

ISBE Growth Model Work Group (GMWG) Meeting April 7, 2011

Summary

Present: Chris Koch, State Superintendent of Schools, joined the group at 10:15 and left about 40 minutes later ; Lizanne DeStefano, Chair; Kathlene Shank, recording; Deborah Larson; Amy Novell; Joseph Matula; Mark Doan; Amy Alsop; Colleen Legge; Bob Grimm, William Sayer, ISBE staff; Robin Ehrhart; Linda Tomlinson, ISBE staff; Connie Wise, ISBE staff; Jim Palmer, ISBE staff; Laura Cresap; Jamie Craven ; Carmen Acevedo; Mark Mitovich; Melina Wright; John Bryne; Rense Lange, ISBE staff.

Agenda Item #1: Update on PEAC

Joe Matula reported that the teacher evaluation will be based on Charlotte Danielson. The topic currently being looked at measures of student learning and the principal evaluation is also in progress.

Time line is for principal evaluation is to include student growth as of September 2012.

Training is also being discussed; fidelity is something that must be addressed.

Agenda Item 2: Chris Koch remarks

Dr. Koch said this would be this group's last meeting. That a "Technical Committee" will pick up where we are. He says reauthorization of ESEA is likely to include the topics we have been dealing with and he perceives subgroups will remain a focus.

Agenda Item #2: Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)

This group is national experts; Dr. DeStefano is included on this committee. Several of the experts also advise other states according to Dr. Koch. This group will meet in mid-April.

Agenda Item #3: PARCC Update

The Center for K-12 Assessment and Performance Management at ETS released in February 2011 the document "Coming Together to Raise Achievement". Scope and sequence charts for English, Language Arts, and Math are in progress and will be out for public comment in June. In summer computer assessments will be examined and will be piloted next Fall.

PARCC includes 25 states trying to come together and agree on assessments. Math is currently troubling as issues are examined relative to integration across states. These will be interim assessments; a question was asked about timing of giving the assessments. Jim Palmer responded that there are issues as schools start at different times. He said it is likely we will have "continuous windows of assessment." There are also issues of security and the number of "forms" of tests that will be needed. The plan is to compare scores across states.

The same skills are being taught in a sequence even if not at the same calendar time. Through course assessments including an interim are planned. The thinking now is the first interim would have the least

weight and should have some instructional value. PARCC is backing off of the assessments having instructional value.

How will PARCC compare across SMARTER Balanced Assessments was another question. The answer was that PARCC will be compared with PARCC states and SMARTER will be compared across the states in that consortium. PARCC INCLUDES MORE OF THE LARGE STATES.

The question was asked about ACHIEVE; the plan right now according to Jim Palmer is that these are to be included in the summary of assessments.

Chris Koch says he perceives the common core will hold.

Chris was asked about the relationship between the growth model and PARCC. Without knowing what the assessments look like it can not be said what assessment data would be used in the growth model. At a minimum it would be the "summative score".

Currently grades 3-11 are being addressed by PARCC. Reauthorization may limit the grade range. Mitch Chester, Superintendent of Massachusetts chairs the PARCC meetings. ACHIEVE is also at the table. There are also higher education voices at the table and other entities in addition to ISBE.

Dr. DeStefano commented that in a meeting with GATES people the Illinois Longitudinal Data Systems was mentioned as being a very good model.

Jim Palmer also said that IBM is looking at applying artificial intelligence technology in the scoring of PARCC.

Agenda Item #4: Work Group Draft Report

We went through page by page:

The references to SGWG should be GMWG throughout the document.

Page 1 no comments

Page 2 "The timeline initiating the teacher and principal performance evaluation process is September 1, 2012.

It was brought up we would like to have a timeline for PERA, PARCC, Illinois Longitudinal Data System, and the Growth Model.

Page 3 The sentence that data could be matched for teacher and students and coursework by September 30, 2011 was questioned. It was asked what exactly this means. Dr. DeStefano agreed to add a sentence that tells what this data can be used for.

Top of page 6: It was brought up that Tenn. and Ohio should be moved from under Projection Models" and there should be a separate "VALUE ADDED" and put CPS, Tenn., and Ohio.

Paragraph right before Conclusions: "The SGWG evaluated these models.... Under 1.add "to begin to implement"...

Conclusions, under first bullet to be reworded: "For lack of a vertical scale that includes IAA and PSEA..."

2cd bullet: Weak alignment Add words: "may limit the accuracy of projection models".

4th bullet: Delete the bullet

Suggestion to add to the first full paragraph that starts: "The selection of a student growth model..." a sentence that addresses that depending on the growth there are winners and losers. Dr. DeStefano suggested that it be put it in the next paragraph.

It was requested that in the first sentence the sentence stop at will be used and eliminate the rest of the sentence beginning with including.... We agreed to change the wording "recognizing districts that produce the most growth, allocating resources..., and identifying. It was also suggested we add that it can be in addition to AYP.

It was brought up "permits inclusion" and eliminates the words "easy". And it will say "permits inclusion". The question was asked about "residual gain scores". Dr. DeStefano said it is implied in the next paragraph: "A simple Post-on-Pre. In the sentence "Value added systems... words "residual gain scores" will be added.

Top paragraph page, at the end of the paragraph verbiage will be added as to what CPS is doing. "At grade level excluding high school:

Paragraph that starts..."Much of the discussion..." it was asked if it is worth the use of State resources to facilitate studies specific to EPAS (Educational Planning and Assessment System). Recommendation 2.3 is related to this discussion around EPAS; question was asked about Elementary being included. ACT does not support the use of EPAS as a measure of growth. It was decided to say that "considerable challenges exist" rather than "challenges are expected". WCER studies should be considered.

Recommendations

2.1 Discussion: There was discussion about the State communicating the reasons for why a "particular model" was chosen. Wording will be changed to say this.

2.2 No comments

2.3 Suggestion to spell out EPAS as Educational Planning and Assessment System (EPAS). The question was asked why we are saying this as it was not part of this work group charge.

Under 3: Changed under 3.1, A representative to "Representatives..."

Page 3 second paragraph: To what extent sentence... it was brought up that we should add the word "reliable" along with valid in this sentence.. It was also brought up that relative to PARCC districts will have to "scale up" to update curriculum. Spring 2012 PARCC may have some "stuff" ready for field testing.

Amy Alsop brought up that the political and social contexts are not addressed in our document.

Page 4 Conclusions insert the word "state" before accountability, to read: "student growth for State accountability". It was also brought up ARRA should be acknowledged as an impetus.

Re: 1.1, page 4, It was asked if ISAT should be specified. The answer was that ISAT can be used in the growth model BUT NOT as a measure of learner growth in the teacher and principal evaluation process. It was brought up whether data could be used along with or in place of AYP. To use the data the Feds would have to agree and the State Report Card would need to be modified. It was brought up that the 8th Grade ISAT and the PSEA do not equate.

Concerns were expressed relative to what can be accomplished by October 31, 2011. The issues expressed were around what "implement" means. We suggested adding the words "beginning to implement." The March 2011 data will be the first ISAT data available to use for these purposes.

Also, on 1.1 (or when phrase) needs to be modified by as "or when two or more years of PARCC ...".We agreed to this change.

It was brought up that IAA is included in the list along with ISAT and PSAE. We discussed adding sentences that says: Technical considerations as to how IAA results would be incorporated into the growth model have not been considered by this work group. It is recommended that the technical committee needs to consider the issues related with the use of the IAA.

1.2, we agreed that ISAT, IAA, PSEA will be listed here also. The last sentence is seen as a communication plan and it was suggested that this should be a separate recommendation. It was brought up that this additional recommendation should address a communication plan, training, roll out, legislature, and sub groups needs to be discussed. We can include this on page 8 in recommendations. topics that should be included are; uses of growth model, growth models can and can not tell you, issues related to IAA timelines for the diverse pieces, the transition to PARCC, issues related to specific populations such as special education and ELL and training and roll out.

The question was raised that it is a mistake to do away with this work group; on page 8 we could add a recommendation on an end user group being needed to work with TAC. We agreed we would add these words: "implications of state and local resources and funding" to sentence that starts out "report regularly..."

Recommendation 2: no changes

We discussed the need for an “end user” group in addition to TAC. It was decided that a recommendation be made and be put into 4. Under 4.1 under the e.g. add “Data Advisory Committee”.

We also agreed to recommend that ISBE appoint an “end user” advisory group to TAC.

Under 1.2, we decided to reword to be specific to a “designated individual to represent this work group.

Agenda Item #5: Some Illinois Data on Three Value Added Approaches (Rense Lange and Andy Metcalf)

“Post-on Pre: A finding relative to data analyzed using Post-on Pre (using adjacent grades) two period value added model was that “such a rule would have to vary according to the district level poverty. This means data “would have to be re-estimated for every subgroup.

A problem is that “many schools and certain classrooms are too small to do this reliably. Data had to be analyzed at the district level instead of schools, otherwise all conclusions are imprecise.

“Student Growth Percentiles” data “argues against the use of a single gain score” but the “method is better than Post-on Pre”. Smaller categories may work better.

“Value Tables or Transition Model” also called the “growth to a standard or trajectory model” tracks changes in performance levels from one year to the next for each student. The tables for a district summarize students’ changes in performance levels, rather than scale scores.

Concluding Thoughts:

Dr. DeStefano will send out the draft for a last look; we will not be word “smithing” but dealing only with the main thought and capturing changes we agree to.

This is the last meeting of this group; participants were thanked for their commitment to this work.

Announcements:

At the IAASE Spring meeting Lynne Holdeheide from NCTQ, National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tenn. will give a session on Special Education and Principal Evaluation and the research NCTQ has done on this topic. The conference is in Collinsville, May 12 (Thursday) and May 13 (Friday). You can go to the Illinois Alliance of Administrators of Special Education (IAASE) web site for details of registration or call Norma Gerrish, 618-622-8800, for registration information. The registration cost is \$125 and registration closes on May 5, 2011.