

MS. PRESTON: All right. Good morning to everyone again. We're going to get started with this morning's webinar, Measures of Student Learning or Common Exams. This is a webinar for principals in our state, although we are certainly welcoming this morning other folks from central offices and teacher leaders that have decided to join us today.

The Department of Public Instruction is sponsoring this webinar with the NC Principals and Assistant Principals Association so that we can share information with all of those out of -- all of you working out in our school system.

Just again as we did before, want to do a quick sound check. If you can hear my voice, please raise your hand on your dashboard just so we can make sure that folks can hear still. All right, I see lots of hands raised, which is great. So at this time, I am going to turn it over to Dr. Shirley Prince, the executive director of the NC Principals and Assistant Principals Association, NCPAPA, to welcome us to today's webinar.

DR. PRINCE: Good morning, everyone. Welcome. I want to thank the North Carolina Department of Public Instruction for putting this webinar together. A couple of weeks ago, we started working with them on some questions that were submitted to us, and they have been very gracious to put this webinar together. Thank you for your attention. Thank you to the NCPAPA Board for collecting the questions. And we hope that this webinar will be very informative for you. And I think it will probably be the first of many on this topic. So thank you again for attending.

MS. PRESTON: Thank you, Dr. Prince. Before we get started, we wanted to just go through a few logistics about the webinar environment, so we are recording today's webinar and will be archiving it and posting it online, so if you at any point want to listen again or listen to certain parts or you have colleagues who can't be in attendance today, we can share the information with them via our recording

that we'll post online.

All participants right now are muted and we're going to have to keep it that way because we have such a large audience with us today. There are currently 370 people logged on to the webinar, and we have 700 people registered, so with that large an audience just to make sure everyone can hear, we're going to keep all the participants muted.

If you do have questions as we go along, you can type questions in the question bar on your webinar dashboard and we'll answer as many of those as we can as we go through the webinar. We probably won't get to all the questions, though, so any questions at the end that we haven't answered we're collecting, we'll make it as a Frequently Asked Questions document and then send back out through the NCPAPA listserv on our website as well.

Now to get started for the day by "Setting the Context," I'm going to turn it over to Dr. Garland.

DR. GARLAND: Good morning, everybody. This is Rebecca Garland. I'm the chief academic officer here at the Department of Public Instruction. And for at least the past year, and I'm anticipating for the next couple of years, we'll be primarily and almost every day involved in the development of and working the procedures for the educator effectiveness process.

Just wanted to give you a little context before we get started because some people are asking why would we be doing educator effectiveness and we want to set -- kind of set the context for why we're doing it and not necessarily in priority order, but just as a way of framing the context.

First of all, the whole notion of educator effectiveness started a few years ago in our state when the NCAE, our teachers themselves that they needed new standards to match a new expectation for what it takes for teachers to be effective in the classroom. And so the teachers established their own standards. From their standards, we developed a teacher evaluation system that you have become very familiar with at that particular -- in fact, I'm sure all of you are using it to evaluate teachers in your schools. At the time that the evaluation system was developed, we had five standards that focused on the knowledge and skills

that teachers needed to know and be able to do to be effective in their classroom. So it is not that we were just focusing on teacher effectiveness since our Race to the Top work. This is just, if you will, a continuation of work that has been going on in our state for the past few years.

Now, as part of Race to the Top, we are indeed required to have a teacher evaluation process that includes student growth as one of the matrix. Even if we had not been a Race to the Top state, in order to get a waiver from No Child Left Behind sanctions, the all-or-nothing process that was used and No Child Left Behind, every state with a waiver had to agree to have a teacher evaluation system that includes student growth as part of it. So over 33 states now in our -- across the country are working on this process because they wanted a waiver from No Child Left Behind just like North Carolina did. So Race to the Top is not the only driver, if you will, for the whole process of teacher evaluation.

But why in our state, focusing on teachers, why is now in our state to time to focus on teacher effectiveness? As part of our Race to the Top remodeling effort, we have a lot of initiatives that are taking place at one time. We have new standards. We have new assessments. We have a new accountability system. We're going to have what we hope is a game-changing instructional improvement system when everything is built and up and running with digital content where teachers have access to the same kind of digital content that our teachers who teach in the North Carolina Virtual Public School do. So we feel like we're at a crossroads in our state where we're going to have a lot of new opportunities for schools to become even more effective than they've been in the past.

And the teacher is the key to all of this, so we can have new standards. We can have higher expectations.

We can focus on college and career readiness. We can have new digital tools. But if the teacher in the classroom is not prepared to be able to do all of these initiatives, then the initiatives will not succeed.

So in the past, we've kind of tinkered around the edges. We've done some remodeling. We've done some transformation, but the problem is we've never tried to move everything at once, which we think is important. That synergy has to be there if all of these new innovations are going to work, that they have

to work together for systemic change and not just minor change that you would see around the teachers, so the teacher is at the central point of all of this work being successful. From the state's perspective, we're betting a lot that if we can have really, really effective teachers in the classroom, that we can move the needle on student achievement in our state and see dramatic gains that we have not seen in the past. So from the state's perspective, the focus is on teachers.

But even more important is the student. If you don't have an effective teacher in a classroom, then students actually suffer during the next year because of the preparation they did not get the year before. And most of the data will concur that if a student has a poorly prepared or a poor teacher for more than one year, then that loss occurs over time and can become cumulative to the point that the student never catches up. So every student in our state, in our opinion, deserves a teacher that any educator would not have a reservation about putting his or her own child in that classroom. And I think all of you know that there are teachers in our schools in whose rooms we would not want to put our own students and, in fact, if we had control in a situation, we would not. So we want to make that there aren't any of those; fortunately across our state, but there are a few. And any of us would know that there are some who are better than others. Well, we want them all to be highly effective so that every student has the same level of benefit from being in a particular class.

And then the next reason that we are looking at educator effectiveness is that teachers themselves need better feedback. Teachers want to be good at what they do. Everybody goes to work -- well, we hope that everybody goes to work every day -- with the attitude that I'm going to do the very best job that I can do. And sometimes teachers don't have a clear roadmap for how to get better. And so when you go in and you do your evaluation with them, the more information that you can have at your fingertips that you can share with teachers about how they perform, which is in Standards 1 through 5, which we should never forget and are still the most important standards that teachers need to be concerned with, not just Standard 6, which is primarily data at the end of the year, the better. Standards 1 through 5 allow them to

get better during the year; teachers need that good information, including whether or not their students are growing.

Now in the past, teachers who taught or teach or who have taught in the past in reading and mathematics in grades 3 through 8 or in high school in those courses covered by an End-of-Course assessment, have gotten that type of feedback. They've been able to look at their EVAAS scores if you would sit down and show them their data. They have gotten feedback from the number of students that were proficient, but other teachers in the school didn't have that type of feedback, so it might look like they're doing a good job in the classroom when you're in there, but are they actually having an impact on student learning?

And the only way you really know that is if you have some data. And so our goal through teacher effectiveness is to have EVAAS data on at least the teachers in grades, ultimately, 3 through 12, we hope, but 4 through 12 immediately who teach English, Math, Science or Social Studies and have standards for which we have a Standard Course of Study at the state level.

So that sort of sets the context for you for what we're trying to accomplish. First and primary, students get the type of instruction that they need to be successful, that teachers get the kind of feedback that they need in order to improve their practice. And that, hopefully, the teacher, who is at the absolute core of all of the remodeling that we're trying to do with all of our basic structures, will have knowledge and skills to make all of this work successful so we can move our schools forward to where our schools then can be competitive worldwide. So that kind of gives you the context of what we're trying to do.

Now, what are we basing our decisions on? So we'll talk to you now for just a couple of minutes about the policies and decisions for the process itself.

Some of you may be very familiar and some of you may have heard this before, but I always feel like it's important to go back to the data that are driving us to make our decision. The Gates Foundation, the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, a few years ago, began a project, funded a project called the Measures of Effective Teaching (MET). Harvard University is the research institution working with this whole

program. And there have been some findings coming out of the MET study that we're using on which to base our program. And there will be additional findings, which may help us modify our program as we move forward. So I think it's important to know that we're trying to do at this point is get the process up and running, to get out of the gate.

Arne Duncan has this saying that we all try to listen to that, "Perfect is the enemy of good." So what we are trying to do is get a good system up and running and then, like we did with the ABCs over the course of the decade or so that it was in place, we made modifications. There were different iterations of the ABCs. If we need to, we will modify the teacher effectiveness program as well, so nothing is being done in concrete that once it's poured, it can't be changed. In all of this, we will be looking at data and trying to continue to improve it as we begin to analyze data that we are able to collect from the process.

But currently, if you will, our core is the work from the MET, and it's really demonstrated on this slide. If you look at the first slide, the MET data support the notion that using teacher observation as a tool can help delineate who are the better teachers in terms of student performance. So if you look at the teachers who would score in the top 25 percent as compared to the teachers who would score in the bottom 25 percent, on an observation instrument such as the one that you use to observe teachers, you will see that there are differences in student achievement against the average. So teachers who would be in the top 25 percent on observation show 1.2 months more gain against the average, and teachers at the bottom who show a loss of almost a 1.5 months against the average.

Now, you'll also note there is a greater difference in Math and English Language Arts, not because the English Language Arts teachers are not as good teachers, but because their gains don't show up as dramatically on test results against the average. There are still differences.

Now, also with observation, it's interesting that these data reflect at least four observations in a classroom and you get the strongest results from observation if the same person is not observing the teacher multiple times, but multiple observers instead. So observation has proven to be a good way to get feedback on

teacher performance. But if you'll note, the gains -- the impact on student achievement by itself -- are not as great as if you add other processes to it. Now, if you add to that the teachers who scored in the top 25 percent on both combined -- observation and student survey -- you get even more robust data.

So if you look at a teacher who's in the top 25 percent using both tools in combination, you'd see a swing in achievement from three months more gain against the average. And if you look at the bottom 25 percent, there are two months lost against the average in mathematics, so we're looking at almost about a five-months swing through using those two tools to see the difference in impact of students.

Now, we are looking at a student survey. We had 150,000 students last year who participated in student survey. We are analyzing the data, and we're very, very close to making a recommendation to the State Board of Education regarding student survey in the future.

Just to point out, the student survey was developed by Dr. Ron Ferguson at Harvard. The questions on the survey are directly related to conditions in the classroom that are aligned to strong student achievement. It is not a popularity poll by any stretch of the imagination. And, in fact, I think you can see the questions on the survey or description of the survey if you go the Measures of Effective Teaching website and look at Tripod Survey and you can see a lot of information about student survey. So we're at the point now that we're almost ready to make that decision.

But then if you want to get the most robust data, you have an observation tool. You have student perception. And you also look at impact on student achievement. So on the bottom row, you see the teachers in the top 25 percent against all three of those data points and teachers in the bottom 25 percent, and now you're looking at almost a year's worth of difference -- from point to point, but a significant amount against the average. So the teachers scoring in the top 25 percent using all three tools show almost five months more student gain against the teacher in the bottom five -- the bottom 25 percent who have almost a three-month loss against the average.

So what we're looking at then for our model in this state at this time is using a combination of teacher

observation, which you are already responsible for, student survey that we're trying to figure out a way to easily be able to provide student perception data, and also how teachers have an impact on student growth or student achievement in a school.

Okay? So where are we now? We have added Standard 6 and Standard 8 to the teacher and the principal observation tool. Standard 6 and Standard 8 now show up when you or your teachers go online and look at their teacher evaluation dashboard. What we're doing now is trying to figure out how to populate Standard 6 and Standard 8. For teachers who have an EVAAS score, it is our intent to populate Standard 6 for you. Now, at this particular time, we can't give you all the hows exactly how that's going to work, but what we are anticipating is that teachers will indeed get their data populated into a protocol that would then show up in Standard 6. And EVAAS is helping us with that process.

Teachers will get a status in terms of whether they are effective or not after three years of data, and that will be driven by student growth data, but it will also include whether or not they are proficient on Standards 1 through 5. So a teacher can indeed be meeting growth or exceeding growth, but may not be effective if you observe that they are not proficient on one of those first five standards. In fact, we think that's very possible. You could have a teacher who does great with student growth, but is disrespectful of students and does not have a positive learning environment, and/or in Standard 1, they're not being a teacher leader. They're not coming to work on time. They're not doing the things that you expect them to do. They're not being a good employee. So there are certainly ways that a teacher could have proficient growth, but not have proficient behavior in terms of students or the school. In fact, our data support that that happens now.

Hang on just a second. Okay, my screen went blank. The Common Exams will be used to help us provide that EVAAS score for teachers in grades 4 through 12 in the four core areas in those subjects for which we have standards. Now, it's important to note if in the areas where we have a Standard Course of Study, so if you have local school electives, we'll be working with you at a point in the future to help you figure

out how to do those. And we'll also be continuing to look at K-2 and how we're going to do grade K-3, although we think we have a solution for grade 3. And we also will be looking at how to measure performance in courses such as music, art, band, chorus, so we do have some plans for that that will not involve an EVAAS score and will not involve a Common Exam in those areas. So we'll be sharing that with you in those plans which we hope to unveil next year, not this year.

So again, we have added Standard 6 and Standard 8. Standard 8 for you will be the aggregate score of your state accountability metric, and it will match your growth score in the accountability model, so Common Exams actually will not have an impact on your growth in Standard 8. So certainly, we will be looking at a way for you to get some aggregate information on how Common Exams are working as well.

That's an area where we have not planned all of this out yet, so that's to let you know that we certainly don't have all these decisions made because what we're trying to do is collect a lot of information ourselves before we make some of these decisions.

Keeping in mind that teachers who give Common Exams this year and teachers who teach a state-assessed course will not have an effectiveness score until the fall of 2015, so we are not trying to rush this process. We got permission from the United States Department of Education to start fresh this year, even with teachers who have multiple years of data and for whom we could have an effectiveness score. We didn't think it was fair that all teachers didn't get an opportunity to start fresh knowing what they would be involved in, and for principals to start fresh knowing that your data depend on how your teachers perform in these areas. So everybody gets a fresh start knowing the ground rules as we start moving forward.

And I think it's also very important that teachers are reminded we're talking about growth. We are not talking about proficiency. This is not the No Child Left Behind "they either met or they did not meet" in terms of everybody being at grade level. And the state data strongly support the notion that all students can grow. It doesn't matter if they're students who are behind, if they're students who are ahead, if they're students who are average, all students can grow, and then it's based on average growth across the state.

So no teacher should be at a disadvantage in terms of the type of students that they are teaching because all students can demonstrate growth if they get good instruction from their teacher. So nobody is penalized or should feel that they don't want to go teach in a particular school because somehow they're going to be at a disadvantage. In fact, sometimes students who have been behind who get really good instruction can see phenomenal growth, and so it may even be to an advantage to teach sometimes in a low-performing school if you indeed are really, really good at working with students who need additional help.

So what we know so far is what we will be using for Standard 6 for teachers: End-of-Grade and End-of-Course assessments and CTE Post-Assessments. SAS has very successfully been able to use some of their data and provide EVAAS scores for some of our CTE courses. And with others, we have some pre- and post-tests that we'll be looking at in terms of growth. The Common Exams, the Library of Common Exams, that you'll get more information about today is to how decisions will be made locally. To the extent to which Common Exams will be used in your school, we have two guiding principles that will be discussing again at a future time this morning, but just to let you know, Common Exams principles are every teacher in grades 4 through 12 with core content has an EVAAS score and that's reflective of all the students that the teacher teaches. Beyond that, there's a lot of local flexibility that will be described to you. So using all of those teachers will get an EVAAS score that then will translate into the sixth standard for teachers.

So that's kind of the process from a high-level view and the context. And now Angela Quick will be talking with you about Common Exams themselves, then I'll be back with you to help answer questions in a few minutes.

DR. QUICK: Thank you, Dr. Garland. Good morning. Now, let's talk a little bit about what are these things, what are these common exams or Measures of Student Learning that you have questions about.

But I do want to say as a principal, you need to understand that this is only going to affect those teachers

that do not have EOCs, EOGs, VoCATs, and are already in some kind of formalized assessment pattern. So really, we're talking about those non-tested areas that don't already fit into our EOC and EOG testing and also our VoCATs testing at the high school. So it's important to know that moving forward, we have Common Exams, and we we have create,d a library, is what we're calling it, a library or a collection of these Common Exams.

I do want to say that the positive of this is that if not done by the state, each school and each LEA across the state would have had to use some way to measure student growth. And, again, it's not proficiency. It does not take into account -- it takes into account where students are starting and where they end at the end of the year, not if they're behind three grade levels. So it's very important to know that we're switching gears and talking about growth, taking students where they are when they get to you and moving them forward versus the whole idea of proficiency. So this library of Common Exams is designed for these non-tested areas, and it will populate Standard 6.

Another clarification around this library is that we have used right at 800 teachers to create these assessments, and so the positive about these assessments is that we've seen some synergies and energy around designing new authentic assessments, and we're excited to see what some of the constructed response and some of the writing exercises with these exams will look at because, hopefully, with our new assessments in the future, we can definitely learn from this practice and build it into our state summative assessments for which schools are held accountable.

So let's focus on the why, and why do we have these? Dr. Garland talked about federally, the rationale behind it, but I also think it's important that for any teacher and any principal, I would always want to know how my students were doing in school across the board. And we do have EOC and EOGs and VoCATs measures, but there are also courses that offer substantial content to students' educational knowledge.

So with that, the first statement dealing with -- we've got a good evaluation system that has Standards 1

through 5. This is only a piece of that particular evaluation and it is focused on growth. And so teachers should receive a Standard 6 rating based on their students' growth.

And I do want to say that a lot of questions and topics are talking around Standard 6 for teachers and Standard 8 for principals, but I think, as a former principal, that the most important thing to remember is that Standard 3. If you are really, really asking your teachers to dive into understanding the content that they teach in Essential Standards and in the Common Core this year, if they really focus on that aspect, growth will occur. That's the issue. So for Standard 3, which is not really part of Standard 6, but in a way it is an indirect result of Standard 6, focusing on Standard 3, core instruction, making sure they understand what's new about the content in comparison to the old standards is definitely where you will bring dividends.

And there's a third part of why we did this as a state instead of letting each LEA do it. We wanted to make sure that we had some comparability and focused on being able to help LEAs because some smaller and medium-size LEAs, and perhaps even large LEAs with all that's going on, did not have the capacity to do the psychometric design behind these assessments and then implement them. So that's kind of logistically why MSLs or why Common Exams.

So let's talk about just some guiding principles. The bottom line is in your schools, you would want every ELA, Science, Math, and Social Studies teacher, grades 4 through 12 to have a value-added score. Now, we talked about earlier that we are not ready yet to launch the K-3 aspect, and we're not ready to launch what we're doing around the art, band, music, all of that. We're not there yet at that particular piece.

And I do want to interject just a comment with that. I'm glad that we're not moving forward with a plane that's built instead of kind of building it as we go because what we're trying to do, and Dr. Garland reiterated this, is listen to the field. We've got three years before the measure occurs and is live. We want to make sure that we get feedback and craft this teacher effectiveness model and make it the best that it can be, so it isn't in concrete as was said earlier.

I think it's important to note that, again, ELA, Science, Math and Social Studies teachers, grades 4 through 12, will have a value-added score. Again, that's either from an EOC, an EOG, VoCATs, and if that's not in the repertoire of that particular content or teacher, then that is when an MSL will come into realization within that particular teacher's world.

The second aspect about principles is we want the teacher-growth value to be calculated based on all the students the teacher teaches, and if we need multiple assessments, then we would generate data with that.

So in a few moments, we'll talk about how when administering these, there might be performance tasks on one exam that may be offered earlier so that the performance tasks could be particularly graded. So we'll get to that in a second.

But I do want to say the guiding principles on MSLs and Common Exams come into play when a teacher does not already have a state assessment score or a VoCATs score. So that drastically reduces the number of MSLs in a school, potentially, especially moving forward and noting that we don't have MSLs ready for art and the performance aspects in K-3.

So let's go to a decision tree. I've verbally said this a couple of times, but this will help you. Obviously, for administration, if the teacher has EOC, EOG, or VoCATs scores, you can see the decision tree says that there is no requirement to administer or Measure of Student Learning. And then on the right, if the teacher does not have those particular assessments, then definitely an MSL would be needed to be administered; I prefer the name Common Exam over MSL, but the Common Exam would need to be given so that teachers then would have data to populate into Standard 6.

And I want to say once again, this year is starting new.. For this year, for these Common Exams, it would take three years for that data to actually become a standard in moving forward. So, again, EOCs, EOGs, and VoCATs, you use those. If not, then you will go into our library of Common Exams that we talked about earlier and use the Common Exam that's appropriate for that particular course.

So let's talk about what's out there as a resource for you. And as principals, it definitely is going to be

helpful to talk to other principals and see how they are planning to facilitate this, but as far as scheduling, if you already have your testing schedule for EOCs and EOGs kind of outlined, and you know when final exams are generally given within a school, or comprehensive diagnostic exams you generally do, the idea is these Common Exams will substitute for a course or class final exam. So the scheduling aspect of it is probably something that you can build into already what you generally do or how your school operates at the end of the year.

The resources out there for you, and we're willing to create more and do whatever we need to do to facilitate your comfort in moving forward with this, include an implementation guide for MSLs, and timelines of when assessments or the Common Exam should be given. We do have the assessment specs that are now on the website, so one of the questions was what is the new MSL? What are the questions on it? We now have the blueprints ready for people to look at them and see and utilize, and then a guide of how student growth is going to be measured, and then for your school or for your LEA, planning templates of how you're going to fold this into already existing operations and not really create a separate system.

Again, assessment is part of instruction. It's part of learning, so if we can figure out how to embed this into the already functioning parts of the school and utilize these Common Exams in replace of a common department exam at the high school, which is my background, but at the elementary or grades 3-8, figuring out how to administer it already into the embedded structure of the typical teacher classroom day or instruction, that would definitely help bridge the gap between testing and what we know as Common Exams versus what we know as EOC and EOG type security testing.

So let's go to the next implementation option, the timing. Administration for this fall, this December is optional, so it's important to know that. If a district moves forward and, again, this is a local decision, if the district moves forward and decides to administer MSLs in the fall, and we have around 30 LEAs that have already said, "Yes, we would like to know if our other content areas are growing students" and

through some kind of metric that would be valid. We do have about 30 LEAs that are moving forward, and if they choose to do that, then all MSLs must be administered. You can't pick and choose from the library, but there is one exception. This is new information that will be coming out, so you're some of the first to hear this, if you go in the fall, if your LEA is one of the 30 that decides to go into the fall, you will be able to choose not to administer Geometry and Algebra II. Those are the two MSLs that you can choose not to administer. That is because we have listened to the field, and some LEAs are doing a transition to Common Core based on some 2003 standards and the new Common Core. Some are doing Common Core 1, 2 and 3, which is a local elective. And then we have some moving into the integrated world. And that reason, I want to be very clear, that is the reason why we have three different kinds of groups of assessments - because DPI and the Department are trying to give local flexibility on how to schedule students and work in transitioning the math.

So if you think about this in three buckets, our state has some students who are learning new Common Core math infused with traditional standards from 2003, then we've got some LEAs that are doing Common Core straight out of the gates (Common Core 1, 2, 3). Then we have some LEAs that are doing integrated math, and we all know that in Common Core, some of the integrated math standards that we would chunk into geometry actually go into a different class. So because of that, and because we need to make five additional math MSLs, to accommodate the library so the LEAs have what they need, we are suggesting that those moving first in the fall, and if you're not one of the 30, this really doesn't pertain to you, but if you're one of the 30 LEAs that have signed up to move in the fall, the only two MSLs in Math that will be administered is -- excuse me, the only two MSLs that will not be administered are the Geometry and Algebra II MSLs, if the district chooses not to. If you choose to go ahead and use them, then great. Again, that's a local flexibility or local option.

So you can see in the third bullet if districts choose to administer the MSLs, then that score and that result on the MSL will be used for the sixth standard rating. And, again, I want to restate that it will take three

years of repeated recording and analysis of data in order to have a true six standard rating.

One of the questions asking about whether or not the MSL data is not used in the state accountability model. Again, if you think of this as a separate metric, it is part of teacher growth and student growth, looking at that aspect. This is for teacher effectiveness. This is the artifact for teachers to showcase what they're doing with students once they enter the classroom.

And so the last slide before we get into questions is the flexibility that has been offered to LEAs. This is also being responsive to requests from the field, making sure that this new authentic assessment is available with flexible guidelines. There are LEAs that are interested in online administration. We will give you the MSLs in PDF files, and there are some LEAs that are interested in taking that PDF file and embedding it into already-existing systems in their LEA to deploy online. If that is what an LEA decides to do, that's fine. That's how they may want to administer it. We will be moving to online administration more fully this year and definitely by the 14-15 school year, but if you choose not to do that, you can utilize paper/pencil or you could do some of the things online and then the performance tasks on paper and pencil. That's up to you. So you have flexibility with how to administer this at the local level.

The date of administration goes back to that timeline on the previous slide that's on our website. There are administration timelines where we give recommendations, but I do think it's important to note that this should fit into the already-existing schedule that you have for your building, of teachers teaching, final exams being administered, and the windows in which teachers are generally wrapping up content for the end of the year or end of the semester.

And then, you have flexibility about use for the student grade, which assessments are administered, and how to secure administration. Again, most of the questions we're getting are about proctors and about the security aspect of our Common Exams. And I want to say, a Common Exam is not an EOC. It is not an EOG. And so there is more flexibility around this since the data will not be used to compare schools.

There is a lot less security with Common Exams than with EOCs, EOGs, in general.

So with that, I know we've got about 50 minutes left. I'm going to turn it back over to Dr. Garland to clarify any points, and then we're going to go straight into answering questions.

DR. GARLAND: I wanted to give you a scenario so that you could understand the decision tree and it will be at your local level for the superintendent to help you make these decisions. These decisions may be made at the central office level. The superintendent may have a way that these decisions are made, or it could be left up to the principal, but I wanted to give you a scenario.

So, for example, in an elementary school, if you're self-contained and all of your teachers in grades 4 and 5 are teaching Reading and/or Math, then you would not necessarily, give a Common Exam in your school because every one of your teachers in a core area is already being covered by an EOG.

Now, if you're departmentalized and you have some teachers in fourth grade teaching nothing but Social Studies or nothing but Science, then you give a Common Exam because you would have a teacher in a core area for whom we would not have a EVAAS score. The only caveat would be that the teachers' EVAAS would have to reflect all the students that they teach.

So, for example, if I am teaching three classes of Social Studies and two classes of Science in the fourth grade and they're different students in Science and in Social Studies, than I would give both. But if I'm teaching Social Studies and Science and it's the same students, then the local decision is to whether or not I would give both Science and Social Studies because we're not after how all students are doing statewide in Science and Social Studies. What we are after is whether or not the teachers teaching in Science and Social Studies are having a positive impact on student learning. So it's a very different scenario than what we looked at for EOGs and EOCs.

Now, we were asked a question at the State Board meeting last week could a local board say, "Well, we want to know how our students are doing in Science in Social Studies," so yes, the local board can say, "We're going to give Science and Social Studies to all of our students in grades 4 and 5 because we want to know if they're achieving." That certainly is an option.

The extent to which Common Exams are given really goes back to the guiding principles. Every teacher in a core area in grade 4 through 12 has an EVAAS score, and it's a reflection of how all of the students that that teacher is teaching are doing because we want to make sure that some students are not left out in looking at how student growth is going in a school or in a teacher's classroom.

Just to clarify again, this is not data that will show up on your school report card in terms of how many kids and how they did in Science and Social Studies. Where it will show up, if you remember last year, is in a grid from your school that showed standards and ratings on the teacher evaluation system, and then you had numbers that filled out that grid. So at some point three years from now, there will be a Standard 6 and then you will have the number of teachers who met growth, for example, in Standard 6, the number of teachers who exceeded growth, and the number of teachers who failed to meet growth, but that's the only public reporting. Those data and not actual performance on the Common Exams themselves will be a part of the grid but it will be three years before we pull that data because we will not know if teachers were meeting growth and effective on Standard 6 until that point. So just some clarification around --

(PROBLEM WITH AUDIO)

So we just wanted to do some clarification around what will be publicly reported and what will not.

Truly, we are trying to handle this so that the data become part of the teacher personnel files. For us, it is about the evaluation data. Standards 1 - 5 would only be reported in the aggregate in the grid and not in any type of proficiency score for the school because the administration will vary from school to school and it wouldn't be fair data to report statewide or school to school because you may have some significant differences in the numbers of students even participating in the Common Exams. And so the data would not be comparable from school to school in terms of student proficiency against these Common Exams.

So now Jennifer Preston, who is our Race to the Top Project Coordinator, will try to address the questions that you sent in to us as concerns.

MS. PRESTON: Good morning, everybody. What we did in looking at the list of concerns that were

collected from principals and assistant principals across the state was to try to pull out some common questions and common themes to address here and then anything we don't address, as I mentioned earlier, we'll be publishing some written documents with answers.

One question that we received was around who designed the Common Exams and then also how they've been designed with folks concerned about the validity and reliability of rolling out these assessments, particularly without doing field-testing first.

So Ms. Quick mentioned this a bit earlier, but we have had eight hundred teachers from across the state involved principally in two steps of the design of the exams. They are the folks that gave input on how the different standards in their curriculum should be assessed (with a multiple-choice question or with a performance task), at what weights the standards should be within an assessment, and then we've also had those teachers involved in the item review process. So at this point, high school teachers have come back to review the items. There were over 6,000 items that were generated based on their feedback on what items they wanted to see, and they then worked their way through all 6,000, noting which items were sort of good to go, if they were, which items were problematic and really needed too much work to even be worth fixing, and which items were good, but needed a little bit of work to strengthen them, and then they made specific notes on how the items needed to be strengthened.

We're using the same basic process as the state assessments, but with our EOGs and EOCs, there is not this level of teacher involvement, either in creating the blueprints or in actually reviewing the items that are going to appear on the assessment.

We have had NCDPI psychometricians and test-measurement specialists involved in taking the teachers' feedback and incorporating it into blueprints that become the drivers for what the tests are going to look like. And they are also going to be involved after administration. Because we have some time between when these assessments are administered and when we need to send the data to SAS to produce EVAAS scores, there's a chance for them to look at that data and identify any questions that did not perform well.

As an example, there might be a question where everybody got it correct or a question where everybody got it incorrect. And when we can identify those, we're going to pull them out of the data set before we even send it to SAS, so that item will in no way become a part of how the teacher's growth is calculated. It would almost be like it didn't really exist in terms of what the final data set looks like.

Another question that was voiced across the state is a lack of knowledge about the MSLs and about the Common Exam. And so with the link that's on the screen right now, we wanted to draw your attention to one webpage in particular, which is where we have posted all the assessment specifications for the MSLs. These look a lot like what we post for the state tests, so, for some teachers, this kind of format will look kind of familiar to them. It shows them what standards will be assessed, at what weight, and with which kind of item. The certain standard may be assessed with a mix of multiple-choice and then a performance task. Some standards may be assessed solely with multiple-choice, and some may be assessed solely with performance-based tasks. All that information is on there in those blueprints that have been posted to the web.

We're also getting questions about rubrics. So general information on rubrics will be coming out soon. It's something we're going to talk to the district Curriculum and Instruction leaders about on October 19th because they are kind of the curriculum drivers in their system, and also posting it to our website. We're also going to be releasing an online module in the middle of November that will provide training for teachers on how to use the rubrics to score the performance tasks.

An important thing to note about the MSLs is that every item has its own rubric that's specific to that item, so it's not a matter of one rubric that's used on every single performance task across all the content area. A rubric that's generic really doesn't get into the specificity of how teachers need to be looking for certain pieces of information and student answers. So each item will have its own rubric, and we will be releasing information generally about how the rubrics look, but, of course, the rubrics themselves, as they're tied to the questions, do have to remain secure just like the questions themselves do.

Another big area of concern about the performance items and specifically how they're going to be graded. There is a requirement that there be at least one grader of a student's performance task who is not the teacher of record and who has a content knowledge necessary to score the item. So I used to be a high school World History teacher. I can tell you you would not have wanted me scoring the Physics performance tasks of students that were down the hall taking Physics. But I could very well have scored the Civics and Economics performance tasks and the American History performance tasks, because I had that content knowledge.

The teachers of record of specific students can grade the items, but they can't be the only one who grades the items. There's got to be someone who comes along and also assigns grades so that we then can take an average of the two that have been assigned. If an LEA wants to only have one person grading the work, that's fine. That just has to be not the teacher of record. There are a couple different options for how this can work.

There's also been some concern about how quickly these performance items need to be graded. One thing to note about the Common Exams is that they are administered in a much shorter timeframe than our traditional state assessments. The MSLs have all been designed to fit into a 90-minute block period, and there is a breaking point in them at about halfway through where, if you wanted to do 45 minutes one day and 45 minutes the next day, the infrastructure is kind of built into the test book to let you do that. This means that if an LEA or a school wants to give these while students are still in class, maybe during the last week of class as opposed to waiting until exam week, they can do that. That's something that's possible.

With the exception of English Language Arts, all of the MSLs this fall that will be used in the spring have the performance items at the end, so we are talking about, let's say Chemistry, for example. A district could say, "Well, we're going to have the students take the Chemistry performance item while they're still in class so that teachers can start scoring those, and then we're going to have them take the multiple-

choice part when they would normally go to Chemistry and take their teacher-made final exam during testing week." The reason that ELA is not set up that way is because everything in the ELA assessments is tied to a reading passage. If you have a passage, some multiple-choice, then a performance task and, therefore, the performance tasks are throughout the exam rather than clustered at the end. So it's not an option for ELA, but it is for the other content areas.

And having performance tasks on the assessments at all really is something that we at the Department heard loud and clear from the 800 teachers that we brought together and asked about assessing these content standards. They said, as we know, that our content standards have now become more concept-based. They're not about facts anymore. And to really assess concepts, you often need to have students actually doing some type of work, drawing a diagram, doing a mathematical proof, looking at a document and analyzing it with a written response. And that does mean that as educators, we need to be the ones checking the work that way. That kind of work just simply can't go through a machine like a multiple-choice assessment can.

And so lastly, there was a concern that the Common Exams are hurting students and teachers in various ways. First, I want to talk just a little bit about students and what the Common Exams mean for them. The Common Exam administration process shouldn't affect students any differently than when they made a teacher-created final exam. So when I was a World History teacher, during testing week, my kids came to me for one day, and during that day I gave them a final exam that I had created. Well, as a beginning teacher, I can tell you that exam was not very good, and it didn't give me a lot of information on what they were doing. The only thing that would change for the students is that they'd be taking what I would say is the better exam. It has them actually writing answers and analyzing information. They would still come to me during the testing window. They would still take an assessment. Nothing changes for them about the logistics of what their school day looks like at the end of the year.

MSL scores also do not have to be used in final exam grades. That's an LEA decision. We have some

districts that have said they are going to count them as final exam grades and some that have said they aren't going to. What we will provide when your testing coordinator scans the assessment is a percent correct. That can be where you start to think about a score, but you can take that percent correct and convert it to a letter. You can take the percent correct and you can curve it before you assign a student a grade on how they do on the exam. That percent correct is really just some information that our computer system can spit out that's helpful to folks, but isn't what has to be used in the students' grades at any particular percentage.

And then lastly, for teachers in particular, what we're moving toward is a system here where student growth is incorporated into educator evaluation. And unlike some other states where the Social Studies or Science teacher is forever held accountable for school-wide growth, we don't think that that's a long-term sustainable solution.

We have teachers in Social Studies, Science, Art, K-2, that have kids and they have standards, and they're doing a great job teaching, and those kids are making growth on those standards. That's what we need to capture and use in the teacher's evaluation, not school-wide growth as something that they can control as much as they can control the growth of their kids in their classroom on their standards. And so it does mean rolling out these new assessments, rolling them out in a flexible way, but ultimately what they're really doing is making sure that when we include growth in a teacher's evaluation, it is their kids, their standards, and their context of how they teach.

The last slide on the screen has some contact information, although we will see if we have time to answer some questions that have come in throughout the webinar. There is a general educator effectiveness inbox where you can send questions, thoughts, around this work with the Common Exams or anything about educator effectiveness more broadly.

We also have an educator effectiveness website. All of the district resources that Ms. Quick mentioned earlier -- the implementation plan, the guide for measuring growth, the assessment specifications --

they're all on that website and it's organized into different categories of what you might go there looking for -- a section on the evaluation instrument, a section on student surveys, a section on the Common Exams. You can work through and navigate depending on what you're looking for, and anything you need to know that isn't on there, shoot it to that email address so that we can make sure we get you the information you need as you work with your teachers and your colleagues in the school system.

So we are at 11:00, which is when we know some folks have to leave us because you're all busy people in schools right now and they have other things to attend to, but we can also stay and answer some of the questions that have been coming in throughout the webinar and we'll, as we mentioned, post this later, so if you have to leave, you can always come back at a later time and listen to the question part.

MS. QUICK: I think -- this is Angela. The first question that was submitted is around, "What will the format for the Arts and those particular aspects of Common Exams look like?" Since that is not rolling out this year, we are convening a group of teachers of those content areas to look at how the MSLs or how the Common Exams for those content areas will look. Definitely, we know it will be performance-based and probably some kind of artifact study of what students are doing. So, again, we'll follow the same process that we did earlier, bring the teachers in that actually teach the subjects and figuring out what will be the best way to assess those.

The logistics, I think we went over. You will have the Power Point. You can use it and print it. We will have a listing of all the questions. We can get those off of the screen and the frequently asked questions list.

A couple of questions around the student surveys, "Is the student survey available online now?" and "Are there references for teachers?" and "Do you think the survey will be ready for use this school year?" meaning 12-13.

MS. PRESTON: So for the student survey, if you are interested in finding out a little bit more about the survey, you can visit www.metproject.org and then click on the link for the Tripod Student Survey. We

actually administered two versions of the survey in North Carolina: the short version, which you can actually find posted on the MET site, and then also a longer version that asks kids slightly more detailed questions about their learning environment. That survey is not public, but it has all the questions that are on the short version and just a few extra questions that student answered.

For people that participated in the surveys, because we may have some of those teachers or principals on the line with us now, those results are out, and have been out for about the last three or four weeks.

Teachers had accounts created for them where they can log in and see at the class level. They can't see how individual students responded, but they can see how kids responded to every question that was asked of them on the survey. And then there are a couple different ways that they can run reports to kind of look at specific things they're interested in. We've also loaded that website with resources. There are some sample protocols that teachers in a PLC or as an individual could work through kind of looking at their data, responding to critical questions, and also just research on the background of the surveys and how they've been used.

That level of access rolls up so if the principal had more than five teachers at the school administer the survey, he or she has access to school-wide data on how kids responded, and then that rolls up to the district level where the superintendent can see information at the school level across the two, three, however many schools administered the survey.

That information is out there now and will stay out there for teachers throughout the year. They may at different points want to go back, visit the website, look at their results, and the information is on that project website. If you didn't participate, but are interested in the kinds of questions, they're on the survey.

MS. QUICK: Another question, "Will Reading 3D be used or potentially be used for the basis of EVAAS rating? Couple of questions around the K-3 discussion.

DR. GARLAND: Okay. I'll tell you what we know to date. We are strongly considering re-instituting a

pre-test for grade 3 for a couple of reasons. One, the very strict, rigid student promotion standard now at the end of grade 3, we've learned that by using a pre-test/post-test in grade 3, then schools will have data that give them even a better view, if you will, of which students are not on track to be proficient at the end of grade 3. And, if we administer a pre-test for grade 3, then we'll be able to have an EVAAS score for third-grade teachers. The law, the Excellent Public Schools Act, requires us, for the students' summer camp, to use teachers who have demonstrated growth with students in reading. If we don't use something like the third grade pre-test, then we don't think that we'll be able to have the data to know which students are at risk and also to know which teachers are the best at teaching students in terms of their growth. So we're considering that.

For K-2, there's been some confusion over Reading 3D. As part of the Reading 3D process, students do a running record. Students did running records before we did Reading 3D, so by using the tool that is available in Reading 3D for teachers to be able to enter the student responses, we can use the tool for a reading running record, but it will not be part of the diagnostic process. We don't want any of the teachers' formative data included in this. What we want is a running record at the beginning of the year and a running record at the end of the year to see if students indeed have grown in reading, and we've thought one way that we might be able to do that is by applying Lexiles to the passages. We're trying to figure out a way to look at reading comprehension at the beginning and reading comprehension at the end to see if students have grown. So no, it is not the Reading 3D process given the fact that running records are part of their process, but the running record is done even when you don't do Reading 3D. So I think there has been some confusion about the two, but no, we are not using the Reading 3D process along with formative data in order to do teacher effectiveness for grades K-2.

And Angela described for you the process we're going to look at for Art, so we do have some ideas for how we're going to this work. What we want to do is make sure that the MSLs for spring administration are completed, that the specifications are out, and then ,once all of that is done, we think early January,

everything will be done and ready to go, then we're going to focus our attention in the spring on how to do all of those other groups so that we'll be able to do training with teachers in the late spring and summer, as well as principals, and then have this other part ready to be up and running next year in July when our mountain friends across the state come back to school.

MS. QUICK: I think one, maybe two more questions. One that's been repeated over and over and, Rebecca, Jenn, you all may want to clarify, this response for me, because I was a former Biology teacher, so it says, "Just to clarify, if a teacher teaches Biology and Earth Science, will only the Biology data populate their Standard 6?"

DR. GARLAND: You may have a scenario where you've got one teacher teaching two sections of Biology and three sections of Chemistry. And then you've got another teacher teaching five sections of Biology. So some students will be covered by the MSL exam in Chemistry and other students will be covered with a teacher-made exam in Chemistry. For high school, we think that if you administer Common Exams, you need to do it across the board. So if you're going to use Common Exams for Teacher A in Chemistry, you need to use Common Exams for Teacher B so that there is consistency of a Common Exam, if you will. And the likelihood that all of those teachers in Biology -- I mean, all the students in Biology who would also be in Chemistry is unlikely in a high school, so consequently, you would not have a reflection of every student that a teacher taught. In a very small high school, if you have one Biology teacher, one Chemistry teacher, if the same teacher is teaching Biology and teaching Chemistry and they have the same students, then no, you would not need to give the Chemistry exam, but the chances of that are probably not very high.

So remember the two principles, every teacher has an EVAAS score and it covers every student that the teacher teaches. Obviously, with some few exceptions, we do know some students, for example, some EC students or students who are out for some type of intervention and so there may be two or three students who just are not there, and we understand that, but that would be the exception rather than the

rule.

MS. QUICK: Let's see. And let's do one more. "Are we going to call these Common Exams or MSLs?"

Right now, we are leaning toward Common Exams. I'll be honest with you; we are looking at what to call these. Luckily, before this is fixed in concrete as Dr. Garland said, we've got some time, but right now we are calling them Common Exams because they're supposed to be used in the same format as departmental common exams.

DR. GARLAND: Actually on the test themselves, it will say both so that it will clarify until we come up with a word that is branded.

The problem we've run into with the term "Common Exam" is that some people are associating it with the Common Core, and Common Core, obviously, is mostly covered by EOCs and EOGs, although that's not true at the high school. So that's the only confusion with the term "Common Exam" is that people are associating it with Common Core.

MS. QUICK: And one of the questions, too, about Common Core is "Do the MSLs test Common Core or Essential Standards?" Well, to be honest, MSLs test whatever the Standard Course of Study is, so if it's an ELA or Math course, that would be Common Core State Standards. And if it's anything other than that, it would be Essential Standards. So our MSLs, excuse me, our Common Exams and our EOCs, EOGs, and VoCATs all align to our new Standard Course of Study that teachers are teaching this year.

DR. GARLAND: One comment while they're glancing at questions, one thing that I do want to make you aware of, Dr. Lynne Johnson who is the Director of Educator Recruitment and Development, our Educator Effectiveness Division, has been listening to the webinar. She's here.

We do have some supports in place for principals that Lynne is leading in her division. We are continuing to work as hard as we can to support principals across the state with a better understanding of how with Standards 1 through 5 can have more inter-rater reliability. We've done webinars. We now have an employee, Kim Simmons, whose sole responsibility here in the Department is to work with

principals, to support them in teacher evaluation either through understanding of what the standards really mean and what good instruction on a standard looks like, and on inter-rater reliability, so Lynne's shop is continuing to do everything we can to make the instrument itself, Standards 1 through 5, more effective for you because, again, that's where teachers will get the feedback that they need around their growth in order to get better. So this is an integrated process and, eventually, this whole process will live down in the Educator Effectiveness Division. Right now, because it is a cross-agency initiative to get the Accountability folks working on common exams, to get the policy established with the State Board, it's kind of been divided up across many places in the department, but eventually, all this work lives in Educator Effectiveness.

So we do not want you worrying about Standard 6 and neglecting all of the support and work we need to do in Standards 1 through 5.

MS. QUICK: Okay. Dr. Garland, evidently I did not do such a terrific job of this, but the question around Math and the Math Common Exams again, so will you restate what I tried to state about the Math, the Common Exams, the flexibility for first semester, and what the option is?

DR. GARLAND: Yes, I'll try. And I would like to share with you that your superintendents don't even know this yet. The memo is going out. We're still trying to work on our lists so that we'll know exactly which superintendents to direct this information to.

When we started the Measures of Student Learning, the Common Exams, we were working from the premise that, because of a request made to us last spring, most high schools in the state were going to do transitional-type standards for Algebra II and for Geography because if you looked at the Common Core, there was so much depth of knowledge in those two courses that they were afraid their students would not be successful if they went straight to the Common Core. So we created the Measures of Student Learning around the 2003 standards and anything that was an extension of those concepts covered. So it was infused, if you will, with some Common Core objectives.

We passed those out on September 20th when we had a meeting in Greensboro. Every school system in our state had a team of their HR directors, their curriculum folks, and their testing coordinators. When the curriculum folks saw the specifications for Algebra II and for Geometry, some of them panicked and said, "We're not teaching transitional standards. We're actually teaching straight-up Common Core."

And we had some folks who were teaching Integrated Math II and III state that they were teaching Common Core from an integrated approach. So they immediately saw that the match between the Common Exams with those two courses did not match what they were teaching.

So we came back and rather than trying to force teachers to teach concepts that they had not intended to teach, we brought a group in and, quite frankly, had an emergency math meeting last week and we determined after talking with our friends in Curriculum and Instruction and our Accountability folks that we would try to develop Math Common Exam to meet the needs of wherever schools were within a reasonable context. So we are developing -- in fact, we've already had the conversations, we're developing an Integrated III Common Core Common Exam. We're developing an Algebra II and a Geometry Common Core Common Exam. We're going to give Integrated II students the new Math I assessment because they will not have had that if indeed they're doing a second-year Integrated II Match with Common Core.

We will continue to have the transitional one, and we're doing Math II and III Common Exams for those people who were doing straight-up Math II and III with the new Common Core standards. So, in the end, we're going to have seven or eight, I get the number confused, Common Exams in Mathematics. And then each curriculum person from the LEA will work with the principals to determine which is the appropriate exam based on how math teachers across the district are teaching math standards.

So we had 30 school systems signed up to take Common Exams in the fall. If they are teaching transitional Math, then they want to go ahead and get the Algebra II and Geometry exams that are already developed and for which specifications are out in the public. If that does not match the Math that they are

teaching, then they may defer in those two courses only until the spring and then choose from the menu of options. There will be specifications just like we have for those two courses developed for each one of those math options that we will provide and then people can choose the ones that best match the math that they're teaching in the second and third course of mathematics at the high school.

Now, what we do intend to do is put some people together to see if we can bring some resolution to Math to get it down to at least an integrated approach and a traditional approach in a second and third year of mathematics at the high school. We're very concerned that part of the rationale behind doing Common Core is that students would be able to move smoothly and seamlessly because they have common standards across the country. And it seems to us that we now have students who are even in more jeopardy moving across districts with the type of math the way that we are doing it now.

So that's for the future. We hope that we will be able to bring it down to two options of mathematics in the future (an integrated and a traditional) through Math II and III standards, but for this year, we are trying to meet people where they are and give comfort to people who are trying to teach Math and give them a test that meets what they're trying to do. So I may have confused more, but I thought a little background would help you understand where we are with Math and why we are offering that option.

MS. QUICK: The only other thing I would add not specifically related to Geometry and Algebra II, but is for your high school math students who are taking Pre-Calculus or Advanced Functions and Modeling, those Common Exams are based on the 2003 standards because there are no Common Core standards for a course, what we would call kind of the fourth math course. So that really isn't very much of a surprise usually to those teachers because they know there aren't new Common Core standards for them, but just for you as principals to let you know those are the two where all we have is 2003, hence, we're using the 2003 standards.

DR. GARLAND: Common Core ends with the equivalent of Algebra II.

MS. QUICK: Just in closing, a lot of questions about wanting explanation on Math in writing.

Definitely, you will have that. For frequently asked questions, we've got a great list of questions from you guys and what we're going to do is tie these up. We will respond with answers. It will be posted on that website that is in the presentation. The very last slide has the website and also an email was given out earlier that you can send questions to as well and we can answer. So the frequently asked questions based on this webinar, we will create answers. We'll post them on the website. We'll also send it to Dr. Prince so she can send it out to the membership that submitted questions if that is the best way to go. And then I would say as far as the math group that Dr. Garland mentioned, if you want to have a representative on that, please make sure that your curriculum and instruction lead at your LEA central office is aware of that. We will be asking for representatives.

And then I think another logistics question was about displaying the email and website. Yes, we can pull that back up, but the slide on the webinar has the email address and the website, so you should be seeing that particular slide now.

MS. PRESTON: And one question just on logistics that I have: would it be helpful to folks, and just indicate by raising your hand on the dashboard, if we were to send out these slides in an actual Power Point form so that you could maybe use them with your staff for presentations if you're going to share with them? Would that be something that would be helpful for folks? We normally send out Power Points in PDFs, but we can do it if you'd like to use them that way.

MS. QUICK: They say yes.

MS. PRESTON: Okay. We will take care of doing that, too.

MS. QUICK: And if you have questions or specific concerns around the assessments or the Common Exams, feel free to contact any of us. The email goes to Jennifer and she'll get in touch with us, but obviously, you know how to contact myself, Angela Quick, or Dr. Garland or Dr. Johnson, so we're all easy to find here. And if you want to talk through or ask specific questions, we're here to help and I want your feedback on this process.

DR. GARLAND: And do not anticipate getting anything in Math in writing soon. Next Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday, Angela and I are scheduled across the state to meet in small groups with superintendents, so we will be walking them through the Math scenario and then it will be sent out in writing as a follow-up to them so they will have it in writing and we will make sure that everybody gets a copy. But since you were on the webinar this morning, we did not want you not to have access to the information, but please know that we have not shared this with your superintendents yet, but it just did make sense to us to withhold information for you. They don't like to get information after it is sent out to the field, so please help us explain if they should hear about it and have questions that they will be getting this information firsthand.

MS. QUICK: Thank you very much for your attentiveness and for the numbers of you. We look forward to hearing feedback, and we will get busy immediately on getting the questions answered and posted to our website and sent back to you and also the Power Point slides so that you can use those with your staff or with school board meetings or whatever you would want to do.

Thank you for your attention and have a great day.

(CONCLUDED)

WPU

GLORIA VEILLEUX, TRANSCRIBER