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- Student IDs were first merged across LEA lines in 2011
  - Possible because of improvement on SSIDs
  - Provided the ability for a student’s testing history to follow them to different LEAs

- OAA Math and Reading Value-added Model
  - 2010
    - All Schools were using the original EVAAS MRM methodology
    - Students were only considered the same if they were in the same LEA for above reason.
  - 2011
    - All Schools were using the original EVAAS MRM methodology
    - Students were considered the same as long as they were in the same county
    - Done within county due to computational reasons
Ohio Evaas Timeline

OAA Math and Reading Value-added Model continued...

2012
- All non-community schools used original EVAAS MRM.
  - Students were considered the same as long as they were in the same region.
  - Expanded to region with additional computational power
- All community schools methodology was updated to better account for mobility of students
  - All students prior testing history was used in the gain calculation regardless of where they came from
  - No longer necessary to assume a student was representative of the school that they came from because we were not using the students from those feeder schools that did not enroll at the community schools

2013
- All schools using updated methodology as community schools in the past year
- All students prior testing history was used in gain calculation from across the state
- Students are only used in the analysis if they meet FAY requirement
Mobility Statistics:

E-Schools
- Average percent of students with gains coming from other schools in very small groups = 41%
- None of these students were used in calculating the gain
- Average 2013 Mobility Rate = 48.1%

Comparison Group of Schools
- Brick and Mortar Community, Constellation, and Highly Mobile Traditional Public Schools
- Average percent of students with gains coming from other schools in very small groups = 34%
- None of these students were used in calculating the gain
- Average 2013 Mobility Rate = 29.4%
• Other statistics for comparison
• E-Schools – 7 schools
  • 2013 Percent Non-white – 21%
  • 2013 Percent Economically Disadvantaged – 64%
  • 2013 Percent Indicators Met – 31.3%
• Comparison Schools – 42 schools
  • 2013 Percent Non-white – 78%
  • 2013 Percent Economically Disadvantaged – 95%
  • 2013 Percent Indicators Met – 7.7%
• Overall these schools are fairly comparable
• Instead of looking in the model specifics, look at the individual students.

• Compare all students’ current year scores to their prior year scores after converting to NCEs to get a simple gain.

• What does this tell us about the students?
• What is the difference of the students’ gains when they moved from one school to the next vs. staying at the same school?
• Is this difference comparable for e-schools compared to other highly mobile schools?
Key difference is the average difference in gains of students that came from the same schools vs. the gains of students that came from different schools.

From the mobility statistics

- 41% of prior scores were not used for e-schools
- 34% of prior scores were not used for other comparison schools

Inclusion of these students has a much larger overall impact to the overall gain for e-schools vs. other comparison group schools
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>E-Schools</th>
<th>Comparison Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average simple raw NCE gain of the Students that were in the building this year and last</td>
<td>-0.46</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average simple raw NCE gain of the Students that were in the building this year and in a different building last year</td>
<td>-5.47</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference of these averages This is the impact when including these students when measuring growth</td>
<td>-5.01</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• One question SAS received was to look at the prior year history of students before they went to the e-school.

• Are students performing even worse the year before they get to the e-school?

• Students did about the same or better the year before they were enrolled in the e-school with respect to growth.
  • In math, they typically did better the year before the e-school
  • In reading, they did the same the year before the e-school
Mean score vs year for students coming to eschool from non-eschool in 2013
subject=Math
Mean score vs year for students coming to eschool from non-eschool in 2013
subject=Reading
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