

Accountability Committee Notes – State Board of Education – January 13, 2014

Members present included Tom Gunlock, Ron Rudduck, Mark Smith, Stephanie Dodd, Debe Terhar, C. Todd Jones, Kathleen McGervey, and Sarah Fowler. Senator Peggy Lehner also was in attendance. To listen to the audio tape, please go to [ftp://ftp.ode.state.oh.us/ODEMediaWeb/State Board Meeting Audio/January 2014/Monday-January%2013-Part%206-Accountability.mp3](ftp://ftp.ode.state.oh.us/ODEMediaWeb/State_Board_Meeting_Audio/January_2014/Monday-January%2013-Part%206-Accountability.mp3) . The conversation begins about one-third into the audiotape.

Staff presenting were Tina Thomas-Manning, Matt Cohen, and Chris Woolard. Materials presented included [ODE's draft model](#) vs. one that would be driven more by the gifted dashboard.

Chris Woolard talked about the dashboard update. He indicated that they were working on a mock draft of the dashboard that will be a drill down focusing in the achievement piece. It would be a suite of metrics. Users would need to drill down on the achievement part that could come together as met vs. not met. He stated that we want the indicator to be achievement based and to tie together with the other elements such as the gifted ranking system.

Imperfectly paraphrasing the rest of the discussion:

Matt Cohen – This presentation is really conceptual. We want to know that you are all on board and that we are going in the right direction. We looked at the gifted ranking. We want to tie the indicator to the gifted rankings.

What do we mean by an indicator? An indicator is set of measures with a benchmark where there are a range of scores where more means better. We need one indicator for gifted. We are putting three concepts in the indicator.

1. Gifted opportunity index. This is a sub-indicator with 3 calculations.

The important thing is that you put this in a way where more is better. It is on a scale of 1 to 100. It is the only measure that looks at all gifted students who are identified. The distribution about the benchmark is affected by the data.

2. Gifted performance -- This uses the gifted performance index.

One of the things we noticed is that the gifted performance index is similar to overall performance index of the district. The problem is that gifted PI is limited. It doesn't tell us anything new. So we wanted to answer how are your gifted students doing relative to your students overall?

3. Gifted progress – This essentially is the gifted value-added index.

In order to meet the indicator you have to meet the benchmark for each component. This is the essence of how we would compile the indicator.

Questions?

Mark Smith - Where would value added be part be of the components? Which component? (Matt Cohen – the gifted progress component.)

The three components together will provide that the student will say that students are making good progress. Would districts would be rewarded twice than if gifted are in the general population as well as the gifted performance? (Note: Dr. Smith appeared to be in support of ODE's approach.)

Mary Rose Oakar -- If, in fact, some gifted students don't receive services, doesn't this get compacted in the formula? Why isn't service the most important issue? I don't understand your formula. It doesn't make sense to me.

Matt Cohen – It is actually difficult to put this together in a sensible way. We need to put this together in a way with a better rationale.

Mary Rose Oakar -- Why does it make a difference? If you think more is better, than why do you put together a formula like this? Why demoralize a school district that doesn't have the services?

Matt Cohen – There should be a relationship between having services and getting good results. Theoretically, if you serve more students, your results will be better and you will be rewarded.

Todd Jones -- The strongest incentive the district can have is to meet the goals of the report card. We should look at what we are incentivizing. As I look at this, the easiest way to manipulate the formula is to identify more students. Quality of service is not seen. I understand how incentives work. (He talked about his time working on NCLB at the federal level.) We don't know what the impact will be. I'm not clear if I know if we have evidence that we are coming to a natural float point on this formula. Maybe weight service double or triple.

Matt Cohen -- Nobody else has done this, so this is difficult.

Todd Jones -- I appreciate the framework, but I think it may need some changes.

Second proposal

Tina Thomas-Manning declined to present the proposal so Tom Gunlock presented it. (Click [here](#) for the second proposal).

Tom Gunlock -- I love having debates. So here is another proposal that the gifted association is proposing. There are 18 items. The district would have to meet 80% of these items and compete against similar districts. There would be cuts scores for each typology. This was not exactly the intent of the document that actually was not prepared by OAGC but by someone involved with gifted issues).

Matt Cohen -- If you want to look at other measures you have to establish a benchmark for each measure. It becomes more complex, but it tells you less about what you want to know. Our proposal is to get to the nitty gritty. These are the indicator measures. This will help you find out why you aren't doing well. The more things you add to it the more convoluted it becomes.

Stephanie Dodd -- I don't know if I like this (second proposal) because I've just seen this. But I have problems with the first proposal, and here is why. I just visited a district that has the means to serve. But others do not and it seems unfair to compare wealthier districts to those that are not. This is especially true if we have not mandate services or provided funding. I like the idea of comparing like districts.

Matt Cohen -- Having comparison groups is a bad idea. Do you really want to have different expectations for different groups? The performance index is fair. What are you trying to incentivize? Should you be able to pick and choose? Do you want higher performance levels? Then focus on that and don't put in other nit-picking pieces.

Tom Gunlock -- There are two different drafts and two different paths. Maybe there is a hybrid approach that we can agree on. You all (committee members) have some homework to do.

Stephanie -- The opportunity piece bothers me. Until there are rules and laws in place, how can we ask districts to do this?

Mark Smith -- There are professionals who can make this work (meaning the ODE staff). There is wisdom at looking at looking at this proposal and seeing what we can incorporate from the other proposal. I trust the professionals.

Matt Cohen -- More is not necessarily a good thing.

Here is the Hannah News Account of the gifted performance indicator discussion:

Gifted Indicator

Chris Woolard, Director of Accountability, discussed the Gifted Indicator and Dashboard. There are several related pieces, including the Gifted Value-Added piece, Gifted Rankings, and the Gifted Indicator. "The dashboard will be a drill-down piece of the Achievement component, a natural place for this," he stated. "This will give parents a suite of metrics to give a fuller picture."

Dr. Matt Cohen, chief research officer for ODE, reported, "SB59 updated the ORC with a requirement that ODE produce several sets of rankings including Gifted Rankings. These rankings were released for the 2013 report card and are the average of Gifted Opportunity, Gifted Performance and Gifted Progress," he stated.

"The Gifted Indicator should reflect what has taken place already but includes feedback as to the level of specifics. This presentation is basically conceptual," Cohen stated.

The Indicator has a range of scores where a benchmark has been set, Cohen continued. If the district meets the benchmark, then they have met the indicator. "The Gifted Opportunity Rank combines three measures into one index: percentage of students identified as gifted (all categories); percentage of identified students receiving gifted services (all categories); and percentage of 'all' students receiving gifted services (all categories)," Cohen stated.

"These items are obviously related, but the aim is to put it in terms where more is better." Cohen explained the indicator as a ratio of those served as opposed to total enrollment. "This is the only measure that looks at all Gifted students, regardless of the type of giftedness they possess.

The distribution will be important, because when you make a decision about a benchmark, it will be affected by these data," he stated.

With regard to Gifted Performance, the Gifted Rank uses the Performance Index (PI) score of gifted students to account for performance of gifted students. This is currently computed from the percentage of gifted students scoring at each achievement level on state tests (subject specific and superior cognitive).

Cohen continued, "But the Gifted Performance Index closely matches the overall Performance Index for a school or district. This shouldn't shock anyone. The problem with the Gifted Performance Indicator is that it is a very good measure but it has the limitation that it is not really telling us anything new. We would like to revise this indicator to use the same Performance Index data for gifted students, but compare it to non-gifted students in the school or district."

The Gifted Achievement Index would be the Performance Level of gifted students relative to the Performance Level of school/district as a whole. This would be on a 100 point scale, where 0 means gifted students are performing at the same level, or worse than) non-gifted students in that school/district. A ranking of 100 means ALL gifted students are achieving at the "Advanced Level." This answers what the "premium is that the gifted students are receiving as opposed to the general student population," he explained.

"We now have three measures, progress-performance-opportunity. The proposal is that in order to meet the Indicator, you have to meet the benchmark on all three benchmarks. The task for the committee is to set the three benchmarks. This is the essence of how we want to compile this robust group of data that we have into one composite indicator," Cohen concluded.

Board member Smith noted that a district might be rewarded twice if this is implemented. Cohen argued that it would depend on the district. Smith said this would give us an indicator that would drop if services are eliminated.

Board member Oakar said she did not understand why gifted services were not given more weight. She also questioned the doubling of the total student population in the formula. "It doesn't make sense to me," and asked for more explanation. Cohen said, "If you increase the number of kids being identified, 'or' you increase the number receiving services, that number should go up. It is not a good use of our time to explain the statistical properties here because it doesn't make a whole lot of difference. We could, however, come up with a couple of different alternatives."

Oakar said, "If the motive is to give more services, than why do you have a formula like this? I think it should be based on who gets the services. Why demoralize districts that don't have the services?" Cohen responded, "I use the word incentive."

Jones wanted more information as well and wondered if having identified more students would be advantageous. Cohen said he did not want to get too fixated on the particulars of the formula. "We are the first state going down this road of the Gifted Indicator, which is why this is a framework and one we can build on."

Board member Dodds said she has some reservations because she has been visiting schools in her district, and she's seen such variations in available services. She has concerns about schools that do not have the funds for services. "To me this formula does not compare apples to apples." Cohen said, "You don't want to go down the road of using a different set of criteria for certain districts. Progress is made by all sorts of districts. This formula is an absolute performance index and is fair."