Ohio Student Growth Measures (SGM) Policy and Practice Study

IMPORATANCE

The Ohio Student Growth Measures Policy and Practice study is a two-year study investigating early implementation of Student Growth Measures (SGMs) as part of the Ohio Teacher Evaluation System (OTES) and the Ohio Principal Evaluation System (OPES). The study’s purpose is to provide timely data to inform state policy and state and local practice around teacher and principal evaluation during the early stages of deployment of the new evaluation systems.

BACKGROUND

During the 2012-13 academic year, 13 of Ohio’s Local Education Agencies (LEAs) received funds to pilot a locally-developed Student Growth Measure (SGM) plan with state support. The 13 pilot LEAs are the primary informants for this policy and practice study. However, researchers will also analyze all available statewide data from Ohio’s electronic Teacher and Principal Evaluation System (eTPES).

RESEARCH DESIGN

The study employs a mixed method design that spans quantitative analysis of the SGM and performance rating data uploaded to eTPES and qualitative analysis of teacher and principal interviews and teacher surveys in the 13 LEAs piloting SGMs. The study, begun in early 2013 and to be completed in the fall of 2014, is focused on the following research questions:

1. Do teachers of non-tested subjects and grades perceive Value-Added differently than do teachers of tested subjects and grades?
2. What concerns, if any, do teachers express about the fact that while Value-Added is based on the preceding years’ data (as available) LEA Measures will be for the current year?
3. Are LEAs opting for shared attribution measures for teachers and/or principals for example, building or district Value-Added, Performance Index gains, etc.? Why or why not? Does the decision to rely on shared attribution measures vary by LEA type or other factors (for example, ADM, poverty, etc.)?
4. How are value-added results distributed across district-type, socioeconomic/demographic profiles, performance index, etc. of LEAs?
5. How would the distribution of summative teacher and principal ratings change if the relevant weights on Value-Added and Approved Vendor Assessments were recalibrated along the 0-50 percent continuum?
6. How are Approved Vendor Assessment-based SGM ratings distributed across such factors as district-type, socioeconomic/ demographic profiles, performance index, etc. of LEAs? Does this distribution differ from Ohio Achievement Assessment-based SGM ratings?
7. How do teacher-developed Student Learning Objective (SLO) measures correlate with (a) Value-Added, (b) Approved Vendor Assessment Growth measures, (c) “Shared” measures, and (d) each other? Do the SLO data look different for teachers assigned to special education, ESL, or those subjects (art, music) that are more performance based, as compared to those teachers assigned to core academic subjects?
8. Distribution of SLO measured results and relationship to external factors. Is the distribution of student growth as measured by SLO data similar to that of Value-Added and/or Vendor Assessment data for the same school/district?
9. Do the SGM-based ratings of teachers and principals correlate highly with teacher and principal performance standardized ratings?
10. Do these correlations vary according to a teacher’s Value-Added rating? That is, do performance ratings correlate better for teachers with high Value-Added than for teachers with low Value-Added? Do principals’ performance ratings correlate better for principals with high building Value-Added than for principals with low building Value-Added?
11. What is the distribution of summative teacher and principal ratings across the “Accomplished”, “Skilled”, “Developing”, and “Ineffective” categories? Does this distribution vary across LEA-type, grades, subjects, and/or other contextual factors (ADM, poverty, LEP)?

DATA

Researchers acquired the first year of teacher and principal evaluation data available from eTPES in the fall of 2013. Data were available for only 26 LEAs that fully implemented OTES and/or OPES in the 2012-13 academic year. Site visits were conducted...
in all 13 of the SGM pilot LEAs in the fall and winter of the 2013-14 academic year. During the site visits, group interviews of principals and teachers were conducted separately. The teacher group interviews were further divided by SGM category. “Category A” teachers are teachers who receive teacher-level value-added data. “Category B” teachers are those whose SGM rating is determined, at least in part, by the scores from Ohio Department of Education-approved, vendor-developed assessments. “Category C” teachers are those who do not receive value-added data and do not administer any approved vendor assessments. Category C teachers use locally-developed measures such as Student Learning Objectives (SLOs). Category A teachers were interviewed separately. In total, 160 teachers were interviewed, as well as one or more principals in all pilot districts.

An online survey of all teachers in the 13 SGM pilot districts was deployed in February 2014. The survey was designed to collect teacher experience and perception data regarding the use of SGMs in teacher and principal evaluation. No data are yet available from this active survey.

PRELIMINARY FINDINGS

The teacher interviews revealed an understanding of the need to include SGMs in teacher evaluation, but also skepticism and lack of clarity about how SGMs are being implemented as part of OTES. Some specific findings include:

- A perception by teachers that relatively few teachers will be rated in the highest category of “accomplished.”
- A general lack of trust and misunderstanding of Value-Added data.
- Fairness questions based on teacher SGM categories. For example, Category A teachers do not know the Ohio Achievement Assessment items that will determine their value-added rating, while Category C teachers who develop their own SLO also develop or choose their own assessments and know the items in advance.
- A general concern of teachers that they lack control over their SGM rating when students are not motivated to perform, lack family support, are often absent, and difficult to engage in learning.
- Principals’ time is consumed with teacher observation activities, leaving an inadequate amount of time for other building management and instructional leadership responsibilities.
- Teachers are generally receptive to the performance rubric side of OTES and value the targeted feedback and conversations with principals.

Since only 26 LEAs fully implemented OTES and OPES in the 2012-13 academic year, only a small amount of eTPES data were available for Year 1 analysis. These eTPES data indicated:

- Value-Added ratings for teachers are fairly congruent with other evaluation measures.
- The weight placed on Value-Added (weight could range from 10% to all 50% of SGM portion of OTES) seems to be of little consequence in the final summative rating.

### OTES SGM Ratings in 26 LEAS for 2012-2013 Academic Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SGM Category</th>
<th>Below</th>
<th>Expected</th>
<th>Above</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>69.6%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>56.9%</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>1,015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16.6%</td>
<td>69.9%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>1,004</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>1,453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>69.1%</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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