ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEM REVIEW PANEL
Legislative Services Agency
200 West Washington Street, Suite 301
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204-2789
Tel: (317) 233-0696 Fax: (317) 232-2554

MEETING MINUTES

Meeting Date: October 18, 2013
Meeting Time: 9:00 A.M.
Meeting Place: State House, 200 W. Washington St., Room 233
Meeting City: Indianapolis, Indiana
Meeting Number: 5

Members Present: Dr. Steve Yager, Co-Chairperson; Steve Baker; Melanie Park; Derek Redelman; Dr. Jim Snapp; Robert Lugo; Casandra McLeod; Claire Fiddian-Green; Dr. Shane Robbins; Sheila Seedhouse; Jessica Dunn Feeseer; Scott Bess; Keith Gambill; Cheryl Ramsey; Dr. E. Ric Frataccia; Michele Walker.

Members Absent: Superintendent Glenda Ritz, Co-Chairperson.

Co-Chairperson Yager called the meeting to order at 9:04 a.m. and called upon Irma Reinumagi, Legislative Services Agency, to explain the draft final report (Exhibit A).

Michele Walker, Director of Assessment, Department of Education (DoE), and John Wolf, Literacy Specialist, DoE, presented information on reading assessment options for measuring growth (Exhibits B and C), including the Indiana Literacy Frameworks, which are the current practices in the state. Under the Literacy Frameworks, Indiana administers
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only one summative assessment for determining reading proficiency, the IRead-3 test at the end of grade 3. The Panel discussed what the members would like to have included in reading assessments.

Deb Dailey, Assistant Director of Information Services, DoE, presented information for the Panel's review on options for frameworks and components of models (Exhibit D). The options were developed by DoE as examples of models based on the Panel's discussions in previous meetings. The Panel held considerable discussion on whether existing student data can be analyzed in a timely fashion to test the feasibility of the Panel's recommendations. The Panel discussed the following:

1. A model that included five components (performance, growth, indicators, college and career readiness, and graduation rates)
2. A model that included three components (performance, growth, and college and career readiness).
3. Variations of the models.
4. The existing accountability system.

Danielle Shockey, Deputy Superintendent, DoE, facilitated the Panel's afternoon discussion concerning accountability models. The Panel reached a consensus to have the accountability grading system based on a 100 point scale (the current system uses a four point scale), and to have different frameworks for elementary/middle grades and high school grades. The Panel discussed the following options for the high school framework:

1. A three component framework, with components of performance, growth, and college and career readiness (CCR).
2. A two component framework, with components of performance and growth.

Under the two component framework, performance indicators include reading, math, English/language arts, and the graduation rate, while growth indicators include reading, math, English/language arts, CCR, and the five-year graduation rate. After further discussion, the Panel began working with a modified model, which the Panel will discuss further at its next meeting.

Dr. Yager adjourned the meeting at 3:00 p.m.
FINAL REPORT

Accountability System Review Panel

I. INTRODUCTION

The Accountability System Review Panel (Panel) was created by a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) entered into by the Governor, the Speaker of the House, the President Pro Tempore of the Senate, and the State Superintendent of Public Instruction.

The MOU established the Panel to carry out the following duties:

1. Make recommendations regarding the A-F accountability system, including recommendations regarding measurements based on individual academic performance and growth to proficiency and avoiding recommendations based on measurement of student performance or growth compared with peers.

2. Consider a wide range of data in making its recommendations.

3. Examine other states' accountability system to look for innovative solutions.

4. Ensure the fairness of any recommended accountability system.


6. Exist until after the deadline for such report until December 31, 2013, for the purpose of receiving and investigating any clarifying questions posed by the State Board of Education, the Indiana Department of Education, the Governor, the House, or the Senate, unless otherwise extended or disbanded by the terms of the MOU.

Each signatory to the MOU appointed four members: one teacher, one principal, one superintendent, and one technical advisor. In addition, the State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Glenda Ritz, served as a member and Co-Chairperson. Dr. Steve Yager, Superintendent of Northwest Allen County Schools, served as the other Co-Chairperson.

II. SUMMARY OF WORK PROGRAM

The Panel met seven times before November 1, 2013.

September 19, 2013: The Panel received information on the Indiana Open Door Law and the MOU. A historical perspective on Indiana's accountability system was presented, as well as information concerning federal and state legal requirements for
accountability systems and Indiana's waiver from certain federal accountability requirements. The Panel began discussion concerning what elements the members would like to see included in a system as well as elements that the members would not like to include in a system, taking into account policy needs, development needs, and implementation.

**September 24, 2013:** The Panel began ranking the elements to be included in an accountability system. The Panel received information concerning the role of assessments in accountability systems, particularly in models that focus on growth to proficiency, which is required under Indiana statute. The Panel began examining three growth models of accountability: the gain, the categorical, and the trajectory, and discussed the components of each model, as well as what Indiana's model should include.

**October 4, 2013:** The Panel considered transition options for going from Indiana's current accountability system to a new system, and held considerable discussion of the gain, trajectory, categorical, and student growth percentile models, including considering other states' accountability systems. There was agreement that Indiana's model should look at a student's growth or lack of growth over the course of a year. A hybrid growth model, combining elements of the trajectory model and a criterion-referenced categorical model, was discussed.

**October 8, 2013:** The Panel received and discussed information concerning the current high school achievement model, and information on multiple measures of achievement. Several members of the Panel expressed concerns with the penalty aspects of the current high school model. It considered student data currently collected in Indiana that could be used as measures of achievement, as well as data could potentially be collected. The Panel received worksheets for developing an accountability framework to determine performance indicators and the weight to be given to specific indicators, and looked at models developed by Panel members based upon discussions held at the previous meetings.

**October 18, 2013:**

**October 24, 2013:**

**October 28, 2013:**

**III. ACCOUNTABILITY MODELS CONSIDERED**

The Panel considered the following accountability models in forming its recommendations:

**IV. PANEL RECOMMENDATIONS**
WITNESS LIST

Kirstie Andersen, Office of Legal Affairs, Indiana Department of Education

Wes Bruce, Chief Assessment and Accountability Officer, Indiana Department of Education

Jeff Coyne, Director of Federal Relations, Indiana Department of Education

Debbie Dailey, Assistant Director of Information Services, Indiana Department of Education

Amy Horton, Assistant Superintendent of Student Achievement and Improvement, Indiana Department of Education

Cindy Hurst, Title I Coordinator, Indiana Department of Education

Dan Scott, Goodwill Industries

Michele Walker, Director of Student Assessment, Indiana Department of Education
Current Practices in Indiana

Until all Indiana students acquire the sophisticated reading skills they need to be prepared for college and careers, reading must become and remain a high priority for every school.

The frameworks serve educators throughout the state and provide guidance for effective instruction.

- Indiana Birth-5 Reading Framework
- Indiana K-6 Reading Framework
- Indiana 6-12 Literacy Framework

Framework components include:
- Goals
- Instruction
- Assessment
- Professional development
- Leadership
- Commitment

Leadership Team
Comprehensive Core Program
Interventions
Assessment Plan and Goals

Parent/Guardian Communication
Professional Development
Remediation Structure
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Exhibit B
Each school should provide a comprehensive assessment system, including:
(a) screening measures to identify students at risk of failure,
(b) diagnostic assessments to identify specific deficiencies,
(c) progress-monitoring tools to determine if students are on track, and
(d) summative assessments to identify whether or not students have met grade-level expectations.

Formative
• Drives Instruction
• Informs Small Group Differentiation
• Identifies Intervention and Extension Needs

Summative
• Comprehensive measure of overall reading proficiency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Formative</th>
<th>Summative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Screening</td>
<td>Education Question: Is the student at risk of needing assistance?</td>
<td>Key Features: Brief prediction of reading outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress Monitoring</td>
<td>Continues to assess students at risk of needing assistance</td>
<td>Directly from the core program and district assessments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnostic Assessments</td>
<td>Do teachers need evidence of student growth?</td>
<td>Measures of student growth in specific segments of the curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interim Assessments</td>
<td>What instructional strategies need to be implemented?</td>
<td>Promotes in-depth instructional profiles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summative Evaluation</td>
<td>Is the student at grade level and meeting standards?</td>
<td>Comprehensive measure of overall reading proficiency and skill performance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reading Assessment Options for Accountability

• Exploring Reading Assessment
• Defining Reading Assessment
• Features / Considerations
• Exploring Accountability Options

• What do we want to measure in terms of reading?
• Assessment components vary
  • Accuracy
  • Fluency
  • Phonemic awareness
  • Phonics
  • Letter-sound knowledge
  • Developmental word knowledge
  • Vocabulary
  • Comprehension
  • Analysis of text
  • Reading interest

• Grade levels
  • K-12
  • Numerous combinations
    • K-2, K-3, K-6, K-8, 1-12, 2-10

• Modes
  • Online (general; computer adaptive)
  • Paper/pencil

• Frequency
  • Monthly
  • 2, 3, 4, or more times a year

• Administration
  • One-on-one
  • Small group
  • Whole group

• Purpose / types
  • Formative
  • Summative

• Content
  • Standards-based
  • Which standards?
  • Literacy components

• Scoring
  • Local vs. vendor
  • Hand vs. machine
  • Subjective vs. objective
- Results / Data
  - Criterion-referenced
    - Raw numbers (e.g., number of words per minute)
    - Diagnostic / benchmark
    - Instructional scores/information
    - Predictive
  - Norm-referenced
    - Percentiles (scores, rank)
    - Grade equivalency

- "Reading Assessments" chart contains 14 examples of reading assessment tools
  - 13 Formative
  - 1 Summative

- Examine features and considerations
  - Reflect on purpose/type, results
    - Formative vs. summative
    - Criterion-referenced vs. norm-referenced

- Determine feasibility of reading assessment in terms of accountability
  - Need a minimum of two data points in order to measure growth
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Name</th>
<th>Grade Level(s)</th>
<th>Summative/ Formative (SF)</th>
<th>What Does it Measure?</th>
<th>Mode Online or Paper/Pencil</th>
<th>Frequency of Administration</th>
<th>Administration (i.e. one-on-one (O-O), small/whole group (S/G))</th>
<th>Length of Administration</th>
<th>Result(s)/data Available (i.e. criterion-referenced, norm-referenced, benchmark, objective data)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Intervention Monitoring System (AIMS)</td>
<td>K-12</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Early literacy skills, reading, and language arts</td>
<td>PP</td>
<td>monthly</td>
<td>1-1, G; 10-15 min</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Criterion-referenced, growth norms available: Score based on assessment results in raw numbers. Task based. (Example: words read per minute)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accelerated Reader</td>
<td>K-12</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Reading comprehension</td>
<td>OL, N</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>G; varies</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Norm-referenced: Reports indicating Instructional Reading Level (IRL) using STAR Reading, Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD), percent fiction/nonfiction reading the student has done, quizzes passed, average ATOS book level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acuity (diagnostic and predictive)</td>
<td>3-8</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Vocabulary, structural features of text, comprehension and analysis of text, writing process and features, writing applications, language conventions</td>
<td>OL, N</td>
<td>Diagnostic: 4 times a year Predictive: 3 times a year</td>
<td>G, one class period</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Criterion-referenced: Diagnostic-achievement by academic standard Predictive-achievement by academic standard, expected student performance on the subsequent ISTEP+ or ECA test, Acuity scaled scores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degrees of Reading Power</td>
<td>1-12</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Student’s ability to read and understand increasingly complex text with focus on key ideas &amp; details, knowledge of vocabulary, and analysis of ideas developed within the text</td>
<td>OL, PP</td>
<td>twice a year-fall and spring</td>
<td>G, varies typically a single class period</td>
<td>PP-Y</td>
<td>Criterion-referenced and norm referenced results available: 3 diagnostic scores indicate the student’s comprehension of key ideas and details, knowledge of vocabulary, and analysis of ideas developed within the text. Also provides instructional and Independent DRP Scores.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Name</td>
<td>Grade</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental Reading Assessment</td>
<td>K-8</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>OL (iPad only)/PP</td>
<td>twice a year-fall and spring</td>
<td>mainly 1-1, G at higher levels; varies</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fountas &amp; Pinnell Benchmark Assessment System</td>
<td>K-8</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>PP</td>
<td>3 times a year (BOY, MOY, EOY)</td>
<td>1-1; varies</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IREAD K-2</td>
<td>K-2</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>PP</td>
<td>end-of-year</td>
<td>1-1 with some G; varies</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IREAD 3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>OL/PP, N</td>
<td>end-of-year</td>
<td>G, 72 min.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i-Ready</td>
<td>K-12</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>OL, Y</td>
<td>3-4 times a year</td>
<td>G; 45 min.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mCLASS: Reading 3D (DIBELS and TRC)</td>
<td>K-6</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>OL, Teacher enters student responses via device, software prompts next questions</td>
<td>3 times a year (BOY, MOY, EOY)</td>
<td>mainly 1-1, some G; varies</td>
<td>Teacher enters student responses via device; software generates scores/results</td>
<td>Criterion-referenced: Student benchmark score (Benchmark, Strategic, Intensive), ORF measure, Lexile range, approximate guided reading level, TRC measure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>Grade</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>Scoring</td>
<td>Results</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Next Step Guided Reading Assessment</strong></td>
<td>K-6</td>
<td>3 times a year</td>
<td>PP</td>
<td>1-1 and G; varies</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Northwest Evaluation Association</strong></td>
<td>2-10</td>
<td>up to 4 times a year</td>
<td>OL, Y</td>
<td>G; varies (about an hour)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scholastic Reading Inventory</strong></td>
<td>K-12</td>
<td>4 times a year</td>
<td>OL, Y</td>
<td>G; 20 min.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STAR Reading Enterprise</strong></td>
<td>1-12</td>
<td>3-5 times/year</td>
<td>OL, Y</td>
<td>G; 15 min</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Framework/Components

Options

- The following items have been identified by the panel to potentially be included in the new accountability model:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item / Description</th>
<th>Potential Variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item 1</td>
<td>Variable 1, Variable 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 2</td>
<td>Variable 3, Variable 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 3</td>
<td>Variable 5, Variable 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Using the elements selected through the work of the accountability panel, IDOE has created options for an accountability framework.

- The accountability panel should:
  - Select the framework of accountability to recommend the variables.
  - Select organization and grouping of elements.
  - Recommend guideline for the accountability system including weights and quality assurance measures.

- The State Board of Education will further evaluate the statistical impact of formulas using the defined variables during the rule making process.
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Exhibit D
Highlights:

- 5 Components
  - Performance
  - Growth
  - Indicators
  - College and Career Readiness
  - Graduation

- Elements weights applied to component score; component weights applied to overall score.
- Based on 100 point scale.
- Where applicable, points awarded are equal to calculated rate or score; example: ELA performance points equals ELA performance rate.
- Overall school points awarded for each component and each content area; previous accountability model does not provide an overall performance score for a content area.

Accountability Framework: Option A

- Performance
- Growth
- Indicators
- CCR
- Graduation

Indiana Department of Education
Accountability Framework Report
ABC School District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Overall Performance</th>
<th>CCR</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Graduation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College and Career Readiness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Highlights:

- 3 Components
  - Performance
  - Growth
  - College and Career Readiness

- Based on a 100-point scale.

- Elements weights applied to component score; component weights applied to overall score.

- Where applicable, points awarded are equal to calculated rate or score; example: ELA performance points equals ELA performance rate.

- Overall school points awarded for each Component and each content area; previous accountability model does not provide an overall performance score for a content area.
### Descriptions

*Current A-F Accountability models utilize a 0.0-4.00 point scale to establish categories A-F:*

- 3.51-4.00 points = A
- 3.00-3.50 points = B
- 2.00-2.99 points = C
- 1.00-1.99 points = D
- 0.00-0.99 points = F

*The Accountability Panel has discussed the use of a 0.0-100.0 point scale to establish categories A-F:*

- 90.00-100.00 points = A
- 80.00-89.99 points = B
- 70.00-79.99 points = C
- 60.00-69.99 points = D
- 0.00-59.99 points = F

**Question:**

- Which point scale does the Panel recommend using?
- Which point space does the Panel recommend to establish categories?

### Performance

- Performance Score
  - Pass Rate = Number of students passing test / Number of students taking test
  - Use pass rate as score

- Participation Score or Factor
  - Participation Rate = Number of students with valid test result / Number of students eligible to take test
  - Need: Determine use of participation rate as factor or score

- Categorial Improvement
  - Categorial Improvement Score = Average score of student categorial improvement
  - Need: Determine statistically valid cut scores for category sub divisions; create improvement chart to award points for category changes

### Indicators

- Performance Score
  - Pass Rate = Number of students passing test / Number of students taking test
  - Use pass rate as score

- Participation Score or Factor
  - Participation Rate = Number of students with valid test result / Number of students eligible to take test
  - Need: Determine use of participation rate as factor or score
Growth

Math and ELA Growth
• Assign points 0.00 to 100.00
• Need: Determine use of criterion growth score through statistical analysis; options include awarding points based on median growth score or using the percent of students with growth score greater than specified value as the growth score.

Reading Growth
• Assign points 0.00 to 100.00 as available
• Need: State testing to provide data necessary to calculate reading growth.

Math and ELA 8 to 10 Improvement
• Assign points 0.00 to 100.00
• Need: Establish method to award points

Math and ELA 10 to 12 Improvement
• Assign points 0.00 to 100.00
• Need: Establish method to award points; potentially use percent as score

College and Career Readiness

CCR Achievement
• Assign points 0.00 to 100.00
• Achievement Rate = Number of students receiving IC, IC, DC, or AP / Number of Graduates
• Need: Establish method to award points engaging the Commission for Higher Education

SAT/PSAT
• Assign points 0.00 to 100.00 as available
• Need: Establish method to award points engaging the Commission for Higher Education

Graduation

Four Year Graduation
• Rate = Number of four year graduates / Number of students in cohort
• Use four year rate for score

Five Year Graduation
• Rate = Number of five year graduates / Number of students in cohort
• Use four year rate for score
- Schools with no tested grades
- Small schools with student counts falling below minimum "n" size
- Options for new schools (open less than 4 years)
- Dropout recovery schools