The Student Growth Implementation Committee recommended a model from the class of covariate adjustment models. This model begins by establishing expected growth for each student. The expectation is estimated from historical data each year, and represents the typical growth seen among students who have earned similar test scores the past two years, and share the other characteristics enumerated below. In addition, the expected growth increases for students enrolled in more than one course. Those characteristics (i.e., covariates or variables) are used to establish the expected growth for students. The variables recommended by the committee are:

- The number subject-relevant courses in which the student is enrolled
- Up to two prior years of achievement scores
- Students with Disabilities (SWD) status
- English Language Learner (ELL) status
- Gifted status
- Attendance
- Mobility (number of transitions)
- Difference from modal age in grade (as an indicator of retention)
- Class size
- Homogeneity of entering test scores in the class

The inclusion of these control variables effectively establish expected student scores based on typical growth among students who are similar with regard to these characteristics.

The teacher’s value added score reflects the average amount of growth of the teacher’s students above or below the expected growth of similar students in the state, using the variables accounted for in the model. For example, if a teacher’s value added score is 10, that means that students taught by that teacher, on average, grew 10 points higher than expected for similar students in the state. In the model recommended by the committee, the teacher’s value added score is expressed as a sum of two components: one that reflects how much the school’s students on average grew above or below similar students in the state (a “school component”), and another that reflects how much the teacher’s students on average grew above or below similar students within the school (a “teacher component”).

The committee considered the proportion of the school component that should be attributed to the teacher. The committee’s last vote was to include 25 percent of the common school component in a teacher’s value added score. Based on a request of the committee’s chairman for an additional meeting of the committee to address this one aspect of the recommendation, and the Commissioner’s own observations concerning the committee’s deliberations on this specific issue, the Commissioner has requested additional clarification from the committee on the “school component” recommendation. The Commissioner has requested that the committee reconvene prior to June 8, 2011, to clarify that portion of the recommendation. Following that meeting, the Commissioner will make the final determination on this part of the model.