



TOM TORLAKSON
State Superintendent
of Public Instruction

Review of Alternative Models for Decile Ranks



TOM TORLAKSON
State Superintendent
of Public Instruction

Legislative Requirement for Alternative Models

SB 1458 requires that the State Superintendent of Public Instruction report to the Legislature by October 1, 2013, alternatives to the decile ranks as a method for determining eligibility, preference, or priority for statutory programs



TOM TORLAKSON
State Superintendent
of Public Instruction

Proposed Numeric Model

At the June 25, 2013 PSAA Advisory Committee meeting, a proposed bifurcation model was presented as an alternative method to the decile rank.

- While the proposed alternative model did not require PSAA Advisory Committee action, a suggestion was made to combine the two models (Technical Design Group [TDG] model and CDE model) into one

Proposed Numeric Model (Cont.)



TOM TORLAKSON
State Superintendent
of Public Instruction

Data Set	School	District	County	State
School Challenges				
1. Educational Challenges	√			
2. Relative Rank	√			
Change in API				
3. Schoolwide	√	√	√	√
4. Socioeconomically Disadvantaged (SED) Student Group	√	√	√	√
5. English learner (EL) Student Group	√	√	√	√
Achievement Gap				
6. SED vs. Non-SED Student Groups	√	√	√	√
7. EL vs. Non-EL Student Groups	√	√	√	√
District, County, and State Comparisons				
8. SED Student Group Growth		√	√	√
9. EL Student Group Growth		√	√	√

√: Value displayed



TOM TORLAKSON
State Superintendent
of Public Instruction

Proposed Numeric Model (Cont.)

- At the July 18, 2013 TDG meeting, the members reviewed the “combined model” to determine if the model should be expanded to include race/ethnic groups within the District, County, and State Comparisons section



TOM TORLAKSON
State Superintendent
of Public Instruction

Proposed Numeric Model (Cont.)

- The TDG indicated that the purpose of the numeric model was to provide the Legislature with a simple menu of select data for use in making determinations for statutory program (e.g., funding)



TOM TORLAKSON
State Superintendent
of Public Instruction

Proposed Numeric Model (Cont.)

- As a result, the TDG proposed that the numeric model be reduced to three measures:
 - Educational Challenges
 - Relative Rank
 - Change in Schoolwide API



TOM TORLAKSON
State Superintendent
of Public Instruction

Proposed Numeric Model (Cont.)

1. Educational Challenges (school level only)

This represents educational challenges based on student demographics. To determine the level of educational challenge, an index will be constructed using two independent variables:

- a. Educationally disadvantaged students: These are students eligible for national school lunch program, parent education level is less than high school, students with disabilities, and/or migrant students, **and**
- b. ELs

The results would be displayed using a range of 1 to 100, with 100 reflecting the highest educational challenges.



TOM TORLAKSON
State Superintendent
of Public Instruction

Proposed Numeric Model (Cont.)

2. Relative Rank (school level only)

A school's statewide decile rank (range 1 to 10), as currently calculated, would be displayed.

3. Change in Schoolwide API

This category displays the change in API points made by the school, the district, the county, and the state. The change is the difference between Base to Growth for one API reporting cycle (e.g., -5 points or +3 points).



TOM TORLAKSON
State Superintendent
of Public Instruction

Sample School Report

Categories	School	District	County	State
1. Educational Challenges	79*	N/A	N/A	N/A
2. Relative Rank	2**	N/A	N/A	N/A
3. Change in Schoolwide API	20*** points	10 points	8 points	11 points

* Scale is 1 to 100 (100 reflects the highest educational challenges)

** Scale is 1 to 10 (1 is low and 10 is high)

*** The difference between the 2011 Base API and the 2012 Growth API

N/A: Not applicable



TOM TORLAKSON
State Superintendent
of Public Instruction

Descriptive Model

The CDE is also proposing a descriptive model for the Advisory Committee to consider as an alternative method to the decile ranks. The Descriptive Model would display data using a five-star rating approach, which is familiar to parents and the public (See Handout 1). It contains seven categories and could include an overall school rating.



TOM TORLAKSON
State Superintendent
of Public Instruction

Descriptive Model (Cont.)

- The Descriptive Model allows flexibility in the ranges that can be used for each category. For example, five stars can be used to create ten ratings for a category by using half star increments. The model also accommodates using five ratings in a category by using only whole stars. In addition, a combination of whole and half stars can be used to customize a rating scale.



TOM TORLAKSON
State Superintendent
of Public Instruction

Seven Categories of the Descriptive Model

The proposed model has seven categories and includes an overall school rating:

1. Relative Rank

This is the school's statewide decile rank, as currently calculated.

2. Improvement Over Time

Ten criteria were developed to determine how well schools perform on the API over a three-year period. The ten criteria take into consideration:

- Schools meeting or exceeding schoolwide targets,
- Student group targets,
- Positive or negative growth, and
- Schools that are at or above the statewide goal of 800 which do not have targets.

Improvement Over Time Criteria

Criteria (Last 3 Years)



TOM TORLAKSON
State Superintendent
of Public Instruction

Rating	Number of Years Met Schoolwide Target	Number of Years Met All Significant Student Group Target(s)	API Growth Points for Schools At or Above 800
5 Stars	3	3	Positive growth in all 3 years
4 ½ Stars	3	3	Net growth over three years is positive
4 Stars	3	3	Net growth over three years is negative
3 ½ Stars	3	2	
3 Stars	3	1	
	2	2	
2 ½ Stars	3	0	
	2	1	
2 Stars	2	0	
1 ½ Stars	1	1	
1 Star	1	0	
½ Star	0	0	



TOM TORLAKSON
State Superintendent
of Public Instruction

Seven Categories of the Descriptive Model (Cont.)

3. – 6. Performance of Student Groups

These categories will display data for four student groups:

- Category 3: ELs
- Category 4: SED
- Category 5: African American
- Category 6: Hispanic

For categories 3 and 4, all schools with numerically significant SED and EL student groups will have their Growth APIs compared against the statewide Growth APIs for SED and EL student groups.



TOM TORLAKSON
State Superintendent
of Public Instruction

Seven Categories of the Descriptive Model (Cont.)

Example of the calculation:

$$\begin{array}{r} \text{School's} \\ \text{Numerically Significant} \\ \text{Student Group EL API} \end{array} - \begin{array}{r} \text{Statewide} \\ \text{EL API} \end{array} = \text{Difference}$$


Rank order the difference and divide into ten equal groups.

For categories 5 and 6, all schools with numerically significant African American and Hispanic student groups will have their Growth APIs compared against the statewide Growth APIs for the White student group.



TOM TORLAKSON
State Superintendent
of Public Instruction

Seven Categories of the Descriptive Model (Cont.)

Example of the calculation:

$$\begin{array}{l} \text{School's} \\ \text{Numerically Significant} \\ \text{Student Group} \\ \text{Hispanic API} \end{array} - \begin{array}{l} \text{Statewide} \\ \text{White API} \end{array} = \text{Difference}$$


Rank order the difference and divide into ten equal groups



TOM TORLAKSON
State Superintendent
of Public Instruction

Seven Categories of the Descriptive Model (Cont.)

7. Graduation Rate

For high schools, the Descriptive Model displays the graduation rate as a seventh category. The table below identifies the criteria:

Graduation Rate	Rank
At or below 75 percent	½ Star
76 percent to 80 percent	1 Star
81 percent to 85 percent	2 Stars
86 percent to 90 percent	3 Stars
91 percent to 95 percent	4 Stars
96 percent to 100 percent	5 Stars



TOM TORLAKSON
State Superintendent
of Public Instruction

Descriptive Model (Cont.)

- Questions or Comments?