

and how to appeal, etc and expect to conclude planning during a joint meeting of Title I and School Improvement next week.

3. Deb mentioned a change in plans to convene NH teachers to review the “common core” standards when first public draft released. She just learned the next release will not be identified as public, but in fact will be a second “confidential” release for state review. Deb will notify those involved of date changes as needed.
4. Growth Percentiles: (see slides posted separately) Damian Betebenner, Center for Assessment, presented an extensive overview of the proposed “growth percentiles” model. Growth percentiles are defined as a description of how likely it is that a student’s current score is reasonable given the student’s past history. The percentile norm group is those students who have a similar performance trajectory (Colorado uses the term “academic peer group”).

Damian cautioned that growth percentiles do not connote “good” or “bad”; they only report how students performed relative to others like them. For example, a student could have a high growth percentile by doing better than his/her peers but if all members of the peer group are performing at low levels, still not reaching the “proficient” or other targets considered desirable.

In response to questions about the accuracy of the measure, Damian reiterated the importance of the need to be clear about the meaning of any measure, including growth percentiles, including communicating clearly what the measure says and doesn’t say. The precision of the measure should be matched to its use. For example, a yardstick is not a good tool to use for eye surgery, but sufficient for cutting carpet. The conception of validity says exactly that – a tool is called valid if it is suited to its use. Together with other data, growth percentiles are suitable to be used to make good judgments for many purposes, though imprecise.

Damian continued explaining that the starting point for a growth percentile is the student’s scaled score. The percentile is based on being statistically able to compare a student to peers who scored similarly in all previous years on the same assessment to develop a “percentile” rank for each student. Changes from year to year in a student’s growth percentile are not necessarily “good” or “bad.”

Damian demonstrated ways the interactive graphical representation of New Hampshire’s data could be useful. (ppt/ pdf document) Example: NH schools, grades 3 – 8 – the size of the school is shown by the size of the circle; color gradation shows the relative percentage of free reduced lunch students. Damian highlighted two schools in upper right quadrant (high growth, high achievement) -- ABC Central and XYZ Regional.

“Fifty percent of the 64 students assessed had a growth percentile above 84%.” Could this be idiosyncratic? Greater confidence at larger numbers, e.g., if 10 students show high growth percentile, more questions about confounding influences, but there is more confidence in the measure if there are greater than 50 students.

Damian reported results of several analyses he conducted to examine the strength of relationships between achievement and poverty when using growth percentile reporting. Sorting by poverty, growth measures don't eliminate gaps in achievement. Using traditional measures, correlation typically exists around -0.6 for achievement/ poverty. When looking at growth measures, the correlation between poverty and growth in achievement is around 0.2 or 0.15 – poverty and achievement are still linked, but less strongly, and slightly positive.

Discussion continued about the challenge of judging “good enough” when using growth percentiles. Policy makers would have to agree to the definition of the target – growth toward what – and timeframe for reaching the defined target.

Damian reported that their experience in CO and MA highlight the great challenge to communicate and educate users of the information on the most responsible interpretation of the data. In CO, the state prepared the model and principals piloted it for a year before presenting publicly. This timeline allowed developers to learn how to best frame communication for others, to avoid likely misinterpretations, mis-uses of the data. It remains an ongoing issue and challenge. (see Turning Data into Information slide)

Steve Bos asked how (or if) growth percentiles can be calculated for high schools. Damian explained that a number can be generated using grade 8 and grade 11 data, but that attribution of responsibility for the growth is “murky” at best, given the number of teachers or schools involved in a student's education over the three years between grade 8 and 11. (We may run data that we have just to see what it looks like)

Brief discussion of defining a target. Examples could include –

- all students reach proficiency by X date/ within three years
- all proficient students reach “proficient with distinction”
- individual targets (ie, for individual learning plans) could be problematic if set too low because they could demonstrate attainment of target by growth but remain far below desired goal

Deb Wiswell offered a hope that targets could/ would be set so that they reflect the positive work in NH as evidenced by the national assessments (NAEP).

Participants were advised to explore the Colorado materials at this website:

*** URL for Colorado Growth Website = www.schoolview.org **

5. **Next Meeting: Monday, March 1, 1 – 4 pm in Room 15**

ACTION ITEMS:

1. Damian and Scott: Run NH data as if it were last year; what would look different?
2. Damian and Scott: Examine data if set target at “proficient within three years.”
3. Future meeting agenda item – examine possibilities and challenges of looking at growth gaps; for example, special education, performance levels, gender (?)
5. Deb W will review Damien's data set and decide where and how to distribute to invite comments on whether growth percentile data “makes sense.”