

**Prepared Notes for Board Meeting –
March 26, 2012
Marc A. Schare –
614 791-0067
marc9@aol.com**

Tonight, I have two updates. Let us begin with a “Race to the Top” committee update as work continues in its major areas. In particular, the implementation of the “Common Core” and in the area of teacher evaluations.

With regard to teacher evaluations, as you know, HB153 requires that 50% of a teacher’s evaluation framework include measures of student growth which I think we all assumed would be “value add” - thus begging the question – what about those subjects for which tests are not given. ODE has now defined a rubric. There will be three categories of student growth component. The first is, indeed, testing data, otherwise known as “Teacher-Level Value Added Data”. The rules say that if the data is available, it must be used, either as a single year report or a two or three year rolling average, however, it does not have to be used for the entire 50% - it can be used for as little as 10%.

The second type of value-add data comes from “Vendor Assessments”. Once again, we must use this if it is available and have it count anywhere from 10% up to the entire 50% of the student growth component of the evaluation. ODE must approve the vendor assessment and maintain a list of vendor assessments. The example given in the ODE documentation for a vendor assessment would be the Stanford 10 test for 7th grade social studies. If the test is given in Worthington, we must use the results to evaluate 7th grade social studies teachers, but we have discretion as to whether the results count as 10% or up to 50%.

The third type of value-add data comes from us – locally developed criteria that is used either for those situations where a standardized test is unavailable or undesirable or, even if such tests are available, for up to 40% of the evaluation. We could choose to use locally developed assessments, performance-based assessments, portfolios and so forth as a basis for teacher evaluation. The model also addresses another vexing question related to evaluations – how do you deal with the fact that teaching is often referred to as a team activity. Here, the district is allowed to define a shared attribution model utilizing, perhaps, a composite value-add score or a building performance index, and use that composite for up to 40% of the maximum 50% part of the evaluation that goes to student growth. The other 50% will consist of supervisory evaluation, communication skills, learning environment etc..

To sum this up, it appears that local districts will get a tremendous amount of discretion in determining the best way to evaluate teachers, but parts of the model remain unacceptably prescriptive. For example, no matter how good your principal says you are, if your students are not exceeding that years worth of growth for a years worth of time, , the highest rating you can achieve is “Proficient” and that “Accomplished” rating will

remain elusive to you. At some point, that may be appropriate, but in my opinion, I'd want to have a bit faith in the testing apparatus endemic with common core before making that leap. Time will tell.

For my second update, I went to an ODE presentation that spoke to the conditions that led Ohio to adopt the common core and what we might expect once the implementation begins. The speaker, Michael Sawyer, did not pull any punches. He said that the current system asks too little of our students and has not kept up with a changing world. The most interesting part of this particular presentation was the discussion of the new online assessment from the PARCC consortium. ODE's current projection is that the percentage of students that are rated as "proficient" are going to drop like a rock the first year the PARCC assessments are used. Indeed, the simulation in the presentation indicated that while under the current system, 80% of third graders across the state are deemed proficient in third grade reading, under the new system, only 35% would be deemed proficient. In tenth grade math, those numbers are 83% with the current system and 25% with the new system. This is scary stuff, but only if we're not prepared, and from what I've seen, we will be more than prepared in Worthington when Common Core and PARCC assessments come.

One anecdote from the presentation. Apparently, the PARCC assessments, since they will be done online, will be scored immediately. Even the extended response questions will be scored immediately by artificial intelligence.

The bottom line to tonight's update is this. The rate of change in K-12 education in Ohio is faster than at any time in decades. Formative assessment, common core, new evaluations, new report cards, stronger and newer standards and on and on. I am proud that Worthington is leading in many of these efforts. We are participating in pilots, our ODE Race to the Top consultant said we are doing more than just about anyone else in his territory, we are piloting different evaluation techniques with the support of the WEA, we are updating our data systems to support these efforts and doing all this while still performing, day in and day out, in the classroom and we are doing it with fewer administrators than surrounding districts. It is enthralling just watching this district tackle these new challenges.