



STATE OF MICHIGAN  
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
LANSING



JENNIFER M. GRANHOLM  
GOVERNOR

MICHAEL P. FLANAGAN  
SUPERINTENDENT OF  
PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

TO: Members of the State Board of Education

FROM: Mike Flanagan, Superintendent 

DATE: May 3, 2007

**SUBJ: REVISED BOARD ITEM (ATTACHED)**

Ed Roeber and Joseph Martineau have requested that the attached memo be substituted for the memo that was included in an earlier mailing to state board members. This pertains to item D on the Committee of the Whole agenda for May 8, 2007.

The major change in the item is on page 6, in the tables that depict the labels and abbreviations that would be assigned to each cell in the table, representing whether a student's current performance level on the MEAP or MI-Access represented a change from the previous year's performance level.

When this item was first mailed to the board, there was one more step to go in the process and that was to review the item with the Office of Educational Assessment and Accountability (OEAA) Advisory Committee. That meeting occurred yesterday, May 2.

The committee has positive suggestions that would improve the proposed system. These resulted in a change in the labels in the tables on page 6, and a more accurate wording of the title of the memo where the words "progress standards" have been changed to "performance level change designations."

This will be explained more fully during the presentation at the board meeting. In the meantime, I wanted to provide you with a document that could perhaps be sent to board members yet this week, to allow study and comparison and possible questions before the meeting itself.

STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

KATHLEEN N. STRAUS – PRESIDENT • JOHN C. AUSTIN – VICE PRESIDENT  
CAROLYN L. CURTIN – SECRETARY • MARIANNE YARED MCGUIRE – TREASURER  
NANCY DANHOF – NASBE DELEGATE • ELIZABETH W. BAUER  
REGINALD M. TURNER • CASANDRA E. ULBRICH

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



STATE OF MICHIGAN  
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
LANSING



JENNIFER M. GRANHOLM  
GOVERNOR

MICHAEL P. FLANAGAN  
SUPERINTENDENT OF  
PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

TO: State Board of Education

FROM: Mike Flanagan

DATE: April 23, 2007

SUBJECT: **PRESENTATION ON PROPOSED PERFORMANCE LEVEL CHANGE DESIGNATIONS FOR GRADE 3-8 MEAP AND MI-ACCESS FUNCTIONAL INDEPENDENCE ASSESSMENTS**

The purpose of this State Board of Education item is to present the tentative student-level **performance level change** designations that were recommended for the MEAP Mathematics and English Language Arts and the corresponding MI-Access Functional Independence alternate assessments. This item is a follow-up to previous items concerning the measurement of student progress across years in a value-added fashion. Please note that the *performance level change designations* do not replace the academic achievement standards already approved by the State Board of Education. They supply additional information about changes in student performance from one year to the next.

## BACKGROUND

There were five primary goals for the activity. They were:

1. Implement a maximally valid system for evaluating individual students' change in performance level in the content areas of Mathematics and ELA that does not make problematic assumptions of other existing progress-based value-added models.
2. Implement a system that is capable of capturing significant differences in student change in performance while at the same time minimizing the effect of measurement error on the evaluation of student change in performance level.
3. Implement a system that sets rigorous expectations for student change in performance level that can be met and that, if met, should ultimately result in students reaching proficiency and moving beyond proficiency.
4. Integrate MEAP and MI-Access scores into a single system.
5. Maximize the transparency of the progress-based value-added model to educators and citizens by eliminating all unnecessary complexity.

### STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

KATHLEEN N. STRAUS – PRESIDENT • JOHN C. AUSTIN – VICE PRESIDENT  
CAROLYN L. CURTIN – SECRETARY • MARIANNE YARED MCGUIRE – TREASURER  
NANCY DANHOF – NASBE DELEGATE • ELIZABETH W. BAUER  
REGINALD M. TURNER • CASANDRA E. ULBRICH

608 WEST ALLEGAN STREET • P.O. BOX 30008 • LANSING, MICHIGAN 48909  
[www.michigan.gov/mde](http://www.michigan.gov/mde) • (517) 373-3324

Attachment A details the desired characteristics of the value added model that led to these goals and how the goals were to be achieved. Attachment B gives a brief overview of the standard setting process that led to a system that monitors and evaluates students' transitions from one part of the achievement scale in one grade to another part of the achievement scale in the next grade.

## **ACTIVITIES**

The procedures used were adapted from previous work by Rich Hill (from the National Center for the Improvement of Educational Assessment) and Damian Betebenner (from the College of Education at Boston College). The procedures used are described in detail in attachment B. The activities involved in developing the recommendations are detailed below:

1. The Office of Educational Assessment and Accountability's (OEAA) Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), which is comprised of nationally-recognized measurement and statistics experts, reviewed the procedures to be used on March 27, 2007.
2. The activity in which the recommendations were made took place on March 28-29, 2007.
3. OEAA/MDE staff reviewed the results.
4. The results were presented for review by the OEAA Advisory Committee on May 2, 2007.
5. The TAC will review the final results on May 4, 2007.

## **PROCEDURES**

Very briefly, the rating procedure was carried out by dividing each of the MEAP performance levels (not proficient, partially proficient, proficient, and advanced) into three sub-levels (low, middle, and high), and tracking students transitions from one year to the next (e.g. from the middle of the not proficient category in grade 3 to the top of the partially proficient category the next year in grade 4). The panelists' task was to classify each possible transition into four categories of change, namely *(L)ittle*, *(S)ome*, *(C)onsiderable*, and *(E)xtensive*. The tracking mechanism is called a transition value table.

A parallel task was carried out for MI-Access. Because the MI-Access assessment is shorter, it is divided into fewer performance levels and sub-levels. The top and bottom performance levels (emerging and surpassed) were each divided into three sub-levels (low, mid, and high), while the narrower middle performance level (attained) was divided into only two sub-levels (low and high).

## **RESULTS OF PANEL ACTIVITY**

In other states where this type of activity has been carried out, it was decided beforehand that there would be only one evaluation table that would be the same for all grades and subjects within the regular assessment. We determined that this decision should be addressed by content experts rather than as a

matter of policy. Therefore, the panelists were asked to create a separate table to evaluate student progress in each subject and each pair of adjacent grades. The panelists were then asked to determine whether differences between subjects and grades were substantial and pedagogically meaningful. The panelists indicated that the slight differences among tables were not pedagogically meaningful.

Therefore, as in other states, there is only one change in performance level evaluation table for MEAP (for all grades and subjects), and a parallel table to evaluate change in performance for MI-Access Functional Independence assessments. The table recommended by the panelists for MEAP assessments is given in Figure 1, and the table recommended for MI-Access Functional Independence assessments is given in Figure 2.

**Figure 1. Panel-Recommended MEAP Transition Value Table**

Grade X MEAP Achievement		Grade X+1 MEAP Achievement											
		Not Proficient			Partially Proficient			Proficient			Advanced		
		Low	Mid	High	Low	Mid	High	Low	Mid	High	Low	Mid	High
Not Proficient	Low	L	S	S	S	C	C	E	E	E	E	E	E
	Mid	L	L	S	S	S	C	C	E	E	E	E	E
	High	L	L	L	S	S	S	C	C	E	E	E	E
Partially Proficient	Low	L	L	L	L	S	S	C	C	C	E	E	E
	Mid	L	L	L	L	L	S	C	C	C	E	E	E
	High	L	L	L	L	L	L	S	C	C	E	E	E
Proficient	Low	L	L	L	L	L	L	S	C	C	E	E	E
	Mid	L	L	L	L	L	L	S	C	C	E	E	E
	High	L	L	L	L	L	L	S	S	C	E	E	E
Advanced	Low	L	L	L	L	L	L	S	S	C	E	E	E
	Mid	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	S	S	C	E	E
	High	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	S	S	C	E	E

**NOTE:** L = Little, S = Some, C = Considerable, E = Extensive

**Figure 2. Panel-Recommended MI-Access Functional Independence Transition Value Table**

Grade X MI-Access FI Achievement		Grade X+1 MI-Access FI Achievement								
		Emerging			Attained		Surpassed			
		Low	Mid	High	Low	High	Low	Mid	High	
Emerging	Low	L	S	C	C	C	E	E	E	
	Mid	L	L	S	C	C	E	E	E	
	High	L	L	S	S	C	E	E	E	
Attained	Low	L	L	L	S	S	C	E	E	
	High	L	L	L	S	S	C	C	E	
Surpassed	Low	L	L	L	S	S	C	C	E	
	Mid	L	L	L	L	S	C	C	E	
	High	L	L	L	L	S	S	C	E	

**NOTE:** L = Little, S = Some, C = Considerable, E = Extensive

## **STAFF REVIEW**

After the rating activity was concluded, staff reviewed the recommended value tables and noted that there were significant inconsistencies in the way the panelists applied the labels for student progress depending upon where students started out. These inconsistencies were a result of focusing only on certain segments of the definitions given in attachment B at the cost of the rest of those definitions. For example:

- Students who started out near the bottom of the scale (the low end of not proficient) are required to progress by at least 5 mini-performance levels to be categorized as making "considerable" progress. Based on actual transitions observed from Fall 2005 to Fall 2006, it was rare for low-performing students to make "considerable" progress.
- Students who started out near the middle of the scale (near the low end of proficient) were only required to progress only 1 or 2 mini-performance levels to be categorized as making "considerable" progress. It was common, but not easy for moderately-achieving students to make "considerable" progress.
- Students who started out near the top of the scale (the low, mid, or high ranges of advanced) could drop by one or more mini-performance levels and still be categorized as making "considerable" progress. It was rare for high-performing students to make less than "considerable" progress.

It does not appear to be reasonable or valid to categorize these three very different levels of progress as equivalent. They appear to be considered equivalent because of a strong focus on attaining and maintaining proficiency at the cost of overlooking progressing toward and beyond proficiency.

## **OEAA ADVISORY COMMITTEE REVIEW**

For these reasons, the panel-recommended values were taken to OEAA's Advisory Committee (a policy advisory board representing a diverse set of stakeholder groups) to review and suggest revisions to maximize the understanding of reports to students, parents, teachers, and other stakeholders. The Advisory Committee suggested the following revisions:

1. Change the name of the measure from "Progress" to "Performance Level Change."
2. Add "Decline" as a category of performance level change.
3. Have symmetric categories of "Performance Level Change" with the following descriptive labels:
  - a. Significant Decline
  - b. Decline
  - c. No Change
  - d. Improvement
  - e. Significant Improvement

The effects of the Advisory Committee Recommendations are, respectively, as follows:

1. Eliminate confusion about the measure by moving from a name (Progress) that can be interpreted in many ways to a name (Performance Level Change) that has a clearly descriptive meaning.
2. Increases symmetry in the categories of performance level change.
3. Allows for change in performance level to be clearly described and interpreted in the context of student achievement (for example, a student who transitions from the high end of "Advanced" in one grade to the same place in the next grade has clearly experienced no change in performance level with achievement remaining high).

In addition, the Advisory Committee recommended that this student-level performance level change measure be aggregated into a school-level progress measure that will determine how much yearly progress is enough depending upon where students start out.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

The Advisory Committee's recommendations have been implemented in revised tables. These revised tables are presented in Figures 3 and 4 for MEAP and MI-Access. These **revised** recommended tables evaluate the amount of progress made by individual students. These **revised** tables are intended to be used in the following manners:

1. For reporting individual students' change in performance relative to grade-level expectations to students, parents/guardians, and educators.
2. For reporting aggregate progress of students at the school, district, ISD, and State levels, when there are sufficient numbers of students.
3. For incorporation into EducationYES! based upon a yet-to-be-carried-out school-level standard setting.

## **NEXT STEPS**

OEAA will return to the State Board of Education for approval to use the revised system presented here for the first two purposes. Following SBE approval, the next step will be to incorporate the use of individual student performance level change data into the state and federal school accountability systems (purpose 3). Staff plan to return to the State Board of Education with a comprehensive proposal for the system of state school accreditation. The system will incorporate change in students' performance level, as promised in the EducationYES! policy approved by the Board in 2002. It is anticipated that the revised state school accreditation policy will be ready for use in the 2007-08 school year.

**Figure 3. Revised MEAP Performance Level Change Table**

Grade X MEAP Achievement		Grade X+1 MEAP Achievement											
		Not Proficient			Partially Proficient			Proficient			Advanced		
		Low	Mid	High	Low	Mid	High	Low	Mid	High	Low	Mid	High
Not Proficient	Low	N	I	I	SI	SI	SI	SI	SI	SI	SI	SI	SI
	Mid	D	N	I	I	SI	SI	SI	SI	SI	SI	SI	SI
	High	D	D	N	I	I	SI	SI	SI	SI	SI	SI	SI
Partially Proficient	Low	SD	D	D	N	I	I	SI	SI	SI	SI	SI	SI
	Mid	SD	SD	D	D	N	I	I	SI	SI	SI	SI	SI
	High	SD	SD	SD	D	D	N	I	I	SI	SI	SI	SI
Proficient	Low	SD	SD	SD	SD	D	D	N	I	I	SI	SI	SI
	Mid	SD	SD	SD	SD	SD	D	D	N	I	I	SI	SI
	High	SD	SD	SD	SD	SD	SD	D	D	N	I	I	SI
Advanced	Low	SD	SD	SD	SD	SD	SD	SD	D	D	N	I	I
	Mid	SD	SD	SD	SD	SD	SD	SD	SD	D	D	N	I
	High	SD	SD	SD	SD	SD	SD	SD	SD	SD	D	D	N

**NOTE:** SD = Significant Decline, D = Decline, N = No Change, I = Improvement, SI = Significant Improvement

**Figure 4. Revised MI-Access Functional Independence Performance Level Change Table**

Grade X MI-Access FI Achievement		Grade X+1 MI-Access FI Achievement								
		Emerging			Attained		Surpassed			
		Low	Mid	High	Low	High	Low	Mid	High	
Emerging	Low	N	I	I	SI	SI	SI	SI	SI	
	Mid	D	N	I	I	SI	SI	SI	SI	
	High	D	D	N	I	I	SI	SI	SI	
Attained	Low	SD	D	D	N	I	I	SI	SI	
	High	SD	SD	D	D	N	I	I	SI	
Surpassed	Low	SD	SD	SD	D	D	N	I	I	
	Mid	SD	SD	SD	SD	D	D	N	I	
	High	SD	SD	SD	SD	SD	D	D	N	

**NOTE:** SD = Significant Decline, D = Decline, N = No Change, I = Improvement, SI = Significant Improvement

## Desired Characteristics of the Progress-Based Value-Added Model

This attachment describes the desired characteristics of the model, and indicates how the chosen model fulfills those desired characteristics. The desired characteristics are taken from Rigney & Martineau (2006):

1. Consistency with policy goals of proficiency for all students, while:
  - a. Holding high expectations for all students regardless of current achievement
  - b. Balancing fairness toward students with fairness toward educators by setting targets based upon observable transitions
2. Freely available for scientific scrutiny to enhance and validate the model
3. Maximal transparency *and* validity
4. Based on alignment to content standard and performance standards
5. Integrate MEAP and MI-Access Functional Independence results into a single system
6. Adaptable for monitoring the progress of different groups of children (e.g. SWD and ELL)
7. Appropriate statistical model for the MEAP and MI-Access scales

Each of these desired characteristics is explained individually below:

- 1. Consistency with policy goals of proficiency for all students, while:**
  - a. Holding high expectations for all students regardless of current achievement**
  - b. Balancing fairness toward students with fairness toward educators by setting targets based upon observable transitions**

One of the reasons for implementing a progress-based value-added model is to ameliorate some of the adverse effects of status models.

Status models are seen as focusing solely on equity toward students—that is that no student is expected to perform lower than any other student simply because of their ethnicity, family income, or other demographic characteristics. Status models (such as the No Child Left Behind—NCLB—model for adequate yearly progress) provide exactly the same expectations for all students.

Status models are also seen as being unfair toward educators because all students (and therefore educators) are held to the same achievement standard. This means that educators are held to different standards for fostering student learning depending upon the incoming achievement level of the students they teach, which is often strongly related to demographics.

Value-added models are seen as more fair toward educators in that all educators are held to exactly the same standard for fostering student learning. One of the mantras of value-added modeling is “one year of growth for one year of instruction.”

The problem is that with value-added models, if all students are held to the same progress standards, existing achievement gaps may remain unabated. This is not fair toward students in that students belonging to historically lower achieving groups will be expected to remain lower achieving.

One of the desired characteristics of the model is to balance fairness toward educators with fairness toward students.

The approach that this model takes to that dilemma is to set rigorous standards for student progress, particularly those who are not yet proficient, but to set those progress standards in a reasonable way such that the progress targets can be attained. This means that the targets for progress may not take students all the way to proficient in one year, but that rigorous targets are set to move students toward proficiency, beyond proficiency, or to maintaining proficiency.

## **2. Freely available for scientific scrutiny to enhance and validate the model**

There are some value added models with components that are proprietary and cannot be validated even by qualified statisticians. Michigan has chosen to use only methods that reside in the public domain for this model.

## **3. Maximal transparency and validity**

Most value added models are highly complicated statistical models understood only by a few. One of the reasons cited for the complexity is maintaining the validity of the system. However, this raises questions about how well the results of the model can be explained and accepted when the evaluation methods are not accessible to those being evaluated.

Michigan's approach to resolving this conflict between validity and transparency is to use a transition table approach (adapted from Hill, 2005 and Betebenner, 2005) that follows children from one portion of an achievement scale in one grade to another portion in another grade. By setting up the model in this way, individual students, teachers, and administrators can replicate the results of the model for themselves if desired.

In addition, Michigan has taken the approach of reporting progress in a manner analogous to the reports of student achievement—providing a progress score and a progress level for each student, and aggregating to the school level in the same manner as for achievement.

## **4. Based on alignment to content standard and performance standards**

Most value added models are norm-referenced, meaning that the results indicate which schools are above or below average in terms of the progress their students make. While normative interpretations can be useful, they do not tell whether students in any given school made enough progress to ultimately achieve proficiency, move beyond proficiency, or maintain proficiency.

Michigan's approach to this problem was to explicitly set standards for student progress, evaluating the different types of progress individual students can make toward proficiency, beyond proficiency, and in maintaining proficiency.

Again, note that the already-approved academic achievement standards are not to be replaced by the progress standards. The progress standards provide information about how students are progressing across grades in relation to the academic achievement standards.

## **5. Integrate MEAP and MI-Access Functional Independence results into a single system**

Most value added models assume that all students' scores are on the same scale, making it impossible to integrate regular and alternate assessments into the same system.

The system created by Michigan resolves this issue by rating student progress on both the MEAP and MI-Access into the same categories by including cross-assessment discussions in the standard setting activity to identify, discuss, and validate any differences across assessments.

## **6. Adaptable for monitoring the progress of different groups of children (e.g. SWD and ELL)**

Most value added models have this capacity, and Michigan felt it was important to maintain that capacity by creating a model whose outcomes could become the focus of statistical models identifying the relationships between demographic groups and the progress they made.

## **7. Appropriate statistical model for the MEAP and MI-Access scales**

Almost all value added models assume that the achievement scales they analyze have highly unrealistic psychometric properties, namely that the scales are interval-level scales, linear, and measure only one type of achievement from the bottom of the lowest grade to the top of the highest grade (see Martineau, 2006; Martineau, Subedi, et al., 2007; Reckase, 2004; Schmidt et al., 2005, for explanations of why this is highly problematic).

Michigan has determined to resolve this technical psychometric issue by treating the scales as ordinal, non-linear, and measuring several different types of achievement, depending upon what is being taught in each grade. A detailed description of how this was accomplished is given by Martineau, Paek, et al. (2007) and Martineau (2007).

## **References**

Betebenner, D. W. (2005, June). *Performance Standards in Measures of Educational Effectiveness*. Paper presented at the 25th Annual Conference on Large Scale Assessment of the Council of Chief State School Officers, San Antonio, TX.

- Hill, R. (2005, June). *Measuring Student Growth Through Value Tables*. Paper presented at the 25th Annual Conference on Large Scale Assessment of the Council of Chief State School Officers, San Antonio, TX.
- Martineau, J. A. (2006). Distorting Value Added: The Use of Longitudinal, Vertically Scaled Student Achievement Data for Growth-Based Value-Added Accountability. *Journal of Educational and Behavioral Statistics, 31*(1), 35-62.
- Martineau, J.A. (2007). *Designing a Valid and Transparent Progress-Based Value-Added Accountability Model*. Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the American Educational Research Association (AERA), Chicago, IL.
- Martineau, J. A., Subedi, D., Ward, K., Li, T., Diao, Q., Drake, S., Kao, S.-C., Li, X., Lu, Y., Pang, F.-H., Song, T., Zheng, Y. (2007). Non-Linear Trajectories through Multidimensional Content Spaces: An Examination of Common Psychometric Claims of Unidimensionality, Linearity, and Interval-Level Measurement. In Lissitz R.W. (Ed.). *Assessing and Modeling Cognitive Development in School: Intellectual Growth and Standard Setting*. JAM Press, Maple Grove, MN.
- Martineau, J. A., Paek, P., Keene, J., & Hirsch, T. (2007). Integrated, Comprehensive Alignment as a Foundation for Measuring Student Progress. *Educational Measurement: Issues & Practice, 26*(1), 28-35.
- Reckase, M. D. (2004). The Real World Is More Complicated Than We Would Like. *Journal of Educational and Behavioral Statistics, 29*(1), 117-120.
- Rigney, S. L., & Martineau, J. A. (2006). NCLB and Growth Models: In Conflict or in Concert? In R. L. Lissitz (Ed.), *Longitudinal and Value Added Models of Student Performance* (pp. 47-81). Maple Grove, MN: JAM Press.
- Schmidt, W. H., Houang, R. T., & McKnight, C. C. (2005). Value-Added Research: Right Idea but Wrong Solution? In R. Lissitz (Ed.), *Value Added Models in Education: Theory and Applications* (pp. 145-164). Maple Grove, MN: JAM Press.

### Brief Description of the Progress Standard Setting Procedure

As a first step in the process, panelists were welcomed and given their charge. They were divided into four groups—one for MI-Access Functional Independence Mathematics, one for MI-Access Functional Independence English Language Arts (ELA), one for MEAP Mathematics, and one for MEAP ELA depending upon their experience and subject matter expertise. There were teachers from each grade (3-8) on each panel.

Before splitting into their groups, the panelists were introduced to the progress level definitions, which were:

**EXTENSIVE (E):** A highly rigorous degree of progress, consisting of

- Extensive progress toward proficiency,
- Extensive maintenance of proficiency, or
- Extensive progress beyond proficiency

**CONSIDERABLE (C):** A rigorous degree of progress, consisting of

- Considerable progress toward proficiency,
- Considerable maintenance of proficiency, or
- Considerable progress beyond proficiency

**SOME (S):** A moderate degree of progress, consisting of

- Some progress toward proficiency,
- Some maintenance of proficiency, or
- Some progress beyond proficiency

**LITTLE OR NONE (L):** A lack of progress, consisting of

- Lack of progress toward proficiency,
- Any decline out of proficiency, or
- Considerable or extensive decline in proficiency

The panelists were instructed to keep in mind the difference between growth and progress in that all students are likely to grow to some degree from year to year, but that progress is defined relative to proficiency (the cut score between the *partially proficient* and *proficient* performance levels). This was a critical point of definition of which panelists were reminded throughout the process. This maintained the focus of the procedure on progressing toward, maintaining, or progressing beyond proficiency.

Note that the definitions are written in clear language but that there is enough overlap between the labels that there was significant room for discussion among panelists concerning what definition of progress is appropriate for a given degree of progress.

After the whole-group introduction to the definitions, the groups broke up into separate rooms to further discuss what the definitions mean in practice. At this point, the panelists were asked to fill in a 4 by 4 progress table for the grade 7/8

transitions, with an example from one of the MEAP panelists shown below. For MI-Access the tables were 3 by 3, reflecting the three performance levels in MI-Access (*Emerging, Attained, and Surpassed*). Panelists were instructed to focus on students making full progress steps (e.g. from the middle of the not proficient category in grade 7 to the middle of the same category in grade 8 [a step of zero performance levels], or from the low end of the proficient category in grade 7 to the low end of the advanced category in grade 8 [a full step upward]).

Grade 7, Fall 2005 MEAP ELA Achievement	Grade 8, Fall 2006 MEAP ELA Achievement			
	Not Proficient	Partially Proficient	Proficient	Advanced
Not Proficient	S	C	E	E
Partially Proficient	L	S	C	E
Proficient	L	L	C	E
Advanced	L	L	C	E

After the first round, panelists were provided with impact data showing what percentages of students actually made the transitions they had just rated. The panelists were shown how their groups rated each transition as well. They discussed in their small groups the ratings they had given in light of the ratings all other panelists had given and in light of the impact data.

At this point, the panelists completed another round of ratings. After the second round of ratings, the panelists all convened into one large group to discuss the ratings they had given across the different tests (MEAP and MI-Access) and subjects (Mathematics and ELA). After the group discussions, they separated into their groups again, and completed a third and final round of 4 by 4 table ratings for grades 7-8.

Panelists then went through the same process for the grade 3/4 transition. They discussed among themselves any differences between the 7/8 table and the 3/4 table.

At this point, the panelists were asked to move on to a 12 by 12 table (for MEAP) or an 8 by 8 table (for MI-Access) for the grade 7/8 transition. The final values from the 4 by 4 (or 3 by 3) tables were plugged into the larger tables by transferring the values to complete steps (e.g. low end of one category to low end of another). A sample translation of the above 4 by 4 table to a 12 by 12 table is provided below:

Fall 2005 MEAP ELA Achievement		Fall 2006 MEAP ELA Achievement											
		Not Proficient			Partially Proficient			Proficient			Advanced		
		Low	Mid	High	Low	Mid	High	Low	Mid	High	Low	Mid	High
Not Proficient	Low	S			C			E			E		
	Mid		S			C			E			E	
	High			S			C			E			E
Partially Proficient	Low	L			S			C			E		
	Mid		L			S			C			E	

	High	L	S	C	E
Proficient	Low	L	L	C	E
	Mid	L	L	C	E
	High	L	L	C	E
Advanced	Low	L	L	C	E
	Mid	L	L	C	E
	High	L	L	C	E

Panelists then engaged in a group consensus process in which they verified the pre-filled values (they changed several of them with the greater precision afforded by the larger tables), and filled in the empty cells as a group with group discussion and voting.

Following the 12 by 12 activity for the grade 7/8 transition, the groups again reconvened as a single large group to discuss any differences across subjects and tests. Following this discussion, the groups broke back up to determine whether any changes were needed in their individual tables.

Then groups moved on to the grade 3/4 large transition tables without retaining the grade 7/8 tables. After this activity, the panelists were to move on to the grade 5/6 transitions if the 3/4 and 7/8 transition tables were different. At this point, the panelists indicated that it does not matter what grade students are in nor what content area are being measured: the point is that relative to ultimately becoming proficient, progressing beyond proficient, or maintaining proficiency, the evaluations should be the same for all grades and subjects within an assessment.

Panelists in particular expressed concern that they saw no content- or grade-based reason for evaluating the same type of transition (e.g. from the low end of the partially proficient level to the middle of the proficient level) differently. The panelists recommended that the minor differences among the grade level transition tables and among the subject transition tables be smoothed by the Michigan Department of Education staff to create a single transition table for each assessment (MEAP and MI-Access Functional Independence).

As a final step in the process, the panelists filled out evaluations concerning the process. Those results are presented on the remaining pages of this attachment (B).

**Michigan Progress Classification  
Evaluation Form**

**MEAP Summary**

*The numbers in the response boxes indicate how many individual panelists indicated that response. The number of panelist is this group was 16, only 15 evaluation forms were received.*

***Instructions:*** Please place an "X" in the response option that best reflects your opinions related to the statements below.

1. Please indicate the importance of the following factors in determining progress categories.				
Factor	Not Important	Somewhat Important	Important	Very Important
a. Progress category definitions			1	13
b. Your perceptions of the difficulty of the assessment	3	2	7	1
c. Your own classroom experience		4	6	4
d. Your initial classification of student progress	1	3	8	2
e. Discussions in your committee				14
f. Impact data	2	7	3	2
g. Policy environment	3	5	2	3
h. What students would vs. should be able to do	2	5	3	4

2. How confident are you in the classification of student progress at each level of progress

Progress Level	Not Confident	Somewhat Confident	Confident	Very Confident
Little or None	1	3	4	7
Some		2	6	6
Considerable		2	6	7
Exemplary		1	5	8

**Michigan Progress Classification  
Evaluation Form**

**MI-ACCESS Summary**

*The numbers in the response boxes indicate how many individual panelists indicated that response. The number of panelist in this group was 10, but only 9 evaluations were received.*

***Instructions:*** Please place an "X" in the response option that best reflects your opinions related to the statements below.

1. Please indicate the importance of the following factors in determining progress categories.				
Factor	Not Important	Somewhat Important	Important	Very Important
a. Progress category definitions				8
b. Your perceptions of the difficulty of the assessment	4		4	1
c. Your own classroom experience	1		2	6
d. Your initial classification of student progress		2	3	3
e. Discussions in your committee				9
f. Impact data	1	3	3	2
g. Policy environment	1	1	5	1
h. What students would vs. should be able to do	4	2	1	2

2. How confident are you in the classification of student progress at each level of progress

Progress Level	Not Confident	Somewhat Confident	Confident	Very Confident
Little or None	1		1	7
Some		1	2	6
Considerable		1	2	6
Exemplary		1		8