



# **INDIANA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION**

---

## **A-F Growth to Proficiency Table**

### **Summary of Comments**

April 15, 2016

Cynthia Roach, Senior Director of Accountability and Assessment

Maggie Paino, Director of Accountability

# Overview of Comments

- ▶ Total comments received: 172

- ▶ Types of comments:

- ▶ Award 100 pts for all Typical/Standard movement students (63)

*Response: This option was rejected during the March SBOE meeting.*

- ▶ Complaints about the model, accountability, or assessments in general (30)

*Response: These comments did not provide any useful suggestions.*

- ▶ Clarification questions on how model works (20)

*Response: IDOE posted clarifying information to their Learning Connections List Serve.*

# Overview of Comments

- ▶ Types of comments continued:

- ▶ Award points for DNP Low movement students (15)

*Response: Low movement students who are not passing (DNP), are moving further away from ever passing. Thus contradicts the requirement to produce a “growth to proficiency” model.*

- ▶ Specific changes to the overall A-F model (15)

*Response: The overall model was approved in 2015 and is not open for public comment at this time. However, these same suggestions should be shared again once we start updating the model to bring it into compliance with changes required through ESSA.*

# Overview of Comments

- ▶ Types of comments continued:

- These Comments Refer Specifically to SGPs*

- ▶ Ceiling effect for top performing students (13)

- Response: This is not possible and these comments indicate an area of confusion with how SGPs are calculated as well as an area of need for better communication.*

- ▶ Growth should be based on raw/scale score comparisons, not SGPs. Concerns about use of SGPs for growth (6).

- Response: Comparison of scale scores is not a valid way of determining student growth, as was identified in one of the Validity Studies. The use of SGPs is the most valid way to determine growth for students as was demonstrated by our national experts and approved by the SBOE when the initial model was approved.*

# Overview of Comments

- ▶ Types of Comments Continued:

*These Comments Refer Specifically to SGPs*

- ▶ “This method of determining student growth forces a comparison of students against each other, which is contrary to Indiana Code 20-31-8-5.4 prohibiting peer to peer comparisons.”

*Response: The growth to proficiency table was reviewed by legal staff and the Attorney General, and determined to be legal within the requirements of IC 20-31-8-5.4. In addition, SGPs are applied in a criterion manner to determine if the required growth target is met.*

# Overview of Comments

## ► Types of Comments Continued:

### *These Comments Refer Specifically to SGPs*

- “The proposed ranking creates inequitable opportunities for students to move up within the accountability table and does not adequately address the relationship between a student’s background and learning outcomes.”

*Response: The Indiana Growth to Standard Model utilizes observed growth, student growth percentiles, to award points to students demonstrating growth sufficient to put them on track to reach/maintain Passing status on the ISTEP+. Points awarded to each student for demonstrating growth are based upon their progress toward reaching/maintaining Passing status and not upon peer based comparisons. The table does not focus a comparison between students. Each student is compared to a range of growth scores that has been empirically determined to show whether a student is demonstrating Low, Standard or High Movement (corresponding to moving down, horizontally, or up with regard to Indiana’s performance levels). Target ranges for growth will be empirically determined annually. Because growth is to the states standard, all students can potentially demonstrate growth that moves them up. There is no forced comparison of students against each other. All student progress is judged relative to their growth to standard.*

# Overview of Comments

## ► Types of Comments Continued:

### *These Comments Refer Specifically to SGPs*

- “There is a minimum 6-year stabilization period that will follow the implementation of the new test to replace ISTEP+. During this time, the model, as it is presented, ensures a large number of *all* students will be placed in low growth categories leaving students, schools and districts with accountability ratings that are not reflective of the commitment of Indiana public educators and their students’ learning. At the same time, Indiana will also be coming into compliance with the new federal accountability system, Every Student Succeeds Act, which may cause additional confusion and instability.”

*Response: As already mentioned, target ranges are established empirically on an annual basis to ensure that students demonstrating sufficient growth to reach/maintain passing status are awarded points. The tables does not necessitate “a large number of all students will be placed in low growth categories”. The target ranges are set to reflect the growth necessary to move-up relative to the standards and if students in the state increasingly reach these outcomes, the accountability ratings will reflect that. The Accountability System Review Panel was very aware of the challenges associated with serving lower achieving students and took special care so that the value table would not mask those efforts.*

# Overview of Comments

## ▶ Type of Comments Continued:

- ▶ Students should receive at least 100 points for Pass or Pass+ low growth (2).

*Response: The Accountability Panel defined 100 points as students who are passing, and are staying on track by a year's growth. Prior year Pass or Pass+ students who are achieving low growth may not actually be passing the test this year, and are not "staying on track". We will be carefully tracking the Pass+ low growth students to ensure that we are not inappropriately penalizing these students when their growth may actually just be "normal".*

- ▶ Give additional points for "at risk" students (2)

*Response: No suggestions for how to do this were provided and the current chart does not include this type of breakout, Thus, how to accomplish this task would require a longer conversation and a change to the overall model, which is not possible at this time.*

# Overview of Comments

## ▶ Types of Comments Received Continued:

- ▶ No points should be awarded for any low movement (2)

*Response: By awarding no points to P and PP categories, the system penalizes students who may still be proficient but simply did not hit the same level of proficiency from the prior year. This would punish students who met expectations of achieving proficiency.*

- ▶ Award the same number of growth points regardless of prior year status (2)

*Response: This type of chart was reviewed and found to severely impact high poverty schools the most.*

# Overview of Comments

## ▶ Type of Comments Continued:

- ▶ Request that high growth be awarded the same number of points across categories (2)
  - ▶ “We are concerned that this model calls for giving more points for students who demonstrate high growth but still do not pass than it does for excelling students who make similar growth jumps. This unfairly penalizes high performing students and excessively caps them from greater recognition.”

*Response: The number of high growth points was raised to be the same for both Pass and Pass+ students and it now stands at 150 points, which is a great incentive. However, the DNP raised even higher to 175 points was to specifically incentivize the lowest performing students to passing, and aligns with one of the beliefs of the Accountability Panel. Additionally, the type of movement made by the DNP in high growth is a much bigger leap than those students with a prior year status of Pass or Pass Plus because these students had further to go.*

# Overview of Comments

## ▶ Types of Comments Continued:

- ▶ Low growth students should get the same number of points across categories (1).

*Response: How to accomplish this was not provided and could be translated into 0 points across categories, something that was considered and determined to be too detrimental, or 50 points across categories, which was addressed earlier.*

- ▶ Request to adjust the target ranges (1)

*Response: These are not policy decisions and are determined by reviewing the actual student data.*

- ▶ Like the proposed table as is (1)

*Response: Thank You! 😊*

# Additional Data Reviewed

## ► Demographic Growth Results

	ELA		Math	
Group	Avg Growth Score	Difference	Avg Growth Score	Difference
White	97.28	6.75	97.8	10.2
Black	90.53		87.6	
General Ed	98.4	15.78	97.68	9.33
Special Ed	82.63		88.35	
Paid	100.05	7.48	100.95	9.08
FRL	92.58		91.88	

## ► Demographic Performance Results

	E/LA		MATH	
GROUP	PROFICIENCY RATE	DIFFERENCE	PROFICIENCY RATE	DIFFERENCE
White	71.50	26	66.10	32.6
Black	45.50		35.50	
General Ed	73.10	45.2	65.70	36.4
Special Ed	27.90		29.30	
Paid	78.80	24.6	73.50	26.1
FRL	54.20		47.40	



# Additional Data Reviewed

- ▶ Comparison of Demographic Growth and Performance Grades

GROUP	E/LA		MATH	
	Grade for Growth	Grade for Performance	Grade for Growth	Grade for Performance
White	A	C	A	D
Black	A	F	B	F
General Ed	A	C	A	D
Special Ed	B	F	B	F
Paid	A	C	A	C
FRL	A	F	A	F

Questions?