MS. PRESTON: We are going to be recording the webinar, and then we'll be posting it online so that if you have colleagues who couldn't join this morning or you yourself at any point want to go back and listen to a particular part with anyone, you'll have the ability to do that.

Right now, I do have everybody who's on the webinar with us muted. There are about 60 people online, so we're going to keep it that way so we don't have to deal with background noise or echoing or any of those types of things.

If, at any point during the webinar, you have questions, please feel free to type them into the questions bar on your dashboard. We did have some questions sent in ahead of time and we'll be sure to answer those, but we'll also try to get to as many other questions asked during the webinar as we can. If we do run out of time and there are any questions that were asked that we didn't get a chance to answer, we'll take those, write up answers to them to make a frequently asked questions documents, and go ahead and get that out to folks through our listservs and posting it online.

So before we dig into the actual material for today, I just want to introduce myself and then also to let you know that I'm in the room with a team of people here at the Department. My name is Jennifer Preston. I'm the Race to the Top project coordinator for Educator Effectiveness. I work on the D(2) part of Race to the Top for those of you have read the state plan and also worked on your local district plan for Race to the Top. This section focuses on taking a look at our evaluation system and explicitly including student growth, increased training on our standards, and some other ways that we can provide teachers with better feedback on their classroom instruction and then also how their students are learning.

I'm in the room with a series of folks from the Exceptional Children Division here at DPI, so we're going to have them go around and just say their name so that you know who's here.

MS. MCCOY: Dreama McCoy, Consultant for Autism.

MS. GREER: Claire Greer.

MS. THOMAS: Sherry Thomas.

MS. COLWELL: Beverly Colwell

MS. WOLFE: Ira Wolfe.

MS. PRESTON: Okay. Before we get into any real specifics about measuring growth for the new standard on the teacher evaluation instrument, we want to first set the context. North Carolina is most definitely in a time of change when it comes to education. The 2012-13 school year is bringing new curriculum in the Common Core and Essential Standards, as well as new assessments. We're converting to PowerSchool from NCWISE. We're getting ready to launch the instructional improvement system in the near future. With so much changing, why are we focusing so much on educator effectiveness?

As people who still are, or probably were at some point, classroom teachers, we can all say that it's because all of those other efforts are really secondary to having an effective teacher in every classroom and an effective school leader in every building.

North Carolina could have the best assessments in the world, the best curriculum, and tons of great technology, but if there aren't people working with our kids every day that want to use those tools and want to educate them in the right way, nothing that we change from an infrastructure point of view is really going to get the results that we want for North Carolina students.

The work around educator effectiveness, especially the Common Exams or Measures of Student Learning, which we're going to talk about in more detail today, are really rooted in the belief that students in North Carolina deserve an effective teacher in all of their courses and grades. It's not just about who teaches them fourth grade ELA or Math or who teaches them Biology. That's one part of the instruction they get in our public schools, but they're also learning Social Studies. They go through grades kindergarten, first, and second, and we need to make sure that all of the people that are interacting with our kids and are educating them are effective.

We also know that teachers in North Carolina want to be effective. We have a lot of great teachers in

North Carolina, and those great teachers are often looking for how they can get even better. That's what they want to do for themselves and for their kids. What we need to do is take our evaluation system and really sort of reshape it into one that provides good feedback to teachers so that they know what their strengths are - everybody has those - but also so that they know what their weaknesses are – what are the areas where they can improve by going through professional development and working with other people in their school to make their performance even better? It's not about firing our way to a better teaching force. That's something that we hear a lot out in school districts and with teachers, and that's really not what the system is about. What it's really about is identifying two groups of teachers: first, the group of teachers that are the strongest because those are the people that we can all learn from. Those are the people that can help mentor our new teachers, can help be in leadership positions, and can really set the tone in school buildings in the right direction. We also need to identify teachers who need additional support, not to fire them, but to give them the support they need - to give them professional development that's directed, that focuses on their areas for improvement, and can ultimately help improve them and make them into those effective teachers.

North Carolina, along with a lot of other states, has been using research from out in the field in designing our educator effectiveness model. This work is definitely something that we could do by saying, okay, theoretically, what do we think makes for an effective teacher? But we found is that it's actually better to base things on research that has been done both here in North Carolina and in other states. What you're looking at the screen are some results from the Measures of Effective Teaching Project. This is a project funded by the Gates Foundation that has been operating in six school systems for about four or five years. One of those systems is Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools, so this research has, in part, taken place here in North Carolina. The goal of the MET Project is to figure out what kind of evaluation system provides teachers with the best feedback and actually differentiates between our teachers that are doing a great job and our teachers that need some help improving their teaching.

What you're looking at on the screen - and we'll walk through this in a little bit more detail - are the differences in student learning among teachers identified as being in the top 25 percent or the bottom 25 percent of the teaching population, and they are identified through a couple of different methods. The first horizontal line with the observation tool is just that. This says, let's use just an observation tool to identify teachers that are at the top 25 percent and teachers that are at the bottom 25 percent. By observation tool, it could be anything. In some states, it's the Danielson Framework. In North Carolina it's the North Carolina Evaluation Instrument. It really doesn't matter. The point is you're looking at just results from observations.

When we do that, what you can see is that there are differences in how much students learn when they're in class with one of the top 25-percent teachers and how much they don't learn when they're in class with one of the bottom 25-percent teachers. So if we look at the state Math test, for example, it's about a month more instruction for the kids that are in the top 25-percent classroom, and the kids that are with the bottom 25 percent of teachers are losing about a month and a half of learning compared to the average. The very thin, white lines that are running down the center there are the average amount of growth shown in classroom across the states.

So what happens if we still continue to use that observation tool because that is a great way of principals and other evaluators actually getting into classrooms and seeing what's happening. What if we still use that, but we also administer some kind of student survey, something that North Carolina piloted this spring. We asked students specific questions about the kinds of things that happen in their classroom. If we take the results from the observation and the student survey and combine them, then identify the top 25 percent of teachers and the bottom 25 percent of teachers, we're seeing more difference in the learning of those students. So kids that are with one of the top 25-percent teachers are gaining about three more months of learning in Math compared to the average, and students that are with the bottom 25 percent of teachers are losing about two months compared to the average. So we're starting to see bigger

differences.

Now when we look at the last row, this is the kind of system we are trying to create here in North Carolina. It still uses an observation. It includes perceptions of students on their classroom environment. It also includes some quantitative measure of growth that students make in a classroom. What we can now see are pretty drastic differences. Students that are with one of the top 25 percent of teachers are gaining four and a half more months of learning compared to students in the average classroom. Students that are with one of the bottom 25 percent of teachers are losing about three months compared to the average classroom.

What we also know from lots of research dating back quite a while about teacher quality is that it tends to vary more within a school than it does across schools or across districts. We frequently have places where these two teachers may teach right next door to each other. The same students are coming in on the same bus and eating in the same cafeteria together. In one classroom, they're gaining four and a half months more than the average, and, in the classroom right next door, they're losing three months, which makes for a total difference of almost an entire school year in the learning of the kids in those two classrooms.

So what do we need? We have an observation instrument already that's been in place. Educators in North Carolina have been evaluated with that for about five years, depending on when your system entered the implementation cycle. In some places, it's been about two or three years. But we don't really yet have a system that looks like the one we just saw on the screen, so there are a couple of things we need to add.

So the first thing we need to add is that quantitative measure of student growth, and that has been done with Standard 6 and Standard 8, which have been added to the teacher evaluation instrument for Standard 6 and the principal and assistant principal evaluation instrument for Standard 8.

We also need some way of taking that step back from the ratings on the different standards and saying

“what do these mean about a teacher overall?” We've never really had a way to do that in North Carolina before. We've been able to say this teacher is proficient on Standard 1, developing on Standard 2, accomplished on Standard 3, but what does that mean overall? We're now going to do that with what's called an educator status.

We also need to measure student growth in areas where we don't measure it right now with state assessments, and that's where the Common Exams or Measures of Student Learning come in. These assessments are specifically for ELA, Science, Math, and Social Studies in grades 4 through 12. We also have other areas in which kids are learning standards and they're growing, but it's difficult to measure it in kind of a standardized way. Some examples there are K to 2, grade 3 - even though kids are taking EOGs, we don't really have a starting point from which to measure growth - and also lots of our performance areas, which range from World Languages to the Performing Arts to Physical Education standards.

First, just the basics about Standard 6 and 8, which teachers should be seeing when they log in to the McREL online evaluation instrument. Standard 6 focuses on teachers contributing to the academic success of their students. Nothing's changed about the first five standards. They're still exactly the same as they've been before. For principals and assistant principals, the new eighth standard is academic achievement leadership. Their original seven standards are all framed in terms of leaderships of different types, and so the eighth standard is as well.

One of the most important things I'll probably say today, and one that we constantly emphasize and need your help in sharing with educators, is that Standards 6 and 8 are measures of growth. Because of No Child Left Behind and other polices, we've been in an area where so much has been focused on proficiency. What percentage of your kids makes 3s or 4s on state tests? That's not what educator effectiveness and the sixth and eighth standards are about. They are about how much kids grow over the course of a year.

I'm sure we all know, and can probably imagine, a sixth grade ELA teacher who has students that come in reading on a second- or third-grade reading level. Maybe, at the end of the year, they've made two years worth of growth in reading and are now reading at the fourth- or fifth-grade reading level. They're probably not going to get fours or threes on the state test. The proficiency rate that that teacher sees may not be very high; but, when we look under that, and we look at the growth that those kids have made, we see what a tremendous teacher we're looking at - one who is actually able to make two years worth of reading growth with kids and play a pretty critical role in helping them catch up, helping them get back to where they are on grade level. That's the kind of teacher that we're looking for in the educator effectiveness model.

In determining growth, there are lots of different assessments out there, and we need some more specificity on what assessments we're talking about being used to measure growth. At their last Board meeting, the State Board made a very small revision to TCP-C-006, which is the State Board policy around the evaluation of teachers. They essentially clarified what kind of data goes into EVAAS. What we are talking about is going into EVAAS to produce value-added scores for teachers is, of course, our End-of-Grade and End-of-Course assessments that have always gone into that system.

We've also now been able to move results from most of our CTE Post-Assessments into EVAAS and generate value-added scores as well, and we are expecting that the Common Exams administered during the '12-13 school year will also be able to go into EVAAS. That means that all of these teachers would be able to have a value-added score that could be a large part of their sixth standard rating.

Now we're going to dig a little bit more deeply into the Common Exams themselves and then we should finish with plenty of time for questions. The Department of Public Instruction is designing what we're calling a Library of Common Exams for non-tested grades and subjects for district use to populate Standard 6. The reason we say "library" is because not every district or every school is going to be administering every one of our exams. There's a lot of district flexibility in this such that it's almost like

going into a library and taking the books you need, but not taking the books you don't need.

So a big question that's been asked is why do we have statewide Measures of Student Learning or Common Exams? Why are these being designed at the state level? There are really three big reasons for that in our North Carolina context. The first is that we have a statewide evaluation system, and that's not true in a lot of other states. In a lot of other states there are district-level evaluation systems and so district-level assessments make sense there for kind of looking at the same level. Because we have a statewide system that's supposed to be consistent across all the LEAs in the state, the need for that statewide assessment is also there.

The second reason is that we do believe that teachers in all content areas should receive a Standard 6 rating that's based on the growth of their kids in their content area. There are other states out there where school-wide growth is always part of the evaluation for teachers of Social Studies or K-3 or other content areas that don't have assessments. In North Carolina, we are using that as sort of an interim measure of growth, but the goal would be that teachers' evaluations, the part that's based on student growth, should be about their kids and the standards they teach them, not a measure of school-wide growth.

Then lastly, just from a capacity perspective, knowing all the budget cuts that have been going on, when you think about something like assessment design that involves psychometricians, statisticians, test-measurement specialists, curriculum folks, we here at DPI know that a lot of LEAs just don't have the staff members or the capacity to do that in-house. They also don't have the funding to contract for someone to do it. This is a place where the State can step in; we have those resources here already and can help with design and these assessments.

There are two principles for administration for the Common Exams for the '12-13 school year. The first is that every English Language Arts, Science, Math, or Social Studies teacher in grades 4 through 12 should have a value-added score. The second is that that value-added score should be based on all the students that a teacher teaches. In the cases in which a teacher is giving multiple assessments to his or her

kids, all the data would be aggregated. The best example for that one is a fifth-grade self-contained teacher. That fifth-grade self-contained teacher is giving Science, Math and ELA EOGs to all of their students. That data is all going to be aggregated together to produce the growth value for that teacher. This is a decision tree that districts can use in deciding when and how they're going to administer the Common Exams. It really starts with asking if the teacher in question gives some kind of state assessment to all of their students, and if he or she does, there's no state requirement to administer a Measure of Student Learning. If he or she doesn't, you next have to take a look at if he or she is teaching courses or grades in which we have a Common Exam for this school year. If we do, then it does have to be administered. If we don't, like the Arts, for example, where we're just not there yet with a statewide measure for growth, then there's no state requirement for '12-13. This usually makes more sense to people when we talk about concrete examples, so let's share a couple.

At the high school level, we can imagine a high school Science teacher who, first semester, teaches three blocks of Biology, and, second semester, teaches three blocks of Earth & Environmental Science. So we ask ourselves about that teacher: does he or she administer an End-of-Course, End-of-Grade or CTE assessment to all their kids? The answer is no, not to all of them. He or she does to the Biology kids, so those are taken care of, but we don't have any data on how those Earth & Environmental Science kids are doing. That's when the administration of the Common Exam is required. We don't want that teacher's growth value to represent only half of the kids that he or she teaches and sort of leave out the other half of the students.

An example more in the lower-grades area would be a fourth-grade teacher who is in a self-contained classroom. She or her has the kids all day and teaches them Math, Science, Social Studies and ELA. Because the ELA and Math EOGs are going to be administered there, we've actually got plenty of data. The teacher is giving two state tests to each of those kids. Because we have that data, there's no state requirement that that teacher gives a Social Studies Measure of Student Learning or the Science Measure

of Student Learning. That's a district decision. In some districts, there has been the decision that they are going to go ahead and administer more of these assessments than is required. I gave fourth grade as an example because that's one of the places we're seeing this decision. There are districts saying, "Well, you know, our fourth-grade students go into fifth grade where there is a Science EOG. We're going to go ahead and give them the fourth-grade Science Common Exam because that's going to help us get good information on where they stand as they go into fifth grade and are preparing for a state test." That's an example of where districts have some flexibility in how they administer the exams.

In terms of resources that are out there, these are all posted to our website and they have also been shared in paper copy with the three attendees from every district that attended our statewide meeting on educator effectiveness on September 20th. Each LEA sent a team that had, in most cases, the HR director, the testing and accountability director, and the curriculum and instruction director.

We have made available an implementation guide for the Measures of Student Learning that shares information about what kinds of materials are needed and has some sample scripts for administration if districts want to use those. We have also made available an administration timeline and specifications. Just like we do with the state test, if a World History teacher is wondering, "Which standards are going to be assessed heavily on this Common Exam?" he or she can actually go to a file with the specifications, pull it up, and take a look at that.

We've also released a Guide to Measuring Student Growth, which is broken down into content-specific sections so that a Social Studies teacher can say, "Well, I want to know how growth is measured for me." He or she goes to the table of contents, finds the page where Social Studies is discussed, and can read a little bit more.

We've also released an optional local planning template that districts can use if they'd like to - they don't have to - that walks through some of the big decisions that districts have to make about educator effectiveness and about the Common Exams.

I've also just received a helpful note here that you folks did receive a link to a wiki where all of these materials are posted in one place. They're on our NC Public Schools site, and they're also on the wiki link that you received. Those are two places you can find them.

There are a couple of administration and implementation options that are sort of new developments. The first one is a big one. The administration of the high school Common Exams this fall is now optional. Starting in the spring, with the end of second semester, all the Common Exams have to be administered in school districts, but the administration of the high school ones for the fall is optional. To date, there are about 30 districts that have decided to go ahead and administer the ones in the fall, and then the rest of the districts will be waiting until the spring. If a district does choose to administer the Common Exams in the fall, there's one additional area where they have flexibility, and that's around Geometry and Algebra II. What we've got in those specific courses is a really wide variety of how districts are teaching them. Some districts have shifted completely to Common Core. Some districts are just focusing on the 2003 standards, but working in some of the Common Core and kind of gradually ramping students up to that new level of rigor. By the spring, we will have available a variety of different second Math and third Math assessments, so the districts have a little bit more flexibility to pick the one that aligns with how they decided to teach high school Math as we transition to the Common Core.

Lastly, if a district does decide to administer these exams in the fall, then the results will count for the teachers' sixth standard ratings.

Just to highlight a couple areas of district flexibility: one is the administration mode. We have some systems that are going to put these assessments online. They're essentially going to take them and kind of drop them in to a benchmarking or formative assessment system that they already maintain, and they're going to administer that way.

We do also have systems that are going to do it in the more traditional way of paper-and-pencil assessments. Then we have some systems that are going to do a hybrid of the two. One example I've

heard is loading the actual test itself onto a computer and having students look at the questions on a computer screen, but then having them actually bubble-in their answers on an answer sheet. That's kind of a way to sort of mix the two.

The date of administration is also an area where districts can make some decisions. There's no testing window for these like there is for the state test. Depending on how high schools schedule their end of the year, and depending on how middle and elementary schools schedule their EOGs, there's flexibility on when these assessments can be given.

They've also been written to take, at least for the high school, 90 minutes. If a district wants to have high school kids take them during an exam block, they certainly can. They could also take it during the last week of class; the test would fit within a class period if that is the district's preferred schedule.

Use in a student grade is also not required. As we all know with the state tests, there's a requirement that they count for at least 25 percent of a high school student's grade. That's not true with the Common Exams, although districts can certainly use the grades for final exam grades for students if they'd like to.

We've already talked a little bit about which assessments are administered, and districts are using that decision tree to decide which teachers administers what.

Lastly, how do we ensure a secured administration? The way that we administer state tests - the EOCs and EOGs - is certainly one way that you can ensure assessments are administered in a secure way. It's not the only way though, and there's more flexibility here for districts to do things like have teachers rotate and not administer to their own students, similar to how some districts do administration of the CTE assessments. Proctors are not required. Roving proctors are fine. Having teachers switch classes is fine. There are lots of different ways that districts can decide how to make administration secure that don't follow exactly, line by line, the guidelines that are there for the state tests.

There are some widespread concerns that we have been getting from across the field, so the next slides are sort of an FAQ document, so to speak. A lot of people have wondered about the Common Exams,

how they've been designed, and who's been involved in designing them. We use the same basic processes for the state test, but with one really big difference, which is about eight times more teacher involvement. We've had 800 teachers from across the state involved in designing these exams, really at two big points. The first was in creating the blueprints. These teachers were the ones that actually looked at the standards that they teach, decided how those standards should be assessed, and how heavily the standard should be weighted on an assessment. They've also been involved in actually reviewing the item. Before any item makes its way onto a Common Exam, it's been reviewed by several of these teachers that have been working with us along the way.

We do still have involvement from our pyschometricians and test-measurement specialists because they are the ones that can look at the form as a whole, look at the scales, and help make sure that the test has good validity and reliability as well.

Another question has been around teacher and administrator uncertainty or what's going to be on the MSLs. We want to specifically draw attention to the assessment specifications that are online, and the website's right here. As I mentioned earlier, the specifications show the weights of the different standards - how heavily they're assessed - and then also lets you know which standard will be assessed with performance tasks and which standards will be assessed with multiple-choice questions.

Next week, we're also going to be releasing to Curriculum and Instruction leaders, and posting on our website, some general information about the rubrics that will be used for scoring the performance tasks. We can't really release the rubrics ahead of time because each item has its own specific rubric. If we release the rubrics, we'd pretty much be saying what's on the test, which is something that we can't do. We are going to have an online module, released in mid-November, that will have some examples of performance tasks with their associated rubrics and will give teachers some information on how they're going to use the rubrics to score the performance tasks. That brings up another question we've gotten across the board - which is how the performance tasks will be graded.

The policy here is that there has to be at least one grader who is not the student teacher of record and who has the content knowledge necessary to score the item. So, for example, I was a high school Social Studies teacher and I primarily taught World History, but I could have scored performance tasks in Civics and in U.S. History. You would not have wanted me scoring their performance tasks on the Chemistry Common Exam. That would have been something I didn't have the content knowledge to do.

The teacher of record, himself or herself, can score, and, a lot of times, they want to because they want to see the work those students actually produced. That's fine, but if they do, there needs to be a second grader so that we can make sure that these grades are valid.

With the exception of the ELA assessments, the performance items on all the Common Exams are the last items on the test. Districts can do something like have students take the performance items earlier than they take the multiple-choice items to allow time for grading. They can do that, except for ELA. In ELA, all the questions are linked to a reading passage. Rather than being at the end of the assessment, the performance tasks are kind of scattered throughout because you'll have a reading passage, some multiple-choice questions, and then a performance task.

The reason there are performance tasks on these exams at all is because that's what the 800 teachers we've been relying on so heavily during this process told us. With new standards, we're moving away from facts and moving more toward understanding of concepts and themes. The teachers asked for questions that require students to produce some kind of work - whether it's a math proof, a short-answer question, or a science lab diagram. That's why the questions are appearing on the Common Exams.

The last concern, just to be very upfront about it, has been that these assessments are ultimately going to hurt students and that they're going to hurt teachers. Especially at the high school level, which is what we're preparing for first with so many districts administering in the fall, the experience of a student taking a Common Exam really shouldn't look any different than when they took a teacher-made final exam. Scores from the MSLs don't have to be used as final exam grades for students. The report that testing

coordinators will get will provide the percent of questions answered correctly for each student. That also doesn't have to be the grade. That can be a starting place. The district may want to take the percent of questions answered correctly and curve it. They may want to take it and convert it to a letter grade. It's really just a report that we can provide as a resource, but it doesn't have to be the be-all/end-all for what a student's exam grade is.

Lastly, there is a philosophical idea. We're moving toward a system of a better teacher evaluation, and it's only fair to base some part of their evaluation on the growth of their students. If we're going to do that, have that part of the evaluation based on growth be about a teacher's own kids in their own content area, it does mean putting some new assessments out there for those teachers not giving anything that we administer through the State Testing Program.

I'll leave this slide up as we move into questions. There are two things on here. The first is a general educator effectiveness email address. If you have any questions, concerns, or thoughts about educator effectiveness, you can send them to this email address. It goes to a couple different people. You'll probably get a response from me, but you might not necessarily as there are a few different people working on answering questions that come in to this email account so that answers get out there quickly. And then we've also put up the NC Public Schools Educator Effectiveness website. All of the materials we've referenced today, as well as some others, are available on the web, kind of in all one place, and we update this pretty frequently. About every two or three days, I'm send something new to our web services team to post on there as a resource. We encourage you to check this frequently and to encourage your teachers, principals, and colleagues to check it as well for the latest updates on this policy area.

So what I thought I'd do next is answer the questions that we got ahead of time and then we can also turn to any questions that may have been asked been asked along the way. So one question that came up is, "Where do modifications for the Measures of Student Learning go on the student IEP?" We are recommending that those go on the district assessment area. There's no real limitations as to what can be

written there like there are with some others, where there are sort of space restrictions and things like that. It's a good place where you can record what students are taking and then what kinds of modifications they need to be receiving.

In terms of modifications to the actual assessments themselves, when the Department makes available the exams to LEA testing coordinators, there will be two versions of each one. One will be what most students will take, sort of a regular administration book, and the second test book will have one item on a page and large-print. We know that those are two modifications that a lot of students get. It's easier for DPI to just do it before we make PDFs and then send them out that way.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Can we tag something on to that, Jenn, there was a question that came up.

MS. PRESTON: Oh, of course.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: What about Braille as well?

MS. PRESTON: As it has been with district assessments in the past, Braille is a district responsibility. So the second question was, "How do EC teachers or other non-teachers of record get their names into NCWISE and EVAAS?" So in the next couple of weeks, the Department is going to be releasing a guide to using NCWISE to make sure that what's entered in there is good quality data that's can be used for educator effectiveness. Some of what we will be putting in there is things that have been in place and in policy for a while, but haven't really been followed in some districts. For example, one thing that we will be reminding folks is about co-teaching and how there are Teacher 1 and Teacher 2 fields in NCWISE. If there is a co-teaching environment where the two teachers are in the room every day, both working with the students, it can be coded in that way into NCWISE.

Now, another process that's going to be new this year is the roster verification process that is going to be housed within EVAAS. I'm thinking that's where the next part of the question comes from. Of course, we want the data that are in NCWISE to be as accurate as possible. We're going to take those data and

move it into EVAAS, and they are going to become the basis of the roster verification process. The whole point of the roster verification process is that teachers will be able to go in and indicate when things aren't showing the whole picture. So, for example, a teacher who is supporting students and who is providing instruction, might log into roster verification and not see those kids listed with him or her. The teacher can pick the kids from the menu and move them into his or her class roster and indicate that he or she is responsible for instruction.

Now, we're going to try our best we can to take the information that's entered there and upload it back into NCWISE so that all of our data systems are accurate. What's entered into the EVAAS roster verification tool is actually what will be used in determining Standard 6 information for teachers, so that's a big reason why teachers in North Carolina are all getting EVAAS accounts this year. The way roster verification worked in the past really varied from school to school. In some schools, teachers got a piece of paper that they could mark on and then turn back in, but they never really knew if any changes were made. In other places, teachers have reported they didn't really get that option. Now, with all teachers having accounts, they'll all be able to go in, and they all have ownership of the process. Everybody's accountable for making sure that kids are linked to the appropriate teachers.

The third question was, "How is Standard 6 information populated into McREL for non-teachers of record?" That will really depend on how the non-teacher of record is supporting or providing instruction for students. Within the roster verification tool, there's also a feature where teachers can indicate that they are both responsible for a student's instruction and even the percentage at which they are. One teacher could say that the or she is responsible for 90 percent of the students', let's say Biology instruction, and maybe there is an EC teacher who is supporting the teacher once a week or something like that. That teacher could indicate that he or she is responsible for 10 percent or 15 percent. That's a discussion that takes place between those teachers and also involves administrators in the building. They ultimately have to sign off on all the teacher and student linkages. The information that's entered into that system is

ultimately used to determine whether or not the teacher has made, exceeded, or did not meet expected growth, and then that's what goes into McREL's sixth standard rating.

So then the last question was "(Indiscernible 14:59:40) calculate appropriate percentage of instructional responsibility for EC teachers that support a caseload of students?" This is not anything that we have specific guidance on at this point. If it is something that folks feel is needed, I mean, we want to provide all the resources we can and can definitely look at making some recommendations.

The critical thing about a lot in this area is the role that EC teachers play and how they're supporting teachers in some cases and differentiating for their EC kids and how they're also supporting the students themselves varies so much from school to school and from district to district. But if this is something that's needed and you have any particular thoughts or ideas about that, you know, we definitely welcome them and want to work with you in partnership to make sure that we're getting this right for folks.

Those were the questions that we got ahead of time, but I'm sure there are more that have come up during the webinar, so we'll try and go through those now as well.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: And I've responded to some that are from the technical assistance about getting the webinar and things, so those were up already.

MS. PRESTON: Okay.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: The first question, "How does the research on the top 25 percent and the bottom 25 percent align with the decision to add additional school days? Does time with (indiscernible 15:0105) effective teachers equate to a decrease in student learning?"

MS. PRESTON: So the research on the top 25 and bottom 25 percent of teachers cuts across six different school systems that were located in, I think, five different states. In those five different states, you have different school days and different requirements for school calendars, and so that wasn't something that was specifically looked at in the analysis itself. What we showed on the screen is fairly similar in terms of general trends on what happens if you show that data just for Charlotte-Meck, a district

that does have the same calendar that we all have, obviously, with the same requirements for number of days and things like that. Time wasn't a specific aspect that the study was looking at.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Next question, "Where do EC teachers fall in relation to Standard 6?" My guess is that question is really looking at those teachers that may not be teacher of record.

MS. PRESTON: Teachers who are playing a role in directly supporting students are now going to have that flexibility of that roster verification tool to help show what kind of supports they are providing to which students in what content areas. There may be cases where they're supporting students on just one content area. There may be cases where they’re supporting students on two content areas. It’s not a critique of NCWISE or anything like that, but the system is limited in the number of fields that exist for the number of teachers assigned to support kids. There's a way in there to kind of indicate percentage of time, but it's not something that's widely used, partially because it's kind of buried down in the system itself. We're hoping that this roster verification tool is going to give people, both regular and EC teachers, the chance to indicate which students they're supporting, what that support looks like, and how much responsibility they have for instruction.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Next question, "What type of data will be returned to the teacher? For example, specific data comes back by sub-groups so that the teacher will be able to see how effective they were with the EC students versus regular students, or will they just receive an overall data not broken down by sub-groups?"

MS. PRESTON: The answer to that question depends on which system the teacher is going to look at. If the teacher logs into just McREL where we have our Standards 1 through 5, all that they will see for Standard 6 is the rating. That's all they'll see: that they either met expected growth, did not meet expected growth, or exceeded expected growth, and that's actually not really helpful in an instructional way in most cases. We encourage teachers to log into the EVAAS accounts that they're going to get because they will be able to see their value-added score and they'll be able to see it broken down by subject, if they taught

more than one. A fifth grade teacher who administered the EOGs in Science, ELA and Math would be able to see student growth on each of those content areas. There are also options in there for various ad hoc reports, some of which are kind of pre-populated. They are ones that we know teachers pull frequently and want to use. An example is a report showing the growth of their AIG students or the growth of their EC students. They can also run reports several different ways, so they could tell the system to run them a report that looks at growth by their different class periods, for example, or for male students versus female students. Having the data in the system really provides teachers with a chance to think about what things they'd like to see, and then, in most cases, there's a report that can do that. If there's not, we need folks to let us know because we want to make that system as useful of possible. If there is a type of analysis that teachers want to do, that they just can't figure out how to get the system to do, let us know because we can probably build that in and enhance the system so that you can get that kind of data.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: "Will there be an Extend 2 type version and what about Extend 1?"

MS. PRESTON: So I'll start with EXTEND 1 first, and Claire is more than welcome to jump in here if she'd like. For EXTEND 1, we, along with a lot of other states, are really thinking about how to measure growth for that population of students. I think everybody on the call knows that we can't really measure growth with the EXTEND 1 assessment as it currently is. We do have a group of teachers that we brought together, out of that 800, that are focusing on the EXTEND 1 population. Claire is really leading and driving that work as well as paying close attention to what other states are thinking about this. There's really no easy answer for this population, so there won't be anything in effect for this population in '12-13. Teachers of EXTEND 1 students won't start being in this educator effectiveness model this year, but we are hopeful to have something in place by '13-14 or '14-15. It's a lot of development work. We want to make sure that it's careful and not rushed just to meet some kind of deadline, so those conversations are ongoing there.

With the Common Exams themselves, there will be no EXTEND 2 versions of these, although I would note that there are Common Exams aligned to the Occupational Course of Study for kids who are taking those courses. The accountability division here at DPI is doing a series of linking studies this year to see if we can, in fact, take scores on EXTEND 2 versions of the EOGs and EOCs and perhaps put that into EVAAS to get a growth score for those teachers. We haven't been able to do it before because we haven't really had the kind of quantitative information we need. Hopefully, through the linking studies, we'll get that information and we'll be able to provide those value-added scores for teachers.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Can a district use the classroom accommodations for tests and quizzes on the IEP for MSLs?"

MS. PRESTON: Yes, absolutely. It's uncommon to get a question with a yes-or-no answer. Thank you for that one.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: "Are there particular publishing companies or textbooks recommended to our Social Studies teachers that may be better resources to prepare for the MSL exam?"

MS. PRESTON: Our Social Studies curriculum folks who would really need to be the ones to answer that question. I don't know that they've recommended any particular resources in terms of publishing companies or online resources. We have made those test specifications available. One thing that I would say about Social Studies, particularly because it's so near and dear to me as a former teacher in that area, is when you look at the Measures of Student Learning, most of them are primarily multiple-choice with maybe a few performance tasks. That's not really so true in Social Studies, where there are more performance tasks than there are in most of the other content areas. That's really because the new Social Studies standards, which are so concept- and theme-oriented and not fact-oriented, require you to do two things on assessment. The first thing is, if you're going to ask kids multiple-choice questions, they have to come with stimulus materials - a map that they look at, a diagram, a short reading passage that they're sort of interacting with – then ask for a response to a question.

The other way that you can assess concepts is through performance tasks. So, for example, a question for an American History student could be something like, "Identify and analyze the role of two key reformers in the early 1900s in the United States." I may have taught my kids about ten different reformers than Claire taught her kids, but both of our kids can answer that question pulling on what they have been taught as facts to support the different standards. That's true for our other assessments as well. There are questions that are more kind of thematically oriented on the Physics and Chemistry assessments, as well as other hard science courses. With Social Studies and the new standards there, it's particularly true. Kids are not necessarily learning the same facts - they're not all learning the same historical figures they used to, they're not all learning the same battles - but when we ask questions that way, they have an equal chance of being able to answer successfully.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Jen, we have a series of questions. I'm going to put it in one --

MS PRESTON: Okay.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- and it's talking about all those related service providers, so OT, PT, (indiscernible 15:09:38) --

MS. PRESTON: Okay.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- the (indiscernible 15:09:38) support teachers, autism support teachers. They will not be in McREL, is the first question, and then, "What about those teachers of visually and hearing-impaired that may be those floating or itinerate teachers? Will they be evaluated with the McREL system as well?"

MS. PRESTON: Okay. Within the MCREL system right now, the online component of it at least, is intended to capture the evaluation results and processes for teachers and principals. Then, as many of you know, because I've recognized some names on the list as attendees in the webinar, the Department is working to create evaluation instruments for school nurses, OTs, and PTs. The speech language pathologist process is very close to being done. The instrument for school psychologists and others will

be aligned with their professional standards, which have been approved by the Board in most case. They are not going to include a measure of student growth because, really, how you do that with someone who is supporting maybe even an entire district, like a school social worker? It is really stretching the boundaries of what our assessments are intended to measure. So there would be no Standard 6 equivalent for most of those folks.

We are going to start development on an evaluation instrument for an academic specialist. It may well have a different name by the time we finish the process, but what we know is that there are a lot of teachers out there who are not at the central office level and they're not at the administration level, but what they do on a daily basis is, maybe occasionally supporting kids, but a lot are supporting teachers in how they instruct their kids. Examples here are lead teachers - folks like that who don't have their own classroom anymore - and really there are not a lot of places to put them in our current system. They're not classroom teachers, so using a classroom teacher instrument can be done, but not really in the way it should be. They're not school administrators, so using that instrument doesn't real work either. We have identified a gap and are working on designing an instrument that would fill that gap for teachers who are primarily based in school buildings, but what they're doing isn't instructing kids on a day-to-day basis.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Great. EXTEND scores have not been part of EVAAS traditionally?"

MS. PRESTON: That's right.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: "Will this change so that teachers of students taking that EXTEND 2 will have a rating of some type?"

MS. PRESTON: Sure. So we are hopeful that that will be able to change, but it will depend on the results of those linking studies that are done this year. Many of you may be wondering: "Why am I field-testing EXTEND 2 items this year? I thought field-testing was over." I know we've gotten a lot of those questions. Those are actually to do those linking studies. Now, of course, if the linking studies show us that when you put EXTEND 2 results in EVAAS, the results you get are not valid in the end, then we're

not going to do it, and we're going to have to sort of go back to the drawing board on that one. It is our goal that the studies will show that that's something we can do.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Last question I have, "Clarify the EXTEND 1 statement about teachers having no value-added data. Won't they get whole-school averages?"

MS. PRESTON: They will get whole-school average as their sixth standard rating, but we have to talk about when three years of data for a teacher's status start. In order for a teacher to be effective, highly effective, or in need of improvement, he or she has to have three years of student growth information, and that three years has to be growth information about their kids in their content area. It's not three years of school growth. Teachers get a sixth-standard rating that's based on school-wide growth for a couple of different reasons. The first is as a discussion point so they can talk about how they do contribute to the academic environment on the school. It fosters good conversation between principals and teachers. The three years of data for them don't start until when the measures of student growth are ready. As an example, for a second-grade teacher, his or her sixth standard rating based on '11 to '12 will be based on school-wide data. His or her sixth standard rating for '12 to '13 will be based on school-wide data, too. By '13-14, we will have something in place for measuring growth for second-grade teachers. That's their first year, so it's not a combination of, "Well, I had two years of school-wide and then I got my own, so that's my three." School-wide data is not one of your three years. That data used to determine overall status needs to be about your kids and your content area.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Question about (indiscernible 15;14:26) school and how this information will then translate to the (indiscernible 15:14:30).

MS. PRESTON: That's the big question, isn't it? There are lots of people working on the NCWISE to PowerSchool conversion. I've been a part of a group that's been looking at course codes and one thing we've been talking a lot about course codes is the need to be able to record lots of things about a course that aren't necessarily in the code itself - like the fact that there may be multiple teachers who are

responsible for different amounts of instructional time. It may be a blended online course, for example, or a course taught exclusively through the virtual school. I do know that the system is really flexible because we building it now and preparing to move everything in. We're at a point now where we can really tell them a lot of what we need to be able to track and then have them build that in. And (indiscernible 15:15:21) we'll move into there because, of course, we need to be able to do things like (indiscernible 15:15:29) for next year. There are lots of technical people working to make sure that that transition happens smoothly.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: One more question and then I think we're getting close to our time.

MS. PRESTON: Sure.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: "Preschool teachers will not have any rating. They won't even have a school (indiscernible 15:15:46), true?"

MS. PRESTON: That's right. Preschool teachers will not have a sixth standard rating at any point through what the Department's doing around educator effectiveness. Now, of course, we do also have an Early Learning Challenge grant. There is a lot of work going on with that project - both through some staff members at the agency, but also in the Governor's Office and DHHS as well. Perhaps someday, we'll get to a point where there are preschool assessments that we can take a look at, but we're not there now. They will not have a sixth standard rating.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Those are all our questions.

MS. PRESTON: Okay. Alright. Thank you very much to everybody for making the time to attend today. I know you're all incredibly busy and sitting in front of a computer listening for an hour is something that it takes a lot of effort to make the time to do. We will archive the webinar and get that link out to you so that you can share with any colleagues who didn't attend and also come back to yourself if you need any information. If I can ever help answer any questions or just hear some thoughts or concerns you have on how we can make the system better, please do send an email to that email address

that's still on the screen. We definitely want to work with the people to make it a system that's fair and valid and works for everyone.

So thank you. Have a great day.

(CONCLUDED)

WPU

GLORIA VEILLEUX, TRANSCRIBER