



## NEW HAMPSHIRE ACCOUNTABILITY TASK FORCE MEETING

**TUESDAY, MAY 11, 2010, 1:00 PM – 4:00 PM**  
**NH DOE, CONCORD, BOARD ROOM**

**Next Meeting: Friday, June 4, 2010, 9 am – 12 pm**

### **Present:**

**District Reps:** Patrick Connors (Epsom); Kathy Stavanger, SNHU; Heather Cummings (Governor Wentworth); Chris Demers (Concord); Donna Crook (Manchester);

**NH DOE:** Deb Wiswell, Ken Relihan, Merry Fortier, Susan Randall, Keith Burke

**Center for Assessment:** Scott Marion

**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 presentation to the committee of the Legislature.
  - Input system*** –NH DOE IT are now loading the input system for a preview after this meeting; recognize the need for offering different levels of access – school, department, superintendent levels; if all goes well, schools will have all summer to load their information before Sept. 2010;
  - TO DO:*** information for distribution when the system is launched
  - Meeting with the Legislature, April 20*** – progress on the performance system; joint session with House and Senate (last minute conflict with Senate committee – met with Senate Ed. On 5/4); not as much time for the meeting as desired; ppt posted on website; good questions raised about the types of measures used, whether the Dept. will provide student-level data; expressed support for the two level structure of the Performance Based components, with level 2 being locally define objectives and targets; Deb provided the handouts shared with the legislators.
2. **Today’s Agenda:** make decisions about the use of growth percentiles to recommend to the Commissioner’s Task Force as they develop the adequacy accountability system.
3. **Growth Percentiles:** Scott began discussion of the growth models with a question: Complete the definition – A student growth percentile is a measure of . . .
  - rank order of students who score the same historically
  - comparative growth of academic peers (i.e., can find more academic peers with more years of data; limited # peers with only one year’s data)

- students who have followed a similar achievement course
- using NECAP scores for math and reading
- descriptive of student academic history

Q – what about high school growth?

Not ready yet because of limited data; examining some options for looking at high school students' assessment history; it will be important to see what insight this information offers

Response to question re: Slide 6 – “targeted assistance” – could mean money, resources, personnel

Review timeline:

- Input component starts this year (2010);
- Performance component becomes a requirement 2011- 2012;
- Dept. is hoping to find time for software resources to allow schools to “play with” the performance system, including the SGP before it becomes required;

Q: what does the roll-out plan consist of? Making people “smart” about this will be critical; ideas for roll-out include webinars, attending the regional C-I-A meetings; Scott pointed out that Damian (Betebenner, Center for Assessment) is working on documentation under a grant;

IDEA/ SUGGESTION – For roll out, connect with the state RTI Task Force and other state initiatives; would benefit educators around the state to use similar terminology; definitely need to connect with P+ trainers.

**Comments:**

- “devil’s in the details” – what about subgroups? What about individual growth targets? What is the correlation between SGP and status scores? Concern is that students well below proficiency will have to make high “catch-up” growth to meet proficiency within the targeted time period; policy piece intersects with this fundamental difference in student performance; for example, if you have a long way to go and a short time to get there, will need to go “awfully fast” to make the target;
- Scott showed the Colorado “triangle” student performance projection to explain the high targets for students below proficient; NWEA benchmark assessments use a one year growth target, which leaves students who start out below proficient still below even though they meet their NWEA identified targets; in developing the SGP, developers chose not to use a one year target but to look at the ultimate goal of proficiency.
- revisit discussion of the chart comparing observed median SGP and target median SGP; it is reasonable to use this aggregated target for school accountability.
- cautions on potential mis-interpretation when using subgroups; this SGP model is “agnostic” on subgroups – data is collected and recorded by individual students; users can group the individuals by their own subgroups, e.g. language, ethnicity, disability, program participants, etc.

Q: What if we change the measure used to calculate the SGP (i.e., no more NECAP)? This system works through transitions because the system can identify academic peers no matter what the data source/ measure was/ is.

Q: Confused about setting a target at 3 years or end of 8<sup>th</sup> grade, or high school – how does that work? Scott used the triangle graph to show that the student grew at an acceptable rate by extending the arrow between gr 4 and gr 5 points and seeing that the projection (line) would show the student is over the proficient line. Growth for every student is captured for every year. Schools are credited with helping students meet their targets by projecting from existing performance.

**Discussion** of (a) individual targets and (b) aggregate targets: currently, AMO is aggregate target.  
 How much growth is good enough at the individual level?  
 How much growth is good enough at the aggregate level?

**Comment:**

- concern about mathematics in high school; currently 75% students are NOT proficient in mathematics; will anyone be judged adequate? Set aside mathematics for further discussion.
- FOR three year targets – sense of urgency; puts more pressure, encourages earlier intervention with greater likelihood the intervention will have a significant impact;
- AGAINST three year target – too high an expectation for newcomers to a school or to the country;

**Question for the group:** What should be set as the growth-based performance targets – proficient in / by (a) 3 years (b) end of high school; (c) end of eighth grade (Scott recommended replacing high school with eighth grade.)

**CONSENSUS:** Set the target as “on track” to be proficient in three years or by the eighth grade assessment (end of seventh grade), whichever comes first.”

*Q: do the quadrant boundaries (on the ‘bubble’ graphs) stay the same or change year to year?*

- No requirement that they stay constant; may need to/ choose to adjust after examining actual data because of changes in rates of student achievement gains/ losses;
- IDEA – divide the bubble graph into nine squares, those in the lowest leftmost will be most challenged, least successful
- IDEA – diagonal or parabolic dividers on the bubble graph to applaud growth but hold accountable for not meeting status proficiency
- bubble graph -- we could set standards for the graph for “index scores” (Y axis) and SGP (X axis); does it pass the ‘smell’ test -- i.e., does actual data confirm the results of the model when looking at real NH schools?
- recognize that the standards for growth targets will reflect the values of the standard setting group

As an example of a possible way to look across all indicators to reach an “adequacy” decision, Deb demonstrated a table with indicators in the left column and related “scores” on a 1-4 scale.

**Question for the Group:** should we use a Rubric or Bubble/ Quadrant view to report school performance?

**CONSENSUS:** Use the bubble/ quadrant descriptively to show the distribution of schools along the two dimensions.

Wrinkles to Consider:

- is there concern that high achieving schools will have low growth targets? CO allocated ‘points’ at different scales for those schools meeting proficiency and those below; provided some discrimination between high performers and struggling schools; allocated points to minimize the impact of “accident of birth”
- suppose use absolute: # S proficient, #S on track to be proficient; #S NOT on track? Would it be simpler to explain than a rubric?
- dilemma: anything less than 100% ‘on track’ (or proficient) would be a hard sell;

**Discussion** of “super subgroups” idea. Scott described the conversation and decisions made in Utah to capture students only once. Utah defined two major groups: those with any one classification along

current ethnic, poverty or disability groupings in one “super subgroup” and those without a classification in the other “super—subgroup.” Does that work in NH? What about high performing Asian students? What super subgroups make sense?

3. **Next Meeting:** Friday, June 4, 2010

**Action Items:**

1. Scott: create bubble chart for super subgroups for NH data.
2. All Task Force members consider what materials will be needed to explain SGP to various audiences. See for example the materials produced by MA and CO:

Massachusetts Growth Model Resources, Guidance --  
<http://www.doe.mass.edu/mcas/growth/>

URL for Colorado Growth Website = [www.schoolview.org](http://www.schoolview.org) \*\*