UIP Target Setting with Colorado Growth Model Data

Accountability & Data Analysis Unit

COLORADO
Department of Education

The purpose of this fact sheet is to provide a brief orientation concerning how Colorado Growth Model data may be used to support target setting within an improvement planning process.

Background

The Colorado Growth Model (CGM) provides student, school, and district level growth data based on the normative performance of students based on comparison to academic peer groups that had similar score histories[1,2]. This data is one of the most commonly used data-points to monitor performance and is often incorporated as a target within the improvement planning process.

When engaged in improvement planning, teams will examine achievement data and growth data together to help determine progress and to set goals for the upcoming years. There are many possible strategies for establishing growth targets. This fact sheet provides an overview of how growth data can be more effectively used within a target setting process and provides examples of different approaches for the use of that data.

Colorado Growth Model & Target Setting

Within improvement plans, schools and districts identify targets that help guide their implementation. Schools and districts will need to balance setting meaningful targets that are relevant to local context yet are ambitious enough to meet expectations.

A few reminders when establishing growth targets based on CGM data.

- Median growth percentiles (MGP) are normative and based on comparison to like student groups (i.e. academic peer groups). So, depending on your particular reference group a given MGP may not result in sufficient change to move the student to grade level expectations. For example, a student that has an achievement score at the bottom of level one on CMAS Math may require a very high growth percentile to move that child to grade level expectation compared to a student that is already at level five.
- While student level math and ELA growth percentiles are not correlated between years, math and ELA growth percentiles at the school and district level are. This means establishing multi-year targets at the systems level would be a meaningful approach to target-setting.

Overview of Target Setting Approaches

Colorado growth model data may be applied to the target-setting process in many different ways. Each approach has strengths and limitations and some are easier to calculate. Table 1 briefly describes the various possibilities along with important points of consideration from the most basic to more complex target setting. Page three provides examples of each approach. Schools may want to initially consider the first approach as it provides a basis for meeting accountability goals and they are encouraged to consider other approaches as they can provide a more in-depth and accurate approach to target setting.

Table 1. Target Setting Methods Based on Colorado Growth Model Data

Name	Description	Metric	Strength(s)	Limitation(s)
State Growth Targets	Adopt annual growth targets that meet or exceed state-wide median growth percentiles.	Comparison of School/District MGP to State MGP of 50; Percentage of grade-levels or student groups meeting or exceeding 50.	Provides a simple point of comparison between school, district, and/or state growth rates.	For students that are performing below grade-level expectations a growth target of 50 is likely insufficient to move them to grade level expectations over time.
Framework Cut-Point Targets	Use the MGP cut-points included within the performance frameworks for target setting.	District/School targets based on growth indicator cut-points.	Provides a target that is clearly aligned to accountability expectations and associated with framework points.	The utilized cut-points may not reflect the growth needed to move student groups to grade level expectations.
Performance Based Growth Targets	Identify differentiated targets based on current student achievement. The further the identified group of students are from grade level expectations the greater the growth percentile required.	Variable MGP target that is adjusted based on the desired performance of the student group(s) of interest.	Incorporates consideration of student performance relative to the growth rate needed to show improvement.	Fails to provide a clear basis for determining the appropriateness of a given target. In effect, the target is a 'best guess' based on the starting point of the students of interest.
On-Track Targets	Determine if MGPs meet or exceed the cuts needed to be considered on-track; and/or use the percentage of student's statewide meeting on-track expectations as a target.	Percentage of student's on-track compared to the typical percent change between performance levels for the state. The MGP of the target group compared to the growth percentile required to be on-track.	Targets aligned to performance expectations. Provides annual targets that may be both ambitious and attainable for teachers. Also, provides information based on student performance level (e.g. catch-up).	The results are anchored to performance expectations that may be lower than grade level expectations.

Examples of Target Setting by Method

Following adoption of a target-setting approach, it's important to clearly describe our future growth expectations to allow for monitoring. Examples of such statements aligned to each approach are provided below. For each method, we provide two examples to help illustrate the impact of different school contexts that impact the meaningfulness of the established growth targets (e.g. low achieving school vs. high achieving school; catch-up vs. keep-up, etc.).

State Growth Targets

- **Example 1:** *The 2019 Median Student Growth Percentile for CMAS Math will meet or exceed the state Median Student Growth Percentile of 50 for all tested grades and disaggregated groups.*
- **Example 2:** *The percentage of grade levels with Median Student Growth Percentiles meeting or exceeding the Median State Growth Percentile of 50 in CMAS ELA shall increase from 25% (2/8) in 2018 to 75% (6/8) in 2019 for the district.*

Framework Cut-Point Targets

- **Example 1**: *Median growth percentiles in mathematics for grades 7 and 8 are just below the "approaching" cut point. The district will increase the MGP for mathematics from 33 to at least 50, the "meets" cut point during the 2019 academic year.*
- **Example 2**: *Median growth percentiles in mathematics for all students are just above the "meets" cut point. The school will increase the MGP for mathematics from 55 to at least 65, the "exceeds" cut point during the 2019 academic year.*

Performance Based Growth Targets

- **Example 1:** *During 2019, only 10% of students met grade level expectations on the CMAS ELA assessment. The school will achieve and MGP of 80 for students not meeting expectation to help close performance gaps.*
- **Example 2:** *All students in A+ Magnet School achieved grade level expectations on the 2019 CMAS Math assessment. In order to maintain performance the MGP across all grades will remain above the 35th percentile.*

On-Track Targets

- **Example 1**: *Increase the percentage of level one students who are meeting their on-track growth goals from 25% to at least 45%*
- **Example 2:** *Increase the percentage of students meeting on-track growth from 20% to 50% on CMAS Math during year one and from 50% to 75% during year two.*

Where can I learn more?

- For additional information concerning the Colorado Growth Model visit: www.cde.state.co.us/accountabilit/coloradogrowthmodel
- For additional information concerning improvement planning & target setting visit: http://www.cde.stte.co.us/uip
- For questions about this fact sheet, contact Johann Liljengren at: Liljengren_j@cde.state.co.us or Dan Jorgensen, PhD at: Jorgensen_d@cde.state.co.us.