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ABSTRACT

There were three Ohio research efforts about Student Growth Measures (SGM) for Teacher and Principal Evaluations: 1) extended testing for previously non-tested subjects and grades, 2) relationship between the teacher and principal evaluation systems/implementation plans, and 3) an empirical study of Local Education Agencies’ (LEA) year-end evaluation data from 2013. In 2011-2012 Ohio offered a 2 year mini-grant to LEAs agreeing to administer extended testing for Value-Added measures (VAM) in grades and content areas not represented in the Ohio Achievement Assessment (OAA). The mini-grant allowed the state to create testing pools sufficient to produce teacher level VAMs. American College Testing (ACT), End of Course (EOC), Terra Nova, MAPs, and/or Star assessments were administered. The two year study of a sample of 23 funded LEAs has provided findings for the local and national discussions about student growth measures and teacher/principal evaluations. At the same time Ohio completed a case study for a sample of 21 LEAs about the relationship between OTES/OPES implementation. And finally, 21 LEA’s final 2013 teacher and principal evaluation data were analyzed for general trends.

BACKGROUND

The Ohio Principal Evaluation System (OPES) comprises principal performance based on the Ohio principal standards and SGMs. The Ohio Teacher Evaluation System (OTES) model also comprises two components: teacher performance rubric based on a state developed rubric and SGMs. Not every grade/subject in Ohio receives value-added measures (VAM). Ohio’s preferred measure of student growth. To this end, LEAs are allowed to use state approved vendor measures and teacher developed Student Learning Objectives (SLOs) as portions of SGMs in OPES and OTES if VAMs are not available or do not represent a teachers full teaching load. The Ohio approved vendors agreed to provide EVAAS VAM scores in Fall, 2013 and 2014 for mini grant participants.

METHODS

The 23 LEA visits yielded 58 transcripts of interviews and focus groups. Audio files were transcribed verbatim for analysis. Nvivo is the software package of choice for the qualitative analysis. Themes and codes from the transcribed interviews were used to respond to each of the four research areas. The conceptual framework for the analysis is sociocultural theory which recognizes that K-12 school participants’ feedback regarding extended testing and the new evaluation system simultaneously include the personal, interpersonal, and institutional (ODE/LEA) planes.

RESULTS

1. What were the challenges and successes for teacher buy-in and implementation of extended testing?
2. What are the issues regarding linking students to the teacher of record for VAM?
3. How are VAM data used in OTES/OPES?
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CONCLUSIONS

Teachers were concerned about the extended testing being aligned to their curriculum, the lack of student motivation to perform well on the extended tests, and the amount of instructional time lost during testing. Some teachers like roster verification but others are concerned that the distribution of instructional assignment is unfair. Teachers recommend keeping track of the amount of time students are in the class throughout the year. Teachers use the extended testing for tracking and grouping students for intervention. Although they like the idea of accountability in their evaluation, they do not think OTES is fair.

The qualitative data will be incorporated with quantitative data for further analysis at the completion of the two year study.

SUGGESTIONS

1. OTES/OPES implementation needs to be tailored to fit the school’s needs and culture.
2. Teacher buy-in needs to be a priority in the implementation process.
3. Inconsistent state trainings for SLOs need to be addressed.
4. Teachers need to be provided with the necessary resources and support to effectively implement extended testing.

CONCLUSION

This research effort provided valuable insights about the implementation and impact of extended testing and teacher/principal evaluations. The findings can be used to inform future research and policy decisions.

REFERENCES

- American College Testing
- End of Course (EOC)
- Terra Nova
- MAPs
- Star assessments
- EVAAS
- Nvivo
- Sociocultural theory