

Student Growth Workgroup

Educator Effectiveness Project

MINUTES

October 28, 2011: Meeting #3

Utah Law and Justice Center

Present: Linda Alder, Lynne Baty, James Birch, Jay Blain, Aaron Brough, Wendy Carver, Robert Cox, Lori Gardner, John Jesse, Jen Lambert; Kerrie Naylor, JoEllen Shaeffer, David Smith, Selena Terry, Darryl Thomas, and Christine Marriott (guest presenter from Salt Lake District)

Excused: Emily Tew, Leah Voorhies, Laurel Brown, Sydnee Dickson, Cathy Jensen, Brian McGill, Judy Park.

1. Welcome

Kerrie Naylor

- Roll, travel vouchers, etc.
- Review and approve Minutes Meeting #2 Oct. 19, 2011
- Review Agenda
- Goals for today

Kerrie and Lynne welcomed the group.

Review of Minutes (October 19, 2011)

- **John Jesse asked that we edit bullet three under Judy Park to indicate she recommended the Student Growth Committee use the Student Growth Percentile model**
- **Motion (JoEllen) Second (Aaron) approved**

Review of Agenda items and Goals for today:

- **Visit the subject of non-tested grades and subjects**
- **Talk in depth about the assessments types for NTSG in Scott Marion's work**
- **Come to an understanding of the methodologies and analytic approaches and begin to decide what to use for Utah's non-tested subjects and grades**

2. Local Student Growth Model Presentations

- Salt Lake City

Jo Ellen Shaeffer

Christine Marriott

JoEllen Shaeffer introduced Christina. Christina Marriott presented to the group what SL District has been doing to measure student growth.

Project Goals:

- **Recognize effort and expense**
- **Provide teachers quality feedback**
- **Provide data to principals to empower them as instructional leaders**

Highlights of the presentation:

Each year they have put together data folders for each teacher. Christine and JoEllen meet with each teacher individually. The data is reflective data. Teachers use the information to set new goals.

They want to refine the model and started using scaled scores to refine growth on CRT compared to UPASS model.

Looking at scaled scores how many points gain would be acceptable? Should not be arbitrary.

Student growth solution:

Use our SLCSO data to determine what is the normal or average gain for students

Bad idea to compare different tests (test sequences due to apparent differences in equating).

They have created a custom sequence for each test sequence.

Possible methods to aggregate growth to the teacher

- 1. Percent of students at or above the average (with confidence interval)*
- 2. Comparison between the student gain score and the average gain score*

Inform, Recognize, Reward, Evaluate

- Show teachers the expected gain for each student on all test results*
- Aggregate to classroom and provide feedback about rankings*
- Public recognition and or Performance Pay*
- Provide detailed information from multiple years to teachers and principals for ECAP, staffing decisions*

They provide reflective data sheets for teachers in August before they are completely involved with their new students. Important so they have a chance to reflect. They also give current year data and individual student historical data.

They provide scaled scores for current year, previous year and point difference. Teachers may have students who are proficient (4) but have lost points in the scaled score. Students are compared to other students in "their bin".

They have built trust over the years by providing data to teachers. This system is understandable to the average teacher.

Each bin needs at least 150 students to be statistically accurate.

Any assessment can be used with this type of report as long as it is given throughout the district with a pre and post test.

It is important not to have just individual teacher bonuses, but school wide bonuses as well.

Principals also receive reports by school, teacher, and grade marked as effective, highly effective and ineffective. Helps the principal decide where they need to put their resources. They found that their Title I schools have a greater percentage of ineffective teachers. This could be attributed to placement of newer teachers at Title I schools. The district could use information to give teacher PD, remediate teachers, or move ineffective teachers and replace them with more effective teachers.

The system doesn't work for teachers who switch subjects in Elementary. It also has problems for Special Education teachers.

All teachers above 70% will be recognized. Their SIG schools received performance pay.

They recognize that there are still lots of work to do.

PowerPoint presentation will be emailed out to committee members.

Discussion followed with the committee around SGP strengths and weaknesses.

3. Discussion: Non-tested Subjects and Grades Kerrie
- Considerations for non-tested grades
 - Summary of Approaches for non-tested grades

Kerrie introduced an ACTIVITY and asked members to be in groups of three.

Instructions: Take time to reflect on what you learned and the insights you had from Chris' presentation. Write down your thoughts as a team of three. What questions do you still have?

The information from the groups was compiled and will be attached to the minutes.

After this activity, Kerrie reviewed the focus of our work. Discussion Questions/Accountability Questions for selecting measures for student growth for Utah's Educator Evaluation. Handout was distributed.

Kerrie then asked the members to divide into four groups.

Instructions: Each group will review/discuss the Marion articles: A survey of approaches used to evaluate educators in non-tested grades and subjects by Katie Buckley and Approaches and considerations for incorporating student performance results from "non-tested" grades and subjects into educator effectiveness determinations by Scott Marion and Katie Buckley.

The Four groups were asked to discuss the variety of assessment types to provide measures of student performance in Non- tested subjects and grades.

1. Norm-referenced tests NRT (p.15 in Survey)
2. Interim assessments (p15-16 in Survey and P 8 in Approaches)
3. End of course exams that are standardized (p16 -17 in Survey and p 9 in Approaches)
4. School or teacher developed measures (p17 in Survey)

The groups recorded what each assessment type is, how it works, what it could look like in Utah, the advantages and disadvantages of the assessment for NTSG.

This information is attached to the minutes.

Kerrie suggested that we save the next activity listed below for next meeting:

Same four groups discuss analytic approaches or methods to evaluate effectiveness in NTSG

1. Value added models (p 18 in Survey and p 11 in Approaches)

2. *Conditional status models (p 19 in Survey and p 12 in Approaches)*
3. *School-wide growth models (p 20-21 in Survey and p 13 in Approaches)*
4. *Student learning objectives SLOs (p21-22 in Survey and p 14-15 in Approaches)*

Record what the method is and why it would work or not work in Utah. Describe how it works and what LEAs and the SEA may need to do to make it work.

This will be discussed at the Nov. 15 meeting.

Lunch Break 12-1:00

4. Smarter Balance Update

Kevin King
John Jesse

Kevin King presented to the group information about Smarter Balance Assessments: Two questions to think about: Kevin

1. *Do we have a single answer for all the categories and fields*
2. *Dealing with the totality of any single teacher, how do we accommodate for teachers who have tested and non-tested subjects*

Discussion: We need to do the good enough but needs to be revisited often and make changes as necessary. Stakes should remain low until we are comfortable. We are not sure the correct answer lies here. However, there is an answer out there.

- *An appeal process is important.*
- *There needs to be statewide uniformity on the process and the appeal.*

Highlights of Smarter Balance presentation by Kevin King:

- *Smarter Balance Assessment Consortium*
- *This will be next generation of assessment.*
- *SBAC is dedicated to the breadth*
- *Strength of SBAC is: Formative, Interim and summative*
- *Why SBAC?*
- *Willing to be different*
- *Balanced System: formative, interim, summative*
- *Innovative assessment*
- *Test design*
- *State controlled: Utah is invested in the process*
- *Educator involvement: Our strength is involvement of teachers in development*
- *Comparability: Same test state to state in this consortium*

- *Economy of scale: Many states are working together*
- *Local flexibility: Whole system is designed for flexibility*
- *Accessibility: Accessibility and accommodations are a huge part of SBAC. Built from the ground up rather than a retro fit*
- *Focus on college and career ready: the goal*
- *What is SBAC:*
 - *It is computer adaptive (with performance tasks)*
 - *Tailored online reporting: develop a system to meet many needs focused on achievement and growth*
 - *Current achievement and growth*

Time line:

12-13: Continue with current CRT

SBAC Educator/Vendor Item Writing

Pilot SBAC Items

13-14: SBAC Field testing

SBAC Summative Test

SBAC Interim Tests

SBAC Formative Tools and Processes

CAT Engine

Adaptive Algorithms

Scoring and Reporting Systems

13-14: Accountability

Request waiver from USED for Language Arts and Math

Other tests keep moving along

CRTS and or adaptive testing

Science

DWA Kinder

DIBELS

3rd grade summative reading

College and career ready – pending legislation

UAA, UALPA, NAEP

14-15: Operational throughout state

PowerPoint will be shared with the committee.

5. Guiding Principles for Our Work

Lynne Baty

This will be discussed at the next meeting.

6. Update on Assistance from Center

Kerrie

We need to be prepared as a committee on the direction we need to go before the consultants meet with us. Read the articles again and discuss more at the Nov. 15 meeting.

7. Closing Comments

Kerrie and Lynne

Kerrie and Lynne thanked everyone for participating. An email will be sent with the minutes, the ppts. and the notes from the group work.

8. Future Meetings:

- **Nov. 15: 9-3:00, Utah Law and Justice Center**
- Dec. 7: 9-3:00, Utah Law and Justice Center
- Jan. 10: 9-3:00, Utah Law and Justice Center
- Feb. 7: 9-3:00, Utah Law and Justice Center
- Mar. 8, 9-3:00, Utah Law and Justice Center

Lunch will be provided at noon. Thank you for your participation. Minutes will be sent electronically.