Creating a New Growth-to-Standard (i.e. On-Track) Measure

To get a sense of how likely students are to increase their level of achievement proficiency over time, we analyzed historical trajectories bridging across CSAP, TCAP, CMAS, PSAT and SAT assessments. We focused on 2013 CSAP/TCAP as the starting year for analysis and followed this cohort of students through the 2014, 2015, 2016 and 2017 state assessments. Results on the following page are broken out by content area (Reading/English Language Arts/Evidence-based Reading and Writing) and Mathematics, grade level (Elementary and Middle school only), and by the CMAS proficiency level the student would have obtained in 2013 if the current standards had always been in place.

Fields containing 2013 achievement N-counts, 2013 achievement percentile rank, 2014 growth percentile N-counts, and 2014 median growth percentiles are included to help contextualize the observed on-track outcomes. The basic on-track question for students initially scoring at Levels 1, 2 and 3 is: “how likely are you to move up one or more levels within a given time frame?” with a follow-up applicable: “how likely are you to move up one or more levels and then maintain that gain for a given time frame?” For students initially scoring at or above the proficiency benchmark (Level 4), the question is “how likely are you to stay at or above benchmark over a given time frame?” Historical results for each of these questions are reported given timeframe intervals of 1, 2, 3 and 4-years, so we can gauge how easy/difficult each transition/timeframe combination is to attain.

The state-level results are presented (highlighted in gray) as a gauge of “attainability” and compared against an exemplar group of higher-growth schools that had the best on-track results to show what “ambitious” trajectories would look like.

Outstanding theoretical decision points to consider when reviewing the attached data:

* For a target to be attainable, what’s the necessary proportion of students who’ve been successful at moving up historically?
* For a target to be ambitious, should we be looking at the trajectories of high-growth exemplar schools?
* Does the clock start over every year (like CSAP/TCAP) or should this be a set trajectory where we track your progress from the first test result (like ELP)
* If the clock resets, to be successfully on-track, do you have to maintain the gains made? Or do you get credit for moving up a level even if it’s not sustained?
* Are there concerns publishing the performance frameworks with meets state expectations cuts of less than 50% of students on-track to proficiency?