	-	4.5%	-	77.3%	-	18.2%
F/R lunch Elig	1	3	<10	<10	-	-	-	-	-	-
Not F/R lunch Elig.	1	3	16	31	-	12.9%	-	61.3%	-	25.8%

Note: No data reported in 2002 because only one district chose this module.

<b>Mathematics <i>Grade 4 - Geometry</i></b>										
	<b>Number of Districts</b>		<b>Number of Students</b>		<b>Level 1 (Low)</b>		<b>Level 2</b>		<b>Level 3 (High)</b>	
	2002	2003	2002	2003	2002	2003	2002	2003	2002	2003
All Students Tested	3	2	74	32	28.4%	9.4%	54.1%	62.5%	17.6%	28.1%
Male	3	2	43	12	32.6%	16.7%	48.8%	66.7%	18.6%	16.7%
Female	3	2	31	20	22.6%	5.0%	61.3%	60.0%	16.1%	35.0%
F/R lunch Elig	3	2	26	10	19.2%	20.0%	69.2%	70.0%	11.5%	10.0%
<b>Not F/R lunch Elig.</b>	3	2	48	22	33.3%	4.5%	45.8%	59.1%	20.8%	36.4%

## Grade 8 Mathematics

<b>Mathematics <i>Grade 8 - Problem-Solving Strategies &amp; Process</i></b>										
	<b>Number of Districts</b>		<b>Number of Students</b>		<b>Level 1 (Low)</b>		<b>Level 2</b>		<b>Level 3 (High)</b>	
	2002	2003	2002	2003	2002	2003	2002	2003	2002	2003
All Students Tested	6	6	262	257	27.1%	30.4%	53.4%	58.8%	19.5%	10.9%
Male	6	6	136	144	24.3%	31.9%	53.7%	57.6%	22.1%	10.4%
Female	6	6	125	112	30.4%	28.6%	52.8%	59.8%	16.8%	11.6%
F/R lunch Elig	6	6	56	56	46.4%	35.7%	46.4%	57.1%	7.1%	7.1%
<b>Not F/R lunch Elig.</b>	6	6	206	201	21.8%	28.9%	55.3%	59.2%	22.8%	11.9%

<b>Mathematics <i>Grade 8 - Geometry</i></b>										
	<b>Number of Districts</b>		<b>Number of Students</b>		<b>Level 1 (Low)</b>		<b>Level 2</b>		<b>Level 3 (High)</b>	
	2002	2003	2002	2003	2002	2003	2002	2003	2002	2003
All Students Tested	2	2	53	41	56.6%	17.1%	35.8%	73.2%	7.5%	9.8%
Male	2	2	20	25	45.0%	24.0%	50.0%	72.0%	5.0%	4.0%
Female	2	2	33	16	63.6%	6.3%	27.3%	75.0%	9.1%	18.8%
F/R lunch Elig	2	2	15	<10	73.3%	-	26.7%	-	0%	-
<b>Not F/R lunch Elig.</b>	2	2	38	35	50.0%	17.1%	39.5%	71.4%	10.5%	11.4%

<b>Mathematics <i>Grade 8 - Patterns, Functions &amp; Algebra</i></b>										
	<b>Number of Districts</b>		<b>Number of Students</b>		<b>Level 1 (Low)</b>		<b>Level 2</b>		<b>Level 3 (High)</b>	
	2002	2003	2002	2003	2002	2003	2002	2003	2002	2003
All Students Tested	6	9	284	383	30.3%	20.1%	51.4%	64.2%	18.3%	15.7%
Male	6	9	135	202	33.3%	19.8%	48.9%	62.9%	17.8%	17.3%
Female	6	9	149	179	27.5%	20.7%	53.7%	65.4%	18.8%	14.0%
F/R lunch Elig	6	9	52	81	34.6%	23.5%	51.9%	66.7%	13.5%	9.9%
<b>Not F/R lunch Elig.</b>	6	9	232	302	29.3%	19.2%	51.3%	63.6%	19.4%	17.2%

<b>Mathematics <i>Grade 8 - Solving Work-Related Math Problems</i></b>										
	Number of Districts		Number of Students		Level 1 (Low)		Level 2		Level 3 (High)	
	2002	2003	2002	2003	2002	2003	2002	2003	2002	2003
All Students Tested	2	2	55	59	43.6%	35.6%	41.8%	55.9%	14.5%	8.5%
Male	2	2	28	26	39.3%	42.3%	39.3%	50.0%	21.4%	7.7%
Female	2	2	26	33	46.2%	30.3%	46.2%	60.6%	7.7%	9.1%
F/R lunch Elig	2	2	13	18	46.2%	50.0%	30.8%	44.4%	23.1%	5.6%
Not F/R lunch Elig.	2	2	42	41	42.9%	29.3%	45.2%	61.0%	11.9%	9.8%

## Grade 11 Mathematics

<b>Mathematics <i>Grade 11 - Problem-Solving Strategies &amp; Process</i></b>										
	Number of Districts		Number of Students		Level 1 (Low)		Level 2		Level 3 (High)	
	2002	2003	2002	2003	2002	2003	2002	2003	2002	2003
All Students Tested	2	3	42	59	14.3%	18.6%	57.1%	62.7%	28.6%	18.6%
Male	2	3	20	30	25.0%	20.0%	50.0%	60.0%	25.0%	20.0%
Female	2	3	22	29	4.5%	17.2%	63.6%	65.5%	31.8%	17.2%
F/R lunch Elig	2	3	<10	<10	-	-	-	-	-	-
Not F/R lunch Elig.	2	3	34	55	11.8%	20.0%	55.9%	61.8%	32.4%	18.2%

<b>Mathematics <i>Grade 11 - Number Concepts &amp; Operations</i></b>										
	Number of Districts		Number of Students		Level 1 (Low)		Level 2		Level 3 (High)	
	2002	2003	2002	2003	2002	2003	2002	2003	2002	2003
All Students Tested	2	3	85	126	11.8%	26.2%	49.4%	41.3%	38.8%	32.5%
Male	2	3	44	68	11.4%	27.9%	38.6%	36.8%	50.0%	35.3%
Female	2	3	41	57	12.2%	22.8%	61.0%	47.4%	26.8%	29.8%
F/R lunch Elig	2	3	17	-	11.8%	-	35.3%	-	52.9%	-
Not F/R lunch Elig.	2	3	68	-	11.8%	-	52.9%	-	35.3%	-

Note: F/R lunch status not reported in 2003 - coding errors by districts.

<b>Mathematics <i>Grade 11 - Measurement</i></b>										
	Number of Districts		Number of Students		Level 1 (Low)		Level 2		Level 3 (High)	
	2002	2003	2002	2003	2002	2003	2002	2003	2002	2003
All Students Tested	1	2	-	67	-	11.9%	-	46.3%	-	41.8%
Male	1	2	-	35	-	17.1%	-	45.7%	-	37.1%
Female	1	2	-	32	-	6.3%	-	46.9%	-	46.9%
F/R lunch Elig	1	2	-	13	-	15.4%	-	69.2%	-	15.4%
Not F/R lunch Elig.	1	2	-	54	-	11.1%	-	40.7%	-	48.1%

Note: No data reported in 2002 because only one district chose this module.

**Mathematics *Grade 11* - Geometry**

	Number of Districts		Number of Students		Level 1 (Low)		Level 2		Level 3 (High)	
	2002	2003	2002	2003	2002	2003	2002	2003	2002	2003
All Students Tested	5	5	225	203	24.0%	19.7%	57.8%	51.2%	18.2%	29.1%
Male	5	5	113	105	23.0%	14.3%	57.5%	49.5%	19.5%	36.2%
Female	5	5	112	95	25.0%	25.3%	58.0%	52.6%	17.0%	22.1%
F/R lunch Elig	5	5	17	53	52.9%	26.4%	41.2%	49.1%	5.9%	24.5%
Not F/R lunch Elig.	5	5	208	150	21.6%	17.3%	59.1%	52.0%	19.2%	30.7%

**Mathematics *Grade 11* - Data Interpretation, Statistics & Probability**

	Number of Districts		Number of Students		Level 1 (Low)		Level 2		Level 3 (High)	
	2002	2003	2002	2003	2002	2003	2002	2003	2002	2003
All Students Tested	2	2	49	50	42.9%	16.0%	42.9%	46.0%	14.3%	38.0%
Male	2	2	24	25	33.3%	16.0%	45.8%	52.0%	20.8%	32.0%
Female	2	2	25	25	52.0%	16.0%	40.0%	40.0%	8.0%	44.0%
F/R lunch Elig	2	2	<10	19	-	21.1%	-	57.9%	-	21.1%
Not F/R lunch Elig.	2	2	43	31	41.9%	12.9%	41.9%	38.7%	16.3%	48.4%

**Mathematics *Grade 11* - Patterns, Functions & Algebra**

	Number of Districts		Number of Students		Level 1 (Low)		Level 2		Level 3 (High)	
	2002	2003	2002	2003	2002	2003	2002	2003	2002	2003
All Students Tested	7	9	378	354	27.8%	21.5%	47.4%	52.0%	24.9%	26.6%
Male	7	9	179	181	26.8%	17.1%	48.6%	54.1%	24.6%	28.7%
Female	7	9	198	173	28.8%	26.0%	46.0%	49.7%	25.3%	24.3%
F/R lunch Elig	7	9	54	61	38.9%	24.6%	46.3%	60.7%	14.8%	14.8%
Not F/R lunch Elig.	7	9	324	293	25.9%	20.8%	47.5%	50.2%	26.5%	29.0%

**Mathematics *Grade 11* - Solving Work-Related Math Problems**

	Number of Districts		Number of Students		Level 1 (Low)		Level 2		Level 3 (High)	
	2002	2003	2002	2003	2002	2003	2002	2003	2002	2003
All Students Tested	2	2	84	45	25.0%	11.1%	57.1%	68.9%	17.9%	20.0%
Male	2	2	31	22	32.3%	13.6%	54.8%	68.2%	12.9%	18.2%
Female	2	2	53	23	20.8%	8.7%	58.5%	69.6%	20.8%	21.7%
F/R lunch Elig	2	2	23	13	30.4%	30.8%	47.8%	53.8%	21.7%	15.4%
Not F/R lunch Elig.	2	2	61	32	23.0%	3.1%	60.7%	75.0%	16.4%	21.9%