• This is not about DATA—this is a complete paradigm shift

• This is a time-tested, proven product.

• Changes the end-goal to “Value Added” versus pass/fail. Examples: A student can pass year after year and still be “losing value.” Schools can be rated “Exemplary” and actually be “losing value” with many of their students.

• Brings the psychosocial dimension to center stage

• Long held data misconceptions are eliminated

• Systematically dispels the myths that hinder excellence

• Highly cost effective: As low as $1,695 per school when purchased district wide.
Fundamentally changes your schools

- Creates a sense of control over accountability
- Refocuses instruction
- Substitutes “valued added” as the new end-goal
- Highlights & utilizes psychosocial factors
- Reconnects teachers to their passion for teaching
- Demonstrates to students their importance
- Creates a gestalt of excellence
7th Grade TAKS Needs Assessment Profile

ALERT! Student failed to pass Reading on the 04/06 TAKS and did not achieve passing on the 04/05 TAKS!
ALERT! Student failed to pass Math on the 04/06 TAKS and did not achieve passing on the 04/05 TAKS!

STUDENT: James

CAMPUS 2006-2007: Texas Middle School

Date of Administration: 04/06
ID: 999999999
Date of Birth: 08/31/1993
Sex: Male
Ethnicity: Hispanic
LEP - Yes
Program Participation -
Title I - No
Migrant - No
Bilingual - No
ESL - Yes
G/T - No
Special Ed - No

TEST 2003 SS 2004 SS 2005 SS 2006 SS Anticipated 2006 Scale Score
Math 1863 1877 2023 1976 Failed
Math'06 Failed
Reading 1766 1844 2036 1930 Failed
Reading'06 Failed

Lexile® Measure -- 775L
Typical reader measures for 7th graders are reported to fall
within the range of 735L to 1065L.

OBJECTIVE LEVEL PERFORMANCE ANALYSIS

Instructional Areas Within Strike Zone

Math
Obj. 2 Patterns, Relationships, and Algebraic Reasoning 50.0% Correct
Obj. 6 Mathematical Processes and Tools 55.6% Correct

Reading
Obj. 3 Using Strategies to Analyze 70.0% Correct

Aberrant Objectives
Student’s objective performance was at least 1 standard
deviation below campus performance on the following objectives.

Math
Obj. 1 Numbers, Operations, and Quantitative Reasoning 30.0% Correct
Obj. 4 Concepts and Uses of Measurement 20.0% Correct
Obj. 5 Probability and Statistics 28.6% Correct

Reading
Obj. 1 Basic Understanding 58.3% Correct
Obj. 4 Applying Critical Thinking Skills 50.0% Correct

RELATIVE PERFORMANCE ANALYSIS

Mathematics

Interpretive Analysis (Confidence Level Relatively High)
- Concern Level Very High - student scored elsewhere at this level - possible Negative Banding
- Regression to mean not a factor - an established negative STASIS may exist
- If current performance verifies STASIS, concern should rise
- Scenario Recommendation: PSYCHO/SOCIAL & INSTRUCTIONAL/ Reconceptualize
- Refer to school response to Scenario #23

Performed like other students with similar entry scores
Initial Math Data Based Assessment ----RED

Math Residual is 0.47

Reading

Interpretive Analysis (Confidence Level Relatively High)
- Concern Level High - there’s a slight probability student could slip backward
- Note: Regression to mean is a possible factor working against you
- Possible loss more likely if previous STASIS can be established
- Scenario Recommendation: INSTRUCTIONAL/ENCOURAGE (student likely inner directed)
- Refer to school response to Scenario #19

Performed slightly higher than other students with similar entry scores
Initial Reading Data Based Assessment ----YELLOW

IMPORTANT NOTE: All statements made in this document are based on statistical probabilities only and are not meant to imply definitive outcomes of any sort.
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STUDENT: Amanda

CAMPUS 2006-2007: Texas Middle School

Date of Administration: 04/06
ID: 999999999
Date of Birth: 09/15/1992
Sex: Female
Ethnicity: Hispanic
LEP - Yes

Program Participation ---- Title 1 - No
Migrant - No
Bilingual - No
ESL - Yes
G/T - No
Special Ed - No

Current and Historical Performance Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TAKS Outcomes</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>Anticipated 2006 Scale Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Math'06</td>
<td>Passed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Math'06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math'05</td>
<td>Passed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Math'05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math'04</td>
<td>Passed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Math'04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math'03</td>
<td>Passed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Math'03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading'06</td>
<td>Passed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reading'06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading'05</td>
<td>Failed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reading'05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading'04</td>
<td>Failed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reading'04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading'03</td>
<td>Failed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reading'03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lexile® Measure -- 1050L
Typical reader measures for 7th graders are reported to fall within the range of 735L to 1065L.

OBJECTIVE LEVEL PERFORMANCE ANALYSIS

Instructional Areas Within Strike Zone

Math
Obj. 3 Geometry and Spatial Reasoning 85.7% Correct
Obj. 4 Concepts and Uses of Measurement 80.0% Correct
Obj. 6 Mathematical Processes and Tools 66.7% Correct

Reading
Obj. 3 Using Strategies to Analyze 80.0% Correct

Aberrant Objectives
Student’s objective performance was at least 1 standard deviation below campus performance on the following objectives.

Math
No Objectives in this Category.

Reading
No Objectives in this Category.

RELATIVE PERFORMANCE ANALYSIS

Mathematics
Interpretive Analysis (Confidence Level Relatively High)

- CONCERN LEVEL LOW - however there’s a probability student could slip backward
- NOTE: Regression to mean is now likely working against you
- Possible loss more likely if previous STASIS can be established
- Scenario Recommendation: INSTRUCTIONAL FOCUS (student likely inner directed)
- Refer to school response to Scenario #10

Performed much higher than other students with similar entry scores

Initial Math Data Based Assessment ---- BLUE

Reading
Interpretive Analysis (Confidence Level Relatively High)

- CONCERN LEVEL LOW - however there’s a probability student could slip backward
- NOTE: Regression to mean is now likely working against you
- Possible loss more likely if previous STASIS can be established
- Scenario Recommendation: INSTRUCTIONAL FOCUS (student likely inner directed)
- Refer to school response to Scenario #5

Performed much higher than other students with similar entry scores

Initial Reading Data Based Assessment ---- GREEN

IMPORTANT NOTE: All statements made in this document are based on statistical probabilities only and are not meant to imply definitive outcomes of any sort.
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STUDENT: Laura  
CAMPUS 2006-2007: Texas Middle School

DATE OF ADMINISTRATION: 04/06  
ID: 999999999  
DATE OF BIRTH: 04/15/1993  
SEX: Female  
ETHNICITY: White, Not Hispanic  
LEP - No  
PROGRAM PARTICIPATION:  
Title 1 - No  
Migrant - No  
Bilingual - No  
ESL - No  
G/T - No  
SPECIAL ED - No  

Current and Historical Performance Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>Anticipated 2006 Scale Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>2400</td>
<td>2336</td>
<td>2677</td>
<td>2243</td>
<td>2386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>2267</td>
<td>2153</td>
<td>2653</td>
<td>2134</td>
<td>2309</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lexile® Measure ~ 900L
Typical reader measures for 7th graders are reported to fall within the range of 735L to 1065L.

OBJECTIVE LEVEL PERFORMANCE ANALYSIS

Instructional Areas Within Strike Zone

Math
- Obj. 1 Numbers, Operations, and Quantitative Reasoning 80.0% Correct
- Obj. 2 Patterns, Relationships, and Algebraic Reasoning 80.0% Correct
- Obj. 5 Probability and Statistics 85.7% Correct

Reading
- Obj. 4 Applying Critical Thinking Skills 81.3% Correct

Aberrant Objectives

Student’s objective performance was at least 1 standard deviation below campus performance on the following objectives.

Math
- No Objectives in this Category.

Reading
- Obj. 1 Basic Understanding 75.0% Correct
- Obj. 3 Using Strategies to Analyze 60.0% Correct

RELATIVE PERFORMANCE ANALYSIS

Mathematics

Interpretive Analysis (Confidence Level Relatively High)
- CONCERN LEVEL LOW - student is scoring much lower than projections predicted
- Moderate gain probability, regression to mean in your favor
- Gain more likely if previous STASIS can be established
- Scenario Recommendation: PSYCHO/SOCIAL
- Refer to school response to Scenario #1

Reading

Interpretive Analysis (Confidence Level Relatively High)
- CONCERN LEVEL LOW - student is scoring much lower than projections predicted
- Moderate gain probability, regression to mean in your favor
- Gain more likely if previous STASIS can be established
- Scenario Recommendation: PSYCHO/SOCIAL
- Refer to school response to Scenario #6

IMPORTANT NOTE: All statements made in this document are based on statistical probabilities only and are not meant to imply definitive outcomes of any sort.
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NOTE!  Student failed to pass Reading on the 04/06 TAKS administration.

STUDENT: Michael  CAMPUS 2006-2007: Texas Middle School

Date of Administration: 04/06  ID: 999999999  Date of Birth: 02/18/1993  Sex: Male  Ethnicity: White not Hispanic  LEP - No

Program Participation ---- Title 1 - No  Migrant - No  Bilingual - No  ESL - No  G/T - No  Special Ed - No

Current and Historical Performance Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>Anticipated 2006 Scale Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>Math'06- Passed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2158</td>
<td>2100</td>
<td>2110</td>
<td>2109</td>
<td>Math'05- Passed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2125</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Math'04- Passed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Math'03- Passed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reading'06- Failed</td>
<td>Reading'05- Passed</td>
<td>Reading'04- Passed</td>
<td>Reading'03- Passed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2116</td>
<td>2067</td>
<td>2290</td>
<td>2082</td>
<td>2168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lexile® Measure ~ 835L
Typical reader measures for 7th graders are reported to fall within the range of 735L to 1065L.

OBJECTIVE LEVEL PERFORMANCE ANALYSIS

Instructional Areas Within Strike Zone

Math
Obj. 3 Geometry and Spatial Reasoning 71.4% Correct
Obj. 4 Concepts and Uses of Measurement 60.0% Correct

Reading
Obj. 2 Applying Knowledge of Literary Elements 80.0% Correct

Aberrant Objectives
Student's objective performance was at least 1 standard deviation below campus performance on the following objectives.

Math
Obj. 1 Numbers, Operations, and Quantitative Reasoning 50.0% Correct

Reading
Obj. 3 Using Strategies to Analyze 60.0% Correct

RELATIVE PERFORMANCE ANALYSIS

Mathematics
Interpretive Analysis  (Confidence Level Relatively High)

Math Residual is -0.15

Concern Level Moderate - scored consistently at this level - possible Neutral Banding
Regression to mean not a factor - current performance is likely Stasis
Check current performance to verify Stasis
Refer to school response to Scenario #13

Performed like other students with similar entry scores
Initial Math Data Based Assessment ----GRAY

Reading
Interpretive Analysis  (Confidence Level Relatively High)

Reading Residual is -0.77

Concern Level Moderate - student is scoring lower than projections predicted
Moderate gain probability, regression to mean in your favor
Gain more likely if previous Stasis can be established
Scenario Recommendation: Psycho/Social & Instructional/ Consider Reconceptualizing
Refer to school response to Scenario #12

Performed slightly lower than other students with similar entry scores
Initial Reading Data Based Assessment ----GRAY

IMPORTANT NOTE: All statements made in this document are based on statistical probabilities only and are not meant to imply definitive outcomes of any sort.
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Who will PASS?

All Three Students Narrowly Passed the 6th Grade Standard in 2006

**Tail Left**

Last Year’s Predicted Score was 2300 (Should have gotten)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2006</th>
<th>6th</th>
<th>7th</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>2100</td>
<td>2100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6th Grade score becomes the entry 7th Grade score

3rd | 4th | 5th | 6th | 7th |
---|-----|-----|-----|-----|
2221| 2252| 2297| 2100| 2100|

**Centered**

Last Year’s Predicted Score was 2056 (Should have gotten)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2006</th>
<th>6th*</th>
<th>7th</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>2100</td>
<td>2100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6th Grade score becomes the entry 7th Grade score

* Passed that year

3rd* | 4th* | 5th* | 6th* | 7th |
-----|------|------|------|-----|
2121| 2077| 2119| 2100| 2100|

**Tail Right**

Last Year’s Predicted Score was 1925 (Should have gotten)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2006</th>
<th>6th</th>
<th>7th</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2100</td>
<td>2100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6th Grade score becomes the entry 7th Grade score

3rd | 4th | 5th | 6th | 7th |
---|-----|-----|-----|-----|
1931| 1997| 1827| 2100| 2100|
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Color</th>
<th>Psycho/Social</th>
<th>Instructional</th>
<th>Instructional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Green</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gray</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>Instructional</td>
<td>Instructional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>Instructional (Encouragement)</td>
<td>Instructional (Encouragement)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Very Negative</td>
<td>Instructional (Encouragement)</td>
<td>Instructional (Encouragement)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Scenarios**

- **UNDERPERFORMING**: Banding Groups
- **OUTPERFORMING**: Check for Inner Directed
What will your schools get in the INOVA Process?

Formerly known as Campus TAKS, our product was recently renamed the INOVA Process to better reflect its character. The INOVA Process is designed to increase your school’s TAKS scores, improve your ability to match appropriate interventions with students’ needs and enhance your long-term instructional effectiveness. Ultimately, it’s designed to build your staff’s confidence in their ability to positively respond to any test system placed in their path. Built on a foundation of fifteen years of site-based experience in responding to accountability systems in two states (Texas and California), the INOVA Process has proved itself to be one of the most successful systems for raising accountability ratings. The Process starts by presenting you with a completed comprehensive disaggregation of your TAKS test results not only for this past year but also longitudinally. The disaggregation includes critical proprietary information analysis that yields “perspectives” into your data that are not available through any other source. These powerful analytical tools are delivered to your school complete and ready to use. The breadth of this product ranges from individual student profiles by subject area to grouped analyses by campus and district. Embedded in this system is also a unique analysis coined “tail-left” that precisely targets scenarios of rapid potential gains among your student population. The Process also leads to what we term “scenario analysis” which facilitates your staff’s ability to match student needs to interventions and then evaluate the effectiveness of those interventions. The materials are tied to a detailed step-by-step approach that turns them from mere data into a powerful motivational device for creating positive changes in your school’s response plan to the current or any future test measures your school will face. Here are just a few examples of what you’ll be able to do immediately upon receipt of your INOVA Process materials:

- **Individual Student Profiles** are generated on each student for which the district has a valid test record. These profiles allow staff to 1) Target specific students by the level of intervention required to not only meet but exceed the school’s TAKS and AYP goals, 2) Target specific objectives requiring intervention by specific individual needs, and 3) Identify “patterns” of test performance, by student, later to be tied to “scenario” analysis (discerning sets of students that fall into the same basic performance trends)

- **“Strike Zone” analysis by student**. Each student record is analyzed to determine the specific objectives which would yield the highest potential gain for that particular student. These are the areas where the student could progress the fastest—not only improving test performance but more importantly improving the student’s belief in his abilities (self-esteem and psychological persistence)

- **“Aberrant analysis” is conducted by student**. This is designed to identify students whose performance is not inline with the schools’. This is accomplished by first analyzing how each individual school did on ALL the tested objectives and then based on that level of school performance identifying which students scored aberrant to the school. The value of this analysis is that it can readily identify students who did not master an objective even though the majority of the students in the school did. This “flags” students whose instruction must be modified in the future---Even though the school taught the concept effectively (i.e., the majority of the students in the school got it right) this student did far below his peers.
A new section called “Interpretive Analysis” does exactly that—it interprets the residuals (the basis of Tail-left), sets concern levels, and signals general scenario response strategies.

You will be able to readily identify students with the highest potential for immediate increases in scores and those requiring more long-term interventions (also those poised for commended performance). This takes two forms: 1) one is in a proprietary analysis termed “tail left” that identifies students that underperformed or outperformed (conducted by student and illustrated on the profiles) and 2) aggregate listings of students that fall into one of twenty-five performance “scenarios.” The staff is taught the importance of scenario analysis and how its results can guide future instruction.

As mentioned above, profiles are tied to your school’s “Scenario Responses” (the Process helps you begin developing approaches to these). More importantly your school learns which 6 of the 25 possible scenarios are pivotal to beating the TAKS and which 3 additional scenarios are the keys to beating the AYP. By targeting these 9 pivotal “scenarios”, your school enhances its mathematical probability of beating both TAKS and the AYP.

Your INOVA Process “kit” also includes: 1) a set of critical listings (students by scenario, Super-green list—students that could hit Commended Performance, Color code lists, Potential Gain Report—which students exactly can bring the school the most rapid improvement in performance and where the school stands on tail-left/tail-right distribution), 2) transparencies of how many greens, blues, grays, yellows and reds they have (to help in their discussions with staff) and 3) student labels to build mentoring packets.

Through the “productivity analysis” component your staff will learn to identify strengths and weaknesses in their school’s instructional interventions—enabling them to begin building a plan of systemic change in their instructional response system. Staff is briefly trained on using the enclosed CD (containing an EXCEL file of the profile data) to do “productivity analysis”. More extensive training in this area can be purchased at the district’s discretion. In this regard, the INOVA Process also helps identify programs that get you the results you want and those that don’t.

As mentioned above, a data CD is also enclosed in your materials kit that contains: 1) an EXCEL data file of all the information illustrated in the profiles (so that your staff can create their own lists and queries) and add variables---This file also allows schools (with the internal capacity) to do what we previously called “productivity analysis” and 2) PDFs of all the profiles on a CD so that you always have a complete copy of all the profiles and lists we provided you (this makes it easier to work with the data---lose a sheet---no problem, just print another from the CD).

Use the INOVA Process to directly motivate positive actions—The Process is designed to elicit precise attitudinal and behavioral shifts in your staff that lead to increased student achievement. Many of the illustrations of “data” included in the materials you’ll receive are designed to enhance your presentations to staff on student needs and the actions required to achieve your TAKS and AYP goals.