



TO: Indiana State Board of Education
FROM: Indiana Department of Education; Center for Education and Career Innovation
RE: Accountability Panel Update
DATE: March 4, 2014

SUMMARY

The Accountability Panel convened February 27, 2013 to continue refining system recommendations. Team members from CECI and IDOE presented throughout the meeting. In addition, Dr. Damian Betebenner and Dr. Derek Briggs were in attendance to present information to the panel as well as participate in panel discussions.

Following are items discussed during the panel meeting:

- **Categorical Status Improvement.** CECI and IDOE generated and evaluated multiple data simulations. Data files and summary information for four viable options were prepared for the panel to review prior to the panel meeting. The options for Categorical Status Improvement were presented and discussed February 27th. These options were categorized by the primary focus of the categorical improvement component:
 - **A:** The Categorical Status Improvement component places focus on a student improving at least one category each year.
 - **B:** The Categorical Status Improvement component places focus on a student maintaining proficiency or improving at least one category each year.

After reviewing value tables, point tables, grade distributions and case studies, the panel concluded that the “B” category reflected the objective of the Categorical Status Improvement component.

Remaining work concerning the Categorical component include the following:

- Review capacity for additional subcategories, specifically additional subcategories in the “Pass” status band.
- Redefine cut scores between subcategories to create more evenly distributed bands.
- Conduct additional data review such as grade level and regression to the mean analysis.

- **Categorical Improvement and Targeted Growth** Dr. Damian Betebenner presented a paper he created for IDOE concerning his analysis of the subcategories created for Categorical Improvement and the movement between each subcategory. Dr. Betebenner displayed the student growth percentiles that would be required to achieve a category improvement from each band. His summary is as follows:

“This report presents results associated with achievement level transitions using an equal achievement level partitioning of the current ISTEP 3 achievement levels to 8 achievement levels. The results suggest that the current cutpoints put the bulk of students (approximately 95 percent) into 4 achievement levels such that a value table approach to calculating growth will place almost all emphasis on those 4 categories. Moreover, contingency table results as well as SGP target analyses indicate that the majority of students in these four categories will not transition to other categories and remain in the starting category. It is recommended that careful consideration to the way that cutscores between refined achievement levels are defined so that the goals of the categorical transition approach to modeling student progress fulfills the initial policy goals associated with the approach.”

- **Accountability System Review** Dr. Derek Briggs was asked to review the proposed accountability system and provide feedback concerning the model. Following were his comments and points of concern:

- **Scale:** Dr. Briggs addressed the concerns around transitioning to a 100 point scale. Primary example of the concern is the percent of points available in the F category: 25% with old model; 60% with new model. Dr. Briggs stated that this may be more of an illusion than a reality and urged the panel to review the minimum observed points, noting it was likely that zero was not the actual minimum on the scale.
- **Weighting Growth and Performance:** Dr. Briggs noted the assignment of weights was a policy driven decision. He also commented that consideration should be given to the resources available for the lower performance

categories to ensure that resources can be devoted to these placements. Category distributions were discussed and the panel completed a blind survey of likely percentages per category level.

- **Overall Model:** Dr. Briggs reviewed the model overall and provided feedback.
 - **Strengths:**
 - Overall ease in communication.
 - Transparent with a level of face value provided in the formulation.
 - Ease in point assignments. The calculation is fair and transparent to end users.
 - **Concerns (specifically around Growth components):**
 - Simplicity may cause a loss of accuracy and detail. Reducing the growth data to 1 previous year could result in more noise or bouncing of student status.
 - Messaging Categorical Status Improvement could be challenging.
 - Reliability of subcategories in Categorical model. The potential exists that schools may be rewarded or penalized for regression to the mean or “luck” as opposed to true growth.
 - The panel is being tasked to create an absolute measure of growth based on an assessment that may not have been designed to support this measure.
 - The Categorical Improvement component incorporates the student status and is a reflection of the status change. Movement inside the subcategories (both positive and negative growth) will not be reflected in the categorical improvement.
 - Changes to assessments will likely result in a revision of the values and points tables for categorical improvement.
- **Additional Discussions:** The panel engaged in following discussions:
 - **Panel Subcommittees** It was suggested that subcommittees be created to review specific components and report back to the panel.
 - **Displays** The panel would like to provide recommendations concerning the display of data on public and secure report pages.