

TO: Indiana State Board of Education
FROM: Indiana Department of Education
RE: Growth to Proficiency Table Target Ranges
DATE: September 24, 2019

Pursuant to 511 IAC 6.2-10-2(a), growth domain points for the State accountability system shall be based on a growth to proficiency table as approved and published by the State Board of Education (Board).

In 2019, Indiana transitioned from the ISTEP assessment to the ILEARN assessment for grades 3 through, which resulted in the resetting of performance standards to align with college and career readiness. This reset of performance standards led to a review of the growth to proficiency table used for State accountability purposes to ensure the target ranges used to indicate the type of movement made by each individual student were valid and reliable, and aligned with the new ILEARN assessment.

The Indiana Department of Education (Department) worked with Dr. Damian Betebenner, who provided suggested amendments to the growth to proficiency table in response to the transition to ILEARN and its new performance standards. The Department recommends the Board adopt the target ranges outlined in the attached memo to be part of the official growth to proficiency table beginning with accountability determinations for the 2018-2019 school year.

Indiana Target Range Discovery for 2019

Damian W. Betebenner

The National Center for the Improvement of Educational Assessment
Dover, New Hampshire

September 23, 2019

Background

In 2019, Indiana transitioned from the ISTEP assessment to the ILEARN assessment in grades 3 to 8 in ELA and Mathematics. The transition involved the resetting of performance standards. Indiana currently uses a points based growth-to-standard methodology for its growth model. Because the growth-to-standard model utilizes the performance standards underlying the assessment, a recalibration is required to ensure that student growth (i.e., the growth target ranges) are appropriately aligned with the new performance standards.

In 2018, Indiana had 3 achievement levels (Did Not Pass, Pass, and Pass Plus). In 2019, Indiana adopted 4 achievement levels (Below Proficiency, Approaching Proficiency, At Proficiency, Above Proficiency). Growth to standard target ranges are calibrated based upon a subdivision of the starting achievement level of the student. The 3 achievement levels previously used by Indiana were subdivided into 8 achievement levels (Did Not Pass 1, 2, 3; Pass 1, 2, 3; Pass Plus 1, 2) for purposes of defining growth target ranges. The target ranges were calibrated to support and reward growth leading to increases with respect to Indiana's performance levels. Because Indiana has adopted new performance levels, those performance levels were subdivided into 8 achievement levels (as was done previously) to investigate new target ranges.

Analyses

Aggregate SGP summaries were calculated based upon the movement between the 8 subdivided achievement levels between 2018 and 2019. In general, growth spanning a transition of 2 or more achievement levels is highly unlikely. The vast majority of students remain within the same achievement level or move to an adjacent one (either up or down). To that end, the associated excel spreadsheet provides mean/median growth statistics associated with one or less achievement level transitions in ELA and Mathematics from 2018 to 2019. In general, due to the slightly more rigorous performance standards in 2019, growth to standard targets are slightly higher than in previous years.

Based upon an examination of the growth results, attached is a proposed set of target ranges for 2019.

Based upon these target ranges, correlations between prior achievement and points by school are: 0.37 for ELA and 0.31 for Mathematics. The correlations are consistent with what was observed last year.

It is recommended that Indiana look at the distribution of school scores to ensure that the distribution is aligned with current policy priorities. The distribution can be shifted by changing the points associated with the different target ranges. Moreover, if the proportion of points between the

| Initial Achievement level | Low Growth | Moderate Growth | High Growth |
|---------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| DID NOT PASS 1 | 0 to 30 (0 points) | 31 to 59 (75 points) | 60 to 99 (175 points) |
| DID NOT PASS 2 | 0 to 30 (0 points) | 31 to 59 (75 points) | 60 to 99 (175 points) |
| DID NOT PASS 3 | 0 to 35 (0 points) | 36 to 59 (75 points) | 60 to 99 (175 points) |
| PASS 1 | 0 to 45 (50 points) | 46 to 65 (100 points) | 66 to 99 (150 points) |
| PASS 2 | 0 to 45 (50 points) | 46 to 65 (100 points) | 66 to 99 (150 points) |
| PASS 3 | 0 to 45 (50 points) | 46 to 65 (100 points) | 66 to 99 (150 points) |
| PASS PLUS 1 | 0 to 45 (50 points) | 46 to 64 (100 points) | 65 to 99 (150 points) |
| PASS PLUS 2 | 0 to 45 (50 points) | 46 to 64 (100 points) | 65 to 99 (150 points) |

Table 1: Proposed targets ranges (and number of points) by initial achievement level for 2019

levels within and achievement level remains consistent, the correlations just reported will remain the same.