NCAASE National Center on Assessment and Accountability for Special Education

Advancing research on growth measures, models, and policies for improved practice

Critical Issues in Studying Growth on State Tests for Students with Disabilities

Gerald Tindal, Joseph Stevens, & Joseph F. T. Nese University of Oregon Ann Schulte, Stephen N. Elliott, & Alexander Kurz Arizona State University

Session Abstract

This presentation focuses on areas critical to understanding achievement growth for students with disabilities on state tests. Specifically, we discuss (a) growth by disability; (b) disability classification changes in interpreting growth; and (c) opportunity to learn and growth on curriculum based measures as predictors conditioned by disability status.

Suggested outline

- NCAASE Overview IES Cooperative Agreement
- NCAASE Sample Findings-Highlights
 - Methodological challenges in studying growth for students with disabilities (PA slides, Once sometimes slides)
 - Growth in students with disabilities (reading & math growth on general test, ORF, alternate) think we have too much to present here
 - Understanding the determinants of growth-Opportunity to learn study
- Future Directions

NCAASE 2011-2016 Key Research Questions

- 1. What is the natural developmental progress in achievement for students with disabilities?
- 2. What models best characterize achievement growth for students with disabilities who are participating in general achievement tests?
- 3. How do various growth models represent school effects for students with and without disabilities, and how do results compare to those derived from the status models now in us?
- 4. How do results from different types of interim assessments of students' achievement meaningfully contribute to a model of academic growth for students with disabilities?
- 5. How can information about opportunity to learn and achievement growth be used to enhance academic outcomes for students with disabilities?





Figure 1. Mean mathematics achievement by grade and student group.





Figure 2. Achievement gap effect sizes between all SWoD students and exceptionality group by grade.





Figure 3. Ann will insert reading results with similar format





Figure 4. Ann will insert results for reading with similar format



Figure 5. Mean mathematics achievement by grade and LD status.





Figure 6. Interaction of LD Status With FRL Status on Mathematics Achievement Growth.





Figure 7. Interaction of LD Status With Black Race/ethnicity on Mathematics Achievement Growth.



Once • Always • Ever



Findings on Oral Reading Fluency

- A 30 year history of oral reading fluency
 - Stability across researchers, measures, time periods, and populations
 - One word per week growth
- Findings on progress monitoring for students with disabilities (and considering measurement conditions)
- Stratified random sample of students for establishing norms (easyCBM)



Findings on ORF





Grade 4 Unconditional Model with Intercept and Slope

Fixed Effect	Coefficient	Std. Error	t-ratio	df	p-value
For intercept	97.10	1.36	71.38	958	<0.001
For slope	0.65	0.04	17.52	958	< 0.001

Grade 4 Conditional Model with Student Characteristics and Measurement Conditions

Fixed effect	Coefficient	SE	<i>t</i> -ratio	df	<i>p</i> -value
Intercept	115.61	2.70	42.83	952	< 0.001
Sex	-0.93	2.47	-0.38	952	0.707
Disability	-25.32	3.71	-6.82	952	< 0.000
Ethnicity	-1.56	2.58	-0.61	952	0.545
ELL	-23.83	3.90	-6.11	952	< 0.001
Grade Level	-11.04	4.13	-2.67	952	0.008
Performances	-2.52	0.38	-6.60	952	< 0.001
Slope	0.72	0.08	8.87	952	< 0.001
Sex	-0.10	0.07	-1.34	952	0.181
Disability	-0.07	0.10	-0.72	952	0.472
Ethnicity	0.01	0.08	0.15	952	0.879
ELL	0.26	0.13	1.98	952	0.047
Grade Level	0.02	0.10	0.24	952	0.809
PRFs	0.00	0.01	0.56	952	0.579

Advancing research on growth measures, models, and policies for improved practice

National Center on Assessment and Accountability for Special Education

Transition Matrix from Grade 3 (2009) to Grade 4 (2010)

	_		_					Grade	e 4		
(Gr	rowth	n for				Low	Nearly Meets	Meets	Exceeds	Level Change
					Low		156	35	9	0	
	S	WS(CD	Creada 2	Nearl	y Meets	33	53	48	8	0 (-3 levels)
				Grade 3	Meet	S	5	40	143	114	17 (-2 levels)
	130				Excee	eds	0	1	21	115	197 (-1 level)
0					امرا	Change		0	6	94	467
Sore			Grade 3		Level	Change		(+3 levels)	(+2 levels)	(+1 level)	(no change)
sessment Rea	110 100	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	 Proficien cy Cut Score Unconditi onal 	diagonal	ls). Transitior	n Matrix from	Grade 4	(2010) to Grade 5	(2011)		
e As			Growth					G	rade 5		_
ternate	90		Grade 3 Below	_			Lo	w Nearly Mee	ets Meets	Exceeds	Level Change
A			GenEd <			Low	10	53 13	3	0	
	80	3 4 5	40%	(Grade 4	Nearly Meet	s 4	2 48	29	4	0 (-3 levels)
		Grade		,	Jiaue 4	Meets	1	5 28	99	49	7 (-2 levels)
						Exceeds	:	3 2	41	95	91 (-1 level)
						Level Chang	ge	3 (+3 levels	17) (+2 levels	111) (+1 lovel)	405
										I (TI LEVEL	(no change)

Note. There were no students in the lowest level (Very Low). Level Change indicates the

NCAASE National Center on Assessment and number of a Accountability for Special Education diagonals). number of students that changed achievement level (i.e., sum of the diagonal and off- 16^{-1}

Multiple Testing Opportunities





17

Multiple Testing Opportunities

a) Opportunity 1



Advancing research on growth measures, models, and policies for improved practice

Accountability for Special Education

SWSCD Alternate-General Participation



NCAASE Multiple Measures Study where OTL is featured as a Process Variable

Our Key Research Questions

- Do students with disabilities have equal access to the general curriculum in comparison to their classmates without disabilities?
- What is the relationship between opportunity to learn and academic growth in mathematics for all students? Is the relationship different for students with and without disabilities?
- To what extent are variations in growth for students with and without disabilities related to OTL?



Opportunity to Learn the Intended Curriculum



A unified conceptualization of OTL ^{gro} based on 50+ years of empirical research.

Definition: Opportunity to Learn

The degree to which a teacher dedicates instructional time and content coverage to the intended curriculum objectives emphasizing higher-order cognitive processes, evidence-based instructional practices, and alternative grouping formats.

(Kurz, 2011)



MyiLOGS: Calendar Reporting

			My 💷	DGS" (M Populate	e Reports OPrint Lesso	ns Class Profile Print View
School: Desert Meadows Na	me: Teacher turquoise1005m C	lass: Tunnell Gr. 8 Math			View: Cale	endar 🛛 🙆 🐼
Return to main page		0	December	2010 💿		<u>Return to main page</u>
Skills	Monday	Tuesday		Wednesday	Thursday	Friday
S1 Number/ Operations S1C1PO1 Compare/order S1C1PO2 Classify rational/irrational S1C1PO2 model read numbers S1C1PO4 model/solve absolute value S1C2PO1 Factors/multiples/prime S1C2PO2 Rational number effects S1C2PO3 Percent inc., dec, simple interest S1C2PO4 Std/scientific notation conver. S1C3PO1 Estimate1 S1C3PO2 Estimate on number line S2 Data Analy, Prob., Discrete Math S3 Patterns, Algebra, and Functions			S2C31 S2C21 S2C21 S2C21 Conce Time	202 Counting-factorial notation 1 2 15 min. 201 Theoretical/experimental 2 15 min. 203 Sample space for dep/indep 2 15 min. 202 Compare 2 10 min. 204 Available for Instruction 2 10 min.	S2C2PO1 Theoretical/experimental S2C2PO2 Compare outcome/prediction IS min. S2C2PO3 Sample space for dep/indep IS min. S2C3PO2 Counting-factorial notation S2C3PO2 Counting-factorial notation IS min. Concept Review Bell Work ID min. Time Not Available for Instruction ID min. X	Testing I for min. 3 Time Not Available for Instruction 15 min. Concept Review Bell Work I for 5 min.
S4 Geometry and Measurement S5 Structure, Logic Custom Skills/Activities Drag skills from the calendar here to delete them.	Time Not Available for Instruction 240 min. S2C2PO2 Compare outcome/prediction 240 min.	 Time Not Available for Instruct 30 min. S3C3PO1 Alg. expressions, equinequalities 15 min. S3C3PO2 Evaluate expression 15 min. S3C3PO3 Linear equations and inequalities 20 min. 	ction 7 S3C31 wations, Time	202 Evaluate expression 2 3 30 min. Not Available for Instruction 5 50 min.	S3C3PO2 Evaluate expression	S3C3PO1 Alg. expressions, equations, inequalities 10 Image: Signal state of the s
	8	¥ ®		📑 🖉 🖉 🕽	/ × 📑 🐔 🕽	×

NCAASE National Center on Assessment and Accountability for Special Education

Initial OTL Study using MyiLOGS

"Based on this sample's general education classrooms, which represented a full inclusion model, students with disabilities experienced less time on standards, more non-instructional time, and less content coverage compared to their class. ... At least for students with disabilities nested in general education classrooms, OTL appears to be a differentiated opportunity structure. ...the instructional differences do not indicate equal or equitable OTL for students with disabilities.

- Given their disability-related characteristics, students with disabilities may need at
- least as much OTL, if not more, than their peers without disabilities. However, the
- Current findings suggest the exact opposite; if replicable, these data would pose
- serious instructional challenges for teachers and hold profound implications for policy
- makers focusing on academic proficiency and growth without consideration for the

instructional inputs and processes that affect student outcomes."

ASE National Center on Assessment and Accountability for Special Education

Advancing research on growth measures, models, and policies for improved practice Jrz, Elliott, Lemons, Kettler, Zigmond, &

Kloo, 2014)

Multiple Measures Study

Four 2-year Longitudinal Cohorts: 4-5, 5-6, 6-7, & 7-8





Multiple Measures Study: Year 1 Findings

- Teachers (N = 69) and students (N = 261; 136 SWD + 125 SWoD) from AZ & OR schools grades 4th-8th.
- A regression analysis showed OTL, easyCBM, grade, and special education status predicted nearly 67% of the variance in students' end of year mathematics achievement as measured by the OR Assessment of Knowledge & Skills in Math. By comparison, this same set of measures accounted for 61% of the variance in students' end of year mathematics achievement on the AZ Instructional Measurement of Skills test.
- Inspection of the regression results showed
 - CBM measures are the best single predictor of end-of-year achievement (46% of the variance)
 - OTL indices of time, content, cognitive processes, and instructional practices contributed an additional 10% to the prediction of end of year achievement for students in mathematics.
- More information to come from this study as we finish Year 2; we will have achievement growth data for all these students!

Thank You & Stay in Touch

http://www.ncaase.com

NCAASE National Center on Assessment and Accountability for Special Education