USE OF SCHOOLWIDE GROWTH

WEBINAR #1

April 26, 2013
Agenda and Speakers

- Introduction: U.S. Department of Education
  - Monique Chism, Ph.D., Director, SASA
  - Victoria Hammer, Ph.D., Christine Pilgrim

- Overview of Approach (with Q&A):
  - Mariann Lemke, Center on Great Teachers and Leaders at AIR

- Implementation of Approach (with Q&A):
  - Luke Kohlmoos, Tennessee
  - Russ Keglovits, Nevada
  - General Q&A

- Wrap-Up
Webinar Series: Three Approaches to Measuring Growth for Non-Tested Grades and Subjects

- Schoolwide growth or value-added scores
- Student learning objectives (SLOs)
- Developing additional assessments to measure student growth

Each webinar will include a short presentation on the topic by a representative of the Center on Great Teachers and Leaders and by State and/or district leaders using the approach.
Timeline for the Webinars

- **Schoolwide growth or value-added scores**
  - Friday, April 26, 2013, from 2:00 to 3:15 p.m. ET

- **Student learning objectives**
  - Thursday, May 2, 2013, from 3:45 to 5:00 p.m. ET

- **Developing additional assessments to measure student growth**
  - Friday, May 10, 2013, from 2:00 to 3:15 p.m. ET

Recorded webinars posted to:
Use of Schoolwide Growth to Measure Growth for Teachers of Nontested Grades and Subjects

Mariann Lemke
Principal Research Analyst
April 2013
States and school districts are searching for new ways to build educator evaluation systems that include multiple measures. Recent reforms have pushed states and school districts to consider student growth as one of these measures.

Challenge: About 69 percent of all teachers cannot be accurately assessed with current models based on test scores, such as value-added models (Prince et al., 2009).
Objectives of Webinars

- States come away with updated information about the approaches in use, both from a general perspective and from the practical perspective of implementation.
- States come away with access to concrete resources from colleagues in other states.
- States find or seek opportunities for collaboration.
Center on Great Teachers and Leaders: Mission

The mission of the Center on Great Teachers and Leaders (GTL Center) is to foster the capacity of vibrant networks of practitioners, researchers, innovators, and experts to build and sustain a seamless system of support for great teachers and leaders for every school in every state in the nation.
Schoolwide Growth
Approach: Schoolwide Growth

- Who can be evaluated with schoolwide growth measures?
  - Individual teachers in untested grades and subjects
  - Principals and other administrators
  - Other school personnel
What do we mean by *schoolwide growth measures*?

- Often, this means taking existing value-added or growth measures in reading and mathematics and applying them to individual teachers in other subjects or administrators. (Teachers or administrators may select measures.)
- Need not focus only on existing measures on reading or mathematics, however (e.g., team-based SLOs or subjects in which a small number of teachers represent the work of the school). Could be extended to nonacademic areas as well.
Some Recent Uses

- 2011–12 Tennessee TEAM
- TAP: The System for Teacher and Student Advancement
- 2011–12 Washington DCPS IMPACT
- 2011–12 Delaware DPAS II
What Is Known About Schoolwide Growth

- Are measures of schoolwide growth “good”?
  - Validity, reliability, fairness—To what extent are these measures relevant to the work of the educator being evaluated? To what extent do they correspond with other measures? How well can they distinguish among educators? How consistent are the measures?

- Do measures of schoolwide growth have any impact?
  - Do they contribute to changes in teacher practice (e.g., collaboration, retention)?
  - Do they contribute to improvement in student outcomes?
What Is Known About Schoolwide Growth: Are the Measures Good?

- Existing studies on use of value-added measures for teacher evaluation—not focused on schoolwide growth, however
  - e.g., Gates Measures of Effective Teaching (2013) and other studies provide insight into strengths and limitations of value-added measures

- Newer studies on use of value-added measures for principal evaluation
  - e.g., Grissom, Kalogrides, and Loeb (2012) suggest challenges of distinguishing school and principal

- No studies on other types of locally developed schoolwide measures (e.g., in SLO context)
What Is Known About Schoolwide Growth: Are the Measures Good?

- Newer information on educator perceptions of schoolwide measures, e.g., Tennessee Year 1 Implementation Report
  - Administrators consistently noted that having schoolwide value-added scores has led to an increase in collaboration among teachers and a higher emphasis on academic standards in all subjects.
  - Teachers in subjects and grades that do not yield an individual value-added score do not believe it is fair to have 35 percent of their evaluations determined by schoolwide scores.

Source: [http://www.tn.gov/education/doc/yr_1_tchr_eval_rpt.pdf](http://www.tn.gov/education/doc/yr_1_tchr_eval_rpt.pdf)
Some studies have tested the impact of various policy responses to teacher evaluation data in which schoolwide growth was used as one measure of teacher effectiveness—e.g., merit pay studies.
Resources: Measuring Growth in Untested Grades and Subjects


Resources: Use of Value-Added for Teacher Evaluation*


*Not specific to schoolwide growth
Resources: Schoolwide Growth/Value-Added for Principal Evaluation


Resources: Measuring Growth for Special Populations


Advancing state efforts to grow, respect, and retain great teachers and leaders for all students
Use of School-Wide Growth in Teacher Evaluation

Spring 2013
We aim to be the fastest improving state in the country by 2015

We will measure our success by our progress on NAEP, ACT, and PARCC
Continuous Improvement

- Improvements outlined in our Y1 report: [http://www.tn.gov/education/doc/yr_1_tchr_eval_rpt.pdf](http://www.tn.gov/education/doc/yr_1_tchr_eval_rpt.pdf)

- Positive feedback from principals on school-wide measure

- Universal feedback to reduce weight of school-wide/system-wide growth

- Important to learn from and respond to implementation feedback, build credibility
Components of Evaluation - Tested

- **Qualitative**
  - Observations in planning, environment, and instruction
  - Professionalism rubric

- **Growth measure**
  - TVAAS or comparable measure

- **Achievement measure**
  - Goal set by teacher and evaluator
Components of Evaluation - NTGS

- **Qualitative**
  - Observations in planning, environment, and instruction
  - Professionalism rubric

- **Growth measure**
  - School-wide or system-wide growth

- **Achievement measure**
  - Goal set by teacher and evaluator
Expanding Choices

- K-2 Assessment - Individual growth for 1\textsuperscript{st}, 2\textsuperscript{nd} and 3\textsuperscript{rd} grade teachers
- Portfolio Model - Individual growth for Fine Arts teachers
- Targeted school-wide scores – CTE Concentrator school-wide
- Choices for school-wide – Composite, literacy, numeracy, literacy/numeracy, SAT 10 only, TCAP/EOC only
- Pilots for new measures – World Languages, PE
Challenges with 15% Student Achievement

- Non-differentiating distribution
- Variable implementation
- Time and effort at school level
- Lack of actionable feedback
- Some promising strategies in isolation
Resources

E-mail:
- Questions: Team.Questions@tn.gov
- Feedback: Team.Feedback@tn.gov
- Training: TNED.Registration@tn.gov

Websites:
- **NIET Best Practices Portal**: Portal with hours of video and professional development resources. [www.nietbestpractices.org](http://www.nietbestpractices.org)
- **TEAM website**: [www.team-tn.org](http://www.team-tn.org)
- **TEAM Training website**: [http://tn.gov/education/team/training.shtml](http://tn.gov/education/team/training.shtml)
- Weekly TEAM Updates
Using School-Wide Measures of Student Achievement in Teacher Evaluation

Nevada Department of Education

April 26th, 2013
How the Framework Operates

Weighting the Measures and Determining the Ratings

- Instruction / Instructional Leadership = 35%
- Professional Responsibilities = 15%
- Student Performance = 50%
  - Student growth = 35%
  - Student subpopulation gap reduction = 10%
  - Student proficiency = 5%
Weighting the Measures

Total Evaluation: Weighting

- Instructional Practices (35%)
- Professional Responsibilities (15%)
- Student Performance (15%)

Student Performance Domain

- Growth (35%)
- Proficiency (5%)
- Subgroup Populations Gap (10%)

Growth (35%)
Proficiency (5%)
Subgroup Populations Gap (10%)

For teachers in tested grades & subjects, performance ratings are based on a combination of school-wide scores and scores from the students in the teacher’s class(es).

For teachers in non-tested grades & subjects, performance ratings are based on school-wide scores only.
How the Framework will Improve Over Time

- Continuing Role of TLC
- Aligning Policy
- Data System Enhancement/Tech
- Validation Implications and Actions
- Accountability and Public Reporting
- Stakeholder Engagement

- 1-3-5-7-10 Year Philosophy
- Resources/Finance Implications
- Professional Development and Supports
- Human Capital Decisions
- Higher Education/Pre-service (internships, induction, etc.)
“1-3-5-7-10 Year Plan”

- The array of student performance data is the best that can be accomplished at this time, given current assessment systems and available data.
- Priority to be given to growing assessment systems over time, to accommodate more direct attributions of student performance to teacher performance, particularly for Group 2 teachers.

- [http://www.doe.nv.gov/Teacher_Leaders_Council/](http://www.doe.nv.gov/Teacher_Leaders_Council/)
Contact Information

• Russ Keglovits
• Office of Assessment, Program Accountability, and Curriculum
• Nevada Department of Education
• rkeglovits@doe.nv.gov
Contact Information

StateSupport@ed.gov