How to meet OSPI documentation guidelines for Learning Assistance Program students using MAP Growth results

Starting in the 2014–15 school year, school districts were required to document the amount of academic growth gained by students participating in the Learning Assistance Program (LAP) and to provide annual entrance and exit data for all participating students. These data are submitted to the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) using the state's Comprehensive Education Data and Research System (CEDARS). OSPI has provided a user's guide with instructions for entering these data.
The required data points outlined within that document include the following:

- Starting and ending scores
- Grade levels associated with starting and ending scores
- Dates of starting and ending scores

In addition to these six data points, the number of "months of growth" made by the student must be provided, based on the changes between the starting scores and final scores on the assessment.

MAP® Growth™ assessment data can be used to fulfill these general reporting requirements. However, no simple, single relationship between MAP Growth RIT scores and "months of instruction" exists, and as such, caution is warranted when attempting to translate student growth results into this simplified metric. Just as physical growth is not constant for all kids and all ages, changes in MAP Growth scores are not the same for all students across all grades, either. Gains made on the MAP Growth assessments and other assessments are not linear, meaning that the magnitude of gains made by students varies within and across grades over the course of a given school year. Further, distributions of growth vary across grades and subject areas, with some grades/subjects showing greater variation in growth than others. Because of these factors, simplistic translations of gains to months of instruction can result in misinterpretations of student growth results (for example, see Baird & Pane, 2019; Kuhfeld & Soland, 2020; Thum & Kuhfeld, forthcoming).

A technically sound and defensible approach to translating MAP Growth results to an interpretable outcome relies on robust NWEA® growth norms that consider a student's grade, instructional exposure, and initial starting score to estimate how much growth might be expected to occur between two test events. All students who take MAP Growth assessments receive a normative growth projection. Student growth can be interpreted relative to this growth projection and expressed as a growth percentile. If a student's growth from fall to spring was equivalent to the amount of projected growth, that student would receive a growth percentile of 50. Put differently, the amount of observed growth is consistent with the amount of growth projected to occur over the course of the school year. Growth greater than the growth projection would result in a growth percentile higher than 50, and vice versa.

This growth percentile value, identified as a Conditional Growth Percentile (CGP) in standard NWEA MAP Growth reports, could serve as the basis for contextualizing the growth observed for a student between two test events that occurred within or across school years. Parameters can also be established to categorize student growth as below average, average, and above average (or any other categorizations), to identify when student growth falls short, is consistent with, or exceeds normative growth thresholds. NWEA can support our partner districts in establishing these thresholds.

Translating student MAP Growth results to "months of growth"

NWEA recognizes that the state requires districts to report student growth results as a "months of growth" metric. We noted above that there are a number of challenges with this approach. These differences should be accounted for in summations of student growth to avoid overstating or understating the magnitude of gains made by students. NWEA recommends that steps be taken to allow for greater flexibility in the reporting of student growth results to ensure that student growth summaries are accurate reflections of the improvements students make. However, in response to the state's requirement to report growth in terms of "months of growth," NWEA previously offered the following guidance that can be used to fulfill this requirement.

Achievement Status and Growth Summary Report

Sanchez, Joyce
Homeroom

Term Tested:	Spring 2019-2020	**Norms Reference Data:**	2020 and User Norms[1].
Term Rostered:	Spring 2019-2020	**Growth Comparison Period:**	Fall 2019 - Spring 2020
District:	NWEA Sample District - Partner Accounts	**Weeks of Instruction:**	Start - 4 (Fall 2019) End - 32 (Spring 2020)
School:	Kobuk Valley Elementary School	**Optional Grouping:**	None
		Small Group Display:	No

Math: Math K-12

				Achievement Status				Growth							
				Fall 2019		Spring 2020		Student						Comparative	
ID	Name	SP20 Grade	SP20 Date	RIT Range (+/- SEM)	Percentile Range (+/- SE)	RIT Range (+/- SEM)	Percentile Range (+/- SE)	Projected RIT	Projected Growth	Observed Growth	Observed Growth SE	Growth Index	Met Projected Growth	Conditional Growth Index	Conditional Growth Percentile
S11155	Baker, Phyllis	3	3/16/20	213-**216**-219	96-**98**-99	221-**224**-228	91-**95**-97	227	11	8	4.7	-3	**No** ‡	-0.43	33
S11123	Banks, Felipe	3	3/25/20	205-**209**-213*	88-**93**-96*	225-**228**-231	96-**97**-98	219	10	19	5.1†	9	**Yes**	1.29	90
S11148	Barrett, Tamara	3	3/19/20	190-**193**-196	54-**63**-72	205-**208**-212	60-**69**-77	205	12	15	4.7	3	**Yes** ‡	0.41	66
S11149	Bell, Gerardo	3	3/16/20	199-**203**-207*	77-**85**-91*	225-**228**-231	96-**97**-98	214	11	25	5.2†	14	**Yes**	2.04	98
S11112	Burke, Elsa	3	3/16/20	197-**201**-205*	73-**82**-89*	209-**212**-215	71-**78**-84	212	11	11	5.1†	0	**Yes** ‡	-0.06	47
S11139	Cross, Erica	3	3/23/20	197-**200**-204	72-**80**-87	204-**207**-210	57-**66**-74	212	12	7	4.8†	-5	**No**	-0.72	24
S11131	Dion, Ilona	3	3/23/20	197-**201**-205*	73-**82**-89*	213-**217**-221*	80-**87**-92*	212	11	16	5.5†	5	**Yes** ‡	0.65	74
S11153	Escalante, Zulma	3	3/25/20	184-**188**-192*	38-**49**-60*	198-**201**-205	40-**50**-60	201	13	13	5.2†	0	**Yes** ‡	0.05	52
S11143	Evans, Janis	3	3/26/20	216-**220**-224*	98-**99**-99*	219-**222**-225	89-**93**-96	230	10	2	5.2†	-8	**No**	-1.12	13
S11106	Foster, Ruth	3	3/20/20	189-**193**-197*	52-**63**-73*	194-**197**-200	31-**39**-46	205	12	4	4.7	-8	**No**	-1.26	10
S11124	Garcia, Sean	3	3/23/20	192-**196**-200*	61-**71**-80*	211-**214**-217	76-**82**-87	208	12	18	4.7	6	**Yes**	0.93	82
S11137	Hall, Fred	3	3/20/20	182-**186**-190*	31-**43**-56*	195-**197**-200	32-**39**-46	199	13	11	5.1†	-2	**No** ‡	-0.28	39
S11152	Hitchcock, Chan	3	3/20/20	190-**194**-198*	56-**66**-75*	203-**206**-209	54-**64**-72	206	12	12	5.0†	0	**Yes** ‡	-0.03	49
S11127	Holmes, Sadie	3	3/24/20	190-**194**-198*	54-**66**-76*	196-**199**-202	35-**44**-54	206	12	5	5.4†	-7	**No**	-1.01	16
S11129	Jackson, Wallace	3	3/18/20	200-**203**-206	81-**86**-90	215-**219**-223*	84-**90**-94*	215	12	16	4.6	4	**Yes** ‡	0.64	74
S11145	Jenkins, Patricia	3	3/23/20	180-**183**-186	27-**34**-42	193-**196**-199	29-**36**-43	196	13	13	3.9	0	**Yes** ‡	0.02	51
S11120	Kelly, Kathy	3	3/26/20	178-**182**-186*	22-**32**-43*	189-**192**-195	19-**26**-34	195	13	10	5.2†	-3	**No** ‡	-0.47	32
S11140	King, Kathryn	3	3/23/20	201-**205**-209*	82-**89**-93*	197-**201**-205*	38-**50**-62*	216	11	-4	5.9†	-15	**No**	-2.03	2
S11147	Martin, Phillip	3	3/26/20	204-**207**-210	88-**92**-94	207-**211**-215*	66-**76**-83*	219	12	4	4.8†	-8	**No**	-1.17	12
S11117	Nelson, Ronald	3	3/23/20	170-**174**-178*	9-**15**-22*	174-**178**-182*	3-**5**-9*	188	14	4	5.4†	-10	**No**	-1.42	8
S11109	Ortiz, Elsa	3	3/18/20	189-**191**-194	50-**57**-65	188-**192**-196*	18-**26**-37*	203	12	1	4.9†	-11	**No**	-1.72	4

Explanatory Notes

** Due to statistical unreliability, summary data for groups of less than 10 are not shown. If Small Group Display is selected, summaries for small groups will be displayed.
*** Student did not have a valid, growth test event in this term.

[1]User norms are based on the group of students who have taken the test in the selected subject and course. These results are not comparable to results based on nationally representative norms.
† SE on Observed Growth is greater than normal. Use metric with caution.
* SE or SEM greater than normal. Use metric with caution.
‡Indicates that projected growth falls within standard error of observed growth.
Click here for more information on Met Projected Growth.

Generated by: Nick Kalakailo
8/21/20, 7:44:40 AM

Figure 1: Fall-to-spring Achievement Status and Growth Summary Report.

Where to find the necessary data points

Many of the data points required for LAP reporting are contained within one of the standard reports available to all schools using MAP Growth assessments. This report is called the Achievement Status and Growth Summary (ASG) Report, and it provides observed student scores at two different time periods, the amount of growth produced by a student over that time period, and the normative growth projection for that student.

The computation of "months of growth" can make use of the normative growth projection provided within the ASG report, which is based on each student's observed starting score, instructional exposure, and enrolled grade. Fall-to-fall and spring-to-spring growth norms based on default instructional weeks (fall = fouth, winter = 20th, spring = 32nd instructional week) assume that the test dates associated with starting and ending scores were a full year apart (i.e., 36 weeks of instruction), whereas the fall-to-spring growth norms based on default instructional weeks assume approximately six months have elapsed (i.e., 28 weeks of instruction). This impacts how the "months of growth" metric is computed, so it is important to note if the particular ASG report is a fall-to-fall, spring-to-spring, or fall-to-spring report.

Fall-to-fall and spring-to-spring ASG reports

Both the fall-to-fall and spring-to-spring ASG reports based on default instructional weeks assume that a full year has elapsed between the start and the end. When using one of these ASG reports, growth is computed by simply finding the difference between the end score and beginning scores. The translation to "months of growth" can then be found by dividing that difference by the normative growth projection. For example, if a student showed eight points of growth and the projected growth was 10 points, then that student achieved 80% of their respective growth goal. If the growth projection is treated as a "year of growth," then 80% of 10 months' worth of instruction is eight months. If the observed

growth was six points and the growth projection was eight points, then that student achieved 6/8, or 75%, of their growth goal.

Because the CEDARS data entry system only accepts month values of one through nine or 10+, whenever the ASG report indicated that a student met/exceeded the growth projection, one can enter "10+" within the CEDARS system. In other words, no calculations are required when the student's observed growth met/exceeded the growth projection. If the ASG report indicates that the student did not meet their growth projection, then the calculation from the preceding paragraph is required. For growth less than the growth projection (including negative growth), round the months to the nearest positive integer prior to entry into CEDARS.

Fall-to-spring ASG reports

When a fall-to-spring ASG report is used, the growth projection assumes that roughly six months have elapsed between the two assessments. This will be noted within the CEDARS system because the enrolled grade associated with the starting and ending scores will be the same.

The calculations required with a fall-to-spring ASG report are roughly the same as with other ASG reports: Compute the difference between the end score and beginning scores, then divide that difference by the normative growth projection. For example, if a student showed eight points of growth and a growth projection of 10, then that student achieved 80% of their respective growth goal. Eighty percent of six months' worth of instruction is 4.8 months. If the observed growth was six points and the growth projection was eight points, then that student would have achieved 6/8, or 75%, of their growth goal. Seventy-five percent of six months would be 4.5 months.

The only difference with fall-to-spring ASG reports is that the conversion of observed growth into "months" will always be required. The "met projected growth" field on the ASG report will not provide a shortcut to avoid the calculation as was the case with the fall-to-fall and spring-to-spring ASG reports. For all calculated months of growth (including negative growth), round the months to the nearest positive integer prior to entry into CEDARS.

nwea

AUG20 | KAP5828