

Model Analysis Interpretation Guide

Each of the proposed models were analyzed by the Accountability Advisory Group. This is how the analysis is presented.

K-8 Model 1
 All models use weighted proficiency (1.6, 1.1, 1.3) and the same calculation for ELI proficiency and growth.
 Growth uses weight 0 (0-2 SGP, 0-4 SGT) and is capped at 40 points, and Menu Item 1 (EOC math, 6-3 min
 grid, choice assessment).
Pros:

- The relationship between high poverty and growth (weighted at 2/4) is lower in this model than other models.
- ELI points were available to 46% of schools. Most schools received all the growth points (70% - 5, 91% - 3 or 4). Four in ten schools got all the proficiency points with an additional 18% getting 4 points and 23% getting 3 points.

Cons:

- The average proficiency points is 24/40.
- The maximum growth points were earned by 62% of schools, 83% obtained 35 points or more. Only 1% received 22 or fewer points.
- There was a high inverse correlation between total proficiency points and lunch rate (-.794); the higher the percentage of students in poverty, the lower the proficiency points earned by the school. This model had a relatively low correlation between growth and FRL (-.242). The overall correlation was -.633.
- Only 8% of high poverty schools earn points to put them in the top 20% of schools.

First, we describe the components of the model – how growth is weighted, what components are in the menu, etc.

Then we list some summary statements about the model.

Next, we divided the schools into groups based on total points, each representing 20% of the schools. Since cut scores have not been set yet, we felt this would give an idea of how schools would be effected. We included the percent of schools at high and low free and reduced lunch

Distributions:

In order to evaluate the impact of the model the schools were put into five groups and their characteristics are described below:

Group	#	# FRL>70%	# FRL < 30	% Title	% Rural	% Charter	An 'A' Letter Grade in 2014
Top 20%	262	8%	54%	33%	11%	28%	76%
80%	262	28%	24%	63%	18%	20%	44%
60%	262	47%	6%	79%	25%	20%	18%
40%	262	68%	4%	87%	19%	19%	8%
Bottom 20%	262	83%	0%	91%	31%	17%	3%
# Schools	1310						

percentages, percent of schools that are Title I, rural and charter and the percent that had an A letter grade in 2014, the last year grades were given. For K-8 the percentages represent the percent of the group (that 20%). For high school the percentages represent the percent of all schools. There was not time before Monday to make them consistent.

Finally, we graphed the total points and the growth points by Free and Reduced Lunch groupings.

This visually displays the distribution of points per school as well as the difference between richer and poorer schools.

