

Measuring Student Growth in Achievement: Recommendations for Next Steps
Final Version: 5/3/10

*Submitted to the Missouri Commissioner of Education by the
“Missouri Model for Measuring Teacher/Leader Effects” Work Group

- 1) Missouri should utilize the methods for calculating and reporting student growth in achievement that best meet our stated purposes. Both Value-Added Models and Student Growth Percentiles appear to have promise (as well as limitations) in terms of meeting our needs. For example, we could use Value-Added Models to meet building-level accountability purposes and to begin to examine teacher-level effects (in keeping with all of the cautions and caveats cited in the literature), while we could use Student Growth Percentiles to provide an easily understood description of student growth at all levels, to inform instruction at the individual-student level, and to inform judgments about teacher and leader accountability (in keeping with emerging research findings about this approach). In addition, we may need to continue to implement our Growth-to-Standards Model to meet AYP purposes and, in the future, we may want to consider using this model as one way to track students’ college/workplace readiness.

Recommendation 1 Vote Tally: 22 yes; 5 no

(Two “yes” votes were sent by email after the 4/22/10 meeting concluded. These voters were unable to cast their votes on this recommendation during the webinar because of technical difficulties with the polling system.)

- 2) DESE should continue to support research initiatives that focus on growth data. We need much more information about how longitudinal MAP scores (and scores from other assessments) can be used to measure growth, which the work underway at OSEDA/MU, at the MU Department of Economics, and at other research centers (as well as Park Hill School District’s use of EVAAS data) will provide. Our colleagues’ investigations will help us answer a multitude of technical questions pertaining to the quality of data linkages, suitability of score scales, fit of model to purpose, reliability and validity of growth estimates, etc.

Recommendation 2 Vote Tally: 25 yes; 0 no

- 3) DESE should also establish and convene a Growth Model Technical Advisory Committee to help us articulate and resolve the technical issues associated with implementing growth models and to help us move this work forward. This committee would be comprised of nationally recognized researchers who have demonstrated expertise in this area.
- 4) DESE should also establish and convene a Growth Model Practitioner Advisory Committee that includes representatives from all pertinent stakeholder groups (e.g., teachers, administrators, teacher/leader educators, policymakers, parents) to provide input about important field-related issues pertaining to longitudinal data analyses and to help us move this work forward.

Recommendations 3 and 4 Vote Tally: 23 yes; 1 no

Note about Recommendations 3 and 4: The Work Group is recommending that DESE establish these two groups. We understand that the Commissioner will determine how the groups function (i.e., whether they meet separately or jointly; how the two groups interact with one another and with DESE staff, etc.).

Measuring Student Growth in Achievement: Recommendations for Next Steps

Page 2

Final Version (5/3/10)

- 5) DESE should work with both of these advisory groups and all pertinent stakeholder groups to develop and implement a comprehensive strategic plan for educating stakeholders about the power of longitudinal data analyses and about how to appropriately interpret and use growth data (including cautions and caveats). Professional development in interpreting and using growth data is critical.

Recommendation 5 Vote Tally: 22 yes; 0 no

- 6) DESE should use a collaborative and transparent approach to designing and implementing teacher/leader evaluation systems and educator-preparation program evaluation systems that utilize student growth data (as one of many indicators). This work should include open discussions with representatives from all pertinent stakeholder groups, and it should address relevant policy and practice issues, including those having to do with the evaluation of the large number of educators whose primary responsibilities are not directly tied to currently tested subjects.

Recommendation 6 Vote Tally: 23 yes; 0 no

- 7) DESE should encourage educator-preparation programs to strengthen degree requirements/course offerings in assessment and evaluation, so that professionals entering the field will have the necessary knowledge and skills to interpret and use growth data.

Recommendation 7 Vote Tally: 22 yes; 1 no

**Each recommendation was endorsed by a large majority of Work Group members who participated in the April 22, 2010, meeting. Thirty-one members (or their representatives) were in attendance at the beginning of the meeting, although several members signed-off prior to adjournment. Then, between April 27 and April 29, all Work Group members had the opportunity to review and approve recommendations. No team member responded with negative feedback or opted to file a “minority report.”*

Summary Note:

Members of this Work Group were charged with recommending one or more approaches for measuring student growth in achievement that will yield valid and reliable data—data that will be used to inform a variety of educational decisions, including, but not limited to, the evaluation of teachers and principals. We believe that our seven recommendations meet our assigned task.

Our recommendations are informed by published research findings and policy statements, as well as by commentary from experts. Thus, we believe that Missouri’s next steps must also be grounded in the literature and guided by expert judgment. Moreover, we urge DESE staff to keep in mind that the quality of growth data is dependent upon two important factors: 1) the accuracy and completeness of the longitudinal data linkages; and 2) the technical characteristics of the assessments and the meaningfulness of the score scales.

Key References Informing the “Missouri Model for Measuring Teacher/Leader Effects” Work Group’s Deliberations and Recommendations

- American Educational Research Association. (Summer 2004). *Teachers matter: Evidence from value-added assessment*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Betebenner, D. (2007). *A primer on student growth percentiles*. Dover, NH: National Center for the Improvement of Educational Assessment.
- Betebenner, D. (2009a). *Growth, standards, and accountability*. Dover, NH: National Center for the Improvement of Educational Assessment.
- Betebenner, D. (2009b). Norm- and criterion-referenced student growth. *Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice*, 28(4), 42-51.
- Betebenner, D., & Linn, R. (2010). *Growth in student achievement: Issues of measurement, longitudinal data analysis, and accountability*. Princeton, NJ: Center for K-12 Assessment & Performance Management.
- Betebenner, D., & Linn, R. (2010). *Growth in student achievement: Issues of measurement, longitudinal data analysis, and accountability* (policy brief). Center for K-12 Assessment & Performance Management.
- Board on Testing and Assessment; National Research Council. (October 5, 2009). *Letter report to the U.S. Department of Education on the Race to the Top Fund*. Washington, DC: National Academy of Sciences. <http://www.nap.edu/catalog/12780.html>.
- Braun, H. (2005). *Using student progress to evaluate teachers: A primer on value-added models*. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.
- Briggs, D. (2008). *The goals and uses of value-added models*. Paper prepared for the workshop of the Committee on Value-Added Methodology for Instructional Improvement, Program Evaluation, and Educational Accountability, National Research Council, Washington, DC, November 13-14.
- Council of Chief State School Officers. (2008). *Implementer’s guide to growth models*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Goe, L. (2008). *Key issue: Using value-added models to identify and support highly effective teachers*. Washington, DC: National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality.
- Harris, D. (2009). Would accountability based on teacher value-added be smart policy? An examination of the statistical properties and policy alternatives. *Education Finance and Policy*, 4(4), 319-350.
- National Association of State Boards of Education. (October 2005). *Evaluating value-added: Findings and recommendations from the NASBE study group on value-added assessment (Executive Summary)*. Washington, DC: Author.
- National Association of State Boards of Education. (February 2006). *Implementing value-added assessments*. Washington, DC: Author.
- National Research Council and National Academy of Education. (2010). *Getting value out of value-added: Report of a workshop*. Committee on Value-Added Methodology for Instructional Improvement, Program Evaluation, and Educational Accountability. H. Braun, N. Chudowsky, and J. Koenig (Eds.). Center for Education, Division of Behavioral and Social Sciences and Education, Washington, DC: The National Academies Press.
- *Race to the Top, Application for Initial Funding* (November 18, 2009).
- *Race to the Top, 74 Federal Register 221* (November 18, 2009).
- Rand Corporation. (2004). *The promise and peril of using value-added modeling to measure teacher effectiveness*. Santa Monica, CA: Author.
- Reckase, M. (2004). The real world is more complicated than we would like. *Journal of Educational and Behavioral Statistics*, 29(1), 117-120.
- Rivkin, S. (November 2007). *Value-added analysis and education policy*. Brief 1. Washington, DC: Urban Institute/National Center for Analysis of Longitudinal Data in Education Research.
- Sass, T. (November 2008). *The stability of value-added measures of teacher quality and implications for teacher compensation policy*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute/National Center for Analysis of Longitudinal Data in Education Research.