



JOHN ENGLER  
GOVERNOR

STATE OF MICHIGAN  
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
LANSING



THOMAS D. WATKINS, JR.  
SUPERINTENDENT OF  
PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

**TO:** State Board of Education

**FROM:** Thomas D. Watkins, Jr.

**DATE:** September 6, 2002

**SUBJECT:** Report on Activities to Implement Education YES! - A Yardstick for Excellent Schools

At the August meeting, staff provided the State Board with an update on activities to implement *Education YES!* At that time we summarized the work of the Accreditation Advisory Committee and provided a preview of issues that will come before the Board as *Education YES!* moves toward implementation. The State Board of Education charged the Accreditation Advisory Committee to undertake three tasks:

- Initial Distribution of Schools in Categories
- School Performance Indicators
- Alignment with Federal Legislation

In April of 2002, the State Board appointed the following five members to the Accreditation Advisory Committee:

|                      |  |
|----------------------|--|
| Philip Kearney       | University of Michigan – Ann Arbor           |
| Sharon Johnson Lewis | Council of the Great Cities Schools – Wn. DC |
| Lawrence Lezotte     | Effective Schools Products, Ltd. - Okemos    |
| Mark Reckase         | Michigan State University – East Lansing     |
| Edward Roeber        | Measured Progress – Dover, NH                |

The Advisory Committee's chairman – Dr. Philip Kearney, developed a set of notes from the Committee's August meeting. Dr. Kearney's notes are provided in Attachment A. The notes provide a summary of the Committee's work to date and their recommendations. The Committee is scheduled to meet next week, on Monday September 9 and Tuesday, September 10. Dr. Kearney will provide an updated report to the Board on September 12.

One area that the Board was particularly interested in at the August meeting was the relationship of Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) and *Education YES!* The Committee's work on the area of

**STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION**  
KATHLEEN N. STRAUS – PRESIDENT • SHARON L. GIRE – VICE PRESIDENT  
MICHAEL DAVID WARREN, JR. – SECRETARY • EILEEN LAPPIN WEISER – TREASURER  
MARIANNE YARED MCGUIRE – NASBE DELEGATE • JOHN C. AUSTIN • HERBERT S. MOYER • SHARON A. WISE

608 WEST ALLEGAN STREET • P.O. BOX 30008 • LANSING, MICHIGAN 48909  
www.michigan.gov • (517) 373-3324

“change” in *Education YES!* is intended to link *Education YES!* with AYP by providing an improvement target for all Michigan schools.

An update in the school performance indicators will be provided in addition to an update on achievement measures in *Education YES!* At the August meeting staff reported on the work that the Kent Intermediate School District has coordinated, on behalf of the Michigan Association of Intermediate School Administrators (ISD Superintendents) in the development of specifications for the indicators and in the development of data collection questions. That work is in the final design phase and will soon be ready for pilot testing and data entry at the local school level.

PK Draft – 8-13-02

**SUMMARY NOTES FROM AUGUST 1-2, 2002 MEETING OF THE ACCREDITATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE (including updates, reiteration and/or modification of discussions and decisions from the July 15-16 and prior meetings of the committee)**

**Basic Policy Assumption (agreed to by the committee)**

Scores/grades for Status & Change will reflect a school's success vis-à-vis academic achievement, both generally and in terms of serving sub-populations. Scores/grades for "Growth" will be limited to reflecting a district's success in these same terms until such time as the state creates a cross-grade scale to validly and reliably measure school growth.

**Basic Metric for Status (agreed to by the committee)**

The score(s)/grade(s) for a given year for a given school will reflect a 3-year average.

The categories will follow the MEAP categories, i.e.:

For Math:

Exceed expectations ) Proficient  
Meets expectations ) Proficient  
Basic  
Less than Basic

For Reading (until 2003-04, then identical to above) (problem?)

Satisfactory ) Proficient  
Moderate  
Low

"Ed's Index w/Mark's Modification" will be used:

The index calls for weights, e.g., 120 or 6 for Exceeds Expectations, 110 or 5 for Meets Expectations, 60 or 3 for Basic, etc. Mark's modification would capture the full range of scores rather than leave the reduction of scores to four categories.

(The weights could reflect different intervals, e.g. 3, 2, 1, 0 rather than 6, 5, 3, 0.)

(Reading)s + (Math)s = SCORE i.e, 50/50 or 33/33/33

Report out school scores (with letter grades) for (combined achievement status) SCORE, Reading Score, Math Score and all sub-populations

Before finalizing, the committee will review simulations prepared by John Wick.

**Basic Metric for Change (agreed to by the committee)**

The score(s)/grade(s) for a given year for a given school will reflect a 3-year average

The score(s)/grade(s) will be tied to Adequate Yearly Progress by virtue of setting the premise that all schools will achieve 100 percent proficient (i.e., Exceeds Expectations plus Meets Expectations on the MEAP) at 12 years.

Calculation:

For each school:

- identify the percent proficient in Year 1
- set the slope from Year 1 to Year 12
- in Year 2 determine if the school exceeded, met, almost met, or did not meet its target, i.e., the slope
- assign grade of A to school which exceeds target (slope), B to meets target, C to almost meets, D or E to does not meet
- provide a slope for the sub-groups but without a grade, for interpretative purposes
- in Year 3 and subsequent years, recalculate the slope and repeat the process

These results can be laid over the AYP template with the slope line based on percent proficient in Year 1 in the school at the 20<sup>th</sup> percentile and 100 percent proficient in Year 12, thus tying the school's Change score/grade into the AYP "score."

It also was agreed/suggested that constant monitoring and reporting of results will be necessary to determine if adjustments are needed.

**Basic Metric for Growth (agreed to by the committee)**

The committee is of the view that to properly measure growth three requirements are necessary: (1) the domain is specified; (2) there are measures at adjacent grade levels; and (3) these

measures are set against a vertically equated scale. Since these requirements have not yet been met, and likely will not be met for another year or two, the committee developed the following two-part recommendation:

### Long-term Solution

The committee recommends that the state create a cross-grade scale as the new assessment system to comply with No Child Left Behind (NCLB) is developed. This will permit growth from grade-to-grade to be calculated (e.g., from grade 3 to grade 4, grade 4 to grade 5, grade 5 to grade 6, and so on). In order to do this, the following will need to be done:

1. Create grade-level benchmarks for grades 3-8 plus high school.
2. Create a MEAP testing system that measures these grade-level benchmarks in such a manner that a cross-grade scale can be developed.
3. Create a "value-added" approach to growth from grade to grade.
4. Implement a system to track students across grades within districts, and including demographic variables such as racial-ethnic data and length of time in the school. Students who have been enrolled in the building for less than one year will not be included in growth reporting.
5. Report growth at the building level across the multiple grade comparisons within schools at each level, reporting each feeder school and the school it feeds as a pair of schools.

### Interim Solution

Since it will not be possible to fully implement the system outlined above until the new MEAP system has been used for two years (since current plans call for implementing this system for the first time in 2004-05, it will be after the 2005-06 school year), we recommend the following interim solution:

1. Create a common scale for MEAP mathematics scores at grades elementary, middle school and high school. Create another common scale for the reading assessments.
2. Using this common scale, create a new score scale, anchored at grade 4 at a hypothetical score of 100.
3. Using an NRT(norm referenced test) expected-growth scale, determine an anticipated "growth" score from the base of 100.
4. Anchor this expected gain in a baseline year.
5. Use this expected gain to calculate the extent to which local schools exceeded, matched, or did not meet this expected gain.

6. Report the school scores (the grade 4 feeder school results for the grade 7 schools, and the grade 7 feeder schools results for the grade 10 schools) only at the district level, reporting each feeder school and the school it feeds as a pair of schools.

Before finalizing, the committee will review simulations prepared by John Wick

### **Setting Letter Grades/Cut Scores (agreed to by the committee)**

A standard setting panel(s), a representative group to include teachers, administrators, board members, parents, business persons, etc., will recommend to the committee cut scores/letter grades for Status and Growth (we have set letter grades for Change agreed?), and eventually for Performance (Program) Indicators. The committee in turn will review, decide and make its recommendations to the State Board. The standard setting panel(s) will follow a set protocol directed by John Wick, with the assistance of a facilitator. Paul Bielawski will be responsible for selection of the panel members and the facilitator.

### **Adequate Yearly Progress**

The Committee supported the following recommendations:

- Use total scores only (without subpopulation data) on only Reading and Math for triggering sanctions
- Use NCLB target of the 20<sup>th</sup> %ile for the baseline
- Report all results under the AYP format
- Urge schools to disaggregate and review/analyze their data in anticipation of using sub-populations as sanction triggers for 2000-03

### **Performance Indicators**

The rubrics currently being developed need to undergo considerable "winnowing" by a competent person(s) to produce 6 to 7 survey-type questions in each of the eleven areas, i.e., questions that can readily be responded to by the school's personnel, team, principal. The questions should be constructed so as to require that the respondent(s) base each response on "evidence," not simply on his, her, their subjective evaluation. It is anticipated that the responses from the individual schools will be subject to external audit.

The winnowing will need to be done as quickly as possible following the August 16 completion and finalizing of the rubrics in all eleven areas, i.e., no later than August 26 to permit the piloting

to go forward. The piloting, to the extent possible, should include a stratified random sample of schools.

It also was agreed that, in its final form, the data collection document should provide for a sign-off both at the school level and by the superintendent.

Grades/scores on the Performance Indicators initially will be set by the standard setting panel(s) involved with the Status and Growth scores/grades. The Accreditation Advisory Committee, in turn will review, decide and make its recommendations to the State Board.

### **The Initial Year of Implementation (agreed to by the committee)**

The committee will include in its recommendations to the State Board that 2002-03 be viewed as "a first-year implementation" of EducationYES! subject to further study and refinement, especially in terms of identifying measures, indicators, areas that will need particular attention.

### **Pending Questions/Issues**

1. The divisor question, i.e., what shall be the divisor(s)?
2. MI-Access
3. Categories for racial-ethnic groups
4. Missing data, i.e., from 4 to 7 to 11 on "growth" measures
5. School and district comparisons, i.e., self-selection? Top 10 percent? Other?
6. Documentation

### **Future Meetings**

We agreed on the following meeting schedule (recognizing that some members may be absent on some of the days):

September 9-10 – Monday, Tuesday – Ann Arbor  
October 10-11 – Thursday, Friday -- TBD  
November 18-19 – Monday, Tuesday – TBD  
December 9-10 – Monday, Tuesday -- TBD