

FILE TWO

NCPAPA WEBINAR

MS. PRESTON: So good afternoon again.. It's 1:00, so we're going to go ahead and get started with today's webinar. Just one more time – let's do another sound check. If you can hear the sound of my voice, please raise your hand on your webinar dashboard so that I can know everyone is able to hear.

(PAUSE)

MS. PRESTON: All right, fantastic. Thank you so much. First, to welcome everyone to our webinar today. My name's Jennifer Preston. I'm the Race to the Top Project Coordinator for Educator Effectiveness at the Department of Public Instruction. I'll be running through today's webinar and sharing some information about the state's educator effectiveness model, some updates on EVAAS, our State Board-approved growth model, and the Common Exams, or the Measures of Student Learning. We've actually specifically left a lot of time on this webinar for questions because really, especially for people that are in the field practicing, doing this every day, sometimes the most is learned when we all just have the opportunity to ask questions and then engage in discussion around those.

This email address on the screen is on a resource slide later on in the webinar, but that is our educator effectiveness email box. If you have any questions about educator effectiveness, the Measures of Student Learning, and the Common Exams, you can send those to this account. You will nine times out of ten get a response from me. We do have some other staff members that, based on the topics folks ask about, will sometimes help answer questions, and it allows us to log the questions coming in and then actually tailor our frequently asked questions documents to what's on folks' minds.

A few announcements before we get started. We are recording today's webinar and then we will post it online so that if you have to drop off at any point or you have colleagues who wanted to join and were unable to, they can access and see the slides, listen to the audio, and sort of watch the webinar all at once through the video.

We do have quite a few people online today. There are 127 people currently with us and there were a lot

more than that registered. So to make sure we don't have to deal with any background noise, we are going to keep everyone muted, but please ask questions throughout by typing them in the questions bar. As I mentioned, we have plenty of time for questions at the end of the webinar and we'll also be able to have a list of the questions that were asked. If there are any we don't get to, we can address those in a frequently asked questions document that we can send out via email to the folks who registered for today. So the first part of our discussion may actually be familiar to some of you if you have attended one of our regional READY meetings that we've held over the last two weeks. Our leadership team has been to six of the state's eight regions (we are doing two more meetings next week) to share information about how North Carolina is moving forward with educator evaluation, our new accountability model, and Home Base, which is the new name of our instructional improvement system.

So if you've been to those meetings, some of this information is not new -- you've heard it before -- but we know some folks on the line have not been able to attend and that it always actually helps to hear information twice so that you can ask questions about it after you hear it the second time.

North Carolina is focused on educator evaluation, both for principals and assistant principals and for teachers, as a part of our Race to the Top effort, but it really goes beyond that. It goes to the basic assumption behind all the work that we're doing in READY, which is that our students need to be ready for life after high school, whether that's going into a community college, a four-year college, directly into the workforce, or going into the military. Our kids have lots of different paths they want to take. And to prepare them for those paths, we have to have really effective teachers in all our classrooms. Effective teachers need to work in environments that are led by effective leaders that really develop that capacity in them to be the great teachers that our kids need.

And undergirding all this work are two really critical assumptions. The first is the acknowledgment that, despite what is sometimes out there in the media, being a teacher and educating students is not easy. It takes a lot of skills. It takes a lot of knowledge, and it takes someone that really has a deep commitment to the task ahead of them. We also know that, as educators who want to do the best things for students,

we can all improve. Our teachers who are good want to become great, and so we need an evaluation system that provides them with the feedback and the next steps to help them make that transition. And ultimately, it is about the learning of our students. They are really the reason why we do the evaluation process at all. They are the reason our principals, assistant principals, and peers go into classrooms and observe. They're why we give and receive feedback as a part of professional growth. And their learning, whether they're making a lot of it or whether they're struggling, is so critical that we do need to look at student growth data and how we can include that in the evaluation process.

So, first, to talk a little bit about teachers, and then we'll talk about administrators in just a minute. One thing that's very important, particularly as we're now almost halfway into the 2012-13 school year, is our messaging and our communication about the educator evaluation process as a system. Because Standard 6 for teachers and Standard 8 for principals are new, there has been a lot of focus on them in the last year or so, and, in some ways, that makes perfect sense. When something is new, people have questions. It's what they want to learn more about, but what we have to keep reminding teachers -- and as administrators we ask you for your help with this -- is that North Carolina has six evaluation standards and they are each equal. This is especially important for teachers who live sort of on the borders of North Carolina where they may read a lot about what's going on in Tennessee or Virginia or other states across the nation. A lot of states have set up these kind of index models of educator effectiveness. It's almost as if they've decided that teacher effectiveness is worth a hundred points and then 50 of it should come from student growth. Forty of it should come from principal observations.

We don't have a system anything like that in North Carolina. First, the idea that teaching equates to a number of points given all the different parts that it includes, to us, doesn't make very much sense, and it doesn't make very much sense to the State Board. What we have instead is a system developed by teachers that has six standards, and teachers need to be proficient on each one of those in order to be effective. There isn't one that matters more than the others. And the ultimate goal of this system is really to do two things: to use these six standards to identify who our strongest teachers are because they are the

Page 3

people that we can all learn from. How do they work with their students? What do they do in their classrooms? How can we replicate some of their practices so that other teachers are also able to have that strong performance?

And a second goal is to support teachers who need to increase their effectiveness. Very few people get into education for any reason other than that they want to help kids learn. And so people that get in with that type of motivation want to get better, and, when we can see with our evaluation system that we have teachers struggling in one of these areas, three of these areas, maybe in all six, we need to use the system to get the teachers the feedback they need and then get them the support they need to improve.

The message is really the same with our administrator evaluation process only we're talking about eight standards instead of six. We have the same methodology with an overall effectiveness rating. There are expectations that our principals and assistant principals are proficient on each one of our eight standards. And, again, we use these evaluation results to identify who our strongest school administrators are and then also to identify administrators who need some support so that we can provide that to them and help them increase their effectiveness.

One new requirement that was passed by the State Board of Education for the 2010-11 school year was that every teacher receives a yearly evaluation. It used to be up to districts given some State Board policies around licensure, and tenure decisions. Districts on their own had the ability to decide how frequently they evaluated teachers. Now, this process takes place every year, and their rationale for this decision is that we use evaluations for really critical purposes, and those purposes merit doing the evaluation cycle every year. We use the evaluation system to identify strengths. Every teacher has their strengths in the things that they are good at that we want to help them build on and also encourage them to share those strengths with their colleagues. And every teacher has areas for growth. Even a really strong teacher probably has some aspects of their practice that they want to improve, and the evaluation system is really our vehicle for that improvement.

It's also important to remind our teachers and our administrators that the evaluation process is just that --

Page 4

it's a process. It's not something that happens only at the end of the year, only when we get student achievement data back. It really starts at the beginning of the year for principals, assistant principals, and teachers. In designing this process, the Professional Teaching Standards Commission wanted to make evaluation something that isn't done to a teacher, but rather that the teacher is an active participant in. And that's where having the self-assessment, the teacher-developed professional development plan, and having conferences throughout the process come into play. That's where you can kind of see that idea come to life -- that teachers are active participants in their own growth and so they're active participants in their own evaluation process. The same thing applies with principals and assistant principals. During the year, they're pulling together data and evidences that they think best show their impact on their school communities. They're active participants in the process as well.

And our new evaluation process does require something that we can't really put in a State Board policy and that we can't really put in all the manuals we provide around the process, and that's really the idea of courage and bravery. In any profession, teaching, the medical profession, any in the world, and even in our personal lives, it is a hard dynamic to have challenging conversations about where we currently stand, to invite people to give us critical feedback on how we're doing our job, and then to also be brave enough to have those honest conversations with our colleagues, or, as a principal, to have that honest conversation with your teachers about areas where they can improve. The way those conversations are going to work the best is when we all acknowledge that there are ways for us to improve.

And as we also work to sort of re-center ourselves around the idea of teacher evaluation as a system with our six standards for teachers and our eight standards for principals, what we've heard across the state is that we, as the department, need to help districts develop a better understanding of the evaluation rubrics.

To put it simply, to sort of answer the question: what does that standard mean? What does that element mean? What does it look like in a classroom?

And only when we have that clear understanding of those evaluations rubrics are we going to have rating accurately against the standards. Teachers aren't evaluated, and should not be evaluated, on a curve.

That's why we have things like rubrics. They are a defined set of best practices for teachers and leaders, and we are looking at progress and how teachers and leaders are doing against those standards.

When I was a first-year teacher teaching World History, I had my students do research papers. And looking back now, it seems silly, but I started that grading process without a rubric. What I realized a couple of hours into my grading is that my grading was all over the place. I was grading the papers sort of by if the one I was reading was better than the one I had just read. I wasn't measuring them and looking at them against some standard of what I was expecting my students to do. That's a classroom example, but really holds true for the evaluation process. Those standards embody what we want to see from teachers and from school administrators.

And we need to really dig into our standards, dig into our elements, really in the same way that the Common Core is requiring our students to dig into texts. It's the same type of process. So here we've pulled an element from Standard 3, something particularly important in this school year as teachers are learning new content standards to teach the students. What we can see here are the descriptions for a teacher that performs this element at a proficient level and one who does so at an accomplished level.

And, through reading the actual text of the descriptors, we can see some of the key differences. We can see what distinguishes a teacher from being proficient from one who is accomplished.

An accomplished teacher is really one who is motivating students to think about the big questions, to think beyond simply what's presented to them in the class each day, and is motivating them to go beyond that class and make connections with other areas of their lives and other areas of academic study, and so it's much more beyond the classroom than a teacher at the proficient level who knows the content he needs to know to teach the standards in the class each day.

And so for principals and assistant principals as well as teachers, we do have different numbers of standards, but we also have the same rating categories. So for Standards 1-5 for teachers and Standards 1-7 for administrators, we have five rating categories ranging from not demonstrated up to distinguished.

Standard 6 for teachers and Standard 8 for administrators have a different rating scale. Teachers and

principals and assistant principals receive a rating of exceeds expected growth, meets expected growth, or does not meet expected growth on the sixth or eighth standard. So we do go from five categories to three categories so that we can be very cautious in how we're using value-added data for those sixth and eighth standards.

And we've also heard the terms effective and highly effective in our schools, in central offices, and here at the agency. This slide shows in, one slide, we hope, the definitions of what it means to be effective, highly effective, or to be in need of improvement. You don't become an effective teacher based just on your rating on Standard 6 or just on your rating on Standards 1-5. Our definitions of effectiveness really tie back to that idea from the Teaching Standards Commission that all of our standards are important, and teachers need to meet certain levels of expectations on all of them.

So we can talk about the effective status as an example because that is where most of the teachers in North Carolina will find themselves. A teacher has an overall status of effective if they are rated as proficient or higher on Standards 1-5 and if they meet or exceed expected growth on Standard 6, but the really critical part of the Standard 6 part of this slide is that it is a three-year average.

Every year, in the fall, teachers will get a sixth standard rating based on the growth of their kids in the prior academic year. That is good information for them to think about how they may want to structure their classrooms, how they may want to structure their instruction, how they're working with students, but only when we have three years of that data and can average it together does it become an official part of the evaluation process.

We give the data to teachers every year because it really wouldn't be fair to withhold the information from them until there are three years of data and then show it to them all at once. They deserve the right to know how they're doing each year along the way. But it doesn't become an official part of the model until after three years.

The 2012 - 13 school year, the one we're currently in, is the first year of our educator effectiveness model.

There will not be effective, highly effective, or teachers in need of improvement in North Carolina until

after the 2014-15 school year because everybody's starting fresh in 2012-13, and we need our folks to accrue three years of data before we would say we have enough information to say whether a teacher is effective, highly effective, or in need of improvement.

So what's happening with the sixth standard rating that teachers are getting from this fall that they're actually going to receive in a few weeks? That information is really for illustration purposes. It's to let them see how this system is going to work, and it is going to integrate their ratings on Standards 1-5 with their rating on Standard 6. The way that they will see the data will show them that they have three blank years, years that they don't have data for, that, moving forward, will gradually fill in with every school year that we finish. The release is really to let those teachers start to see how the system works, to have the 2012-13 school year to ask questions and to learn more, so that when the system goes live officially next year, hopefully, everyone has had the opportunity to develop that good, strong understanding of it. And so to talk about Standard 6 for just a few more minutes, we already talked a little about how it's new and it's different, but it's not necessarily more important than any of the other standards. One thing we want to be very open and transparent about is that Standard 6 has its limits. Standard 6 is a rating that teachers get after the school year is done. And while there are definitely good analytical processes that teachers can think about using their value-added data -- how do they do with their low-achieving students versus their high-achieving students, for example -- it doesn't give them any concrete next steps for instructional changes. That's where the power of Standards 1-5 is. Principals observing teachers and teachers observing each other are how teachers are going to get the concrete feedback around questioning strategies that they can use, literacy instruction they might want to do, and what kind of assessments they might want to deliver to students over the course of the school year. For those kinds of concrete feedback loops for teachers, we really need to depend on Standards 1-5 for that information.

We've already talked a little bit about Standard 6, and this also applies for principals as well. Standard 6 and Standard 8 both depend on three years' worth of growth data. For a teacher, it's three years of their own data on how their kids have done. For administrators, it's a school-wide data measure on how kids

have done across the grades and subjects and assessments that have been administered at the school. The real reason we wait for three years rather than putting folks into the system right now is because three years is when we really feel confident in the value-added data. Over the course of three years, an elementary school teacher has taught 75 students perhaps as opposed to teaching only 25 in one year. Our high school teachers over three years have taught potentially hundreds of kids depending on what kind of schedule they are on, a block schedule and such. And the more data we have in the system, the more confident we are about the measures. That's really the reason to build in the three years of data requirement.

And we don't want to lose sight of the fact that Standards 1-5 are still high stakes. The State Board policy has not changed around teachers being placed on monitored or directed growth plans when they're rated as developing on any of the first five standards. The Board has not put into policy yet what happens for teachers who are rated as not meeting expected growth after three years of data. They will put that policy in place, but that's not going to affect anybody for the next three years. The policies around monitored and directed growth plans associated with developing ratings are affecting teachers in our schools right now, and will continue to for the next three years.

And so a critical part of this work about including student growth in the evaluation of teachers means that we have to have a measure of how kids are growing in their content area and for the specific students that a teacher teaches. There are some states across the country, -- you may have heard about them in the media, on the news, on the internet -- where school-wide growth is how teachers in non-tested grades or subjects are evaluated.

In North Carolina, that, for us, is an interim measure, something that's used for illustration. A year of data doesn't count for a teacher and isn't one of those three years for a teacher until it's based on their students in their content area. And so that does mean that some teachers will come into this model a bit later than others because it takes a little while longer to develop valid ways to measure growth for some of our grades and content areas. And so we're going to sort of map that out on a timeline and provide you with

Page 9

some updates on the way we'll be measuring student growth for different types of teachers given the content standards and the grades they teach.

So the vast majority of teachers in North Carolina will have a value-added score that will be used to determine their sixth-standard rating, and that value-added score will come from EVAAS. Our End of Grade and End of Course assessments have gone into EVAAS for a long time and will continue to do so. The Common Exams that will be administered across North Carolina this school year will also go into EVAAS and will be used to create value-added scores. And then many of our high school principals may have noticed that your CTE teachers have value-added data for the first time ever. That is a new development for us in North Carolina. There are 44 CTE Post-Assessments where we can use the value-added methodology to produce a value-added score. And I do want to pause on the 44 for just a minute because, again, most of our high school folks know that there are a lot more than 44 CTE Post-Assessments.

Our partners at the SAS Institute only perform value-added analyses when they can feel confident enough that the data fit into one of their prediction models. When it doesn't fit, much like the analogy of not being able to force a round peg into a square hole, we simply can't have a value-added measure. And so for over 90 of our CTE Post-Assessments, the answer was simply no; they don't fit into a prediction model, and, therefore, we'll have to use another method with them. And so for those CTE Post-Assessments, we will use a pre-post test model similar to the model in EVAAS, but different in that we're using a pre-test. This will be how we measure growth in those CTE areas.

The same process will apply for the Common Exams. If some of the Common Exams don't fit into the prediction models, we won't be able to do value-added analysis with them. We say that because we want folks to understand that there is a common sense idea behind this. If data from a particular assessment don't fit in value-added modeling, we can't make them fit just because that would make the system easier. Instead, we need to think about another plan to measure growth validly and reliably for the teachers and kids in that content area.

I mentioned the CTE Post-Assessments using more of a pre-and post-test type model. That is also what we will be looking at for grades K to 3. And so let me explain a little bit more the developments on K-3 assessment.

First, let's talk about third grade. Next calendar year -- so in January and February of this school year -- we will be asking the State Board of Education to approve the use of a third-grade pre-test to kind of bring back the pre-test that we lost a few years ago. Now, one critical difference between the pre-test we used to have for third-graders and the pre-test we will have for third-graders now is that the one we're going to use moving forward is actually a form of the third-grade reading EOG. The pre-test that we used to give to third-graders was really a second-grade EOG for all intents and purposes.

The reason we're administering a form of the third-grade EOG to students is also related to the third-grade retention requirement that the General Assembly has put into place. If there are going to be these very harsh consequences for students if they are not demonstrating proficiency on the third-grade EOG -- the summer camps, the special courses that they may need to take -- we feel it's only fair to the kids, their parents, and their teachers that, at the beginning of third grade, they have a measure of where that student is and then can use that information throughout the school year to figure out how they're going to get the student to where the student needs to be by the end of the year. For K-2, in about 15 school systems, we will be piloting a running record for reading comprehension this spring, and so I also want to pause here to make a distinction for you that I hope you will help us make with teachers.

The Reading 3D program that many of our teachers associate with the devices that they use as they administer the running records and phonics assessments to their students is an assessment program that has traditionally been used to collect formative data for teachers, and it will continue to be used that way.

But just because the program has been used to collect formative data doesn't mean that we can't use those devices, especially since all of our schools are going to have them, to collect some type of summative data. The formative data gathered throughout the year in classrooms is not data that the State is ever going to collect, but what we are piloting in the spring is using those devices to administer a separate

Page 11

passage to look at how students are reading at their reading level. We are not planning on including phonics, only a measure of reading comprehension. And as I said earlier, this is a pilot. We will try this with these school districts, talk to the teachers about their impressions of it, see the data that come out of the pilot, and then may ultimately recommend that to the Board as how we measure growth for K-2 teachers.

Another stream of work that will be operating in a pilot this coming spring is a process called Analysis of Student Work. This is how we will be measuring growth for teachers in areas like the Arts, World Languages, Healthful Living, Physical Education, and, really, the Arts covers Visual Arts, Performing Arts, and Music. These are the courses where the standards tend to be very, very focused on student performance, and they're also the courses where instruction typically doesn't happen in standardized ways. Even within a district, students in one elementary school may see their art teacher far more than students in another elementary school. And because there's really no way to capture that information, we're going to have to use a process that has some human judgment in it because principals know how often their Art teacher and their Physical Education teacher and their Spanish teacher get to work with their students. So we can work with teachers to take those content standards, align examples of types of products that students might do in the classroom to those standards, and then also provide some rubrics that can be used to score the student work. It's something that we're actually working on with the State of Tennessee. Tennessee began this process last year, and it's actually been one that their teachers have rather enjoyed. Of course, everybody has to get accustomed to a new process, but across the board, the feedback from teachers in Tennessee has been that this is, in their minds, the most authentic way you could look at student progress in a course like Art or Physical Education. And we actually have some art teachers from Memphis, Tennessee, where this process was first developed, who are going to come to North Carolina a few times throughout the next semester to work with not only DPI staff, but also staff from our districts on how we might be able to take this process and make it work for us in the North Carolina context.

So given that teachers across the state are giving lots of different kinds of assessments, we have put it on

sort of a high-level timeline of when they will begin to give their assessments and, therefore, when they will have a status for the first time. So you can see on the screen here what I mentioned earlier: that the 2012-13 school year is year one for a lot of our teachers -- those who give End-of-Grade and End-of-Course assessments, Common Exams, or many of our CTE Post-Assessments. Those teachers need three years of data in order to have a status, so, for them, the 2014-15 school year is the first year that that would be possible.

In the 2012-13 school year, we have pilots up and running for K-3 and Analysis of Student Work, but they're not fully in place. So 2013-14 will be the first year of the three-year average for those teachers, meaning that for them, an overall status won't be possible until after the 2015-16 school year.

And so the next two slides provide some examples of the kind of support DPI is providing around the various parts of the evaluation process and system. Our professional development division and Kim Simmons, who is a new staff member at DPI, are working on how to help principals, teachers, and central office staff members develop a really deep understanding of our Professional Teaching Standards. They have been doing that through webinars, in-person training sessions, and soon in the spring, we will actually have sort of a repository of videos where principals and teachers will be able to access videos of classroom instruction and then see how master scorers have rated that classroom. Is it a distinguished, accomplished, proficient on the standards and elements that are observable in a class?

Most of you, I hope, are aware of the North Carolina Educare Evaluation System, NCEES, wiki. If you haven't visited the wiki before, I would encourage you to do so. All of the webinars that take place about the evaluation system and the standards are all archived there so you can view them or your teachers can view them. Upcoming webinars are posted there, and it's also where you can find updated versions of the manuals for all the evaluation processes, for example, and where you can find other resources that have either been developed by DPI or that other districts have been kind enough to share with the Department to share with other districts.

On Standard 6 and Standard 8 specifically, we do have an educator effectiveness website that is part of

the North Carolina public schools site. You can find most of the information we've talked about today on that site. This Power Point is on there in a slightly different form. Guides for teachers, guides for administrators, and training information are all on that site.

We've also mentioned EVAAS a few times today, and so we've put the URL for the EVAAS system on there. EVAAS does employ their own trainers who can do virtual professional development fairly easily, so if you, even as a principal, would like to schedule some customized training for your school, you can contact the folks at SAS. They'll work with you to set up a time and then you can actually get your staff on a webinar with them where they'll look at your school's data. It's always much more powerful when it's real data and not the sample data that we sometimes have to use in larger trainings to protect confidentiality. We encourage you to keep reaching out for those opportunities, and we really like for them to stay busy, so please don't think that if you're a principal in a really tiny, little school that this isn't an option that's open for you. It's really open for all of our schools and teachers across the state.

Our Regional PD Leads also have been trained extensively on the use of EVAAS and so they can support you with the same kinds of training. They might be more likely to be able to do it in-person because they are regionally located, so that's another resource that you may want to take advantage of.

And then we also have ongoing webinars, much like the one we're having today. This is actually a second webinar that we're hosting with administrators after our first webinar in October had a lot of people attend, over 400, and also a lot of people watched the archived recording of it. So we're going to try and keep these scheduled on a sort of bi-monthly, tri-monthly type of basis so that people can get the right information and share with their teachers.

So before I move into questions and answers, I did want to provide just a couple of updates on EVAAS, and then we will get into those questions that you may have. So most of you are probably aware that teachers have received access to their value-added data in EVAAS. This is for teachers who have such data, so, for example, an art teacher doesn't have value-added data, therefore, would not have received access to an EVAAS account yet.

We did stagger that release so that superintendents and their designees at the central office level and principals had access to the teacher report scores about two and a half weeks before we opened up the reporting for teachers. Then, at that point, teachers received an automated email letting them know where they could log into the system, and, much like any other secure site, the first time you access it, they were given kind of a dummy password and then had to change it upon entry.

So we do know from tracking access to the system that teachers are in there looking at that data, which is great. There are some days across the state where upwards of 10,000 folks log into EVAAS and are spending not just a couple of minutes in there, but are spending actually a good amount of time in there looking through the data and getting behind it, which is really exciting.

In the next two weeks - and we'll, of course, be doing the same kind of communication, letting principals and central office staff members know what's coming to teachers before it's out there - we'll be releasing what we're calling teacher dashboards. This is a visual display for teachers that will combine for them their ratings on Standards 1 through 5 that were recorded on the summary rating forms last year in the McREL system, as well as their Standard 6 rating. Teachers in your schools that are looking at their value-added scores right now in EVAAS are not actually looking at their sixth-standard rating. They're looking at the 70 percent of that rating that comes from their individual data. They're not yet seeing the 70/30 weighted average that the Board approved as the sixth standard methodology for the 2011-12 school year. They will see that when they see the dashboards.

When we release the dashboards is also when any teacher in North Carolina who doesn't have an EVAAS account will get one, and that includes our kindergarten teachers, art teachers, and music teachers because their sixth-standard ratings are based on school-wide growth, and so when they access the system, they'll be able to see their ratings on 1 through 5, see their rating on the sixth standard, and then also navigate around and look at trends in school-level data.

In terms of ongoing training for EVAAS, we talked on the last slide about professional development opportunities that are available, but also wanted to let you know that coming throughout the remainder of

the school year with the first release in probably the middle of December, we are going to be embedding what we're calling learning modules into the EVAAS interface. The learning module is a roughly seven-to-ten-minute video about a particular kind of report that a teacher can access 24 hours a day, seven days a week. And the same holds true for principals, really any users of the system. The video will walk through a sample report and the narrator will help folks understand how to interpret the data that's on a report. So we're sort of trying to meet the demands of teachers and principals who may log into their value-added data and log into EVAAS late at night or on the weekends and they have questions and want answers right away. Having those learning modules embedded for them to click and be able to see something like that right then and there, we hope, will develop even deeper understanding of the system. I wanted to also provide some updates on the Measures of Student Learning or North Carolina's Common Exams. To date, there are 40 school systems, two charter schools, and one regional school that have elected to administer the high school Common Exams at the end of first semester. In some cases, that means that administration starts next week, especially with our mountain counties. In other places that means that administration will take place in the middle of January timeframe, but we had to operate under the assumption that the second week of December is when folks are going to need to start in some counties, and so testing coordinators in these fall administration districts and charters have received copies of the tests, information on how to order answer sheets, and we are working with them to ensure that there's as smooth as possible an administration for them as they have elected to administer early. DPI is working on a module that will be housed in NC Education just like NC FALCON and a Call to Change, that will provide training for scoring the performance tasks. We also are preparing with all of our districts for the spring administration window, which is when not only will high school assessments be administered, but also when upper elementary and middle school Science and Social Studies assessments will come on board and be administered. That will be universal administration across all districts and participating charter schools. So the volume will definitely be higher there, and it's really not too early to start planning for that process now.

So that's all the information that I wanted to share with you today, and I've actually done a pretty good job because I took about 45 minutes and I wanted to leave about half of the time for questions and answers. So what I'm going to do is pull up the questions that have been coming in as we've been talking here and just start to provide some answers. If I'm not clear on something, if I maybe misunderstand a question that you've asked, please just type another question into the questions bar so that we can clarify and get the right information out.

One question was if there was an alternate phone number; "I have not received a response." This person has left, so I'm not exactly sure what that question was about, but I'll be sure to follow up with her.

There were some other questions about accessing the webinar. For any of your colleagues who maybe had to drop off early, we will send out the slides to anyone who registered, even those folks who registered and couldn't attend with us today, so that they at least have the slides, and then we'll let you know when the recording is archived. It takes us a couple of weeks to do that, but we try and have them up as soon as possible.

We have a question here: "How is the three-year growth average being calculated when we're utilizing different assessments over the next three years? For example, this year we used the Common Core EOGs and used them again next year, then moved to different assessments in year three, which are the SBAC assessments. Something about that does not seem statistically valid." So the beauty of using a value-added model in a time when you're changing assessments quite frequently is that value-added models don't actually depend on the student's scale scores to do the growth measurements. Anytime we give an assessment, there's a median score, and then because it's the median score, 50 percent of the kids who have taken the test did better than the median, and 50 percent of the kids who took the test did worse than the median.

When we chart out students' positions in the distribution, essentially we look at their percentile, did they perform better than 45 percent of the kids who took the test? Did they perform better than 95 percent of the kids who took the test? That's actually what we're using as we look at growth. We're doing that even

with our older assessments, even with the EOGs that were aligned with our old standards. We've always done value-added that way because scale scores change. I'm sure everyone can also imagine that, at the high school level, when we're talking about value-added, our Biology test was on a very different scale than our Physics test, which was on a different scale than our Chemistry test. This is back when we had more EOCs at the high school level. The only way you can use data about those different assessments to make predictions, to calculate value-added, is if you always standardize things by looking at where students have performed. Every test has an median, and every test has kids who did better than the median and worse than the median. And looking at sort of how much better or how much worse and then comparing that to how they do the next year is really the basis of our value-added calculation.

Okay, we have a question about an assistant principal moving to another school or becoming a principal: how will this value-added be calculated. So for both teachers and principals and assistant principals, growth moves with them when they move to new schools. So if I am an assistant principal who has spent two years in School A. Let's say, I spent 2012 - 13 in School A, I spent 2013 - 14 in School A, but then in 2014 - 15, I move to School B and let's say I become the principal. My three years of growth is calculated by combining the growth in School A for my first year there, the growth in School A for my second year, and then my growth in School B for my first year there. My data is always connected to where I've taught or where I've been an administrator, and if I move, it stays with me. I don't go to a new school and sort of take on their data for the past two years because I'm now the administrator there. I always keep my data from where I was leading a school or teaching in a school.

We have a question about the retention model for third grade: that it had gone away, but is it now coming back? Last spring, actually in their budget bill, the General Assembly passed a series of policies around reading in early elementary school. I am not the expert on that. We actually have a whole division that is working on implementing those policies, but some of the basic parts of them are that students need to demonstrate proficiency on the third-grade reading EOG. Principals will no longer have the ability to promote students to fourth grade over that third-grade test score if it's at Level I or II. For students who

don't demonstrate proficiency starting a few years from now, districts are required to implement what the legislation called summer camps, where students are going to focus really intensively on reading. There are also a couple of parts of the legislation that call for students being able to demonstrate their reading ability on some type of an alternate assessment, maybe not the EOG. If you're interested in finding out more about the specifics of that legislation, just drop me an email at the educator effectiveness account. I can make sure to forward it to that group that works on that every day and they'll be able to provide you with answers to your question.

We have a question about K - 2 Math. We are definitely interested at some point in adding K - 2 Math to our set of Measures of Student Learning. We know that there's a lot going on in schools right now and that some of our schools are just transitioning into the K - 3 reading program Reading 3D, so we're thinking about more of a staggered approach for this, letting folks get into that system, completing our pilot about how the K-3 reading strategy is working for measuring growth, and then yes, potentially down the line, we will explore to what we might be able to do with measuring growth in K - 2 for those students in Math.

There was another question about teachers or administrators changing schools, so I think we've covered that one already.

Question about the comprehension passage used in K - 3: will it be a running record? The answer is yes, perhaps, and I know answers like that are never really very easy, but that's actually the point of a pilot. In the spring, as we pilot this process with our participating schools and districts, we're actually trying a couple of different measures. In some schools, teachers will do a completely separate running record, and that will be how we're looking at the summative end-of-year reading level. In other schools, we're trying something a little bit different, which is that rather than having a completely separate comprehension passage administered, there's a really short reading passage that's administered almost as a confirmation, just a check on if the data obtained in the normal EOY comprehension running record is accurate. So there's the possibility that based on the results of the pilot, we might be going with either of those. Of

Page 19

course, if the quick comprehension check idea holds up and we don't have to require two separate TRCs be administered at the end of the year, that would be ideal. We've got our fingers crossed, but that's really the whole reason we do the pilot: to find out if that type of measurement is fair and valid.

So we have a question here about a way to take into consideration students' socioeconomic status with the final rating of Standard 6 and Standard 8. So the way that the EVAAS growth model works is by making predictions on how students are going to do based on their prior test scores. And prior test scores reflect everything about a student that influences their test scores, even things that we can't measure: their socioeconomic status, their race and ethnicity, their family situation, and their emotional well-being. All those things either have or haven't, in some cases, affected a student's prior test scores. By using those prior test scores as how we make the prediction for how much students will grow, those factors are kind of included within the analysis.

When we look at statewide trends, what we actually see is that some of our very best teachers in terms of producing student growth worked in some of the very poorest districts in North Carolina. That evidence and the fact that it looks pretty much like a normal curve when you graph socioeconomic status and how much kids grow really shows that what the folks at EVAAS have been advancing is holding up in the data: you don't need to separately control for socioeconomic status and thereby set a separate expectation for how a student will do based on their socioeconomic status. Including their prior test scores really does sort of level the playing field and allows some teachers to show tremendous amounts of growth with those kids.

We had a question about, "Did you say there was or was not a policy currently in place about what would be the result of not meeting Standard 6?" There is no a policy currently in place. Our Race to the Top application does say what the policy will be, and it is much like Standards 1 through 5. If a teacher doesn't meet expected growth after three years of student growth data, they move on to a monitored or directed-growth plan. However, something that's in our Race to the Top application is not official policy.

It's not official policy until it's discussed at a Board meeting, voted on, and then included within our

official policy manual. That has not taken place because it is going to be quite a while before we have teachers with three years of data, and it's something the Board will be working on over the next few years. Next question was, "Who is the contact for SAS webinars?" If you go on to their website, there's actually a button that you'll see that says, "Contact Us." If you click on that button, you can send an email that will go to all of the staff members at SAS who work on EVAAS.

Another thing that you can do is send an email to that email address and I'll say it slowly so that you can all write it down, evaas_support@sas.com, and that's all lowercase. That's another way that you can contact that same team and they can work with you to set up a webinar for your specific needs.

We have a question here: "When will Standard 6 be populated into McREL?" That should take place sometime around the turn of this calendar year. As soon as we have the Standard 6 ratings available from EVAAS, we can begin the process of moving them back into McREL. We've never done that before. We've tried it, of course, with data that we've simulated to develop the process, but McREL was really a tool designed to export data very easily and we have had to change some of the programming such that we can upload back in. When we upload the data back in, we want to make sure to do a lot of quality checking to make sure that it uploaded correctly, and so it may not be available until end of December or beginning of January. Teachers will have been able to see this Standard 6 rating in their EVAAS dashboards, but it will take a little while after that to actually move it back into McREL.

"Do teachers, Fine Arts and Health teachers specifically, need to have 140 instructional days with students to receive an effectiveness rating?" So we use the 140 instructional days for full-year schedules and 70 instructional days for a block schedule as sort of the cutoff for where we quantitatively try to measure student growth. We know that teachers in the Fine Arts and in Health Education often see their students for less than 140 days, so that's a big part of the reason why we're using the Analysis of Student Work process. The principal, knowing how often the teacher has seen the students, knows what the reasonable expectation is. A teacher who has been able to see the students for a hundred days really can be expected to have higher levels of student growth on the standards than a teacher who has seen her

Page 21

students for 50 days, both of which are under the 140-day cap. If the kids are in those courses are learning that content area, some measure of evidence from those kids and their actual work can be used in the Analysis of Student Work process.

Another question “In the previous accountability model, we could calculate student growth. This helped teachers understand exactly what the number was measuring and where it came from. The SAS model is a black box, so it is impossible to fully explain how the growth calculation is performed. This seems unfair for such a high-stakes indicator.”

So in the idea of transparency around EVAAS, there are two things that I would say, one that's not always so important to classroom teachers, but sometimes is. SAS has actually published the formula for how EVAAS works. There's sort of a conception out there that it's proprietary and that they haven't published it. They have. It's in a number of academic journals. It's a multi-page statistical formula. So, for most teachers, knowing that it's been published doesn't really help them with understanding how it works.

The conversation that I started a little bit earlier about looking at the percentile where students have scored and then comparing that to the percentile where they score the next year and using that as a way to look at student growth is part of the discussion that is in the trainings that our PD Leads do, that the SAS trainers do, and that the online learning modules will do. We use analogies to help explain the model, too, so for grades 4 through 8 ELA and Math, a good analogy is thinking about kids on a height-and-weight percentile chart, and we're really looking at when we take kids to pediatricians and have those discussions with them is where the kids are on the distribution rather than their actual height or their actual weight. So it is a more complex model than the ABCs growth model. One thing that I would also say, that our accountability director would say if she was sitting here with me, is that the ABCs growth model was never intended to be used to measure growth at the student level. We do know of cases where teachers would calculate things like this student needs to get a 103 scale score to make growth, and this student needs to get a 97 scale score to make growth. That model was never designed to do that. In fact, even though you can produce a number, when the error around the number is so huge, it's really not a

measure of anything. That's another thing that we try to communicate with teachers: the older model may have been used for some things that it shouldn't necessarily have been use for. That's important as we think about transitioning from the ABC model into the EVAAS model.

"When the K-to-3 teachers' EVAAS accounts are created, where are their email addressed pulled, NC Wise or McREL?" We have found that, across the board, the place that teachers keep their email addresses the most updated is in McREL because they like those email notifications about various steps of the process. That's where we've pulled all teacher email addresses, even for grades 3-to-12 teachers, to create their accounts in EVAAS.

"When did you say the teacher dashboards will be released?" We don't have that date exactly hammered down yet. We've still got a couple of things to do first, and I can tell you what we're working on. We've got a few teachers in North Carolina that have one name associated with their test data and another name associated with their evaluation data. They're at the same school. In some cases, they have the same last name. It's just sometimes the difference of Terry in one system versus Teresa in the other system. We don't want to make any assumptions, so we're going back to districts and just clarifying that those people are, in fact, the same people. When we've got that cleaned up, then we'll let everybody know about the release date for the dashboard is.

"We've been told we can curve the scores from the Common Exams, but have been given no further guidance. This will lead to more inconsistencies between districts." Our accountability division is working on a written guide for different options for curving scores from the Common Exams. When the written guide is produced, they're also going to do a webinar so that folks can either read the written guide after they've gone to the webinar or read it and then come on the webinar with questions to ask. We'll record that webinar, like we record all of our other ones, for any testing directors or coordinators who aren't able to attend, and that will be our guidance on some different possibilities for how you might want to curve the scores.

"I would like to see online videos related to interrater reliability with some of the more challenging

elements of the rubric, like global awareness." I hear that almost every meeting I go to with teachers and principals: global awareness is challenging. Twenty-first Century Skills is another challenging areas that's frequently mentioned. I'll certainly pass that information on to our team that is working on those online videos and getting them organized and getting them aligned with our standards.

And this individual also asked, "Are teachers really expected to demonstrate these more difficult skills in every lesson?" That is a really important part about using our rubric as an observation tool. Not every lesson is going to include everything on that rubric. It may not lend itself to the content being taught that day. There may be strategies in use, maybe something that the teacher did before the principal got to the classroom and so they don't see them in the 20 or 30 minutes that they're observing. So, no, the expectation isn't that teachers will demonstrate every single thing in that rubric at a high level in every lesson. We definitely have heard that, and are working to get some more concrete examples of those elements and what it might look like to do it in a classroom up on the web.

"When will training on scoring performance tasks be available?" That should be available very soon, hopefully the end of this week or beginning of next week. When I get off the line with you folks, I actually have a meeting to get an update on where we stand with that. I do know that all of the parts of the module are done. We've videoed. We've uploaded documents, and really, at this point, it's just kind of in the hands of our tech team to make sure it all works. We are very close to that finish line and will let people know as soon as the module is live in NC Education and can be accessed.

"Are the MSLs for the fall going to count towards Standard 6 or 8?" So, yes, if a district elected to administer the Measures of Student Learning this fall, we did make very sure that the superintendent and the other decision-makers understood that if the test is given, it counts. The answer to that question is yes.

"Have the Common Exams for Social Studies and Science for grades 3 to 5 been created? If so, will students be tested in this year?" They are on their way to being created. They are not finished at this point. They'll be made available next spring, but we did bring together teachers to develop assessment

specifications. The item development work has begun, and we'll be bringing teachers back in to review those items and the forms in the spring.

One thing I would note about that question specifically is that there are no Common Exams for grade 3, so we are only talking about Social Studies at grades 4 and 5 and Science at grade 4 because, of course, in grade 5 Science we have the State test.

"Please review the information timeline for Common Exams at the K to 5 level." I'm actually going to just go back to that timeline and that's probably actually a good one to leave up on the screen. Our K-to-5 teachers fall into a couple of these different categories that are on the screen. So for our folks who give End-of-Grade assessments at the elementary school level, if they're giving those during the 2012-to-13 school year, this is their first year of their three years of data. If we have, for example, a fourth-grade science teacher and the teacher is administering the Common Exam, this would also be year one for that teacher.

For our K-to-3 teachers, year one will be in 2013-14, and then at that point they will either be administering the third-grade pre-test if the Board approves that strategy or they will be administering potentially a running record in K - 2, again based on the results of the pilot that we have going on this spring.

"How a growth will be calculated for teachers who teach combination classes." So clarify this for me if I don't answer it exactly right, but combination classes might be something like a self-contained teacher, perhaps. That's how I'm interpreting this question. If I have it wrong, just correct me. If you have a fifth-grade self-contained teacher who is administering the ELA EOG, the Science EOG and the Math EOG to her students, her overall value-added score will be combining those different content areas.

Now in EVAAS, the teacher will still get separate reports because that's good information for the teacher and for the principal: to know that maybe the teacher gets a lot of growth with Science, but not a lot of growth with ELA. The overall value-added score used in the evaluation, though, would be combining those different assessments that were administered.

"Will the training on scoring performance tasks be specific for the different subjects?" So within the online module, it opens sort of the same for everybody, which is some information about the Common Exams in general, how they've been designed, what they're used for, and the module then breaks into different sections. At this point, the module is focused on high school teachers because they're administering these assessments first in some of our systems. There is a sample performance task for English that has sample student work that we have from actual kids across North Carolina who took the short-answer task, and then the student work is scored. That's actually done in a series of videos. The module is divided up so that ELA teachers could just watch the section about ELA. Social Studies teachers could just watch the section about Social Studies. Some systems have said that they think the more their teachers can see about using rubrics to score performance tasks the better, so they're going to require them to complete the whole module.

Within NC Education, there are a couple of different ways for the teachers to track completion and to print completion certificates, and so the districts can really use that however they'd like as a requirement for training. Some systems are doing that: making module completion a requirement for those who score these tests.

I mentioned learning modules, or training about EVAAS reports, "Will these videos be housed on the EVAAS website?" Yes, and they are called learning modules. We have 11 of them scheduled for release during this school year. I actually watched the final production takes of two of them yesterday, so those should be up and running in the system soon, and those will be housed right within the EVAAS site. So if I'm a teacher looking at a student pattern report and I'm a little bit confused about what I'm looking at, there would be a button for me to watch that ten-minute video about the student pattern report.

"What data will be used for EC teachers to determine effectiveness?" So that sort of depends on what the EC teacher is teaching. So let me talk through a couple of different things. The first thing is that we know we cannot use the Extend1 assessment to measure growth for that part of the population, and so those students will fall into the same category of Analysis of Student Work as our art and physical

education teachers. The work that they're doing with their students is very customized based on their needs and what they need to accomplish, and so a type of work product that they can produce may not even be handwritten. Maybe their ability to manipulate something, something like that, can serve as the evidence of student learning for those students.

For EC teachers who are doing an inclusion-type setting where they're co-teaching, the policy is that co-teaching needs to have true, shared responsibility between the Exceptional Children teacher and the regular education teacher, and so those teachers share responsibility for all the students in the course. It's not a situation where the EC teacher is only responsible for the EC kids and the regular education teacher is responsible for the regular education students. It's really that they're sharing responsibility for that course.

For EC teachers who do more of the pull-out type model, if they're supporting students on a particular set of content standards by maybe pulling them out once a week or twice a week to provide intervention, that's something that can be recorded in our roster verification tool that we're going to start using next calendar year, in roughly January or February of this school year. In that situation, those teachers can really talk with that principal and decide how they want to go about sharing responsibility for that student's instruction. If the student's instruction on the standards is 100 percent, and they're with the classroom teacher for 70 percent of the time and the EC teacher provides pull-out services for roughly 30 percent of the time, those teachers and the principal may agree that a 70/30 split of instructional responsibility for those standards is really fair to everyone and reflects how the child is actually learning the standards. I think that covers most of our EC teachers. If I've missed anybody in particular, though, please let me know.

"Please confirm that the grade 3 pre-test will be given in the fall of 2013." I cannot confirm that. That is something that is subject to a State Board of Education vote. I can tell you that DPI will be recommending that to them, but ultimately, there is no firm decision, until the Board votes on it.

"Please provide a written description of how growth is calculated with as much specificity as possible." I

can certainly work on that and get that out to the group maybe next week sometime, so please be on the lookout for that.

“Did I say that the data follows teachers between sites also?” Yes, data do follow teachers and administrators between different schools that they may work in .

"So what about those of us in coaching-type central office positions: will we still be required as teachers to evaluate the same way and what will data come from?" One change the State Board did make to our central office instructional leader instrument was to take out the requirement that someone has to be at a director level in order to be evaluated with the central office evaluation instrument. For some folks, that policy change fixed a lot of their problems because their central office people do have managerial responsibilities and they felt like that instrument was exactly what they needed to evaluate for them. For individuals for whom that's not the perfect fit, just like DPI is developing instruments for school counselors, media specialists, and instructional technology facilitators, we are working on an instrument that we're tentatively calling an instructional coach instrument. It may change in name. It may be more like an academic coach when it's actually finished, but the idea there is someone who is supporting teachers and isn't actually a classroom teacher supporting students. We are working on that process as part of our Race to the Top work..

"Teachers scoff at the idea of 30 percent of their Standard 6 rating coming from the school's data. They understand that they are part of the school, but they also argue that the NCEES evaluates them individually. Can you explain the rationale?" Certainly. Last spring, we took to the Board some different options for ways that they might look at rating on Standard 6. We actually took them three options. One was the 70/30 split. Another was an 80/20 split. And one was a 90/10 split. So in that case, the teacher's value-added Standard 6 rating would have been based 90 percent on their own value-added score and 10 percent on their school value-added score.

We had conducted focus groups across the state with teachers in every region and had had them vote on this idea. Overwhelmingly, the teachers supported the 70/30 split. The NCAE also voiced their support

of the 70/30 split, and, based on those recommendations and also their belief that a school environment is better for kids when teachers are collaborating, the Board did decide to approve the 70/30 split.

Now, what I can tell you is that we will be taking back to the Board this spring a recommendation that they reconsider that idea. Now that we're actually into the system taking a look at data from last year, - which doesn't count for anyone, just as a reminder - what we are seeing is that some teachers doing a great job in their own classrooms will see a decrease in their Standard 6 rating because of that 30-percent school-wide growth. And that's really not an acceptable kind of unintended consequence. So we will be presenting them with some data on the number of teachers that happened to and recommending that they reconsider that 70/30 split.

For the teachers who have their concerns about that, encourage them to contact their State Board members. That's why policies are presented to them for discussion and then they come back and vote on them the next month. In that month period, teachers, administrators, and superintendents contact them and share their thoughts. We can definitely let folks know when that policy is out there for the Board's consideration, and if teachers have ideas about what that percentage should be, they can definitely contact their Board member and voice those concerns.

We've got a couple of specific questions about the third-grade reading summer camps and funding. I'm going to just ask those folks again if they could email those to me at the educator effectiveness account and I will forward those on to our staff members here that are working specifically on that. I know some information about that third-grade requirement, but I certainly wouldn't want to mislead with any kind of inaccurate information, so I want to make sure you get the right answers to your questions.

"For the eighth grade Science test, is the growth based from the fifth grade Science test only or do Reading and Math tests figure into the formula?" Reading and Math tests do figure into the prediction formula for the eighth grade Science test, especially the seventh grade tests because they are a lot more recent for an eighth grader than the Science test they took in fifth grade. Certainly, a lot can change since then. But the fifth grade Science test is a big part of the formula. We're also using their prior test scores

from ELA and Math tests as well.

"Where's the teacher dashboard going to be housed in EVAAS? Will we have a school principal dashboard?" Yes, the teacher dashboard will be housed in EVAAS. Next up on our development list is to have the same kind of thing for principals. From a programming perspective, if we've set it up for teachers, it shouldn't take us very long to set it up for principals. But principals also do know their eighth standard rating already. When they log not EVAAS and look at their school composite, that is the eighth standard rating for them. The teacher sixth standard rating is not so obvious because we've got to do that weighted average. We made developing that dashboard the priority, but yes, do intend to do dashboards for principals as well.

"What happens to a principal or assistant principal who has moved in the middle of the year?" That is one of the handful of pretty specific policy decisions that the Board is going to have to make again in the spring. I can give you some other examples: long-term substitutes, teachers who go on maternity leave, situations that are certainly not the norm in our schools, but definitely happen. There will be some more decisions around those specifics in the spring and some business rules and policies that go along with them.

"If the third grade pre-test does come back, will the third grade teacher's growth be based on the EOG, Reading 3D, or a combination?" So if the third grade pre-test comes back, the growth for third graders would be looking at the pre-test score and then the third-grade EOG score, which would be kind of the post-test score. In that case, the Reading 3D data wouldn't factor-in to looking at growth for third grade teachers at all.

"How will MSLs be reported on EVAAS since they are graded at the school level?" So currently, the MSLs are graded at the school level in terms of the performance items. The answer sheets are constructed such that students respond to the multiple-choice items on a bubble sheet just like they do for our State tests. Teachers then grade the student's constructed response items and they then bubble in the number of points they gave the students. And then that's scanned, the same way we scan the answer

sheets for our State assessments. So DPI can then take that data, clean it like we do any data, make sure that there weren't any technical malfunctions, and work with our testing coordinators to go through that quality-checking process. We can send that over to SAS at same time we send them our EOG and EOC data for them to do the EVAAS analysis.

"Will you be releasing any summary reports on teacher growth using last year's data?" Within EVAAS currently, when teachers or any type of user are looking at a particular grade or subject, there is kind of that reference data on what the percentage at value-added category was across the state, so that's in the system already.

We are also required not only by Race to the Top, but also by the fact that two years ago we accepted the stimulus money, the ARRA funds, to report on teacher quality. So just like we did last year, we released the PDF files that had aggregate-level data on how teachers were evaluated on each standard and how principals were evaluated on each standard. We'll be expanding that to include the sixth and eighth standards as well. Again, nothing tied to a person's name, but we would be saying statements like, "At this high school, 50 percent of the teachers received a meets expected growth on Standard 6; 25 percent exceeded; and 25 person did not meet."

"When Race-to-the-Top funds are gone, will the State of North Carolina be able to continue to write and administer the Common Exams?" Sustainability of all of our Race to the Top projects is definitely a big concern of the Department. Because we've had our 800 teachers working with us and working hard, we have ambitiously worked to have exams to keep us moving with that process even after Race to the Top is over. We've got the teachers. They're doing a great job now. They're turning out thousands of items for all of these assessments, so we're trying to get as much done as we can now, but I would also say that the General Assembly has publicly said, and has said in discussions with us, that they are very interested in pursuing merit-based pay or performance pay. Really, either name applies. They usually do say to us that they know having that type of system is going to require objective measures of student growth. We haven't specifically taken the conversation to the point of talking with them about the Common Exams.

Page 31

They know we're doing them, but if they do want to have some type of merit pay or performance pay type model, we'd have to be having conversations with them about what our state assessment program looks like and if we have the tests and the funding necessary to keep it moving.

"Is it not more challenging for a teacher to have students show growth when they had a near perfect scale score in the previous year's EOG? If a child gets a perfect scale score on the EOG one year, he/she would not show growth if he/she got even one wrong on the following year. There is even a statistical term for this phenomenon." The term is called ceiling effects, which you can think of like a tall person hitting their head on a ceiling. That's the idea - that a child can do really well on our assessments and then there's really not any room for them to do even better. That, again, is the reason why we're looking at value-added that's based on the percentiles and not the student's value-added score.

Within our ELA and Math assessments, if a student scores at the hundredth percentile one year (scores better than a hundred percent of kids in the state) and then he scores at the hundredth percentile the next year, that student has made growth because he didn't lose any of the progress that he was making. Now, in terms of scale scores, the scale score from the first year may be higher than the scale score from the second year. If we were only looking at scale scores, it might look like the child lost ground, but because we're looking at the percentiles, we're able to track that and not the scale scores. It's another thing we've also examined: our statewide distribution of scores. When we look at our students who perform at the very top of our score distribution, our Level IV kids, we see that there's good variation among them, just like there is for any other group of students. Some of our Level IV kids don't make growth, some make growth, and some exceed growth, so there is, within the model, plenty of room for them to kind of show that growth.

We've got a couple of questions here: "Has the constructed response scoring model been released yet?" It has not been released. It should be coming out any day here, so we'll be getting information out about that as soon as we can.

For any districts that are administering early, in the next two weeks, most of those districts have already

contacted me, and, in some cases, we're working with them to see how we can take the information that would be in the module and train their teachers in person or through a WebEx or something like that. I think I've spoken to most of those people, and, for the vast majority of folks, the module will be out in plenty of time to use as part of your training for scoring.

"Can you please restate the common exam requirements for fourth grade?" So for fourth-grade teachers, the general rule is that a fourth-grade teacher needs a value-added score that represents all the kids he teaches, but it doesn't have to represent every child more than once. So if we have a self-contained fourth-grade teacher and that teacher is giving the EOG in ELA in Math, and the same kids are with the teacher all day, then that teacher's value-added score reflects all of those kids. It actually reflects those kids twice because they took two EOGs. There is no requirement for the State for that teacher to administer the Science or Social Studies common exam.

Now, in some places, districts are going to do that, and it's actually particularly true with fourth-grade Science. Some districts have said that, as they think about getting kids ready for fifth grade Science, which is a state test, they see administering the fourth grade Science Common Exam as a good way to have kind of some benchmark data on where those kids are, but there would be no state requirement.

However, if I'm a fourth grade teacher and my elementary school has departmentalized, so to speak, and all I do throughout the course of the day is teach fourth grade science, I don't have a value-added score to represent any of my kids. We've got no information on how they're growing. In that case, the teacher would need to administer the fourth grade Science Common Exam so that those kids are represented in that teacher's Standard Six rating.

"Will the actual rubrics for the constructed response items be more specific than the released examples of rubrics?" So the answer to that is sort of a yes and no, so to speak. For our Science and Math courses specifically, a lot of times, the work the students are doing in a performance item is producing a right answer. The right answer might be something like 75 percent or .07,, a value like that. In that case - where there's an actual correct answer that the students are working to answer - then the rubrics do

include those.

There are some constructed response items, particularly in the Social Studies and ELA areas, where students are pulling from anything they may have learned during the course of the year. Therefore, our rubrics show the numbers of examples a student may need to give or the kinds of examples a student may need to give, but if you ask a student a question about the causes of conflict throughout civilization, a World History type of question, there are dozens of examples the students could pull from based on what their teachers taught them to answer that question and answer it correctly. So when there is such a thing as the one right answer, it is included in the rubric, but where the students' answers could vary a lot depending on what they've been taught, the rubrics do have to be more generic.

"How will growth be calculated for teachers split between sites?" That's another one of those questions that the Board is going to be considering in the spring: our itinerant teachers who move between different areas. For the 201-12 school year, the teacher's sixth standard rating was based on the growth at the school. That was their base school, so the school at which the principal completed their summary rating form. That will be one option that we present to the Board, but we'll also want to talk with them about how we could maybe average growth, so if they're teaching at three schools, average the growth for those three. We'll present them with a couple of different options.

So we are actually at the end of our time. It is 2:30, and there are questions we didn't get to. I was hoping we would get to more of them. So what I will do is make a mark at the last question that we were able to answer. I will type some answers up to these questions and get them out, not only through sending them to the people who were with us today on the webinar, but also through sending them to Dr. Prince at NCPAPA. She also is a great person who helps us communicate with principals.

So information coming soon for the rest of the questions that were on here. If there's anything you asked on here that is urgent, something really burning in your head that you need an answer to now, please always feel free to use that educator effectiveness email account and I will get back with you as soon as I can. If we need to set up a phone call, we'll set up a phone call. If it's an urgent question, please don't

wait until you get the FAQ document. Let me know so we can get the right answer to you now.

So with that, I thank everybody so much for taking time to be with us today. We are here to support you, as you support your teachers in making this process one that is fair and valid for our teachers, but is also focused right around our kids because that's really who we're all working for: at the Department, in central offices, and in schools. It really is all about them, and we want to make a system that keeps them central and is helping our teachers grow in their skills and knowledge so that they can help the kids even more.

So thank you for joining us today. Please be in touch with us, and we will be scheduling these webinars, as I mentioned, every two months or so, so also be on the lookout for our next scheduled time together.

So thank you so much, and we hope you have a great day.

(CONCLUDED)

WPU

GLORIA VEILLEUX, TRANSCRIBER