



Explicitly Valuing Growth

Richard Hill
Center for Assessment
September 20, 2004

Data Assumptions

- Annual testing at every grade
 - Ability to track students over years
 - Vertically moderated content and performance standards
-

Policy Assumptions

- Clear goal and subgoals
 - Belief that schools should be evaluated on student progress from year to year
 - Performance levels are the reporting statistic of choice
 - Student progress should be assessed student-by-student, rather than by averages of students
-

A Neutral Value Table?

Year 1 Level	Year 2 Level				
	Unsat	AB	Basic	Mast	Adv
Unsat					
AB					
Basic			100		
Mast					
Adv					

A Neutral Value Table?

Year 1 Level	Year 2 Level				
	Unsat	AB	Basic	Mast	Adv
Unsat					
AB					
Basic	0	50	100	150	200
Mast					
Adv					

A Neutral Value Table?

Year 1 Level	Year 2 Level				
	Unsat	AB	Basic	Mast	Adv
Unsat	100				
AB		100			
Basic	0	50	100	150	200
Mast				100	
Adv					100

A Neutral Value Table? (Table 1)

Year 1 Level	Year 2 Level				
	Unsat	AB	Basic	Mast	Adv
Unsat	100	150	200	250	300
AB	50	100	150	200	250
Basic	0	50	100	150	200
Mast	-50	0	50	100	150
Adv	-100	-50	0	50	100

An NCLB Value Table

Year 1 Level	Year 2 Level				
	Unsat	AB	Basic	Mast	Adv
Unsat	0	0	100	100	100
AB	0	0	100	100	100
Basic	0	0	100	100	100
Mast	0	0	100	100	100
Adv	0	0	100	100	100

Variation of No Real Additional Gain

- Results should be neutral if no real gain and all growth is valued equally
 - Regression due to:
 - Measurement error
 - Normal variation in growth
 - Correlation across years = .73 (ELA) and .80 (math)
-

Distribution of Students

Year 1 Level	Year 2 Level				
	Unsat	AB	Basic	Mast	Adv
Unsat	64	27	8	0	0
AB	24	43	32	1	0
Basic	4	18	64	13	1
Mast	0	2	39	51	8
Adv	0	0	10	53	37

Average Scores for Subgroups

Year 1 Level	Year 2 Level					Ave.
	Unsat	AB	Basic	Mast	Adv	
Unsat	64	27	8	0	0	120.5
AB	24	43	32	1	0	105.0
Basic	4	18	64	13	1	94.5
Mast	0	2	39	51	8	82.5
Adv	0	0	10	53	37	63.5

Problem

- Create a value table for which the averages of the subgroups are more equal
 - Additional constraint—Any student who is Unsatisfactory in Year 2 earns zero points for growth no matter what the student did in Year 1
-

A More Neutral Value Table

Year 1 Level	Year 2 Level					Ave.
	Unsat	AB	Basic	Mast	Adv	
Unsat						
AB						
Basic	0	50	100	150	200	94.5
Mast						
Adv						

A More Neutral Value Table

Year 1 Level	Year 2 Level					Ave.
	Unsat	AB	Basic	Mast	Adv	
Unsat						
AB						
Basic	0	50	100	150	200	94.5
Mast	0	10	60	110	160	92.5
Adv						

A More Neutral Value Table

Year 1 Level	Year 2 Level					Ave.
	Unsat	AB	Basic	Mast	Adv	
Unsat						
AB						
Basic	0	50	100	150	200	94.5
Mast	0	10	60	110	160	92.5
Adv	0	0	20	90	120	94.1

A More Neutral Value Table

Year 1 Level	Year 2 Level					Ave.
	Unsat	AB	Basic	Mast	Adv	
Unsat						
AB	0	100	150	200	250	93.0
Basic	0	50	100	150	200	94.5
Mast	0	10	60	110	160	92.5
Adv	0	0	20	90	120	94.1

A More Neutral Value Table (Table 2)

Year 1 Level	Year 2 Level					Ave.
	Unsat	AB	Basic	Mast	Adv	
Unsat	0	200	400	500	600	86.0
AB	0	100	150	200	250	93.0
Basic	0	50	100	150	200	94.5
Mast	0	10	60	110	160	92.5
Adv	0	0	20	90	120	94.1

An Alternative Neutral Value Table (Table 3)

Year 1 Level	Year 2 Level					Ave.
	Unsat	AB	Basic	Mast	Adv	
Unsat	50	150	250	350	450	92.5
AB	0	100	150	200	250	93.0
Basic	0	50	100	150	200	94.5
Mast	0	10	60	110	160	92.5
Adv	0	0	20	90	120	94.1

Final Adjustments to Value Table

- First, establish a neutral table
 - Then, adjust according to value judgments
 - E.g., if you think there should be more reward for moving from below Basic to at least Basic, then increase the points for doing that from what the neutral table provided
-

Example

Year 1 Level	Year 2 Level				
	Unsat	AB	Basic	Mast	Adv
Unsat	0	200 150	400	500	600
AB	0	100 50	150	200	250
Basic	0	50 0	100	150	200
Mast	0	10 0	60	110	160
Adv	0	0	20	90	120

Computing School Average

Student	Last Year	Goal for This Year	Points
April	Basic	Mastery	150
Luis	Advanced	Mastery	90
Bill	Unsat.	Unsat.	0
Juan	Unsat.	App. Basic	150
Charisse	App. Basic	App. Basic	50
Average			$440/5 = 88.0$

Assigning Growth Labels

- Separate from computing average growth score (e.g., don't ascribe some real meaning to "100")
 - Should be consistent with long-term policy goals
 - Goals for each student jointly established by principal and teacher will determine score and label if met
-

Subdividing Performance Levels

- Rather than just Basic, have Basic-, Basic, and Basic+
 - Divide Unsatisfactory into finer levels?
 - Has minimal impact on school-level reliability
-

Recommended Data Analyses

- Averages for starting levels
 - Current statewide distribution
 - When combined with goals, that allows you to label schools reasonably
 - Correlation of growth with status
 - Reliability and standard errors
 - For different sized groups
-

Correlations with Baseline Status

- Table 1: -0.16
 - Means lower status schools get *higher* growth scores
 - Two choices
 - Different required growth scores for lower schools
 - Use different Value Table
 - Table 2: +0.47
 - Table 3: +0.43
-

Statistics—Table 2


	Status		Growth	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Student-Level	73	46	92	62
School-Level	70	23	91	23
Percent	-	50	-	37

Correlations—Table 2


- Two samples drawn with replacement
 - Schools with more than 20 students in first sample
 - Status
 - Correlation = .95
 - Standard error = .12 student SD
 - Growth
 - Correlation = .87
 - Standard error = .13 student SD
-

Combining Status and Progress

Progress



Combining Status and Progress



Combining Status and Progress

