Members

Superintendent Glenda Ritz, Co-Chairperson
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 Feeser
Scott Bess
Keith Gambill
Cheryl Ramsey
Dr. E. Ric Frataccia
Michele Walker

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

LSA Staff:

Irma Reinumagi, Attorney for the Panel
Allen Morford, Attorney for the Panel
Chuck Mayfield, Fiscal Analyst for the Panel
David Lusan, Fiscal Analyst for the Panel

Authority: Memorandum of Understanding issued by President Pro Tempore Long, Speaker Bosma, Governor Pence, and Superintendent Ritz

MEETING MINUTES[1]

Meeting Date:	**October 24, 2013**
Meeting Time:	**9:00 A.M.**
Meeting Place:	**State House, 200 W. Washington St., Room 233**
Meeting City:	**Indianapolis, Indiana**
Meeting Number:	**6**

Members Present: **Superintendent Glenda Ritz, Co-Chairperson; 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 Feeser; Scott Bess; Keith Gambill; Cheryl Ramsey; Dr. E. Ric Frataccia; Michele Walker.**

Members Absent: **None.**

Co-Chairperson Ritz called the meeting to order at 9:04 a.m., and explained that the goal for the meeting was to work through the elements of the accountability system selected by the Panel as well as to look at "guardrails" that ensure the fairness of the system and its elements. Mr. Lugo distributed and discussed a document that he had developed using the elements of the system the Panel had discussed at the October 18 meeting and actual data from a K-4 elementary school (Exhibit A).

---

[1] These minutes, exhibits, and other materials referenced in the minutes can be viewed electronically at http://www.in.gov/legislative Hard copies can be obtained in the Legislative Information Center in Room 230 of the State House in Indianapolis, Indiana. Requests for hard copies may be mailed to the Legislative Information Center, Legislative Services Agency, West Washington Street, Indianapolis, IN 46204-2789. A fee of $0.15 per page and mailing costs will be charged for hard copies.

Danielle Shockey, Deputy Superintendent, Department of Education (DoE), presented information concerning decisions the Panel has already made and questions that remain to be answered (Exhibit B). Deb Dailey, Assistant Director of Information Technology, DoE, presented information for the Panel to consider in making decisions (Exhibit C).

Question 1 - What indicators need to be added or altered to fulfill the requirements of HEA 1427-2013 for growth to proficiency? The Panel reached a consensus that a trajectory component be added to the growth portion of the system.

Question 2 - Should a categorical score for performance be an additional data point under the domain of performance? The Panel reached a consensus that a categorical score should not be included in the performance portion of the system.

Question 3 - If categorical improvement in growth in high school is chosen, does it replace improvement for grades 8 through 10? The Panel reached a consensus that categorical improvement in growth in high school should be a part of the final system, but the current use of improvement for grades 8 through 10 should be continued until new assessments that support the final system are in place.

Question 4 - Is there a need to establish a method to award points for growth in the number of students passing exams in grades 10 through 12? The Panel reached a consensus that the current determination of improvement for grades 10 through 12 should be used until new assessments are adopted, after which improvement between the grade in which the assessment is administered and grade 12 should be rewarded.

Question 5 - Is there a need to establish a method to award points for the percentage of students attaining College and Career Readiness (CCR) indicators? The Panel reached a consensus that the current system of awarding points be transitioned through the use of a multiplier over the course of several years to a system in which the percentage of students who have attained a CCR indicator is used. For growth in CCR indicators, the increase in the number of students who have CCR indicators in grade 10 to the number of students who have CCR indicators in grade 12 should be used.

Question 6 - How will the system account for subgroup growth and performance, as required under federal law? Under the current federal waiver, for accountability purposes, Indiana reports data for two "super" subgroups of students - the top 75% and the bottom 25% - instead of data for ten subgroups of students. (Data for the ten subgroups are still reported for monitoring purposes.) The Panel reached a consensus to continue to use the two super subgroups as measures of growth as a categorical score.

Question 7 - How are the federally required Title I labels of "Reward", "Focus", and "Priority" to be aligned with Indiana's accountability categories? The Panel will consider this at its next meeting.

Question 8 - What weights should be assigned to the domains and indicators? On the question of weights for the domains of performance and growth: for the high school portion of the accountability system, the Panel reached a consensus of 70% performance and 30% growth.

At the next meeting, the Panel will continue discussing the questions that need to be addressed and review the final report. Co-Chairperson Ritz adjourned the meeting at 3:08

p.m.

ELA GROWTH 60% of Pie

Categorical

	FBP	DNP	AP	P-	PASS	PASS+	ADV
FBP	60	90	120	150	180	205	230
DNP	40	70	100	130	160	185	210
AP	20	50	80	110	140	165	190
P-	0	30	60	90	120	145	170
Pass	0	10	40	70	100	125	150
pass+	0	0	20	70	80	105	130
ADV	0	0	0	50	60	85	110

ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEMS REVIEW PANEL
24 OCTOBER 2013
EXHIBIT A

For growth each student would receive a point total for the growth based on two year status. If the where Far Below Pass (FBP) and moved to Approaching Pass(AP) they would receive 120 points. All student receive points for growth. To determine the schools Grade for Growth All points would be added and then divided by the number of students. So a school with 77 students total number of growth points is: 7160 points divided by the number of students (77) equals 93 points

Math GROWTH 60% of Pie

Categorical

	FBP	DNP	AP	P-	PASS	PASS+	ADV
FBP	60	90	120	150	180	205	230
DNP	40	70	100	130	160	185	210
AP	20	50	80	110	140	165	190
P-	0	30	60	90	120	145	170
Pass	0	10	40	70	100	125	150
pass+	0	0	20	70	80	105	130
ADV	0	0	0	50	60	85	110

For growth each student would receive a point total for the growth based on two year status. If the where Far Below Pass (FBP) and moved to Approaching Pass(AP) they would receive 120 points. All student receive points for growth. To determine the schools Grade for Growth All points would be added and then divided by the number of students. So a school with 77 (4th grade only growth) students total number of growth points is: 7060 points divided by the number of students (77) equals 91.7 points

91.7

Elementary and Middle School Growth Model

Math Proficiency 40% of the pie

Trajectory-could use current indiana model according to

Decided by: # of students who are p- or above and "ON TRACK" . Plus Number of students moving towards proficeincy. (3 Year attainment) Would be considered proficeint. (DEREK Redleman's (Colorado)Model). So 166 total students 152 P- or above 137 = number of those on track. For those below pass- "On track" would count = 9 This equals 88% which is a 88 points towards group weighting

Group Weighting also within this part of the pie:					
Group	#o of student	Index score	Weight	Points	
All Students	166	88	1	62	
African American	55	83	0	8	
Hispanic	20	92	0	9	
SES	103	85	0	8	
Disabilities	9	59			
Asian	3	10			
LEP	10	56			
				88	**B**

For each of the federal subgroups 30% of the score is accounted for equally for any group with 20 or more students. So in the above situation 3 subgroups count which equals 10%.

	Category	Points
Math	**Growth =**	**92**
Math	**Proficeincy**	**88**

IMAGINING the possibilities. MAKING THEM HAPPEN.

Indiana Department of Education

Glenda Ritz, NBCT
Indiana Superintendent of Public Instruction

Decisions to Date

Decision on Values of Panel

↓

Decision of What was Preferred as Growth Options based on work in 50 States

↓

Decision to Narrow to Categorical and Trajectory

↓

Decision to not add Domain of Multiple Measures

↓

Decision to build model based on Categorical*

Decision made to eliminate the top 75% and bottom 25% indicators

↓

Decision to use a 100 Point Model

↓

Decision to indicate Importance of Reading Achievement and Growth as Future Data Point

↓

Decision to put CCR indicators under the domains of Growth and Performance

↓

Decision to indicate a model that could have data points at all grade levels in the future

ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEMS REVEW PANEL
24 OCTOBER 2013
EXHIBT B

Decision that Science would not be an Indicator

Decision to add PSAT as an element of CCR

Decision to not have as a stand alone indicator the combined ELA/Math

IMAGINING the possibilities. MAKING THEM HAPPEN.

Indiana Department of Education

Glenda Ritz, NBCT
Indiana Superintendent of Public Instruction

Decisions for Today

1. What indicator needs to be added/altered to fulfill requirement of 1427 for growth to proficient?*
2. Should a categorical score for performance be an additional data point under domain of performance?*
3. If we chose categorical improvement in growth in HS, does that replace improvement from 8th-10th?

Model Decisions Today

4. Need to establish a method to award points for 10th to 12th grade growth?

5. Need to establish points for CCR indicators*

Model Decisions Today

6. Need to determine how model accounts for subgroup growth and performance. (Federal Requirement)*

7. Decide on category alignment to Title I federally required labels of Reward, Focus and Priority*

Model Decisions Today

8. Weights for all domains and indicators*

Additional...

- How to handle school with unique situations?
  - configurations with no tested grades?
  - small schools- counts below 'N' size
  - options for new schools
  - dropout recovery schools
  - other

Purpose: Recommendations to the State Board of Education that would provide guidance during the beta testing period. Quality guardrails will be used as a measuring stick for recommended model. Intent is that beta testing will be done along side current model and congruent to rule making to allow for adjustments in the recommended model elements when something may "JDLR (just doesn't look right)." These would be shared with outside experts in accountability model design so as they work with IDOE to build the model specifications they understand the intent.

Examples:

- "If a school has less than ____ % of achievement than they shall not have a grade greater than___"
- "No more than ____% of the schools in the state may fall into same grade band"
- If schools that have historically been an ____ suddenly fall to ____.

IMAGINING the possibilities. MAKING THEM HAPPEN.

Indiana Department of Education

Glenda Ritz, NBCT
Indiana Superintendent of Public Instruction

What Next?

1. Details will be added to meeting summaries, including appendices with related materials

2. Recommendation will be articulated in one summary document

3. Then following summary-technical descriptions will be outlined for all domain and indicator areas

-Next Meeting all this will be shared with Panel

-Final Consensus Decision

-Recommendation to SBOE on November 6th

Indiana Department of Education

2014-15 Accountability Report Card

ABC School of Indiana (1234)

Component	Grades 01-08					Grades 09 - 12					Overall		
Performance	#1 & #2					#1 & #2							
	Pass Rate	Participation Rate	Categorical Score	Points	Enrollment Ratio	Pass Rate	Participation Rate	Categorical Score	Points	Enrollment Ratio	Points	Weighting	Final Points
English/Language Arts													
Math													
Reading													
CCR Achievement (IC,IB,DC,AP,PSAT)* #4													
Graduation #4													
											Total Performance Points:	**0.000**	**0.000**
Growth	#1	#2				#3	#4						
	Categorical Improvement Score			Points	Enrollment Ratio	Improvement Grade 08 to Grade 10	Improvement Grade 10 to Grade 12	Categorical Improvement Score**	Points	Enrollment Ratio	Points	Weighting	Final Points
English/Language Arts													
Math													
Reading													
CCR Achievement (IC,IB,DC,AP,PSAT)*													
Graduation													
											Total Growth Points:	**0.000**	**0.000**

#5 Outside of this Visual

Performance:			
Growth:			

Overall Points: **0.000**

Overall Grade: **A**

Categorical Status Imporvement Distribution

PRYR_IMP_STAT	CUR_IMP_STAT	Count_Students
DNP1	DNP1	33
DNP1	DNP2	73
DNP1	DNP3	40
DNP1	P1	***
DNP1	P2	***
DNP2	DNP1	98
DNP2	DNP2	828
DNP2	DNP3	1501
DNP2	P1	54
DNP2	P2	***
DNP3	DNP1	79
DNP3	DNP2	2515
DNP3	DNP3	46473
DNP3	P1	18563
DNP3	P2	2258
DNP3	PP1	131
P1	DNP1	10
P1	DNP2	166
P1	DNP3	26709
P1	P1	64136
P1	P2	26899
P1	PP1	3123
P1	PP2	45
P2	DNP2	10
P2	DNP3	3339
P2	P1	32891
P2	P2	58927
P2	PP1	24478
P2	PP2	840
P2	PP3	40
PP1	DNP3	171
PP1	P1	3753
PP1	P2	22805
PP1	PP1	33894
PP1	PP2	3824
PP1	PP3	445
PP2	P1	29
PP2	P2	720
PP2	PP1	3576
PP2	PP2	810
PP2	PP3	154
PP3	P2	58
PP3	PP1	566
PP3	PP2	184
PP3	PP3	51

Point Distribution

Improvement Points Awarded	Student Count
55	10
60	10
65	250
70	195
75	3495
80	6268
85	27462
90	34285
95	69278
100	67785
105	60612
110	52457
115	27749
120	24583
125	6082
130	3278
135	844
140	576
145	46
150	40

ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEMS REVIEW PANEL
24 OCTOBER 2013
EXHIBIT C

Status Improvement Value Table								
	Current Year Level							
Previous Year Level	Did Not Pass-1	Did Not Pass-2	Did Not Pass-3	Pass-1	Pass-2	Pass Plus-1	Pass Plus-2	Pass Plus-3
Pass Plus-3	15	30	45	60	75	90	105	
Pass Plus-2	25	40	55	70	85	100		130
Pass Plus -1	35	50	65	80	95		125	140
Pass-2	45	60	75	90		120	135	150
Pass-1	55	70	85		115	130	145	160
Did Not Pass-3	65	80		110	125	140	155	170
Did Not Pass-2	75		105	120	135	150	165	180
Did Not Pass-1		100	115	130	145	160	175	190

Accountability Panel:
College and Career Readiness Data Review

Current Model with 2012 Breakdown

Rate	Point	Count of Schools	Percent of Schools
25.0%-100%	4	316	73.15%
18.4% - 24.9%	3	33	7.64%
11.7%-18.3%	2	31	7.18%
5.0%-11.6%	1	23	5.32%
0%-4.9%	0	29	6.71%

Current CCR Data Without PSAT

RATE_RANGE	Count of Schools in Range	Percent of Schools	
95-100%	5	1.16%	
90-94.9%	3	0.69%	
85-89.9%	5	1.16%	
80-84.9%	2	0.46%	
75-79.9%	10	2.31%	
70.0-74.9%	12	2.78%	
65-69.9%	17	3.94%	
60.0-64.9%	24	5.56%	
55-59.9%	24	5.56%	
0-54.9%	36	8.33%	
45-49.9%	30	6.94%	
40-44.9%	39	9.03%	
35-39.9%	40	9.26%	
30-34.9%	48	11.11%	
25-29.9%	21	4.86%	
20-24.9%	27	6.25%	***25% Goal***
15-19.9%	26	6.02%	
10-14.9%	13	3.01%	
5-9.9%	21	4.86%	
0-4.9%	29	6.71%	

Projected CCR Data With PSAT

RATE_RANGE	Count of Schools in Range	Percent of Schools
95-100%	6	1.44%
90-94.9%	4	0.96%
85-89.9%	1	0.24%
80-84.9%	8	1.91%
75-79.9%	12	2.87%
70.0-74.9%	21	5.02%
65-69.9%	23	5.50%
60.0-64.9%	33	7.89%
55-59.9%	24	5.74%
50-54.9%	42	10.05%
45-49.9%	41	9.81%
40-44.9%	39	9.33%
35-39.9%	36	8.61%
30-34.9%	36	8.61%
25-29.9%	19	4.55%
20-24.9%	18	4.31%
15-19.9%	18	4.31%
10-14.9%	11	2.63%
5-9.9%	13	3.11%
0-4.9%	13	3.11%

Define goal for CCR in new model.
Possibly use rate as points value.

Indiana Department of Education

2014-15 Accountability Report Card

ABC School of Indiana (1234)

Component	Grades 01-08				Grades 09 - 12					Overall		
Performance												
	Pass Rate	Participation Rate	Points	Enrollment Ratio	Pass Rate	Participation Rate		Points	Enrollment Ratio	Points	Weighting	Final Points
English/Language Arts												
Math												
Reading												
CCR Achievement (IC,IB,DC,AP,PSAT)*												
Graduation												
									Total Performance Points:		0.000	0.000
Growth												
	Categorical Improvement Score**	Growth to Proficiency	Points	Enrollment Ratio	Improvement Grade 08 to Grade 10*	Improvement Grade 10 to Grade 12*	Categorical Improvement Score	Points	Enrollment Ratio	Points	Weighting	Final Points
English/Language Arts												
Math												
Reading												
CCR Achievement (IC,IB,DC,AP,PSAT)												
Graduation												

*Retain during transition

Total Growth Points:		0.000	0.000
Performance:			
Growth:			
Overall Points:			0.000
Overall Grade:			A