

MS. PRESTON: We welcome you to our webinar today on the educator effectiveness model for North Carolina. Today, we're going to share some updates on new policy, as well as give everyone an update on where we stand with the Measures of Student Learning. Let me get my slides going here so that everybody can see.

Before we actually get started today, I just want to turn it over to Mr. Elic Senter, who's with NCAE in their instructional advocacy and organizing group. He's just going to give everybody a quick welcome.

MR. SENTER: Hey, everybody. As Jenn said, my name is Elic Senter. I'm the Director of Instructional Advocacy with NCAE. I'm so glad to hear all of you on this call today. This is yet another way that NCAE and DPI partner with great regularity around teacher effectiveness, around teacher evaluation, and around the work that's happening in your schools. Jenn is absolutely excellent to work with. She's a fantastic speaker and happens to be one of the most knowledgeable people that I know, so you're in for great information today.

I'm actually not going to be able to stay on the entire webinar, but I'm going to stick around for a little bit at least. If you have any questions that pop up after this webinar and you don't get a chance to ask them of Jenn, feel free to shoot me an email or give me a call at NCAE. Again, we appreciate you being on the call and we're here in the Center for Instructional Advocacy. My colleague, Angela Farthing, and myself support you as members in any way that we can, but know that DPI is here doing the exact same thing, being here to support you as classroom teachers in the work that you're doing.

I also want to extend another thank you to Jenn and all the folks at DPI for hosting this webinar and for having the target specifically to be NCAE members. Those of you who are on the webinar today - please, please, please do not take this information and put it on a shelf. Please take the information that Jenn is going to share with you today and put it out to members in your schools. Let folks know what's going on.

The whole function of things like this, this webinar and conference calls like this, is to get information out. So please don't keep it to yourselves. Please share what Jenn shares with you today so that

everybody across our state is as clear and up to date as possible.

MS. PRESTON: Okay, great. Thank you, Elic, and thank you so much for those kind words. We're very happy to partner with NCAE to reach as many educators as we can. First of all, I'll just introduce myself. My name is Jennifer Preston. I'm the Race to the Top Project Coordinator for Educator Effectiveness, and I do work at the Department of Public Instruction. One thing we hope will be helpful in facilitating your sharing of any information from today's webinar is that we are going to record it. Once we have the recording in the form in which we can post it to our website, we will do so, and then we'll let everyone know that the recording has been posted. We know that, in today's world in which everyone is so busy and schedules are so crazy, it may be later at night or during a planning period or even on the weekend when teachers may have the time to sit down and listen to something like today's presentation.

We do have everyone on mute for right now, just because there are upward of 75 of you with us today. If we had everybody unmuted, it would get kind of noisy with background noise.

As you have questions, please type them into the questions bar. We should have plenty of time to answer a lot of your questions. But if we do run out of time, we'll take those questions - we'll have a record of them - and we'll prepare a frequently asked questions document that we'll also post on the website right along with where we post the recording. That is just some basic logistics information before we dive into the real content.

I want to go over briefly the agenda for today and the topics that we'll cover. First, we're going to start off with just brief reminders and context setting about North Carolina's educator effectiveness work, sort of where we've been and the review of the developments to date.

Next, I'll share with you some recommendations that the Department has made to the State Board of Education around one of their policies, TCP-C-006, which is the policy that includes teacher evaluation and school administrator evaluation. We've made some recommendations to the Board over the last two months. They are set to vote next week, and I'll share with you what those recommendations have been. We'll talk a little bit about the Common Exams as well as the other Measures of Student Learning that are

being piloted for implementation in the '13-14 school year. Common Exams are being implemented this school year, so I can actually share some information about how first semester administration went in our districts that went ahead with that timeline.

We'll also have a few slides with resources for teachers. I'll hyperlink to those during the presentation and show you where you can find those resources, and, hopefully, you'll be able to make use of those as you develop your understanding of the system and answer any questions that you have about it.

As probably everybody on the line today can say in their sleep, we all know that there are six teaching standards in North Carolina for our teachers, and there are eight leadership standards for our principals and assistant principals.

Prior to the last two years, we had five teaching standards for teachers, and, in the last two years, we have added Standard 6. Standard 6 reads, "Teachers contribute to the academic success of students." With the addition of Standard 6, nothing has changed about Standards 1 through 5. The text is still the same. The rating options are still the same. The only change in the process has been the addition of the sixth standard.

The same is true for principals and assistant principals. They originally had seven evaluation standards, and nothing about those standards has changed. They have the same text and same rating options. What has changed is the addition of the eighth standard, which is academic achievement leadership.

Something we've tried very, very hard to message with all of our teachers, parents, and stakeholders - and would certainly appreciate your help with - is communicating that Standard 6 and 8 are both about academic growth. They are not about academic proficiency. Proficiency certainly is important. We want all of our kids to be on grade level in Reading, Math, and all of our other content areas. But, when we look at what's actually in the locus of control of a classroom teacher, we have to look at growth in order to be fair. Let's say we have a sixth-grade reading teacher whose students come to him reading at a second-grade reading level. By the end of the year, let's say those students are reading at a fourth-grade reading level. They're not going to score 3s or 4s on the sixth-grade reading EOG, but what they have done is made a tremendous amount of growth over the course of the school year - two years' worth of reading

grown in one year's time. That is an outstanding teacher, and those are the kind of people we need to raise up with our educator evaluation system. We need to acknowledge the contribution they make to the learning of our kids and that they can help with the development of our profession.

When we say growth, there are lots of different things that could be talked about there. There are different ways to measure growth and different types of assessments that can be used. The State Board of Education has approved EVAAS, which stands for Education Value-Added Assessment System, as the way that growth will be measured for Standard 6 and 8 when possible. We'll talk a little bit more about exactly what we mean by the "when-possible" phrase. If we all kind of think about the analogy of the square peg and the round hole - sometimes the square peg just won't fit in the round hole. That's really what the "when possible" means.

We can definitely look at growth in an art class or music class. It's certainly possible to look at what students have done and look at the amount of growth they've made over the year. What we will not be able to do with that information, though, is have a value-added score that is very specific in nature, like a 1.67 that a teacher might see in EVAAS. The standards for art and the way we can assess art is different than the way we can assess reading and math. Therefore, we run into a little bit of that square peg, round hole issue. What we don't want to do is force our content standards or our teachers to fit into a certain model just for the sake of fitting into it. We want to design ways to measure growth that stay true to the content standards and to how students are taught those standards.

When we look at the ratings for Standards 6 and 8, they are a little bit different than the rest of the system. As I mentioned, for teachers, nothing has changed about Standards 1 through 5. The rating categories still range from not demonstrated to distinguished. For Standard 6, we do have different rating categories.

They are does not meet expected growth, meets expected growth, or exceeds expected growth.

I want to explain a little bit more about how the teacher ratings in '11-12 worked, and then how they will look moving forward in the '12-13 school year and beyond.

In the '11-12 school year, the State Board of Education approved policy that a Standard 6 rating would include two different components for teachers who had their own growth information. If you were a

teacher in '11-12 who administered one of a large number of the CTE Post-Assessments or EOCs and EOGs in grades 4 and up, there was a high likelihood that you had your own EVAAS growth value. That value was combined with your school's EVAAS growth value; that's the growth across all grades and subjects with state assessments in your school. They were combined together in a 70/30 weighted average. Then, using that value, the sixth standard was assigned - either does not meet expected growth, meets expected growth, or exceeds expected growth.

In selecting those two components and deciding on the weights of 70 percent and 30 percent, the State Board wanted to make sure that they encouraged collaboration and collective ownership of students. We didn't want to make a system that incentivized teachers to worry about their own students and not worry about being good contributors to a school community - both in terms of a school community that supports all of its children and a professional learning community that supports all of its teachers.

Another important note about the '11-12 school year is that most teachers in the state, about 65 percent, did not have their own individual growth values. They are our social studies teachers, most of our science teachers, K-3, and the arts, and these folks received a sixth standard rating really with only one component in it. That one component was the school-wide growth value.

'11-12, however, was baseline data for the system. Anytime you're going to start a system as big and as serious as a teacher effectiveness system, you really need a year to get a measure of how things are looking and, essentially, to test your policies. The sixth standard ratings that teachers received in the '11-12 school year aren't counting for anything. They really are more for illustration purposes so that people can start to see how growth will be added to the evaluation instrument, but not in an environment in which the sixth standard is actually going to count toward something later on - whether it be licensure or your district's decisions about staffing. Really, this was just for illustration to show how the system is going to start. In the end, it turned out to be a really great thing that the 2011 to '12 data did not count for anyone! Analyzing the data led us to be able to share with the Board some unintended consequences from that information.

We discovered two trends that are both troubling, although I would say that the first one is probably more

troubling. Across the whole state, we had 2,853 teachers who, on their own with their own students, met or exceeded expected growth, but they're teachers who worked in struggling schools. Because the schools did not make growth and actually fell very far from making growth, when that value was included in the 30 percent of their sixth standard rating, they were actually pulled down an entire rating. So a teacher who met expected growth with his or her own students received a sixth-standard rating of does not meet expected growth.

Because it happened with pulling teachers down, it's really not surprising that it happened to push teachers up. There are some teachers across the state, a bit fewer, around 2,600, who did not meet expected growth with their own students. But because they're in very high-performing, high-growth schools, their rating was pushed up. In effect, their sixth standard made them look better than the actual data they got with their own students.

So what does that really mean for those teachers? What are the consequences? For teachers who are pushed down, the system discourages our most effective teachers, who can get great growth with students, from going to low-performing schools, which is actually where we need them to go. The kids in those schools need teachers who can help them grow each year and kind of catch up from where they are. We can't have a system that incentivizes teachers to stay away from those schools and focus their efforts on working in our highest-performing schools.

On the flip side of that, the inclusion of school-wide growth also hid the performance of some low-performing teachers. We know that teachers hold high expectations for themselves and their peers, and we've heard from some teachers who were not very happy that their hard work was elevating the evaluation of a peer who hadn't really put in that time and effort to grow his or her students.

So that led to the Department making some recommendations to the State Board of Education around Standard 6 specifically. When we talked with them about the 2012-13 school year, which is the first year that our data actually count, we told them that we were, of course, considering potential weights for teacher-level growth and school-wide growth. Something else that's different from the '11-12 school year to the '12-13 school year is that, with the administration of the Common Exams, about 70 percent of

North Carolina's teachers will have individual growth data. That's a little bit less than double the amount that did last year.

Given that information, we recommended to the Board that a teacher's sixth standard rating be based only on his or her individual growth with his or her own students and his or her own content area. Now, there will be some teachers in '12-13 who will not have individual growth values. A couple of examples - art teachers, healthful living teachers, and teachers in grades K to 3. Those teachers will, again, receive a sixth standard rating based on school-wide growth, but, for them, just like the '11-12 school year, it's data for illustration purposes only. The catchphrase that I use when I talk to teachers is, **“if it's going to count for you, it has to be data on your kids and your content area.”** If it's school-wide data, it's serving an illustration purpose only. When we have data on your kids and how they do on assessments of your content standards, that's when we start to look at it being actually included in the evaluation process. Now, no one wants to take away from the importance of collaboration. In fact, I would imagine we all agree that kids are better off in learning environments where teachers collaborate with each other. It results in better outcomes for students, and we also know that collaboration is everywhere else in our teacher evaluation process. It's actually in every single one of the original five standards. Principals are going to consider how teachers contribute to professional learning communities when they rate them on Standard 1 and consider how teachers are sharing innovative ways of looking at their content in Standard 3. Collaboration is still incredibly important, but we also think that the changes we recommended to the Board will help make the system one that's fairer for all teachers.

I know there may be some school administrators on the phone with us today, so I'm going to quickly go over some changes that we did recommend for principals and assistant principals' Standard 8 ratings. In the '11-12 school year, the Standard 8 rating was based only on school-wide growth, which makes sense for an administrator, and the only assessments that we used to measure school-wide growth were End-of-Grade and End-of-Course assessments.

We heard from a lot of principals, particularly high school principals, who raised the issue that the End-of-Grade and End-of-Course assessments may represent only a handful of the teachers at a school and

only a handful of the students. If we think about a high school, the End-of-Course exams being administered are Math I, Biology, and English II, and we can certainly calculate a growth value based on those three assessments. But a more meaningful representation of growth across all the grades, all the courses, and all the teachers at the school would be to combine data from any End-of-Course assessments administered, any CTE Post-Assessments administered, and any Common Exams that are administered. Measuring growth that way includes far more of the students, the courses or grades, and teachers, and is really a more accurate reflection of school-wide growth.

So in terms of where we stand on policy updates, the State Board of Education first heard the recommendations from the Department two months ago. They had some discussion about it at their April meeting, and, next week, they'll hold their May State Board of Education meeting. At this point, they have indicated that they are going to approve both recommendations - the 100 percent individual growth for Standard 6, and to use all of the assessment data to measure school-wide growth for Standard 8. Once they've voted, we'll be certain to send out some messages through all of our listservs and post some information on our website. Given the discussion last month, they have indicated that they will move forward with approving those two recommendations.

Moving on, we're going to talk a little bit about the Measures of Student Learning, and, hopefully, provide a little bit of clarity around a question I know many of you have: what's the difference between a Measure of Student Learning and a Common Exam? Are they the same thing? Are they different? Are they interchangeable? We're encouraging folks to think about the term Measures of Student Learning as a big umbrella. Measures of Student Learning are assessments, processes, and tools that do just that - measure how much students are learning in a given content area. We have lots of ways we do that. We do it with End-of-Grade and End-of-Course assessments. We do it with Career and Technical Education assessments. We're doing it with Common Exams. So, if you will, a Common Exam is a kind of Measure of Student Learning. We also have different streams of work going on for third grade, for K-2 literacy, and a process called Analysis of Student Work.

The first three that were on the list are assessments that we're all pretty familiar with. We've had them in

our state for a while. The four that are new are the ones that I'm going to share a little bit more information about. Those are the Common Exams, grade 3, K-2 literacy, and Analysis of Student Work. So, first, we'll start by digging into the Common Exams in a bit more detail.

What's on the screen now is what we call the decision tree around when a Common Exam has to be administered and when it doesn't. These are not End-of-Grade or End-of-Course assessments. For example, when we think about fifth grade science, there's never a question of whether or not a student has to take the fifth-grade science EOG. If they're in fifth grade, they have to take the science exam. We do have the flexibility to ask that question with courses that have Common Exams. So as teachers ask themselves the questions that are in the decision tree, they eventually get to whether or not there's a state requirement to administer a Common Exam. It's usually helpful to just sort of walk through this process as if we were a teacher.

Let's say that I am a fifth-grade teacher, and I work in an elementary school where we schedule in a self-contained way. I have my fifth-grade students all day with the exception of art, physical education - those types of courses - and I instruct them in reading, math, science, and social studies. At the end of the year, my students are going to take three EOGs: Reading, Math and Science. So I ask myself the first question on the decision tree: do I administer an End-of-Course, End-of-Grade, or CTE Post-Assessment to all of my students? My answer there is yes. I'm actually administering three End-of-Grade assessments to my students. When I move down the decision tree to the "yes" box, I see that there is no state requirement to administer a Measure of Student Learning. Districts may decide to have separate requirements, and that's certainly within their areas of flexibility. From a state perspective, with so much assessment data on those fifth-grade students, there would be no need to administer a fifth-grade Social Studies Common Exam.

As a different example, let's imagine that I am a high school Science teacher. I'm on a block schedule, so I teach three courses first semester and three courses second semester. Let's say that for one period of the year, I teach biology and those students take the Biology End-of-Course exam. For the remainder of my time, with five other groups of students, I teach Chemistry. I ask myself the first question on the diagram:

do I administer an End-of-Course, End-of-Grade, or CTE Post-Assessment to all of my students? The answer there is no because, while I am giving an assessment to my Biology students, I'm not giving any state assessment to my Chemistry students.

The next question is: do I teach a course or a grade where there is a Measure of Student Learning? In this case, the answer is yes; there is a Chemistry Common Exam. I've arrived at the bottom of the diagram that, yes, there is a state requirement to administer the Measure of Student Learning for that course.

When we think about fairness and we think about the fact that every student matters, that's really the principle behind this process. To evaluate that teacher's sixth standard rating only on the growth of his or her biology students and to essentially leave out five sections, which could be dozens and dozens of kids, from the growth value isn't really fair to that teacher who may make tremendous growth with chemistry students. It's not really fair to those students to be left out of the overall picture of the teacher's ability to impact the learning of students.

For the next set of slides about all the Measures of Student Learning, we've organized them to answer the big questions that people always ask: the what, the when, the how, those types of things. When we talk about Common Exams, we are only talking about a certain set of grades, content areas, and subjects.

There are only Common Exams in English Language Arts, Science, Social Studies and Math in grades 4 through 12 where we do not have an existing End-of-Grade or End-of-Course assessment. Biology is a good example because there is a Biology End-of-Course exam. There is no Biology Common Exam.

With the exception of three or four of them, the Common Exams include multiple-choice items and they include performance tasks.

When we first began the design of the Common Exams, the work began with 800 teachers from across the state who came to Chapel Hill and helped us think about what these exams needed to look like - what kind of items should they include and how heavily should the items be weighted - and it was those teachers who really told us that, with the content standards they teach, performance items had to be included because that was how students would be able to show what they know and are able to do in these content areas.

The Common Exams should be able to go into EVAAS just like our End-of-Grade and End-of-Course assessments do, but we don't know that for sure. Over the summer of 2013, just like they do with our End-of-Grade and End-of-Course data, the SAS Institute will partner with us to analyze the results. Part of the reason that Career and Technical Education Post-Assessments don't all go into EVAAS is because when we tried to do that, some of the assessments just didn't work. They couldn't go into a value-added model, and when they can't fit into the model, there's really no forcing them to. You have to go back to the drawing board and think of a different way to measure growth. It may very well be that there are some Common Exams that can't be used in EVAAS; but, given the information we have from first-semester administration of the high school exams, everything looks like they should work in value-added modeling.

In terms of which students participate in the Common Exams, we've shared that decision tree to go through the process of which exams must be administered, and districts can certainly administer Common Exams that are not required. We know, for example, that some districts are administering the fourth-grade science Common Exam. It may not be required, but when they think about preparing students for a fifth-grade Science EOG, they think the information is helpful as they prepare to get those students ready for that assessment.

In terms of timeline for the Common Exams, there are 35 Common Exams that are being administered during the '12-to-13 school year, and that's across all grades 4 through 12. There are nine additional Common Exams that will come on board during the '13-14 school year. This is available on some handouts on our website, but, just so that you know, those nine are discrete math at the high school level, and then eight assessments aligned to our high school social studies elective courses, which may or may not be offered by your district.

During the '12-13 school year, fall administration of the high school Common Exams was optional.

Districts could decide to move ahead with first-semester administration or they could decide to wait and administer to all of their students, grades 4 through 12, for the first time this spring. There were 39 school districts that decided to go ahead and administer the assessments, and, across all the high school subjects

there were 86,546 exams administered.

The great thing about such a large number of districts partnering to administer the assessments in the fall was that the Department's been able to move quickly and actually make some revisions to the assessments before they're administered this spring. We really see this as a way to use those feedback loops and use the feedback we got from teachers to make the assessments even stronger.

In terms of specific changes that have been made, we have shortened the exam length for about six or seven of the exams. That's especially true for high school English Language Arts, and for some of the advanced math courses at the high school level. We've added additional specificity to the scoring rubrics, which was recommended by the teachers who scored. We've revised the structure of the test books, just some easy changes in how the items are presented to students that teachers thought would help make the process run more smoothly. We've revised our scoring module and also expanded it to include sample performance items from upper elementary and middle school. Lastly, we worked with districts to help them with administration scripts. If they wanted to have some standard language that teachers read before they gave the exam, we worked with them to help make that possible.

Next I'm going to move on to talk a little bit about grade 3, which is actually one of the questions that has come in on the question bar as I've been talking. For grade 3, we're going to be, starting in '13-14 school year, administering a form of the third-grade End-of-Grade Reading assessment at the beginning of third grade. Now, this is different from the third-grade pre-test, which some of you may be familiar with. The third-grade pre-test was actually a second-grade EOG, so to speak. It was an assessment of how students were performing against the second-grade reading standards. The assessment that we're going to administer at the beginning of third grade is actually a third-grade EOG. It's one we could have administered at the end of the year that we've pulled back and are going to administer at the beginning of the year.

With the third-grade reading retention policy that was passed by the General Assembly last session, we think that administering this End-of-Grade assessment at the beginning of the year is more important because of that retention policy than it is because of educator effectiveness. Our third-graders have some

pretty tough expectations to meet moving forward. If they don't score 3s or 4s on the Reading EOG in third grade, they have to attend summer programs and potentially aren't promoted to the fourth grade. If we're going to hold those students to those high levels of expectations, we need to equip their teachers with the kind of information that allows them to, during third grade, help those kids meet those expectations. By administering this End-of-Grade assessment at the beginning of the year, third-grade teachers will know exactly how much the students need to develop over the year and what kind of information the students are going to need to focus on the most.

For third grade, if we have this assessment result at the beginning of the year and we have an assessment result at the end of the year, we'll be able to use them to take a look at growth. It won't work exactly the same way that EVAAS does when we have a lot of prior information about a student and we use it to make predictions of how he or she will score on future exams. It will be a slightly different model, but still one where we can look at how students performed at the beginning of the year, how they performed at the end of the year, and how much growth they made during the year.

All third-grade students will participate in this beginning-of-the-year End-of-Grade assessment. It won't work like the Common Exams where districts can make decisions about which students will take the assessment and which will not. It will be across the board. As I mentioned, this is going to be fully implemented in the '13-14 school year. For some of you who are elementary teachers who may be in year-round schools, the assessments and all the materials that go along with it will be ready for when you start school in July or the beginning of August.

Another question that I've seen coming in quite a few times today is about K-2 teachers. So for K to 2, we are running a pilot this spring, as we speak, in 13 school systems. We are piloting the addition of a step to the normal process that teachers and students follow for the mCLASS: Reading 3D Program.

Some people on the webinar are very familiar with the program. For everyone else who may not be, I'm just going to give a brief overview.

Essentially what we're looking at doing with this process is measuring student's ability to read and comprehend increasingly complex texts that they're presented with. Reading 3D is a program. It starts at

the beginning of the year with the student reading a passage to a teacher and establishing a reading level at beginning of the year. It has an end of the year component in which we see the student's reading level at the end of the year. There is a lot of progress monitoring that takes place over the course of the school year. Those data are for teachers. They use it to help make good instructional decisions around how to serve students. The State is not going to gather any of that information to use in measuring growth. That's really only for the teachers to know. But if we collect that beginning of the year measure of how students can read and comprehend and the end of year measure, we can show how much they've grown over the course of that year.

With our pilot districts, we're piloting three processes for doing that, and they really vary according to who administers the assessment to the students. This process is done one-on-one. An adult - a teacher or a teacher from another classroom - sits with the student, and the student reads aloud to that educator. We are piloting a method in which someone other than the teacher of record administers the end of year reading passage to the student. When we have a pilot, we can see if we get different results depending on who administers to the student, and we can gather feedback from the teachers who are participating in the pilot with us.

Much like with third grade, when we look at measuring growth, we don't have a lot of prior data about how our students have done, particularly if it's kindergarten and they're coming to us in public schools for the first time. We're not going to be able to use the same exact methodology as we do for EVAAS, but we can still use beginning-of-year and end-of-year measures to look at growth over the course of the year. Starting in the '13-14 school year, mCLASS: Reading 3D is going to be required for all K-2 students. Most districts are using it already. There are a few that have not that are going to be coming on board with using the program next year. This is a statewide program because the General Assembly has already funded it. It won't require any additional money for schools or districts. Most teachers in the state are already trained on how to use the program, and it really becomes a way to not reinvent the wheel, so to speak. If we've got this process - we've got this program that third-grade teachers and under are using already - it just makes sense to not duplicate efforts, not add something else, but, instead, to use what we

have in place already.

Just in case you would like to know what your peers are doing, I have on the screen a list of the districts that are participating in the pilot program, stretching all across the state from some larger systems to some tiny systems. The data that we gather from the pilot, both in terms of data on how students read as well as data from teachers on how they felt the process worked, will inform some decisions over the summer around how we're going to administer this process in the future. Full implementation will take place in the '13-14 school year.

Lastly, there is another process that's being piloted this spring with about a hundred teachers across the state, and it's called Analysis of Student Work. This is the Measure of Student Learning for several categories of teachers: for arts teachers, for healthful living teachers, and for world language teachers. What we are considering here is a process through which teachers collect student work artifacts, which really can be anything. In an art class, it could be a picture of a student's sculpture. In a music class, it could be a recording of a student playing an instrument. In a World Language class, it could be students' essays or students' writing on some particular prompt.

The teachers collect student evidence, and then they assess them using whatever rubric they would use traditionally to score the assessment. They then submit both the student work and their assessment of it on a rubric into an online system. It is then blind-reviewed by another teacher in the state. The reason we have to sort of scale this up to a statewide professional learning community is because, in some districts, there may be one Latin teacher. Only someone who knows Latin can look at the work students have done and how much development in their Latin ability over the year has been demonstrated. When teachers submit this work into our online system, the system can do some very great things with it that would be very hard if we were doing this in paper and pencil. The system can strip identifying information so that the process actually is blind.

If I am a Spanish teacher reviewing some student work, I don't know the names of the students. I don't know the name of the teacher who submitted the work. I don't know the name of the high school it's from. I don't even know the name of the district it's from. As a Spanish teacher, I have the professional

skills to look at the assignments the students were given, the work that they did in response to them, and then the rubrics that were used to assess them. That's really where the measurement of the growth comes in.

If I'm looking at pre- and post-measures of students mastery of contents standards, I, as that content area teacher with that expertise, will be assessing whether or not the students met expected growth, exceeded expected growth, or whether the work sample submitted really shows that they did not meet expected growth.

I mentioned the three groups of educators that are piloting that process right now, but I do also want to note that they may not be the only ones who use it. This fall, we will be doing another pilot of that same process with some different groups of educators. We will be exploring this process for teachers who teach AP and IB courses. We'll also be using it for teachers who teach the Extended Content Standards. We'll also be exploring it with AIG and ESL teachers. Some AIG and ESL teachers actually serve as teachers of record for a set of content standards. In that case, they can receive EVAAS growth values and participate in that process. But for those teachers who aren't responsible for direct instruction on a set of content standards, this Analysis of Student Work process is probably going to be a better fit for the kind of support that they provide for students.

Before we move on to take some questions, I do just want to share a few resources that are out there that you can use, some of which are posted on our public - NC public school site -and some of which are housed actually in EVAAS.

First are the teacher evaluation dashboards. If you were a teacher in North Carolina last year and you received an evaluation - a signed summary rating form in the online McREL system - you should be able to log into EVAAS and see a teacher evaluation dashboard. One thing we know is challenging for anyone - teachers, principals, us at the Department - is when we have to have four different browsers open with four different websites up to get all the pieces of information we need. The goal of the teacher evaluation dashboard is to put all the information in one place where teachers can see it. When you look at your evaluation dashboard, you'll be looking at your ratings on Standards 1 through 5 as well as your rating on

Standard 6. You'll be able to track your Standard 6 ratings over the course of the next three years, which is, of course, the requirement - three years of data for teachers to have an overall educator effectiveness status.

While you're logged in to EVAAS looking at your dashboard, we also encourage you to check out our new learning modules. These are really exciting new opportunities for teachers to learn a little bit more about EVAAS and to be able to do that 24 hours a day, seven days a week. The learning modules are roughly seven-to-ten-minute videos on reports within the system that are the most commonly accessed ones. When you open up a learning module, it essentially plays a video where you can see someone narrating how to access a report, what the report tells you, and then how you might use that information moving forward. There are, I believe, five learning modules currently available in the system. A sixth should be released any day now. Over the course of this calendar year, we'll be adding 11 more, so that essentially any report within EVAAS has a learning module that accompanies it.

Specifically related to the Common Exams, we're encouraging folks to take a look at the scoring module that we've prepared. What we've done there is take some sample constructed response items for the grades and content areas with Common Exams. Teachers across the state have assisted us by actually administering those items to their students. They have collected the student responses, scored them with the rubrics, and then allowed us to film that scoring process so we can include that within the scoring module.

The Common Exam scoring module is housed in NC Education, so if you've done any of the Department's other professional development modules - A Call for Change is one, the formative assessment module is another - you already have an NC Education account that you can use to log in and access the module. If you don't have one already, it's free. You just need to have an email address and you can go right to the NC Education site and create an account. There's some more specific information on our website about how to navigate to the module and create an account if you don't have one already. Another good resource for teachers, principals, and central office staff members is some of the work that the Department's been doing around inter-rater reliability. This is actually not about Standard 6, which

most of my presentation today has been about. This is really about how principals do classroom observations and use all the information they have to rate teachers on Standards 1 through 5. We do have a statewide evaluation system - a statewide evaluation rubric - and so we're looking to really develop that consistent understanding of what a particular standard and element looks like.

The website that I've linked to here - and we'll get these slides posted so you can have the hyperlinks, too - provide some videos of classroom instruction so that groups of teachers or principals can watch the videos together and think about how they might rate the teacher on a particular standard or element in the evaluation system.

I'm going to leave this slide up on the screen as I turn to some questions that have been submitted through the question bar. This is our general educator effectiveness inbox, so it comes to me. It comes to a few other colleagues at the Department. Any time you have a question, a concern, a comment about educator effectiveness, we invite you to email us there. We do have a 24-hour response time. We know this is a topic that people need to know about and they need to know the answers quickly, so we try and do that as best we can. I've also included our educator effectiveness website. If there is a resource I've discussed today or a topic I've discussed today, you should be able to find information about it on that site.

When I have a great audience of teachers like I do have on the line today, I also encourage them to let me know if there's a resource missing. If you look at the website and think, "Gosh, it would be great if I had a handout that did x," and you don't find one, please email us and let us know. That's really how we know to develop the next set of resources. We need to know what teachers want to know so that we can get those things in development and then get them pushed out to answer folks' questions.

I'm going to next turn to the question bar, where I do have a few that have come in and a couple that I think I've answered already, but we'll go through these. So one question on here is, "How are and will pre-kindergarten teachers be rated?" About a year and a half ago, perhaps around two years now, pre-kindergarten was actually removed from the Department of Public Instruction and passed over to the Department of Health & Human Services. Essentially, the State Board of Education and the Department of Public Instruction really can't make policy decisions and can't take policy steps around what happens in

pre-k programs. Pre-kindergarten teachers can be evaluated with the teacher evaluation instrument. The instrument is used by a lot of school systems that have pre-K programs, but there will be no Standard 6 data for pre-kindergarten teachers.

There is some work going on under the Race to the Top Early Learning grant, which is a second Race to the Top grant that North Carolina received, to develop standard assessments for pre-kindergarten, but that work is definitely a few years away. If pre-kindergarten teachers are being evaluated with the North Carolina evaluation system, that's perfectly fine, and they can get ratings on Standards 1 through 5. There will be no Standard 6 rating for pre-kindergarten teachers, however.

We have another question about the unintended consequences of the 70/30 split, as I talked about a little bit earlier. The question is, "If that was an unintended consequence, then what was the intended consequence of having the school score count? What is the point of including it if it doesn't help or hurt you?" When the State Board made the decision to include the 70/30 split, it was a pretty heavy discussion. We heard from some folks in the field that wanted the split to be as much as 50/50, and then we also heard from a lot of teachers and principals who felt that it should be 100 percent individual. Ultimately, the intended consequence that the Board was looking for was that including a school-wide measure would really encourage teachers to collaborate, and that, while it may help a teacher or hurt a teacher's individual value-added score, the helping or hurting wouldn't be to the extreme where it would actually drop a teacher an entire rating or raise a teacher an entire rating. Given that we saw that happen with thousands of teachers, that's when the Board did see that these unintended consequences had happened and is more than likely going to act to change the policy.

Next question was, "Are the MSLs the same as Common Exams?" So a Common Exam is a kind of Measure of Student Learning or a kind of MSL, but there are also others. What we're doing in K to 2 with the pilots this spring is a type of Measure of Student Learning. What we're doing in the arts and healthful living is a type of Measure of Student Learning, so they're not exactly the same. It's really more that a Common Exam is a subset of the Measures of Student Learning.

"Is there a handout available for printing?" I'll certainly be taking the slides from today and making them

into a PDF file and then posting that to our website. If you'd like to download them and share with colleagues, which I certainly hope you will, that is something that is easy to do.

We have a couple of questions about CTE for middle school. Our CTE group at the agency is working with teachers from across the state who teach middle school CTE courses, and they are working on designing some Common Exams for CTE middle school courses. They're in development right now. They should be available for the '13-14 school year, and we encourage you to stay tuned. They will be coming out and will be administered starting next year.

So we've got a couple questions about grade 3. One is about how growth will be measured - that's actually a question about K to 2 as well. So the model that we're going to use to measure growth in K through 3 through a pre-assessment of some kind and a post-assessment of some kind is a model that we will be developing. Running the pilot this spring with our partners in those 13 school systems will give us some pre- and post-scores that we can actually use to develop the model for how it will work. So it's kind of a difficult question to answer right now because the pilots are still ongoing and we don't actually have any information back yet. Once we have the information from the pilots, prior to administration beginning across the whole state next year, we'll have a chance to look at what kind of growth we can measure with the results through more of a pre-post type of model.

So we have a question about earth and environmental science, "Will there be a pre-common exam test for high school or how will growth be measured?" So for the high school courses in which students traditionally have not had experience with a set of contents standards, we're able to do value-added analysis by using the assessment data we have. It's usually easiest to explain with an example. So for those of you who may have been teaching back when we had more high school EOCs, we had a Civics and Economics EOC at the high school level. Those students had not taken a social studies assessment prior to taking Civics and Economics, and we were still able to do value-added analysis. That's really done by using the data that we do have on students. So for Civics and Economics, for example, how students have scored on reading assessments is a pretty key factor. How they've done on literacy assessments in the past can be used to predict how they'll do on the Civics and Economics assessment.

For this specific question that's about earth and environmental science, we actually have a lot of data. Students' reading scores do very much matter in how they do on Science assessments because they have to be able to read the questions and understand them. But we also have data on how students have done on fifth- and eighth-grade Science EOGs, and particularly when we get into science like chemistry and physics, we also find that there's a strong relationship between how students have scored on Math assessments and how they score on Science assessments. We use all that information to take a look at how they have grown in relation to what we might have expected given assessment scores on previous State assessments.

There are a couple of questions that all sort of fall into the same kind of category. Some folks asked about specialists. We had some people who asked about elementary reading and math intervention teachers, locally hired resource folks, and instructional technology specialists. There's not necessarily a statewide answer; let me explain that a little bit more.

This week, the Department, in partnership with the SAS Institute, opened up a roster verification process, and you may have already participated in it or probably will be in the next few weeks. Roster verification is essentially a way to gather information on something that we know happens a lot of times in schools, which is that a student may have one teacher of record in NCWISE, but there are a lot of educators who are contributing to that student's growth - people like intervention teachers and reading specialists. Those folks can participate in the roster verification process and essentially claim a certain percentage of responsibility for the instruction of a student.

So if we have a reading specialist, for example, who takes a student one day a week from his or her traditional reading instruction and provides support, it would be reasonable that that teacher might claim 20 percent of the responsibility for that student's growth in reading, and the classroom teacher would claim the 80 percent. The student is with that teacher for 80 percent of the time. That works for cases in which reading specialists, intervention teachers, Title I teachers and EC teachers are responsible for a set of content standards. But we know there are also cases in which those folks are not actually teaching students a set of content standards. Sometimes they're developing a set of skills or they're providing

enrichment. In those cases, participating in the roster verification process isn't really a good solution for those teachers. It isn't a reflection of what they do with their students. For those folks, we will be using that Analysis of Student Work process so that an AIG teacher who perhaps does enrichment with students has the chance to document those activities, document that student work, and then an AIG specialist somewhere else in the state can take a look at how much those students have grown given the type of assignments that they were given to do.

So we are actually a little bit over on time for today, but I do have a couple of questions that I did not get to. I will do two things with the answers to the questions that we did not get to. I will do a frequently asked questions document that I will post on our educator effectiveness website where I will have the recording for this webinar posted. I'll send it to Alec and Angela Farthing over at NCAE so that they can send it out to the listserv that they have. That way, even if you don't find your way to the website, you'll still have the frequently asked questions document from today.

There are some good questions coming in about how we measure growth and Social Studies and about how we prevent teachers from scoring constructed response items higher to keep their colleagues' scores high. We've definitely got some good questions coming in and I want to make sure we get answers out to teachers, but it is also 5:00 and I know that many of you still have some work to do at school or getting home to your own families.

Thank you for joining us today and giving us some of your very valuable time, particularly late in the day when you've had a full day working with your students. So thank you again for your time and for your participation. Please, as you have follow-up questions or anything that comes to mind afterwards, please use that educator effectiveness account to contact us at the Department so that we can hear your concerns, get answers out, and make this model the best it can be for all of our teachers.

So thank you so much for joining today, and we look forward to another webinar in the next couple of months. Take care.

(CONCLUDED)

WPU

GLORIA VEILLEUX, TRANSCRIBER