



Peer Review of “Growth-to-Standard”
Models for States with Approved
ESEA Flexibility Requests

March 8, 2013

Background:

Growth Models for Accountability Purposes

▶ Growth Model Pilot

- ▶ Waivers allow for approved States to use growth data in making adequate yearly progress (AYP) determinations
- ▶ Peer review criteria established
- ▶ 15 States approved to use growth to make AYP determinations

▶ 2008 Regulation (CFR §200.20)

- ▶ Department regulates on use of growth to make AYP
- ▶ Non-ESEA flexibility States must request to use growth to make AYP determinations under 2008 regulation

▶ ESEA Flexibility

- ▶ ESEA flexibility States must meet relevant 2008 regulatory provisions to use growth in determining student proficiency

Growth Models Addressed in this Peer Review

- ▶ Growth models used to determine student proficiency in relation to annual measurable objectives (AMOs) in reading/language arts and mathematics
- ▶ In other words, growth models used to count a student as proficient if that student has shown enough growth to be proficient in a specified number of years

Rationale for this Peer Review

To ensure the integrity, validity and accuracy of State growth models used to count students as meeting AMO targets when they are not yet proficient

States Included in this Peer Review

- ▶ States not previously approved under the growth model pilot to use a growth model to determine student proficiency against AMOs (e.g., New York)
- ▶ States previously approved under the growth model pilot to use a growth model to determine student proficiency against AMOs, but that have made significant changes to the approved model (e.g., Michigan)

States NOT Included in this Peer Review

- ▶ States previously approved under the growth pilot but not yet approved for ESEA flexibility (e.g., Iowa; State may request an extension to continue using approved growth model)
- ▶ ESEA flexibility States using a growth model as part of a multi-measure index within a new accountability system but NOT to count students as meeting AMOs when they are not yet proficient (e.g., Colorado)

States Should Provide Materials for this Review If . . .

- ▶ They are requesting to growth data used to count students as meeting AMO targets in reading/language arts or mathematics when they are not yet proficient.

Will my State's growth model be reviewed?

- ▶ The State plans to use a value-added growth model as part of the teacher and principal support and evaluation system required under ESEA flexibility Principle 3.
NO REVIEW REQUIRED

- ▶ The State plans to use a growth model to count a non-proficient student as meeting the AMO target as a criterion for exiting priority or focus school status.
REVIEW REQUIRED

What States Need to Submit for Review: Growth Model Description

- ▶ Growth model (e.g., trajectory, value table, etc.), including:
 - ▶ Statistical foundation of the model
 - ▶ Data features (e.g., vertically moderated achievement standards, adequate number of students, multiple years of data, etc.)
 - ▶ Growth targets that require students to meet State standards in four or less years or by high school graduation
- ▶ Demonstration of feasibility/impact (*i.e.*, the number/percent of non-proficient students counted as proficient; if available, reliability of the model)

What States Need to Submit for Review: Growth Model Description Con't

- ▶ If relevant, rationale for confidence intervals or any statistical adjustments applied to the model
- ▶ Grades and assessments included in growth model
- ▶ How growth model includes students in different situations (e.g., who change schools or LEAs,)
- ▶ Demonstration that the model does not employ compensatory procedures (e.g., additional points awarded for “advanced” achievement)

What States Need to Submit for Review: Capacity to Implement Model

- ▶ Student match rates sufficient for valid interpretation of results
- ▶ Demonstration of lack of bias in growth data (e.g., comparable match rates for different subgroups)
- ▶ Business rules for assigning students (e.g., students who are in the English Learner for one data point but not for the subsequent data point)

Principles / Assurances

- ▶ All students must be included in the assessment and accountability system, including students with disabilities and English Learners
- ▶ All students in tested grades that have been enrolled for a full academic year must be included in determining student proficiency against AMOs, whether by growth or achievement
- ▶ Model set targets such that students will reach proficiency in four or fewer years or by high school graduation, whichever comes first

Principles / Assurances

- ▶ Growth targets cannot be based on student background characteristics
- ▶ Growth models must measure student achievement separately in reading and mathematics
- ▶ Reporting—actual student performance must be reported at the individual, subgroup, school, district, and State levels

Approval permits a State to...

- ▶ Use a growth model to determine that a student has made sufficient progress to meet the State's proficient academic achievement standard within a specified number of years and count that student as meeting AMOs; and
- ▶ Use this growth data for AMO determinations based on assessments administered in 2012-2013 and 2013-2014

Logistics of Review

- ▶ Requests due: March 29
- ▶ Requests to be reviewed individually by panel of experts: April 1
- ▶ Panel of experts to reviewed together by panel of experts: April 15-16
- ▶ Department considers peer comments in making determinations on approval April 23
- ▶ Department issues determination letters to States that applied May 3

Questions

- ▶ If you are not sure if your State should provide materials for review, call or email your ESEA flexibility contact
- ▶ States we believe need to submit for review: Michigan, New York, New Mexico, Oklahoma