



**Missouri School Improvement Program**  
**MSIP 5 Scoring Guide**  
**Technical Advisory Committee Meeting**  
November 29, 2011

**Determine Standard-setting Methodology**

**Attendees**

Participants:

- Kelvin Adams, superintendent, St. Louis Public Schools
- Betha Doar, director of assessment, St. Louis Public Schools
- Mark Ehlert, research analyst, University of Missouri Economics Department
- Kathy Frederking, manager, St. Charles School District Lewis and Clark Career Center
- Matt Goodman, quality improvement and accountability director, Springfield Public Schools
- Jeff Klein, academic services assistant, Park Hill School District
- Jim Masters, superintendent, Monroe City School District
- Sharon Schattgen, University of Missouri Office of Social and Economic Data Analysis
- Keith Jamtgaard, University of Missouri Office of Social and Economic Data Analysis

DESE staff:

- Margie Vandeven, assistant commissioner, Office of Quality Schools
- Jocelyn Strand, coordinator, Office of Quality Schools
- Ron Wilken, west central area supervisor, Office of Quality Schools

**Meeting Summary**

The Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) hosted a meeting of the MSIP 5 Scoring Guide Technical Advisory Committee from 10:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m., Nov. 29 at the Governor's Office Building in Jefferson City, Mo.

Margie Vandeven opened the meeting with a welcome and introductions. Vandeven explained that this technical advisory was an intentionally small committee for increased effectiveness. She also provided details as to how each of the participants were selected and announced that additional experts -- Mid-Continent Comprehensive Center (MC3) Director Belinda Biscoe, National Center for Improvement of Educational Assessment (NCIEA) Rich Hill, Center on Innovation and Improvement (CII) Consultant Carole Perlman, and Assessment and Accountability Content Center (AACC) Director Stanley Rabinowitz— have agreed to join the Technical Advisory Committee efforts in December's meeting.

Vandeven presented the MSIP 5 policy goals:

- Continuous improvement for all schools and for all students
- Drive actions for moving student achievement to top 10 status; all students graduating ready for success in college and careers
- Distinguish performance of schools and districts in valid accurate and meaningful ways
- Empower all stakeholders through communication and reporting of clear data

She also described values previously identified through regional meetings:

- Single system of accountability (federal, state, local).
- Missouri's accountability system has greater rigor and encourages more meaningful improvement, than the federal accountability system.
- The focus is on what is best for our state and our kids.

Participants then discussed other feedback received from regional meetings held this summer, as well as the initial MSIP 5 steering committee (priorities in order of significance):

- Every school gets better
- Identify and provide support to the lowest 5%
- Ensure that every school is good enough

Design Decisions:

- status vs. growth
- differentiated vs. standardized
- simple/transparent vs. complex/precise
- focused dept resources vs. Department resources distributed to all

Indicators:

- Weighted amount

Vandeven referenced and summarized the public comment (notebook of 2000+ comments that were submitted for the State Board).

Vandeven tasked the committee to work out a weighting system to achieve the desirable results. She suggested that participants review the proposed MSIP 5 standards and indicators handout and said today's work is to develop recommendations/advice concerning the state's values and the weighting of the standards and indicators.

Vandeven then facilitated discussion for a series of MSIP 5 prompts, which contained recommendations developed at the advisory committee meetings held Nov. 8 and 15, 2011.

**1. Academic Achievement – The district administers assessments required by the Missouri Assessment Program (MAP) to measure academic achievement and demonstrates improvement in the performance of its students over time.**

***1\*1. Student performance on assessments required by the MAP meets or exceeds the state standard or demonstrates improvement in performance over time.***

- How this is currently (MSIP 4) calculated; MAP Performance Index (MPI) – similar to Colorado's current system; Index scores
- Looking at performance levels – movement & maintenance

Partners were tasked with discussing generation of an indicator for #1 above.

Share out:

**Group 1:**

- Index

**Group 2:**

- Multiple measures

**Group 3:**

- Fans of the index, much more sensitive than % proficient
- Could still have some difficulties

Vandeven summarized:

- Value recognition of movement at all levels (index)
- Mentioned some of the suggestions of other states (from Carole's summaries of other states' waiver proposals)

***1\*2. The percent of students tested on each required MAP assessment meets or exceeds the state standard.***

- number of years
- how to handle students not enrolled in a building a full academic year
  - attendance is another issue
- grade spans

Share out:

**Group 1:**

- Watch the “move the bubble kids” mentality
- Growth; not as an expectation, but as a means (compensation) by which a district can meet a performance standard

**Group 2:**

- Average of five years; drop off the lowest of the five before averaging
- 3 years status, 3 years progress, 1 year growth
- Concern you can jump to wrong conclusions with only 1 year of data
- Argued for students having to be enrolled in a school a full year before a district is held accountable for their scores

**Group 3:**

- Every year add a new year, drop the oldest year off; most recent years have greatest weight (weighted averages) “Five year smoothing”
- Be sure to “protect” a district's ability to take a risk (don't put too much emphasis on a particular score or year)
- Be careful not to punish districts who are making growth progress, and at the same time be careful not to punish districts that are performing well and maintaining.

Small groups continued active discussion around the topic of a growth model. Some highlights include:

- What is the definition of a year's worth of growth?

- Accountability system for districts, (building level required for national accountability)
- What question do you think that growth should answer?
  - Would the growth be based on grade-level; below-, at-, above- grade level?
- Agreeing to growth as an indicator (a “met”); depends on how growth is measured.
- Proficiency cut scores are “different” at different grade levels . . . this is a potential problem.
- What is the definition of growth (standard)?
- Have they grown enough or more?
- Then, is enough a years growth for a years time? or
- Is enough as much as a typical student grows over a year? or
- Are we trying to identify “failing” schools, or are we trying to figure out how to identify schools that we can help to improve?

Consensus that growth is not an indicator in and of itself.

***1\*3. Growth data indicate that students meet or exceed growth expectations.***

Participants discussed the pros and cons of not using status or growth.

- How could a school not make any growth or status, but still show improvement?
- Status or growth (where growth is available) OR status or improvement (where growth is not available)
- If you don't have growth data, what else (besides improvement) do you look at to show improvement?
- Participation rate:  
95% of all students need to participate in all testing to avoid level not determined (LND)
- Is it necessary to phase in the required participation rate on some of the end of course exams?
- What is ambitious but attainable on participation rates?
- Consider the legitimization of exempting (for subgroups) beyond the 5%

**2. Subgroup Achievement – The district demonstrates required improvement in student performance for its subgroups.**

***2\*1. The performance of students identified on each assessment in identified subgroups, including free/reduced price lunch, racial/ethnic background, English language learners, and students with disabilities, meets or exceeds the state standard or demonstrates required improvement.***

Super subgroups

**3. (K-12 only) College and Career Readiness – the district provides adequate post-secondary preparation for all students.**

***3\*1. The percent of graduates who scored at or above the state standard on any department-approved measure(s) of college and career-readiness, for example, ACT\*, SAT\*, COMPASS\* or Armed Services Vocational Aptitude Battery (ASVAB), meets or exceeds the state standard or demonstrates required improvement.***

- What sort of measures?
- How will the department approve measures?

- Concordance or differentiated measures?
- Dual enrollment or approved dual credit course and/or receive college credit.
- Does this mean that the college hours have to be paid for and earned?
- What does it mean to add these various College and Career Readiness (CCR) measures into an index? Might we be better off not trying to put them into an index?
- What is the difference between an index and a values table?

In closing, Vandeven thanked the participants for their time, expertise and dedicated effort. She noted that there were two more “big” areas that they had not had time to discuss:

- Attendance
- Graduation Rate

Participants agreed that much productive work had been accomplished; however, recognized that more would be necessary. The MSIP 5 Scoring Guide Technical Advisory Committee will next meet in Jefferson City on Dec. 15-16, 2011. The Thursday meeting will start at 10:00 a.m., and the Friday meeting will start at 8:00 a.m.

DRAFT