



NEW HAMPSHIRE ACCOUNTABILITY TASK FORCE MEETING

**MONDAY, MARCH 1, 2010, 1:00 PM – 4:00 PM
NH DOE, CONCORD, ROOM 15**

Next Meeting: Tuesday, March 16, 2010, 1 pm – 4 pm

Present:

District Reps: Patrick Connors (SAU 53); Chris Demers (Concord SD); Kathy Stavanger, SNHU; Chip McGee (Bedford); Lynn Carey (SAU 60)

NH DOE: Deb Wiswell, Ken Relihan, Merry Fortier, Marcia McCaffery, Susan Randall, Keith Burke; Sallie Fellows; Commissioner Virginia Barry; Paul Leather; Tim Kurtz; Kathleen Murphy; Ginny Clifford

Center for Assessment: Scott Marion, Damian Betebenner

New England Comprehensive Center (NECC): Karen Laba

NOTES

1. Deb convened the meeting at 1:10 pm. She provided updates on the “input” component of the adequacy accountability system, and the Commissioner’s Task Force.
 - Input system** – final proofing in progress; will go out to a sampling of elementary, middle and secondary schools by end of March for feedback; expected to go to all schools soon after for submission by end of June;
 - Commissioner’s Task Force (CTF)** – summary handout describing meetings, charge to the CTF; tasks completed to date toward the development of the performance based accountability system; Deb shared a summary of the CTFs struggle to incorporate performance measures that are valued by the local district and beyond test scores; CTF is waiting input on growth percentiles from this AYP Task Force
 - NH Accountability Web Site** – website updating is completed, so notes and materials from CTF and AYP task force meetings are available for public viewing;
2. Damian Betebenner presented the latest growth percentile results calculated on 08-09 data. Deb explained how, when examining the sample data set, whole school information (“bubbles”) show schools in NH doing very well – at the upper end of the vertical achievement scale. Damian pointed out that the location of the schools on the scale for any particular state can be high or low depending on the rigor of their standards. For example, in a state like CO where math standards are harder to reach than reading, the graphs for each subject would look very different. And even though NH math standards may seem harder to reach than reading, the two state graphs may look very different.

Chris Demers suggested the Task Force consider ways to present the information that encourages accurate interpretation: (a) remove the achievement terms (high, low); (b) DO NOT put a line at “50” since that doesn’t represent high achievement; instead (c) insert several horizontal lines for state average, maybe current AMO (state target). [later eliminated because we use an index system]

Keith agreed with Chris that *not* highlighting the line at “50” might help avoid mis-interpretation.

Damian answered questions about the meaning of the color and size keys, clarifying that the number of students presented in the graph really is the number of students for whom a student growth percentile (SGP) is available.

Damian reviewed the derivation of the growth percentile measure. In percentile terms, 50th is recalculated with each new set of data. Over time, the “raw score” that correlated with the 50th percentile in one year may not be the same “raw score” that matched 50th next year.

Much discussion of interpretation of the data, “telling the story” of the information. SGP can be an alert to possible problems but needs to be explored to see if the current point represents a change from previous years, in cases where a school claims “had a bad year.”

Tim posed a question to the group: what does it mean to have a “median SGP of 66”? He expressed his conviction that it is important that all can explain the measure for it to be a useful piece of information.

Discussion:

- suppose a straight scale rather than a percentile? Challenge in accurate interpretation occurs when one doesn’t know whether a measure that represents an ‘absolute’ change, such as ‘3 inches growth,’ is typical or not
- Scott reminded that a school / student can demonstrate high growth but still be achieving at below desired targets
- Central questions = what does a year’s growth mean? In Colorado, they decided after discussion that “year’s growth” means the typical change in a year. However, even if low achievers demonstrate a typical year’s growth, that still leaves them behind their peers. In addition, as targets increase from year to year, low achievers fall farther behind if they maintain only a “typical” year’s growth
- individual reports of SGP would display the cones/ triangles of probability suggesting where the child will end up if high, typical, or low growth ; the example on Damian’s slide shows that, on the Colorado example, an average performing child would have a high likelihood of falling below proficient if he/she only grows typically
- the definition of ‘proficient’ in the NECAP system is that students who are proficient can do the next grade-level work without additional intervention;
- data visualization gives reader lots of information with standards and targets already embedded in the final graphic; makes it powerful, but subject to misunderstanding.

Tim elaborated on the meaning of growth percentiles with an example – using the visual of a number line

Line up all students by score on a number line that goes from x00-x80– all those who scored 350 last year at one point on the line, those scoring 355, 360, 370, etc. would be in front of the 350s and those scoring below 350 would be behind; then, check where those students (the 350s) scored the following year; students who scored the same in the first year are the “norm group” for calculating the growth percentile for each student the subsequent year. So, the next year, students who scored 450 the following year could have a ‘high’ SGP if everyone else scored lower; that same individual would have a ‘low’ SGP if everyone in his/ her peer group scored higher than 450.

Discussion returned to the central question: How do we know how much growth is *enough*?

- ◆ SGP describes how a student's scores in comparison to peers;
- ◆ 'Good enough' requires State Depts./ policy makers to define the time frame and the 'destination' (i.e., achievement target)
- ◆ During the standard setting process (determining 'good enough'), data team usually conducts 'stress testing' to run the data and see how it works out, namely how many schools achieve proposed targets; it is important to establish realistic and ambitious goals but it requires lots of homework examining the data to make sure proposed goals make sense
- ◆

Damian presented a review of "catching up" and "keeping up" examples as described for Colorado.

Example 1: student is 'catching up' – first, know the SGP then decide if that's adequate; CO posed the question. "Is this growth sufficient to put them on track to reach proficient within 3 years?" High school example uses target score on ACT (i.e., 21) "Students will earn a score of 21 on the ACT." But for 3rd graders, high school targets like ACT are too far into the future to be a realistic or useful measure. Each year some progress needs to be made or the student will be too far behind so that it becomes impossible to make up. Example on the slide – student with SGP of 73 starts at a point just barely below proficient; the following year, the model projects that the student needs to grow at the 68th percentile the next year to stay proficient, and, based on historical data, the model suggests he/she needs to demonstrate growth at the 59th percentile to make proficiency the following year. This student would be judged to be on target to be proficient within three years' time.

Targets are typically established as students meeting proficiency. Damian offered the example of a "balloon payment" for a mortgage – the student must make sufficient gains each year and, in some state accountability plans, must demonstrate large gains during the later years to be considered proficient.

To be continued.....

3. **Next Meetings: Tuesday, March 16, 2010, 1 pm – 4 pm.**
Thursday, April 1, 2010, 9 am – 12 n.

Next meeting:

1. Scott will prepare graphics showing the NH scale in place of the Colorado progression.
2. Damian will produce samples of school data for last year and next year on the same grid.
3. Deb will provide copies of the MA Growth Percentile Interpretive Guide for review and links again to the Colorado sample site.

Massachusetts Growth Model Resources, Guidance --

<http://www.doe.mass.edu/mcas/growth/>

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