



**Commissioner's Task Force to Develop a Performance-Based
School Accountability System
September 21, 2010, 9:00 am – 12:00 pm, State Board Room**

**NEXT MEETING: Thursday, October 14, 8:30 am – 12 pm
Joint with AYP Task Force,**

Attending:

X	Virginia Barry, Ph.D.	Commissioner of Education
X	Brian Cochrane	Director of Assessment and Accountability Nashua School District
	Paul Couture	Principal, Stevens High School, Claremont
X	Jerome Frew	Superintendent, Kearsarge Regional School District
	Molly Kelly	Chair, Education Committee, NH Senate
	Daphne Kenyon	NH State Board of Education
X	Paul Leather	Director, Division of Adult Learning, NH Department of Education
X	Scott Marion	National Center for the Improvement of Educational Assessment, Dover
	Deborah McNeish	Principal, Conant/Rumford School, Concord, NH
X	Judith Fillion	Director, Division of Program Support, NH Department of Education
X	Edward Murdough	Bureau of School Approval
X	Kathleen Murphy	Director, Division of Instruction, NH Department of Education
	Emma Rous	Chair, Education Committee, NH House of Representatives
X	Vincent Spiotti	Bethlehem School Board, Bethlehem, NH
X	Franklin Gould	NH House of Representatives, Lebanon, NH
X	Deborah Wiswell	Bureau of Accountability, Curriculum and School Improvement, Division of Instruction, NH Department of Education

Guests

Dean Michener, Executive Director, NH School Boards Association
Damian Bettebenner, Center for Assessment
Karen Laba, Consultant, Committee Documentation

NOTES:**Meeting Objectives:**

- ◆ Examine sample scoring reports for representative high schools based on committee decisions to date
- ◆ Provide input on relative weighting of state defined indicators ("part 1" of performance based system)
- ◆ Revisit discussion of locally-defined indicators ("part 2" of performance based system)

1. Deb Wiswell welcomed the committee and reported those who will be absent from today's meeting. Deb McNeish, Concord, has resigned from the committee and a replacement for her will need to be recruited to ensure the inclusion of an elementary principal perspective.
2. Deb reviewed the agenda and meeting purposes, remarking that it is an ambitious agenda with much to be completed. Several meetings were held with Scott in preparation for today, and the complexity of the data and decisions continues to become more evident as the details are considered.

Deb reported on a "to do" item from last meeting on the reporting of ethnic groups particularly as it refers to Hispanic students: After examining state data, of the students identified as "Hispanic" about 2/3 are also included in the low socioeconomic status (SES) subgroup, leaving 1/3 not captured in that subgroup. The committee will need to consider how to address Hispanic students in the Performance Based system subgroups – whether to include as part of the "whole school" group, low SES group, or separately as an ethnic subgroup.

3. Deb distributed a sample layout for high school data across all performance based indicators selected by the committee to date.

Judy Fillion explained that the Department is now using new ways of identifying low SES students using data from the food stamp program to identify those *eligible but not participating* in free and reduced price lunch programs (FRPL) which is the current measure of poverty. This will become part of the standard data collection for upcoming years replacing the student FRPL applications which have been shown to be inaccurate measures of socioeconomic status.

"DRAFT SCORING SHEET" (handout) prepared by Deb Wiswell:

1. Sample schools selected to represent varied geography, size.
2. Rubrics for assigning points to schools.

Deb presented rubrics for

- reading, math, and science using INDEX scores
- reading, and math using percent proficient
- graduation rate using 2009 cohort ("*2008-2009 Graduation Rate. . .*" chart)
- dropout rate using modified cohort ("*2008-2009 Dropout Rate Based on Class of 2009 Cohort . .*")

Missing for now: Participation rate (3-2-1 points) data not available in time for today's meeting
Additional data shown on the chart: "improvement" = 1 bonus point for placing in the Top 20 when all schools ranked for improvement in achievement using index scores

Total column: maximum points = 30; sample schools range = 9 – 28 points

Discussion of proposed scoring:

- does this list pass the 'smell' test? Does it represent relative performance for the specific schools as evident from other sources?
- small schools may experience greater volatility in a one year cohort dropout rate since a change in one or two students out of 20 has a greater impact than when the graduating

- class/ cohort is 100 or more; would there be an option to produce a two year rate? (could be part 2 data)
- want to align the calculations for this system with those for reporting purposes in the state, so graduation and dropout rates will use the newest revised methods
 - in cases where few points earned for dropout/ graduation rates but more points for math and reading, does that represent an incentive to remove/ eliminate poor performing students? Could that be why lower dropout/ higher graduation rates are higher achieving? (this is the rationale behind the federal participation rate requirement)
 - the blank column on the Draft worksheet could be used to insert "points" earned based on locally developed indicators ("part 2"); placing those points alongside the points earned using the state-defined indicators creates an incentive for schools to include locally defined measures as part of the system (2 years of data; other assessments, etc)

To Be Decided:

What about schools without a cohort rate (some "new" schools or those without 4 years of data)?
 What about schools which have no dropouts but not enough data to calculate a cohort?
 What happens if a school does not have a "subgroup"? How will the max points adjust?

TO DO:

1. Deb will gather the participation data and add it to the sample.
 2. Deb, Scott and Karen will try a design that organizes the information clearly.
 3. Deb, Scott, and Lauren will gather subgroup data for the high schools
3. Scott began a review of elementary and middle school data. (ppt presentation)
- Review of decisions to date:
- subgroups = SWD, low SES, whole school, and All others
 - minimum "n" = 5
 - do other states report on such small "n" groups? E.g. ME = 25; VT = 40; MD = 5; on federally approved system;
- Discussion:
- this system is additive, so points earned across each subgroup add together, versus the federal system under NCLB, which leads to identification if do not meet any one of 36 categories;
 - in this system, the advantage of a low "n" is that schools are held accountable for all their students; states that use a high "n" allow schools to avoid accountability.
 - ELL inclusion still TBD; small subcommittee is assigned responsibility for bringing forward a recommendation
 - schools without 2 years of test data (K-1, K-2, K-3) are problematic; committee will likely require submission of "part 2" locally defined achievement measures
 - additional discussion of history of small schools reporting; do not have to use same system as AYP; can encourage broader view of assessment with these schools, building on what's already in use widely across these schools – for example Gates, NWEA, AIMS-Web;
 - is there a way to tie to teacher effectiveness?
 - with this system, it might provide an opportunity to pair up schools well versed in locally defined measures ("part 2") with those less well skilled to learn from one another
 - high school indicators as presented in the previous segment of the meeting
 - include reading, math, science, but not certain about writing
 - writing has less than 2 years of data because field testing items; will have enough data this year; changes genres each year so perhaps data from year to year isn't comparable
 - recommend using any data we have when it is available, amend the new data pieces become available

Scott reviewed the "bubble charts" for each of the subgroups across the state for reading --

- Reading performance whole school
- Reading performance SWD subgroup (only IEP)
- Reading performance Low SES subgroup (not ELL, not SWD)
- Reading performance "all other" subgroup (not ELL, not SWD, not SES)

Scott invited discussion of how to assign values (points) to a school based on its position on the bubble charts. One option is to make use of individual student SGP "targets" (target is defined as the rate of growth needed to attain or maintain proficiency within three years). SGP targets can be aggregated for a school, then compared with the median ACTUAL SGP for a school. (slides 6 and 7) Schools can be shown to either MEET their median growth target or NOT MEET the target.

This compensates for the fact that high performing schools will have relatively low SGP targets, since many of their students are at or above proficient, while low achieving schools have higher SGP targets in order for their students to attain proficiency within three years.

If growth target is low, it is relatively easy to achieve. It can be argued that the school should not receive high points / value for attaining an easy target. In contrast, if a school has a high growth target, they must work harder to approach, meet or exceed the target, which should merit more points in the performance-based system.

The Colorado solution was to vary the rubric points depending on whether the school MET or DID NOT MEET its median SGP growth target. (slide 11 – adapted from Colorado system):

To use this approach, examine two pieces of information:

- Question 1: did the school median SGO exceed the median target SGP? Simple yes/ no question
- If YES, find the OBSERVED (actual) median SGP for the school on the rubric chart to determine how many points a school earns for growth.

Examples:

School X observed (actual) median SGP is 45, target SGP is 35 = school EXCEEDS its target
 On the YES column, locate 45 in the GREEN zone , School X earns 3 rubric points toward adequacy determination.

School Y observed (actual) median SGP is 55; target SGP is 65 = school DOES NOT meet target SGP
 In the NO column, locate 55 in the NO column, school earns 3 points toward adequacy determination

YES	NO	POINTS
56-99	70-99	4
45-55	55-69	3
30-44	40-54	2
1-29	1-39	1

Schools can earn points toward adequacy for each of the three subgroups for each of the two subject areas:

	Reading	Math
All Others	1-4 points	1-4 points
Low socioeconomic status	1-4 points	1-4 points
Students with disabilities	1-4 points	1-4 points
Total Available Points	3 -12	3-12

Question: if small school doesn't have a subgroup, how does that get included? Scott recommended using average rubric score to get values on the same scale. Or look at the actual data for those schools without some subgroups and judge how to deal with that on an individual basis. Ed Murdough advised that it will only be of significance for those close to the cut score.

Discussion:

-- what about the range of disabilities within the larger classification of Students with Disabilities (SWD)? Are there cases where a district has clustered its most severely cognitively disabled students in one school to better provide services, which would 'penalize' that school? In contrast, many schools have larger percentages of their SWD who have specific learning disabilities and are more likely to attain higher achievement levels. Deb collected data for the special education population and learned that the most severe cognitive disabilities account for only 10% of the identified SWD; other categories account for 90% of the students classified as SWD. Since many of the severely impaired students are eligible for alternative assessment, there is not likely to be a dramatic impact of using the SWD classification as it is currently reported.

Scott showed a sample summary chart with all the data using this approach. The chart for ES and MS is complicated by the additional subgroups and subject areas included. Scott and Deb committed to working on an easier to read format for next meeting, using sample actual schools.

4. The Commissioner will prepare a letter to the legislature requesting an extension of the November report due date until January 2011.

Meeting concluded at 12:05 pm.

TO DO:

1. Scott will clean up the data for elementary and middle schools and prepare sample reports for selected schools.
2. Scott, Deb, and Karen will work on formatting a template to be easier to read, yet complete.
3. Karen will prepare discussion points for the locally defined indicators ('part 2') section of the performance based system.

Next Meetings:

**Thursday, October 14, 8:30 am – 12 pm,
Joint with AYP Task Force,
Monday, November 1, 9 am – 12 pm, Board Room
Monday, November 29, 9 am – 12 pm, Board Room
Thursday, December 16, 9 am – 12 pm, Board Room**