NEW HAMPSHIRE ACCOUNTABILITY TASK FORCE MEETING

THURSDAY, JULY 29, 2010, 9:00 AM - NOON
NH DOE, CONCORD, ROOM 15

Next Meetings:
Tuesday, September 28, 2010, 9 am – 12 pm; Thursday, October 14 , 1-4 PM

Present:
District Reps: Patrick Connors (Epsom); Kathy Stavanger, SNHU; Donna Crook (Manchester); Brian Cochrane, (Nashua)

NH DOE: Deb Wiswell, Merry Fortier, Mary Lane, Tim Kurtz , Ellie Riel

Center for Assessment: Scott Marion

NOTES

1. Deb convened the meeting at 9:10. Karen Laba is now working as a self-employed consultant. She will continue to assist the Task Force with meetings and preparing documents that will go before the legislature for approval. Deb also provided updates on the "input" component of the adequacy accountability system and the "practice" standard setting held in the DOE.

Adequacy surveys are coming in with very few "glitches". The larger task remains: who will help review the responses to the accountability standards?

Merry Fortier, Marcia McCaffrey, Tim Kurtz, Deb and Scott used whole school data to determine if the designations, or positions on the SGP chart were valid. Everyone agreed that they seemed to be. The discussion then moved to how do we set the cut scores for what is "good enough" or adequate. Some possible ideas will be shared later in the agenda.

2. **Today's Agenda:** make decisions and recommendations about the use of student growth percentiles (SGP) and subgroup definitions to the Commissioner's Task Force as they develop the adequacy accountability system.

August 10 is the date of the next Commissioner's Task Force meeting.

3. Overview of Key Policy Recommendations: see the attached PowerPoint presentation for details.

The group, for the most part understands the reason for the subgroups chosen: Special Education students (minus ELLs); Economically Disadvantaged Students (minus SPED and ELL); all others.

There was a discussion as to how to account for growth and status with regard to the ELL subgroup. Tim suggested taking ELL out for Reading but raised the question as to whether to take ELL out for Math.

Decision and To Do: Because of the stark contrast in characteristics of ELLs, a subcommittee was set up. Brian (Nashua), Tim, Donna (Manchester), and Scott (along with Susan Stepick and Susan Morgan if they are willing) will work on how to represent ELL performance and growth..

K-1 and K-2 schools, because they do not have any or at least not 2 years of assessment data could use (Level 2) to demonstrate performance using current local assessment data. Presently, to determine AYP status, these schools inherit the status of the schools that they feed into.

Decision: K-1 and K-2 schools should automatically use Level 2 (locally established goals and results) to demonstrate adequacy in performance.

Merry asked whether we could use a different word such as "system, method, etc." rather than "Level". Level 1 and 2 have already been used multiple times (NECAP Assessment Levels, in the SB180 legislation to describe the two part system, etc.)

Decision: Group agreed, and also committed to think about this and brainstorm some ideas.

Whether we use "index" or "%" proficient on the SGP graph is not on the agenda. However, Scott and Deb proposed that we use % proficient as the Y axis because it is cleaner and more easily understood. Index calculations are our current way to show growth, giving schools partial credit for students on their way to proficient.

Decision: Group agreed.

To think about: Since then, in running data, the thought is that maybe <u>for high schools</u> we keep using the Index for performance calculations because they are not eligible to use the Student Growth Percentile Model.

Discussion on SWD data:
The Student Growth Percentile display of the students with disabilities subgroup is skewed to the lower left more than any other group. When reviewing this data, would it make a difference if we disaggregated by disability since we know that this group of students includes a wide range of abilities and disabilities? Mary Lane with send us the breakdown of the SWD population in NH. What is the percentage of SWD that can and should be showing achievement and/or growth in this model?

Decision: More study needed so we can determine what is the value and range for the lower left quadrant that will identify performance that is so low it could not possibly argued that the opportunity for an adequate education was being provided.

Deb did a "rough" presentation of her chart/grid. There are four areas that designate a range of growth and achievement. This approach would use rubric scoring (1-4) instead of just a simple 'yes' or 'no'. Subgroups are Whole School, Educationally Disadvantaged (only), Economically Disadvantaged (only),All Others (not SPED, not SES, not ELL). Consider what range of score for each level; what is good enough? Or bad enough?. Lots of discussion.

Decision: Need to use same scoring rubric for all groups.

A new chart/grid was designed that more clearly illustrates where the school lies within the Student Growth Percentile chart that shows both achievement and growth. Deb and Scott will work on running two years of data using this new chart/grid to present to the group.

Other ideas:

- divide the bubble graph into nine squares, those in the lowest leftmost will be most challenged, least successful
- 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 using index scores or percent proficient (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? [initial practice on whole school data passed the test]
- 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. And recommend a rubric model for scoring.

Attached to these notes is a synopsis of the charting/graphing we experimented with. It includes a rough drawing and possible scoring values and scenarios such as:
Adequacy = total score of ____ with no single score below ___ or a minimum score.

Still to be determined: What is the performance (growth and achievement) that is so poor that we could not possibly say that the school is providing an opportunity for an adequate education?

One more question: Can a school be deemed "not providing the opportunity for adequacy" in one area but "yes" in all others?? (partial adequacy)??????

3. **Next Meetings**: Tuesday, September 28, 9-12, Room 15

Action Items:
1. Scott: create bubble chart for super subgroups using last two years of 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/