## Agenda

### 9:00 am
**Welcome, Introductions, Warm Up, and Meeting Outcomes**
- Team Member Introduction Whip
- Warm Up – “Matching Needs and Expertise” Activity
- Review Meeting Outcomes
  - Discuss the transition to the New Accountability System
  - Engage in a dialog about key assessment and accountability opportunities and issues
  - Explore alignment between the MARS assessment system and the new Common Core Standards
  - Learn about Progress on the new online Performance Assessment System

### 9:15 am
**Transition to the New Accountability System**
- Comparing key elements of the old and new systems
- Review present and future data informed indicators for the new system
- Discuss transition implications for our school districts

### 9:45 am
**Open Discussion**
- Purpose of Discussion
- Discussion Norms
- Facilitated Whole Group Discussion
- Whole group discussion

### 10:30 am
**Alignment of Common Core Standards with MARS Assessment Tasks and Rubrics**
- Review of tool to check validity of alignment between the Common Core Standards and the MARS Assessment Tasks and Rubrics
- Team practice to do the alignment and validation of at least one MARS task
- Open discussion about the alignment and the utility of the tool
- Update of the Online Progress Assessment Project

### 10:55 am
**Meeting Evaluation**

**Next meeting date: January 26, 2012**
Transitioning to a New Accountability System

Assessment and Accountability Network Meeting

October 20th, 2011
Meeting Outcomes

– Discuss the transition to the New Accountability System

– Engage in a dialog about key assessment and accountability opportunities and issues

– Explore alignment between the MARS assessment system and the new Common Core Standards

– Learn about Progress on the new online Performance Assessment System
Framing the new accountability system

NCLB Focus - Testing and Sanctioning
— Theory of Action: “Fear is a big motivator” (Rod Paige). Use state developed assessments in Math and ELA with the expectation that all students achieve proficiency by 2014. If schools do not meet criteria, they will be sanctioned.

Reauthorization Focus - Teaching and Learning
-Theory of Action: Human capital approach: identify the most and least effective teachers (and principals, and schools of education). Move onus of accountability from schools to teachers and principals. Teachers held accountable for expected growth of all students. Personnel decisions based in part on student performance.
### Framing the new accountability system

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current</th>
<th>(Possible) Future</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Focus on Adequate Yearly Progress (status)</td>
<td>Focus on “continuous improvement” (growth)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All students proficient (in ELA and Math) by 2014</td>
<td>All Students college- and career-ready by 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status measurement model used to identify “high” and “low” performing schools</td>
<td>Growth or value-added measurement model used to identify “effective” teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools who do not make AYP are sanctioned with School Choice and Supplementary Education Services</td>
<td>Special attention given to “bottom” 5% of schools receive special attention and the 5% of schools with largest gaps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher evaluations based in part on student performance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In October 2010, Bill and I were discussing gardening. Specifically, we were discussing a new approach to tree growing that Bill had developed. Bill asserted his method of gardening was superior to my method. To test this assertion Bill, using his method, tended to a tree close to his house (Oakland). Using my method, I tended to a tree close to my house (not Oakland). After one year, the trees were measured. The results are below:
Just measuring the height of the tree does not tell the whole story. The trees were different sizes when the “tending” started.
Simply looking at growth does not tell the whole story either. If we really want a fair comparison, we need to take into account factors beyond the gardeners’ control.

We will control for three environmental factors: rain, soil, temperature. After these environmental conditions are accounted for, we will be left with just the **effect of the gardening method**.
Factors beyond the gardeners’ control

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bill (Oakland)</th>
<th>Jimmy (not Oakland)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>rain</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>soil</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>temperature</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To make the correct prediction about how these factors affect a tree’s growth, we need to sample trees in the area to find patterns. The more trees we can collect data on, the better our prediction will be.
• From such a graph, we can determine trends.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bill (Oakland)</th>
<th>Jimmy (not Oakland)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>rain</td>
<td>High (+3)</td>
<td>Low (-5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>soil</td>
<td>Low (-3)</td>
<td>High (+2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>temperate</td>
<td>High (-8)</td>
<td>Low (+5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• From these trends, we can make adjustments to determine the actual effect that the *gardener* had on the tree’s growth.
Scherrer, Value-Added Modeling: Rationale, Promises, Perils

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bill (Oakland)</th>
<th>Jimmy (not Oakland)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>rain</td>
<td>High (+3)</td>
<td>Low (-5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>soil</td>
<td>Low (-3)</td>
<td>High (+2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>temperature</td>
<td>High (-8)</td>
<td>Low (+5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+16
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70 inches
50 inches

Santa Clara County Office of Education
Using this method, Bill’s method of gardening is determined to be more effective than Jimmy’s (i.e., he made more contributions to the growth of his tree than Jimmy did to his tree)... However, we still know nothing about what Bill’s method is.
Common Measurement Models

• *Status*
• *Growth*
• *Value Added*
Common Measurement Models

• **Status**: a “snapshot” (measure performance at one particular time)

How tall are the trees?

- **Bill**: 60 inches
- **Jimmy**: 70 inches
Common Measurement Models

- **Status**: a “snapshot” (measure performance at one particular time)

How many students are proficient?

![AYP Graph](image)

Santa Clara County Comparisons
Percent Proficient - Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs)
2011 English Language Arts
Common Measurement Models

• *Status*: a “snapshot” (measure performance at one particular time)

How many students are proficient?

**Major Limitation**

rewards teachers for *who* they teach, not *how* they teach
Common Measurement Models

- **Growth**: measures progress (often reported as “gain scores”)

**How many inches did the trees grow?**

- **Bill**: 60 inches (44 inches + 16 inches)
- **Jimmy**: 70 inches (50 inches + 20 inches)
Common Measurement Models

• **Growth:** measures progress (often reported as “gain scores”)

How many API points did the school grow?

![Bar chart showing API points growth for different groups](image-url)
Common Measurement Models

• **Growth**: measures progress (often reported as “gain scores”)

  How many API points did the school grow?

  **Major Limitation**

  assumes teachers are responsible for all of the observed growth (or lack thereof)
Common Measurement Models

• **Value Added**: compares actual growth to expected growth (any deviation from the expected growth is attributed to the ___)

What were my contributions to the tree’s growth?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adjustments</th>
<th>-3</th>
<th>-5</th>
<th>+20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>rain</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>+5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>soil</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>temperature</td>
<td>+8</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+16

-3
+3
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+22
Common Measurement Models

• **Value Added**: compares actual growth to expected growth (any deviation from the expected growth is attributed to the ___)

What were my contributions to the students’ achievement?

need to control for factors known to affect achievement (e.g., prior achievement, SES, class size, parents’ education, mobility, ...)
Value-Added Modeling (VAM)

• The purpose of value-added modeling is to isolate the effect of the teacher.
• How might the use of VAM affect “disadvantaged” schools?
• How might the use of VAM affect “advantaged” schools?
VAM: The Imperfect Panacea

• Dubious Statistical Assumptions
• Validity Issues
  – Fool’s Gold
• Reliability Issues
Why random error is greater in value-added measures
### Value-Added Scores by Teacher

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 1</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 2</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 3</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 6</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Value Added Scores and Margins of Error by Teacher
VAM: The Imperfect Panacea

• Dubious Statistical Assumptions
• Validity Issues
  – Fool’s Gold
• Reliability Issues
• Campbell’s Law
  – Narrowing of the Curriculum
  – Cheating (Big concern for VAM: distorts prior achievement)
Implications for the work of SCCOE

2006-07 High School Graduates' College Enrollment (Estimated)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>California</th>
<th>Santa Clara County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage of High School Graduates Enrolled In CA Post-secondary Institutions</td>
<td>Percentage that completed 1 year of credit within 2 years of postsecondary enrollment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>46.70%</td>
<td>20.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaska Native Not Hispanic</td>
<td>42.10%</td>
<td>16.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Not Hispanic</td>
<td>67.10%</td>
<td>51.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander Not Hispanic</td>
<td>49.40%</td>
<td>22.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American Not Hispanic</td>
<td>45.30%</td>
<td>19.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Not Hispanic</td>
<td>51.70%</td>
<td>30.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races Not Hispanic</td>
<td>49.10%</td>
<td>28.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino Not Hispanic</td>
<td>64.30%</td>
<td>39.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>51.30%</strong></td>
<td><strong>28.30%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socioeconomically Disadvantaged</td>
<td>47.40%</td>
<td>22.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Learner</td>
<td>48.50%</td>
<td>22.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students with Disabilities</td>
<td>34.20%</td>
<td>7.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Transitioning to a New Accountability System

Assessment and Accountability Network Meeting
October 20th, 2011
Inside Mathematics Web Site
Portal to MARS Performance Tasks, Rubrics, and Resources

Introduction: The Inside Mathematics Web Site houses sample MARS Performance Tasks, Rubrics, Resources, and Professional Development within a system that makes all of these resources easy for team members to access and use. You can find this resource at the Web Site below:

http://insidemathematics.org/

When you arrive at the site follow this path to see the MARS resources:

Classroom Video Visits→Public Lessons→Choose a Public Lesson→Go to Lesson Video
October 20th AAN Meeting Evaluation

Introduction:
Please visit the Web site below to complete the online evaluation of our meeting today. The A & A team will use this evaluation information to improve our service to you and your district as well to plan for our next AAN meeting.
Our next AAN meeting is scheduled for Thursday, January 26th!

We look forward to seeing everyone at our next meeting!

Thanks.

Bill Conrad
Director of Assessment and Accountability
Santa Clara County Office of Education
408-453-4332 (Office)
510-761-2007 (Cell)
Bill_Conrad@sccoe.org

Meeting Evaluation Site

http://www.surveymonkey.com/s/L33FYRR
Issues raised by participants:

Diana Wilmot asked if anyone had a procedure for keeping track of students who complete A-G courses. Diana acknowledged that the data she needs exists; however, she is unaware of any system that organizes it. Kristen King mentioned that her district (East Side) is working with Ed Trust on this issue.

Diane Means asked others to share their district’s policy concerning STAR algebra 1 testing. Many shared that their districts have eliminated “little a” algebra classes. Thus, only students who are enrolled in Algebra 1 actually take the STAR algebra 1 test. One participant talked about a course his district offers called “bridge to geometry.” This course is intended for students who previously took algebra 1 and did poorly; it covers 80% of the algebra standards and an introduction to geometry. Students enrolled in this class take the STAR algebra 1 test.

---------------

Participants expressed an interest in seeing each other’s assessment maps