



DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
OFFICE OF THE STATE SUPERINTENDENT OF

EDUCATION

Meeting:	Accountability System - STAR Framework: Growth to Proficiency PARCC: Eligible Participants Deep Dive	
Date/Time:	Monday, July 24 1:00 pm - 3:00 pm	
Location:	OSSE 810 First St. NE Conference Room 806 Washington, DC 20002	
Facilitator(s):	Darrell Ashton, Naomi Watson, Laura Maurizi, Danielle Branson and Matthew Jacovina	
Date Notes Posted:	July 31, 2017	
Meeting Objective: To provide the introduction and overview of Accountability System and deep dive of the PARCC/MSAA Performance, Student Participation, and Growth to Proficiency.		
Agenda Items		
I. PARCC/MSAA Performance	Danielle Branson	
II. Student Participation	Danielle Branson	
III. Growth to Proficiency	Laura Maurizi	
III. Next Steps/Next Meeting	Danielle Branson, Laura Maurizi	
Meeting Notes (Q & A and Feedback)		
Slide #	Questions & Answers	
Slide 1: STAR Framework PARCC/MSAA Performance, Student Participation, and Growth to Proficiency Metrics	N/A	
Slide 2: Goals of Our Discussion	N/A	
Slide 3: Opportunities for Feedback and Questions	N/A	
Slide 4: Agenda	N/A	
Slide 5: Overview of STAR Framework	N/A	
Slide 6: Timeline	N/A	
Slide 7: Domains and Metrics	N/A	

Slide 8: STAR Framework: Elementary Schools without Pre-Kindergarten	N/A
Slide 9: STAR Framework: Elementary Schools with Pre-Kindergarten	N/A
Slide 10: STAR Framework: Middle Schools	N/A
Slide 11: STAR Framework: High Schools	N/A
Slide 12: Metric Deep Dive: PARCC/MSAA Performance	N/A
Slide 13: PARCC 4+/MSAA 3+: Metric Calculation	<p>Q: What is realistic cut-off for minimal enrollment? A: School testing window is what we use, but there are issues with that.</p> <p>Q: If student is enrolled and test, but then in the middle of the window the student transfers, do they count? A: No, we haven't defined "minimally enrolled" This is difficult to determine when the absence is not expected. This may encourage schools to move their testing date later.</p>
Slide 14: PARCC 3+/MSAA 3+: Metric Calculation	
Slide 15: PARCC/MSAA Performance Calculation	N/A
Slide 16: Student Participation	N/A
Slide 17: Participation: Overview	N/A
Slide 18: Participation: Overview	N/A
Slide 19: Participation: Business Rules	<p>Q: What does the data collection process look like? A: We are looking at different collections and looking into course titles. We want to reduce burden but also be aligned with our goal of matching coursework with testing.</p> <p>Q: Is the vision of OSSE to collect data throughout the year, instead of a one-time collection. A: This will have to be one-time collection initially.</p> <p>Q: Is this about how we're feeding the data or making sure course content aligns with testing standards? How is this different than what we currently send you? A: Want to make sure the course aligns with assessment. Another piece is that all students who should test are not registered.</p>
Slide 20: Participation: Business Rules	N/A
Slide 21: Metric Deep	N/A

Dive: Growth to Proficiency	
Slide 22: Growth to Proficiency: Overview	N/A
Slide 23: Growth to Proficiency: Input from Prior Meeting	N/A
Slide 24: Growth to Proficiency: Input from Prior Meeting	N/A
Slide 25: Growth to Proficiency: Decisions	N/A
Slide 26: Growth to Proficiency: Business Rules	N/A
Slide 27: Growth to Proficiency: Business Rules	N/A
Slide 28: Growth to Proficiency: Business Rules	N/A
Slide 29: Growth to Proficiency: Business Rules	<p>Q: Wanted hybrid so that it wouldn't correlate with MGP, but it seems like it would. Have we looked at that?</p> <p>A: A lot of metrics are correlated, but to varying degrees. A school with high MGP may be more likely on average to have higher individualized growth targets, but it is also possible that there will be differentiation at different MGPs. If the whole state is growing faster than the Consortium, schools could have high MGPs and be more likely to meet individual growth targets. The opposite is true for the state has overall low MGPs relative to the consortium; schools could have low MGPs but have a high level of variability in either meeting or missing individual growth targets.</p> <p>Q: Is the percentile based on repeating this percentile each grade year?</p> <p>A: This model makes the assumption that students will grow at the same rate at each grade level.</p>
Slide 30: Growth to Proficiency: Business Rules	N/A
Slide 31: Growth to Proficiency: Business Rules	N/A
Slide 32: Growth to Proficiency: Business Rules	N/A
Slide 33: Growth to Proficiency: Business Rules	<p>Q: Is this DC only or PARCC consortium</p> <p>A: We don't have access to consortium data. Interested in getting access to this for similar analysis, but this is DC only.</p>
Slide 34: Growth to	Q: Are you revisiting this after 2017 data come in?

<p>Proficiency: Business Rules</p>	<p>A: After we send out the dry run data, we would look at the data to see if any of the projections change drastically.</p> <p>Q: In what way will you make this clear for schools to understand the growth targets? A: OSSE will share targets with scores.</p> <p>Q: Are you setting this by bands or scores? A: Scores, the graphs are showing how many years expected to grow to proficiency.</p> <p>Q: How is OSSE wrestling with the data that shows how few students will ever reach proficiency in math? A: OSSE is working to figure that out and may need to prioritize math as a state. We want to be the fastest growing state and want to be attainable and ambitious.</p> <p>Q: When you do dry run what red flags are you looking for to see if the correlation with proficiency is too high? A: We have not identified a specific threshold, but we want to ensure each metric is measuring something different than another metric. We will look at this among different school types and locations.</p>
<p>Slide 35: Growth to Proficiency: Business Rules</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>Slide 36: Growth to Proficiency: Business Rules</p>	<p>Q: Is that even if the students who go from a 751 to 749? A: Yes. This will work in both directions. So a student at 699 will have an additional year than a student who has a 700. This is the nature of any point threshold.</p>
<p>Slide 37: Growth to Proficiency: Business Rules</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>Slide 38: Growth to Proficiency: Business Rules</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>Slide 39: Growth to Proficiency: Business Rules</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>Slide 40: Growth to Proficiency: Business Rules</p>	<p>Q: Are you recommending that we use my first time 5th grade data or 4th grade data as the baseline for 5th grade repeater? A: First 5th grade repeater.</p> <p>FEEDBACK: I think you'd want to always use the 4th grade scores to give schools points for the cumulative growth from 4th grade.</p>
<p>Slide 41: Growth to Proficiency: Business Rules</p>	<p>Q: Is it true that we're looking at course based? A: The growth measure does not include high school assessments, and students in advanced assessments are not included in metric. The only exception for 7th and 8th graders is for advanced math; there is no exception for 7th grader taking 8th grade test.</p> <p>Q: Are 8th grade algebra takers included in growth to proficiency? A: No.</p> <p>Q: Can they be included?</p>

	<p>A: Possibly, but not for another 3 years until we have more data.</p> <p>Q: Will we receive the growth targets now?</p> <p>A: We will discuss the roll out and plan to release targets with scores at the same time.</p>
Slide 42: Questions and Next Steps	N/A
Slide 43: Ways to Stay Engaged	N/A
Slide 44: Appendix	N/A
Slide 45: PARCC/MSAA Participation Calculation	N/A

Feedback via OSSE.ESSA@dc.gov

KIPP DC

- When a kid is retained, the next year’s target should be based not on the prior year’s score but the prior grade’s score (so if the 5th grader was retained and repeats 5th grade, the target should be based on her score from 4th grade not the first 5th grade score). It’s all about progressing in PARCC as you progress through grades, and also I don’t think that comparing growth from 4th to 5th grade PARCC is the same as comparing 5th to 5th grade PARCC.
- I don’t like the move from “continuously” enrolled to “minimally” enrolled for the denominator calculation for PARCC, b/c (a) what’s the point then of holding schools to a testing calendar and (b) there are too many one offs/case-by-case situations where a kid’s not testing despite being enrolled for 15 days in the window (or whatever benchmark is set) was valid and not manipulative by the school.
- For the growth to proficiency piece, I have some major reservations, but I don’t know how to proceed for reasons I’ll explain:
- Some colleagues (who will also comment) have noted that the PARCC scale, while it appears linear, is not actually linear in terms of acquisition of skill expectations. We would need to reread the PARCC tech report, but most assessment scale scoring systems are not based on some sort of linear expectations but with complex calculus instead ... I think that’s actually a major deal breaker on this one if true.
- In any case, I think research is consistent that the acquisition of academic skills is not linear either.
- At heart, though, my concern with this is more basic, in that essentially you’re creating a criterion-based model that is founded on an arbitrary criterion... a linear division of the gap between starting point (defined also by proficiency level, which is crazier) and the end point of 750 (I think?) where the division factor is determined by an imperfect analysis of growth in DC. It doesn’t take starting grade level into account, it doesn’t take a true starting point into account, and yet we’ll be using this system to actually “evaluate” and impose undeserved consequences (and rewards!) on schools... and the whole premise behind it is just plain faulty.
- All that being said, like I said, I don’t know how to proceed b/c I don’t know the answer to the below questions:
 - When OSSE says they are bound to a criterion-based growth model in the state plan, is that b/c ED required one in every state plan? Or did we just volunteer that piece.
 - Does it have to be a graded component of the final score or can it be a display only thing?
 - Is there room to amend our plan next year to remove it?
- Also, my problem I think is boiled down to the fact that this growth model is calculated/based on a student-level analysis, which is why it’s so hard to do this right b/c how, without a ton more data

points, can you actually model this out effectively with PARCC. But:

- What options are there (or does it even exist) for some sort of school-level criterion based growth model?
- Put differently, I can see this as a 2x2 quadrant chart where x axis = complexity of measure, and y axis = validity of measure. I think what OSSE is proposing is somewhere high on the x-axis but low on the y axis. I'd rather shoot for something that is simple (low on x axis) and high on validity. Even if it's something that is sort of based on a notion of how much schools are moving kids from level 1 and 2 to level 3 – where they have a chance eventually to be level 4+ later... etc. None of this fake growth target at the student level.

Next Steps

1. LEAs can provide feedback within 3 business days (by July 27, 2017) via OSSE.ESSA@dc.gov.
2. Notes will be send out 5 business days after the meeting (by August 1, 2017).

Next Meeting

Cancelled: July 27, 2017
8:00 am – 11:00 am