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# **Case Study**

The following educational case study describes the collaboration between Wayne RESA, the intermediate school district of Wayne County, Michigan, and the South Redford School District’s effort to adopt and implement Wayne RESA’s guidance document in order to measure student growth for the purpose of teacher evaluations.

# **About Wayne RESA**

Wayne RESA is a regional educational service agency that provides a broad spectrum of services and support to Wayne County's 32 school districts aimed at improving student achievement and maximizing economies of scale in staff development, purchasing, and administrative services. Services range from curriculum consulting and staff development, helping districts maximize technology use in the classroom, software applications for district student and administrative services, group purchasing and more.

Wayne RESA also provides state-mandated functions including pupil accounting and special education monitoring and compliance. Wayne RESA is the largest regional educational service agency in Michigan and among the largest in the nation.

# **About South Redford**

The South Redford School District is located in metropolitan Detroit, Michigan and educates 3,300 students within one high school, one middle school, four elementary schools (a gifted and talented program within the middle school and high school), early childhood center and an online school. Of these 3,300 students, 74% are African American, 3% Hispanic, 6% two or more races, 16% white and 66% economically disadvantaged. The district has 190 staff members.

# **Introduction**

Michigan Public Act 103 requires that all public school teachers are evaluated using one of four approved evaluation models: The Danielson Model, Thoughtful Classroom, 5-Dimensions, and the Marzano Model. Included with the evaluation models is a student growth component consisting of local and state data. Prior to this case study, beginning in the 2018-19 school year, the growth indicators were to increase from 25% to 40%. For teachers in grades 4-8 in math and ELA this would include 20% state-mandated assessments such as the M-STEP and PSAT, and the other 20% could consist of either locally developed or commercially available assessments. Teachers in other grades and subject areas would use 40% of the locally developed or commercially available assessments since state data is not available. After the case study, the growth indicators remained at 25% for the 2018-19 school year and were scheduled to increase to 40% in 2019-20.

Recently, the Michigan Department of Education (MDE) provided guidance around student growth in the Student Learning Objective (SLO) model and released Student Growth Percentile (SGP) data for M-STEP growth. The prior year, the MDE had not provided guidance surrounding the most effective ways by which a school district should select, or rollout, student growth measures for the purpose of educator evaluation. To address this limitation, in 2015, Wayne RESA developed a multi-faceted student growth guidance document that would fill this missing piece: [***Measuring Student Growth: A Practical Guide to Educator Evaluation***](https://www.resa.net/curriculum/educator-evaluation/). Wayne RESAinvited school districts to receive professional development and to select the most appropriate growth model tailored to their individual needs.

# **Methods**

The South Redford School District leadership team consisting of the superintendent, Brian Galdes, all building principals, the Student Services Director, the Assistant Superintendent of Human Resources, and the District Data Coordinator, met with assessment consultants from Wayne RESA in the summer of 2017. During this initial meeting, an outline was generated which identified the purpose and aims of the collaboration and a working time line was established. Superintendent Galdes voiced his full support of this collaboration that included protected release time for district leadership as well as release time for soon to be identified classroom teacher participants. The classroom teacher participants comprised of four teams representing every school building and level: elementary, middle school, high school and special education/specials.

The 2017-18 academic calendar included monthly protected meeting times, with at least one meeting including two assessment consultants from Wayne RESA. South Redford provided substitute teachers for the teacher leaders and scheduled meeting times for building principals later in the afternoon in order to minimize disruptions.

To respect the differences and the different levels, South Redford selected teacher teams in the following ways:

* Elementary: Selected by principals to represent each building and each grade level
* Middle School: Departments selected a representative based on interest
* High School: Principal selected department heads
* Special Ed/Specials: Selected by principals in conjunction with Student Services Director

# 

# **Organizational Leadership Team**

**CORE LEADERSHIP TEAM:**

* Superintendent
* Assistant Superintendent for Human Resources
* District Data Coordinator
* ISD Assessment Consultants (3)
* High School Principal
* Middle School Principal
* Elementary Principals (4)
* Student Services Director (Special Education)

**SECTIONAL LEADERSHIP TEAM:**

* High School Team
* Middle School Team
* Elementary Team
* Special Education/Specials Team

# **Logic Model for South Redford Schools**

A logic model was created to support the district-wide rollout:

**LONG-TERM OUTCOMES**

* All South Redford teachers and administrators throughout the district have established fair and transparent methods for measuring student growth

**INTERMEDIATE OUTCOMES**

* Teacher teams and administrators are able to measure student growth using the ISD’s guidance document
* Teacher teams choose a growth model and create a guidance document for teachers
* Committee members take responsibility for the district-wide roll-out

**INITIAL OUTCOMES**

* Teacher teams and administrators are knowledgeable in measuring student growth

**OUTPUT**

* Teacher teams and administrators attend the training series and receive instruction in learning how to measure student growth through the guidance document

**ACTIVITIES**

* Four district-wide planning teams are formed and a timeline is generated
* Teacher leaders are identified

**INPUTS**

* South Redford School District and Wayne RESA provide the guidance document learning materials and online resources

# **Instruments**

The theoretical support for this major undertaking was based upon the guidance established by Wayne RESA: ***Measuring Student Growth: A Practical Guide to Educator Evaluation***. This guidance document was created by a countywide multidisciplinary team of educators and administrators whose intent was to provide several methods whereby a district may be able to measure student growth for the purposes of conducting evaluations. This project culminated into six modules including: 1) Growth Models; 2) Developing and Selecting Assessments of Student Growth for Use in Teacher Evaluation Systems; 3) Measuring Student Growth: A Step-by-Step Process to Analyzing your Data; 4) Standard Setting for Student Growth; 5) Student Learning Objectives: A Measure of Educator Effectiveness; and 6) Formative Assessment. These modules were evidence-based and included scholarly citations. They were essentially void of subjectivity and opinions. All six modules were also digitalized and placed on Wayne RESA’s web page as a traditional pdf. The online modules include hands-on activities with numerous complementary Google documents.

# **Time Line**

The district-wide leadership team met with Wayne RESA consultants for the initial planning meeting in October. Superintendent, Assistant Superintendent for Human Resources and District Data Coordinator provided goals, vision, direction and a promise of administrative support with principal buy-in.

The specific implementation timeline followed the guidance document modules:

| **October** | **December** | **January** | **February** | **March** | **May** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Initial planning meeting with administration | Teacher teams studied the “Why” and Section 1 (Growth Models) of Wayne RESA guidance document | Teacher teams studied Section 2  (Developing and Selecting Assessments) of Wayne RESA guidance document | Teacher teams studied Section 3 (Measuring Student Growth) of Wayne RESA guidance document | Teacher teams studied Section 4 (Standard Setting) and 5 (SLO’s) of Wayne RESA guidance document | Teacher teams created a guidance document for teachers |

# 

# **Monthly Agenda Topics**

**December**

* Introductions
* Law
* The why?
* Hopes and Fears
* Studied various growth models

**January**

* Assessment Inventory
* Pros/Cons of various growth models
* Used local data within the growth models
* Ranked and eliminated models that would not be used

**February**

* Studied growth models that were chosen as feasible options:
  + SLO
  + Simple Growth
  + Growth to Proficiency
* Used local data to analyze growth models

**March**

* Narrowed focus of growth models
* Introduction of State growth data – M-STEP SGP
* SLO
* Started creation of district guidance document

**May**

* Finalized district guidance documents
* Teacher teams met and reported out recommendations and findings to staff at their level
* Recommendation of summer think time; to be revisited in the fall
* Collective commitment to revisit at end of each semester
* Sent out a teacher survey to all staff

# **Sample District Guidance Document – High School**

## **Thurston High School Student Growth Data for Teacher Evaluation**

### **PLAN**

* The State of Michigan increased the percentage that student growth data must contribute to teacher evaluation from 25% to 40% to take effect in the 2018-2019 school year.
* South Redford School District selected a committee of teachers representing each department to create a plan for using student growth data in teacher evaluation. The Student Growth Committee included Department Heads.
* The committee met 4 times throughout the 2017-18 school year. The plan includes the following components for using student growth data in teacher evaluation to be implemented at the start of the 2018-2019 school year.

### **DO**

* A common high leverage/high transferable skill prompt will be administered – Department Dashboard Link:
  + For year-long courses – administered at beginning of Semester 1, during Semester 1 exams, and during Semester 2 exams
  + For semester-long courses – administered at beginning of semester and during semester exams
* A common grade level or course rubric will be used for scoring – Department Dashboard Link
* Scoring will be corroborated during Professional Learning Community (PLC) time
* Data will be entered into DnA – Assessment Name Link
* The **Growth to Proficiency Model** will be used for determining adequate growth:
  + Students meet the criteria if either:
    - They are proficient at the end of the semester or year
    - They are not proficient, but grew one level on the rubric
  + The number meeting either criteria will be divided by the total number of students to determine the Percent Met Criteria
* The Pivot Table Report in DnA will be used for the Percent Met Criteria
* Student growth data will be used in the following rubric for Grades 9 – 12:

| **Component** | **Highly Effective** | **Effective** | **Minimally Effective** | **Ineffective** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Observation 60% | Danielson Distinguished | Danielson Proficient | Danielson Basic | Danielson Unsatisfactory |
| Local Data 40% (Percent Met Criteria) | 86-100% | 70-85% | 33-69% | 0-32% |

Turn in mid-year data. Administrator will use as a reference for final evaluation.

### **STUDY**

* The Student Growth Committee and administrators will progress monitor the plan during the 2018-2019 school year

### **ACT**

* The plan will be modified for the 2019-2020 school year if needed

# **Growth Models Presented to Teacher Teams Using District Data**

# **Middle School**

## ***The What***

The middle school working group reviewed the [*Growth Model Summary*](https://www.resa.net/curriculum/educator-evaluation/) found on pages 22-23. This summary included six of the most popular growth models employed by educators.

## ***The Why***

The six growth models were then examined in order to identify and document the strengths and weaknesses associated with each model. Specifically, the working group documented their critique on a large data wall. Next, by consensus, two models were eliminated: the *Performance Index Model* and the *Student Learning Objective Model*. Four models were chosen for additional sub-analysis: *Simple Growth Model*, *Student Growth Percentiles*, *Growth to Proficiency*, and the *Improvement Model*. The four models were simulated using two to three years of real-live, archived, middle school, student assessment data. This approach controlled for potential bias. After careful consideration, discussion, debate and consensus, it was determined that the ***Student Growth Percentiles*** was the most appropriate model to adopt. The following data illustrates this process:

## ***Middle School Data in 4 Models***

### **1. Simple Growth Model**

Paired *t*-test (copy data from Excel into columns) – page 59

Find mean, standard deviation and number of students from paired *t*-test

Input M, SD and N to calculate effect size (page 62)

Effect size = effectiveness label (standard setting)

### **Table 3.11 – Effect Size Rubric (page 63)**

|  | **Highly Effective** | **Effective** | **Minimally Effective** | **Ineffective** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Effect Size** | > 0.80 | 0.33 – 0.79 | 0.20 – 0.32 | < 0.20 |

### **2. Student Growth Percentiles (SGP) Model**

Take fall 2016 data and use the filter to organize from smallest to lowest

Look for cohorts - what do you notice?

Statistically unable to calculate SGP due to the small sample size and not having cohorts.

STAR – SGP built into the reports

| **SGP Range** | **Interpretation** |
| --- | --- |
| 0-25 | Ineffective |
| 26-50 | Minimally Effective |
| 51-75 | Effective |
| 76-99 | Highly Effective |

| **Student ID** | **SGP** |
| --- | --- |
| Student 1 | 39 |
| Student 2 | 74 |
| Student 3 | 77 |
| Student 4 | 70 |
| Student 5 | 34 |
| Student 6 | 39 |
| Student 7 | 36 |
| Student 8 | 61 |
| Student 9 | 73 |

Mean = 55.8

Median = 61 (34, 36, 39, 39, 61, 70, 73, 74, 77)

### **3. Growth to Proficiency Model**

Determine growth targets for each student based on test history

Look for change from fall 2016 to spring 2017

How many are proficient or met their growth target?

Class goal is determined based on standard setting

# **Table 1.6 – Growth to Proficiency Model (page 18)**

| **Student** | **This Year’s Grade 4 Score** | **This Year’s Grade 4 Score** | **Change** | **Was the student’s score proficient?** | **What is the student’s growth target?** | **Did non-proficient students hit growth targets?** | **Did the student meet criteria?** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Student A | 350 | 400 | +50 | Yes | - | - | Yes |
| Student B | 370 | 415 | +45 | Yes | - | - | Yes |
| Student C | 380 | 415 | +35 | Yes | - | - | Yes |
| Student D | 325 | 390 | +65 | No | 59 | Yes | Yes |
| Student E | 310 | 370 | +60 | No | 64 | No | No |

Class Goal: Goal = 75% of students will meet criteria. And 80% met the goal.

Standard setting determined the goal.

# **STAR Reading Proficiency by grade level:**

6th grade fall = 626 🡪 6th grade spring = 698

7th grade fall = 713 🡪 7th grade spring = 806

8th grade fall = 847 🡪 8th grade spring = 908

| **Grade 6**  **Student** | **Fall 2016** | **Spring 2017** | **Change** | **Is the student proficient?** | **Growth target for non-proficient students** | **Did non-proficient students meet growth goal?** | **Did the student meet criteria?** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Student A | 646 | 729 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Student B | 761 | 817 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Student C | 807 | 799 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Student D | 451 | 638 | - | - | 155 | - | - |
| Student E | 458 | 605 | - | - | 150 | - | - |

Class Goal = 75% proficient or met growth target

| **Effect Size** | **Interpretation** |
| --- | --- |
| 0-32% | Ineffective |
| 33-74% | Minimally Effective |
| 75-85% | Effective |
| 86-100% | Highly Effective |

# **STAR Reading Proficiency by grade level:**

6th grade spring = 698

7th grade spring = 806

8th grade spring = 908

| **Achievement Level** | **Spring 2016** | **Spring 2017** | **Change or Growth** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Percent Proficient 6th Grade | 41% | - | - |

| **Percent Proficient** | **Interpretation** |
| --- | --- |
| 0-0.9% | Ineffective |
| 1-2% | Minimally Effective |
| 3-4% | Effective |
| ≥ 5% | Highly Effective |

\*Standard setting

# **4. Improvement Model**

Compares % proficient from year to year (snapshot - not a cohort of students)

# **Table 1.1 – Example of Summary Cut Scores from Individual Participants (page 13)**

| **Achievement Level** | **Last Year’s Grade 4** | **This Year’s Grade 4** | **Change or “Growth”** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Percent Proficient | 55% | 60% | +5% |

# **Growth Models Presented to Teacher Teams Using District Data**

## **Elementary**

### ***The What***

The elementary working group reviewed the [*Growth Model Summary*](https://www.resa.net/curriculum/educator-evaluation/) found on pages 22-23. This summary included six of the most popular growth models employed by educators.

### ***The Why***

Similar to the middle school working group, the six growth models were examined in order to identify and document the strengths and weaknesses associated with each model. Specifically, the working group documented their critique on a large data wall. Next, by consensus, three models were eliminated for further consideration: the *Performance Index Model,* the *Simple Growth Model*, and the *Improvement Model*. Three models were chosen for additional sub-analysis: *Simple Growth Model*, *Student Growth Percentiles*, and the *Growth to Proficiency Model*. These three models were simulated using two to three years of real-live, archived elementary student assessment data. This approach controlled for potential bias. After careful consideration, discussion, debate and consensus, it was determined that the ***Student Growth Percentiles*** would be used with state summative data and the ***Student Learning Objectives Model*** would be used with local student assessment data. The following data illustrates this process:

## ***Elementary School Data in 3 Models***

### **1. Simple Growth Model**

Paired *t*-test (copy data from Excel into columns) – page 59

Find mean, standard deviation and number of students from paired *t*-test

Input M, SD and N to calculate effect size – page 62

Effect size = effectiveness label (standard setting)

# **Table 3.11 – Effect Size Rubric (page 63)**

|  | **Highly Effective** | **Effective** | **Minimally Effective** | **Ineffective** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Effect Size** | > 0.80 | 0.33 – 0.79 | 0.20 – 0.32 | < 0.20 |

### **2. Student Growth Percentiles (SGP) Model**

Take fall 2016 data and use the filter to organize from smallest to lowest

Look for cohorts - what do you notice?

Statistically unable to calculate SGP due to the small sample size and not having cohorts.

SRI – SGP not built into the reports.

| **SGP Range** | **Interpretation** |
| --- | --- |
| 0-25 | Ineffective |
| 26-50 | Minimally Effective |
| 51-75 | Effective |
| 76-99 | Highly Effective |

| **Student ID** | **SGP** |
| --- | --- |
| Student 1 | 39 |
| Student 2 | 74 |
| Student 3 | 77 |
| Student 4 | 70 |
| Student 5 | 34 |
| Student 6 | 39 |
| Student 7 | 36 |
| Student 8 | 61 |
| Student 9 | 73 |

Mean = 55.8

Median = 61 (34, 36, 39, 39, 61, 70, 73, 74, 77)

### **3. Growth to Proficiency Model**

Determine growth targets for each student based on test history

Look for change from fall 2016 to spring 2017

How many are proficient or met their growth target?

Class goal is determined based on standard setting

# **Table 1.6 – Growth to Proficiency Model (page 18)**

| **Student** | **This Year’s Grade 4 Score** | **This Year’s Grade 4 Score** | **Change** | **Was the student’s score proficient?** | **What is the student’s growth target?** | **Did non-proficient students hit growth targets?** | **Did the student meet criteria?** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Student A | 350 | 400 | +50 | Yes | - | - | Yes |
| Student B | 370 | 415 | +45 | Yes | - | - | Yes |
| Student C | 380 | 415 | +35 | Yes | - | - | Yes |
| Student D | 325 | 390 | +65 | No | 59 | Yes | Yes |
| Student E | 310 | 370 | +60 | No | 64 | No | No |

Class Goal: Goal = 75% of students will meet criteria. And 80% met the goal.

Standard setting determined the goal.

**SRI Reading Proficiency by grade level:**

* 2nd grade Fall = 400
* 2nd grade End of Year = 534
* 3rd grade Fall = 535
* 3rd grade End of Year = 644
* 4th grade Fall = 645
* 4th grade End of Year = 749
* 5th grade Fall = 750
* 5th grade End of Year = 839

| **Grade 3**  **Student** | **Fall 2016** | **Spring 2017** | **Change** | **Is the student proficient?** | **Growth target for non-proficient students** | **Did non-proficient students meet growth goal?** | **Did the student meet criteria?** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Student A | 168 | 467 | - | - | 235 | - | - |
| Student B | 466 | 642 | - | - | 85 | - | - |
| Student C | 754 | 833 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Student D | 499 | 598 | - | - | 70 | - | - |
| Student E | 230 | 345 | - | - | 205 | - | - |

Class Goal = 75% proficient or met growth target

| **Percent Proficient** | **Interpretation** |
| --- | --- |
| 0-32% | Ineffective |
| 33-74% | Minimally Effective |
| 75-85% | Effective |
| 86-100% | Highly Effective |

### **Adopted Growth Models Agreed Upon by Consensus (April 2018)**

|  |  | **Elementary** | **Middle School Language Arts/Math** | **Middle School Science/ Social Studies** | **High School** | **Specials/**  **Special Ed** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Local Data** | **Growth Model** | *Student Learning Objective (SLO)* | *Student Growth Percentile (SGP)*  with NWEA’s Conditional Growth Percentile | *Student Growth Percentile (SGP)*  with NWEA’s Reading Conditional Growth Percentile | *Growth to Proficiency*  with High Leverage, High Transferable Skill | *Student Learning Objective (SLO)* |
| **State Data** | **M-STEP** | *SGP*  3-yr. avg. | *SGP*  3-yr. avg. | NA | NA | NA |

**Teacher Survey**

**Survey Purpose** – In order to evaluate if the South Redford School District’s effort to adopt and implement Wayne RESA’s guidance document in order to measure student growth for the purpose of teacher evaluations, a brief, 10-item teacher survey was administered. The following district-wide survey was both anonymous and confidential and there was no way by which to link a completed response back to the responder. The survey will be re-administered in the spring of 2019 in order to determine if perceptions have changed.

**South Redford Teacher Survey Questions May 2018**

1. What best describes your current understanding of the growth model used for the data portion of your 2017-18 educator evaluation?

* Novice
* Developing
* Proficient
* Expert

2. Does South Redford have a clearly communicated plan for using student growth measures as part of your 2017-18 educator evaluation?

* Yes
* No
* Don’t know

3. Have you attended professional development or a staff, grade level, or department meeting to fully understand student growth measures and how it is used in the 2017-18 district evaluation plan?

* Yes
* No

4. I believe that the growth measures we currently use provide me with relevant information that will assist me in making decisions about my instruction.

5 4 3 2 1

Strongly Agree Neither Agree Disagree Strongly

Agree nor Disagree Disagree

5. The student growth measures utilized for my evaluation are fair.

5 4 3 2 1

Strongly Agree Neither Agree Disagree Strongly

Agree nor Disagree Disagree

6. During this school year, how often did you meet with your principal in an educator evaluation coaching conversation?

5 4 3 2 1

Very Often Fairly Often Occasionally Rarely Never

7. During this school year, I received an adequate amount of coaching conversation time with my principal.

5 4 3 2 1

Strongly Agree Neither Agree Disagree Strongly

Agree nor Disagree Disagree

8. During this school year, how often did you meet with your principal to discuss student growth measures?

5 4 3 2 1

Very Often Fairly Often Occasionally Rarely Never

9. How many years have you been teaching in South Redford?

* + 0-3 years
  + 4-5 years
  + 6-10 years
  + 11+ years

10. What level is your staff placement?

* + Elementary school
  + Middle school
  + High school

**Glossary of Definitions**

**Conditional Growth Percentile (CGP):** An NWEA metric that is translated into national percentile rankings for growth.

**Illuminate DnA:** A learning management system that is used by a majority of Wayne County Public Schools.

**Logic Model:** An approach that depicts program theory in a sequence of steps that moves from program services to client outcomes. The model identifies questions that an evaluation could address (Rossi, Lipsey, and Freeman, 2004).

[**Measuring Student Growth: A Practical Guide to Educator Evaluation**](https://www.resa.net/curriculum/educator-evaluation/)

**NWEA MAP:** Measures of Academic Progress. This NWEA computer-adaptive assessment adjusts the difficulty of the test based upon the student’s ability.

**Student Learning Objectives:** An SLO is a measurable, long-term academic goal informed by available data that a teacher or teacher team sets at the beginning of an instructional interval for all students or subgroups of students (p. 75).