



**441 Page Street • P.O. Box 427**  
**Troy, North Carolina 27371-0427**  
**PHONE: (910) 576-6511 • FAX: (910) 576-2044**

---

TO: Board of Education

FROM: Dale Ellis

DATE: July 11, 2016

SUBJ: ACTION ITEM (ASW Recommendation)

Due to State Board of Education guidelines, we are no longer able to request a waiver from the state Analysis of Student Work (ASW) Process. The process options are enclosed for your convenience.

Based upon a careful review of the various models, the administration recommends approval of the Davidson County option as the best alternative to be used in Montgomery County Schools.

I am available to answer any questions you might have.

Here is a description of the NC ASW process and two alternatives approved at the May State Board of Ed meeting. The differences from ASW are highlighted below.

Analysis of Student Work (ASW) Process (<http://ncasw.ncdpi.wikispaces.net/home>)

- Teacher Growth process for Arts Education, Healthful Living, World Language, Advanced Placement and International Baccalaureate educators.
- Teachers collect student work around 5 objectives.
- Teachers will submit an Evidence Collection of artifacts to an online platform for evaluation by reviewers who have content area expertise.
- The online system will select up to 5 classes and the students for artifact submission.

#### Davidson County Alternative

- Five objectives (NC ASW)
- Objectives will be part of the PDP "Add Goal"
- Collection year-long/semester ( NC ASW)
- Focus on student work ( NC ASW)
- Time lapse and measure to show achievement overtime for the product, skill or performance ( NC ASW)
- Principal is the rater
- Teacher may elect to have a committee of three-like subject/content raters review (upon request only)
- Prescriptive feedback by principal
- Keep spreadsheet of teachers and share with DPI

#### Wake County Alternative

- Pilot
- Measurable Growth aligned to PGP
- District content specialist will develop measures, define growth matrix, and conduct blind review of up to 15% of all teachers involved in this process to ensure rating between principal rating and blind reviewer are comparable
- Pre and Post assessments at the school-level
- Evidence remains at the school-level
- Focus on student work
- Growth between two points
- Growth expectations will vary based on time and subjects

\*Teachers who do not meet the state participation requirements for ASW (K-8 teachers with less than 45 min/week or High School teachers with less than 60% ASW classes) fall into the group of educators for whom the state does not yet have a student growth measure.

## Local Student Growth Measurement Plan for ASW Wake County Public School System

### Background and Rationale

The current Analysis of Student Work (ASW) process has been challenging to implement for a number of reasons, including:

- logistics associated with the electronic platform
- insufficient instructions for successful implementation
- lack of teacher confidence in the objectivity of the rating process including the lack of available raters in some content areas

WCPSS believes a local alternative ASW process can be constructed that will provide teachers an opportunity to reflect on their students' growth and their instructional practice as well as provide valid growth results that can inform teacher evaluation. The key to this process will be to incorporate a priori learning progressions and teacher-administrator dialogue into the evaluation of student growth in a way that will result in deeper and more relevant feedback for teachers as well as a valid measurement of growth that is fair and consistent.

### Description of Pilot

In this proposed pilot ASW process, teachers will work with their administrators during the development of their Professional Growth Plan and subsequently the evaluation of the 5 standards of their NCEES to focus on student growth measurements. In these conversations teachers will identify measurable goals along specified learning progressions that will serve as the basis for their ASW measurement during the 2016-17 school year.

Prior to the 2016-17 school year, district content area specialists will meet with focus groups of teachers to create draft examples of student work elements that include a matrix for standards and objectives and the learning progressions that constitute growth on those standards/objectives. These initial discussions will help teachers calibrate growth expectations around those learning progressions as well as to communicate to them all of the required elements of the local ASW process for 2016-17 in terms of evidence collection and other expectations.

During the 2016-17 school year, teachers will then collect and store evidence of student work from multiple students and classes to support the ASW process. This student work will include both "pre" (i.e., before instruction on the standard has begun) and "post" (i.e., after instruction on the standard has been completed) samples to compare for growth purposes. Unlike the state process, this evidence will simply remain at the school site during the year.

Toward the end of the 2016-17 school year, the district will sample students from each teacher's class lists in a manner consistent with current state ASW procedures. At this point, the proposed pilot will diverge from the current state model to test out the core hypothesis of the ASW pilot. Instead of uploading student work samples into the state's online system, student work collected from those sampled students will instead be evaluated for evidence of growth by *the teacher's school-based administrator* to make an initial determination of growth. This rating will be determined through a dialogic process between the teacher and administrator, supported by student work samples *as well as an a priori learning progression rubric created for the specific standard*. This will allow the teachers and their evaluators to have a conversation around student work guided by an agreed-upon learning progression that will clarify whether student growth is evident in the work samples. Then in a second phase, content experts from within the district who are blind to the identity of the teacher (the approach currently used in the state ASW process) will re-score a random sample of those student work samples. Ratings from the blind content experts will then be compared to the initial ratings agreed upon by teachers and their administrators to determine whether the school-based administrators and

teachers together, supported by established learning progressions and evidence of student work, can provide growth results which are fair and comparable to those of blind raters as currently used by the state.

The proposed ASW pilot will not only test an ASW approach which is potentially scalable and more efficient than the current state process. It will also accomplish the following additional objectives:

- It will yield a more teacher-friendly ASW process. It simplifies documentation, allows teachers to use student work in the format in which it is already collected, and even facilitates student involvement in the collection of work samples if desired.
- It encourages reflective practice, since teachers share data with their administrators that demonstrates growth and then develop their PGP based on that information, rather than having feedback provided by an anonymous rater who is not familiar with that teacher or their context.
- It builds administrator capacity. By providing principals specific guidance via the learning progressions, they will develop better capacity to provide recommendations on what to look for and how to provide support to ASW teachers around student achievement growth.

### **Communication Plan**

This pilot process has been developed in consultation with ASW teachers from the beginning, and the details of the final proposal are being shared with ASW teachers through the district content-area specialists involved in the ASW process. A focus group of district teachers across ASW subjects was convened in April to determine the feasibility of the pilot plan from the teacher's perspective, and the proposed adjustments to the state process incorporated into the proposed pilot were overwhelmingly supported by that group as well.

Below is a description of how the proposed pilot process addresses the assurances communicated by NCDPI in the application.

#### **Assurance #1: Clear Connection to the Content Standards**

In cooperation with their evaluator, teachers will:

1. Follow an ASW template provided by the district that outlines the process and expectations (this template will be an adaptation of the one provided by NCDPI and aligned with the PGP document)
2. Select objectives to reflect growth along a set learning progression from across the strands of the NC Essential Standards in the pertinent subject area.
3. Choose 2 classes from different *levels* (either grade levels such as K-2, 3-5, etc., or academic levels) of their teaching schedule as target classrooms for evidence collection.

#### **Assurance #2: Evidence Must Focus on Student Work**

No changes proposed to this component. Evidence will follow the same standards provided in the current state-level ASW plan.

#### **Assurance #3: Measuring Growth**

As in the state model, teachers will provide evidence of growth between 2 points in time on selected essential standards. However, the expectations for growth will be based on learning progressions appropriate to both the standards as well as duration and intensity of instruction for that particular teacher. District-level content leaders will focus on teachers with similar frequency and duration to validate the process. For example, growth expectations for teachers who only have contact with students on a weekly basis (i.e., who teach 45 minutes once per week) will not be the same as for teachers who have daily instruction with students in that same course/subject, etc.

**Assurance #4: Rater Qualifications/Rating Process**

At the core of this proposed pilot is an explicit test of Assurance #4. This will proceed in two phases. In Phase I, the school-based administrator responsible for evaluating Standards 1-5 in the NCEES for each ASW teacher will determine through dialogue with the teacher whether that teacher warrants a rating of “does not meet”, “meets”, or “exceeds” expected growth based on the student work samples provided and the learning progression established a priori for the standard. In Phase 2 of the rating process, the content-area specialists from within the district will conduct blind, random checks across content areas and grade levels (15% of all teachers in the ASW process) to see whether the rating of a school-based administrator is comparable to the rating of a content expert who is “blind” to both the identity of the teacher as well as the rating that the teacher’s administrator provided in Phase 1. Our hypothesis for this pilot is that a school-based administrator and teacher together can, given appropriate samples of student work and an agreed-upon learning progression to use in the evaluation of that work, come to a fair and accurate rating of growth that is comparable to the judgment of a content-area expert who is blind to the identity of the teacher (i.e., the current state process).

**Assurance #5: Results Sharing**

The district will share a comprehensive listing of teacher-level growth by content area and grade level as required. The district will also share the results of the pilot study to evaluate the feasibility of the approach for future years.

*Please attach a plan of how your district/charter school intends to measure growth for these teachers, specifically addressing each of the local option plan assurances.*

**RATIONALE:**

- Davidson County Schools believes that the fact that Standard 6 has been moved into Standard 1-5 supports the notion that a building level principal has the best grasp of the achievement and growth on an individual teacher.
- Our locally developed option, as outlined below, allows for more specific feedback than a blind review.
- Additionally, upon request, this option allows the individual teacher to gain feedback from a team or committee of raters strengthening their ability to grow (as well as the students) through the evaluation process.
- By their very nature, Fine Arts, Healthful Living, and World Language curriculums are very broad and are ill-defined by narrow points in time. Without the ability for discourse and discussion between the teacher and the rater, the impactful information demonstrating student growth and teacher impact are lost in the process.
- Our district has a team of Instructional Program Specialists in place to work with principals who may need support in understanding these highly specialized curriculum areas and growth in each of them.

Davidson County Schools will require middle and high school teachers whose classes are 60% or more in content areas of Arts Education, Healthful Living, World Languages, and Advancement Placement to participate in the locally developed option. Davidson County Schools elementary teachers do not see students more than 45 minutes per week, and therefore, will not be required to participate in the locally developed option. Teachers are exempt from the ASW process if they are on approved extended leave for 20 or more consecutive days in a year-long calendar or 10 or more consecutive days in a semester block schedule.

**Local Student Growth Measurement Plan**

**1. Clear Connection to the Content Standards**

- a. Teachers will select five (5) objectives from the appropriate standards for their content area. (*NC Standard Course of Study-Essential Standards* or College Board). Each curriculum content strand shall be represented with at least one objective.
- b. Evidence and/or assessments will include multiple objectives that are not duplicated from the appropriate content standards.
- c. Evidence and/or assessments must demonstrate a level of academic rigor appropriate to the level of the course/subject.
- d. Objectives will be recorded on the "Add Goal" portion of teacher's Professional Development Plan (PDP) located at the bottom of the PDP portion of the NCEES platform.
- e. Teachers will conference with their principal at the due date of the PDP, sharing which objectives were selected and how the teacher will capture growth in two points of time.
- f. Teachers who teach on a semester plan will complete two objectives in the first semester and three objectives in the second semester.

Example 1- Standard/Objective Selection for the individual teacher's PDP

Goal	Activity	Expected Outcome	Resources	Timeline
<i>List the Standard or Objective selected.</i>	<i>Describe the task (narrative).</i>	<i>What will the finished product or skill be when the task is complete?</i>	<i>Will the teacher measure individual growth or whole-class growth?</i>	<i>What is target completion of point 1 evidence to point 2 evidence?</i>  <i>What is the frequency/duration of the course taught?</i>

2. *Evidence Must Focus on Student Work*

- a. Evidence collected by Davidson County Schools' teachers will focus on student work, not on teacher performance.
- b. Evidence that demonstrates achievement (a skill, product, or performance) must have a point of evidence prior to the paramount achievement demonstrating growth between two points in time.

3. *Measuring Growth*

- a. Growth will be measured between two points in time. It must be evident to the reviewer and explained by the teacher the growth that has occurred between point 1 and point 2.
- b. The student's task must align with the verb in the objective and be clear to the rater.
- c. Davidson County Schools will use the current ASW model *Evidence Collection Rating Form* as a tool to average of all five objectives reviewed to inform the teacher's rating of "Does Not Meet, Meets, or Exceeds Growth."

4. *Rater Qualifications/Rating Process*

- a. The principal will rate and evaluate the student growth evidence presented as a part of the semester-end/year-end conference for the teacher's Professional Development Plan using the current ASW model *Evidence Collection Rating Form*. Evidence and supporting documentation presented to the principal must support that the individual student or whole-class has grown from one point in time to another. Principals may elect to offer written feedback (in addition to verbal feedback) to be recorded on the teacher's year-end Professional Development Plan review.
- b. Teachers on a semesterly schedule will have a rating/review of two objectives at the conclusion of the first semester and a rating/review of the final three objectives at the conclusion of the second semester. Teachers on a yearly schedule will have a rating/review of all five objectives at the conclusion of the academic year.
- c. If the principal does not feel they can offer effective feedback during the summative evaluation for the teacher and/or the teacher would like additional feedback, the teacher may elect to have

- a committee of at least three like-subject/content raters review and rate the evidence submitted. Where reasonably possible, the raters will have blind knowledge of the teacher being evaluated.
- d. Achievement, observed as a part of growth, will be considered in the total evaluation.
- e. As a part of the teacher's year-end summative evaluation, all evidence submitted and rated will be discussed between the principal and the participating teacher.

#### 5. *Results Sharing*

- a. Prescriptive feedback will be offered by principals and/or the rater committee to the individual teacher and recorded/noted as a part of their Professional Development Plan review.
- b. Davidson County Schools will share teacher-level growth results from our local option plan with the North Carolina Department of Public Instruction and State Board of Education as requested.
- c. A spreadsheet listing of all teachers required to complete the local option for ASW and their ratings will be kept by Davidson County Schools Human Resource Department annually.

The local option plan was developed in response to teacher and stakeholder feedback gathered through a series of stakeholder conversations and meetings from January 2016 through April 2016.

If approved, the local option plan for measurement will be communicated to all stakeholders electronically and in face-to-face meetings between teachers and Instructional Program Specialists by content area as well as between principals and district leadership during late May and June 2016.