Race to the Top
Progress Update – January 2012 Monthly Call

Directions: In preparation for monthly calls, a State must provide responses to the questions in Part A for their overall plan, and responses to the questions in Part B for ***two*** application sub-criterion.

Part A: *In preparation for monthly calls, States must provide information that addresses the three questions below on the implementation of all aspects of its approved scope of work. This may include a written response. If your State already has a state-specific system to report on its progress, please work with your program officer to determine the best method of providing this information for your State.*

1. What were the State's key accomplishments and challenges this past month?

   Accomplishments

   - Consolidated project schedules for years 2, 3, and 4 will be submitted to USDE by January 30, 2012
   - Identified outcomes and content for Priority Schools' Academy
   - Remaining modules for EEA follow-up were sent to LEAs on January 24. 2012
   - Identified and resolved impediments to increasing Breakthrough Center support to Baltimore City Public Schools. Project managers are now meeting with many principals to discuss interventions
   - Investigated *Indistar* as a tool to support principals in turnaround schools. Will be shared with selected Executive Officers
   - Hired education specialist for leadership who will provide ongoing support to principals in Breakthrough Center schools
   - Completed the Facilitation Guide for Discussion of Maryland Charter School Quality Standards Implementation to accompany the Quality Standards Implementation Guide
   - Approved proposal and awarded grant to Baltimore City Public Schools for incentive compensation to teachers and principals in lowest 5% schools
   - Approved proposal and awarded grant to Kent County Public Schools for compensation incentives to teachers in shortage areas
   - Notice of grant awards sent to 16 LEAs for incentives to teachers who obtain ESOL certification
   - Project 2 - Formative assessments: Content for assessment for learning in development; assessment for learning portal in development; content management system procurement in progress that will store teacher assessment for learning tools and templates
   - Project 11 – Infrastructure: Test environment installation completed. Designing production environment for business intelligence platform and procurements initiated for remaining infrastructure components
   - Project 27 – Dashboards: Four of twelve, Year 2, dashboards in development
   - Project 28 - Multimedia: Two multi-media modules for OBIEE training purchased and being installed for online user acceptance testing. Procurement for LEA LDS data coaching services initiated
   - Project 29 - LEA Grants: LEA technology infrastructure grant program initiatied with request for proposals

- Projects 32-35: Adaptive Testing & Item Bank: Requirements being written for system procurements; LEA collaboration team initiated to help select systems
- Project 46-MSA Vertical Alignment: This project is completed. Final recommendations from the National Psychometric Council provided to MSDE
- Projects 47/48-Educator Effectiveness and growth: State educator effectiveness and growth computation defined; selecting teacher performance rating method and data collection tools and administrator professional performance rating method and tools for state system
- Project 60–Data Exchange: Selection of master file transfer tool completed and procurement initiated; data dictionary installed and being tested.
- Project 61– P20 and Higher Ed data warehouses: data map and gap competed for 4 of 15 policy questions completed and data mart schema designs initiated; higher education data warehouse schema development initiated
- Project 79 –Statewide Transcript: revised rollout method to accelerate LEA implementation of system; 4 of 24 LEAs implementing system at present
- RFP for two STEM online high school courses in Cybersecurity and Environmental Science are under review by DoIT. Selected second set of online high school STEM courses for next RFP.
- Local school systems are implementing professional development opportunities for teachers and supervisors to review and analyze pre-assessment data as well as post-assessment data for the Foundations of Technology Course.
- Drafted a Request For Information (RFI) under procurement review. This will provide visibility into existing content management and delivery system products.
- A draft quality control review protocol has been produced along with several sample rubrics to be used in judging the quality of Professional Development offerings to be added to the portal
- Hardware Infrastructure strategy has been finalized for procuring hardware and supporting the applications. Required server specifications will be developed from the results of the Learning Management System vendor analysis of vendors

<u>Challenges</u>

- Project 47/48 - Educator effectiveness and student growth system has challenges in designing measures for non-tested courses, effectively linking teachers to student performance, and for creating a transitions process moving from state tests to PARCC tests.
- As a result of our meeting with leadership in Baltimore City, some of the program managers associated with the Breakthrough Center are now directly involved with schools; however, providing support for leadership development continues to be a challenge. To date, there has been no response to our inquiries to identify needs and plan collaboratively to respond to those needs.

2. Is the State on track to meet the goals and timelines associated with the activities outlined in its approved scope of work? If not, what strategies is the State employing in order to meet its goals?

   Yes, we are on track to meet our timelines and goals

3. How can the Department help the State meet its goals?

   Your approval of the amendments provided the support we needed. Thank you!

Race to the Top
Progress Update – Monthly Call

Part B: *In preparation for monthly calls, States must submit written responses to the following questions for **two** application sub-criteria (e.g. (A)(2) and (D)(4)).* [1] *All responses in this section should be tailored to the goals and projects associated with this sub-criterion.*

Application sub-criterion: (D)(2)

STATE's goals for this sub-criterion:

- Develop statewide Student Growth Measure for statewide educator evaluations
- Expand the Educator Information System

Relevant projects:

28/27 Develop and Implement a Statistical Model to Measure Student Growth
29/48 Develop and Implement an Educator Evaluation System
30/49 Expand Educator Information System to Accommodate Additional Data

1. What is the extent of the State's progress toward meeting the goals and performance measures and implementing the activities that are included in its approved scope of work for this sub-criterion?
2. What methods, tools, and processes is the State using to determine the progress toward the goals and performance measures and the quality of implementation of the activities described for this application sub-criterion?
3. What is the State's assessment of its quality of implementation to date?
4. If the State is not on track to meet the goals, performance measures, timelines and quality of implementation related to this sub-criterion as outlined in its approved scope of work, why not, and what strategies is the State employing in order to meet goals and performance measures?
5. What are the obstacles and/or risks that could impact the State's ability to meet its goals and performance measures related to this sub-criterion?

Rather than respond in the aggregate to the questions above, the answers to each of the questions are provided below in the narratives for each project

Project 28/47: Develop and Implement a Statistical Model to Measure Student Growth

This project supports Maryland educational reform initiatives by developing and implementing a student growth model so student performance outcome measures may be used in educator effectiveness evaluations. This project assessed the strengths and limitations of various value-added growth models in Year 1. In the current year, Year 2, the SEA team has tested the

[1] On each monthly call, program officers and states should work together to select two sub-criteria for the following month.

Colorado growth model as a key student growth measure and distributed the data to seven LEAs for use in a no-fault teacher effectiveness pilot. Based on preliminary direction of the LEA pilots, MSDE is consolidating the best practices of the LEAs in order to develop a multi-component state student growth measurement system.

The following has been accomplished:

- Preparation of initial requirements document for student growth index method.
- Design of approach using value matrices for non-tested areas to create student growth index
- Design of state level computation for the combined local plus state multi-component growth measure
- Installation of the Colorado system with associated data structures to capture and store student growth percentile data from the system and process of student data for grades 3-8 from years 2007-2011
- Development of proof-of-concept dashboards showing aggregation and drill down dis-aggregation of growth data from the state to LEA to school to subgroups
- Completion of system technical architecture to productionalize the system and integration of the data with teacher effectiveness data to create a single teacher effectiveness measure
- Initiation of assessment of short-comings with Colorado models and identification of solutions to improve the measure with the National Psychometric Council
- Initiation of new procurement for psychometric consulting support to facilitate the development of a full student growth measurement system

The project is currently on track to achieve the development and testing in year 2 as outlined in the grant scope of work. At this time MSDE has a variety of external consultants that are participating in the review of its models and approaches, and no additional help is required.

The greatest challenge has been the LEA-SEA-Union collaborative effort via the Governors Council to develop acceptable teacher and student growth measurements. Other key challenges faced by the project are:

- The fidelity of the student growth computation with non-vertically aligned tests
- Finding substitute measures to measure high school growth in the absence of yearly summative tests
- Finding measures that are meaningful for student growth for non-summative tested courses
- Finding measures that are meaningful for early childhood growth
- Linking reliability the student growth for a subject and academic year to a teacher

- Transitioning from state summative tests to PARCC tests and finding how to produce growth measures during the transition time
- Developing alignment between the state growth measures and LEAs growth measures
- Developing student growth use policies and practices that ensure proper use of data

Through on-going dialogue we are working through these issues.

Project 29/48: Develop and Implement an Educator Evaluation System

This project develops and implements an educator evaluation system that allows LEAs that do not have a system, to implement a system of fair evaluations that use student performance measures and professional performance measures for administrators and teachers. Year 2 activities include identifying the best administrator and teacher performance measurement practices, tools and methods in Maryland LEAs, procure an educator effectiveness system, and initiate a pilot it in one or more LEAs.

The following has been accomplished:

- Survey of LEAs for teacher evaluation tools and procedures
- Preparation of strategy and initial requirements document for educator effectiveness measures and a system
- Creation of LEA collaboration team to review and participate in the selection of administrator and teacher effectiveness tools and methods
- Design of state level computation system to combine local plus state multi-component educator effectiveness measures with student growth measures
- Design of a portfolio method for teachers and initiation of a single-LEA pilot
- Matrix that shows the initial identification of administrator rating tools and procedures, teacher rating tools and procedures, and training packages that can meet state LEA needs

The project is currently on track to achieve the selection and procurement of administrator and teacher effectiveness measurement tools and procedures. At this time MSDE, has a variety of LEA collaboration partners and external consultants that are participating in the review of its models and approaches, and no additional help is required.

The greatest challenge has been the delay in the project as various stakeholder groups seek to identify acceptable approaches to educator effectiveness measures. Through on-going dialogue among and between MSDE, LEAs, and the teachers' unions via the Governor's Council, we are working through these issues. Having the MSDE educator effectiveness systems team working in parallel with to Governors Council has allowed the team to remain on time and anticipate acceptable solutions to rapidly procure and initiate a pilot.

Project 30/49: Expand Educator Information System to Accommodate Additional Data

The RTTT EIS Expansion project System Boundary Document and all other Planning Phase SDLC artifacts have been completed. The project is currently in the design phase. The hardware infrastructure configuration has been defined, which will enable the procurement of the hardware for the expansion. A meeting was held earlier in January with the Maryland Department of Public Safety and Correctional Services (DPSCS) to plan the details of the hardware infrastructure implementation. Procurement of hardware and software would begin in February. Additionally, a demonstration of the features and functionality of the Microsoft Dynamics CRM 2011 was conducted by Avanade, a Microsoft CRM approved vendor. This aided in the determination of further requirements needed for the enhancement of the system. MSDE submitted a TORFP to the Department of Information Technology (DoIT) to procure consulting services to support the EIS Expansion and hiring of key staff is in progress. A Senior IT Specialist has been selected and will begin work in February. The Maryland State Department of Education has completed an amendment for the Expansion of the Educator Information System project.

One of the measures of progress is the review and approval of System Development Lifecycle (SDLC) by DoIT Oversight. The project has also been promoted to the Post Implementation Review (PIR) phase. The project is also tracked diligently through weekly meetings, monthly status updates, and the project schedules.

The Department of Information Technology is responsible for reviewing the artifacts produced by the project and ensures that the artifacts meets or exceeds their expectation. The DOIT oversight committee has given approval for the project to move forward. The project is currently on track.

The expedient hiring of key resources to support the continued technical development is a unique risk to Project 49 and the TORFP has enabled MSDE to bridge the gap between the short-term RFRs and complete staffing RFPs.

Interim Report to the Maryland Council for Educator Effectiveness (please see Attachment A)

Evaluation: Based on the responses to the previous question, evaluate the State's performance and progress to date for this sub-criterion (choose one)

Red (1) Orange (2) Yellow (3) Green (4)[2]

Paperwork Reduction Act Statement

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless such collection displays a valid OMB control number. Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 74 hours (annually) per response, including time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. The obligation to respond to this collection is required to obtain or retain benefit (34 CFR 75.720, 75.730-732; 34 CFR 80.40 and 80.41). Send comments regarding the burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to the U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Ave., SW, Washington, DC 20210-4537 or email ICDocketMgr@ed.gov and reference the OMB Control Number 1894-0011.

[2] Red – substantially off-track and/or has significant quality concerns; urgent and decisive action is required; Orange –off-track and/or there are quality concerns; many aspects require significant attention; Yellow –generally on-track and of high or good quality; only a few aspects require additional attention; Green – on-track with high quality.

Attachment A

INTERIM REPORT TO THE MARYLAND COUNCIL FOR EDUCATOR EFFECTIVENESS

December 15, 2011

Prepared for the Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE)

by Richard J. Wenning on behalf of the Race to the Top (RTTT) Technical Assistance Network

The contents of this interim report are based on unstructured and structured interviews and meetings with pilot district staff and MSDE staff. While this report captures a snapshot of progress to date, it is not a complete evaluation of the efficacy of the pilot process. A properly designed formal evaluation of the pilot phase would be necessary to obtain that perspective.

I. PURPOSES AND USES OF EDUCATOR EFFECTIVENESS SYSTEMS

Educator effectiveness systems are asked to serve both public accountability and internal improvement purposes. Accordingly, they need to furnish information that is useful to support both annual evaluative judgments and inquiry into patterns of performance and practice to support improvement and professional development. Coherent systems balance these purposes and ensure strong support for the capacity of schools to manage their own performance. Each pilot district expressed a clear intent to use their system for instructional improvement, professional development, and attracting and retaining effective teachers. Some districts are considering how their systems might be used for compensation and tenure decisions.

II. DESIGNING EDUCATOR EFFECTIVENESS SYSTEMS

The development of coherent, useful and reliable educator effectiveness systems requires consideration of professional values and judgments, sound technical design, and political support. This is complex work with only an emerging national knowledge base. Well-conceived pilot phases are valuable both for initial design and initial implementation.

At present, Maryland's pilot districts are primarily at an early discovery and exploration stage in their design of systems that are consistent with the Council's initial recommendations for a statewide educator evaluation system. For example, there is greater focus on what measures to use and exploration of their properties than on how best to use them. Testing scenarios for their use will be a key next step in the pilot process.

III. EDUCATOR EFFECTIVENESS SYSTEM COMPONENTS & CURRENT STATUS OF PILOT ACTIVITIES

Pilot districts were asked to describe the status of the design and implementation of their educator effectiveness systems across a variety of dimensions. A summary of their perspectives and insights appears below.

1. Categories of Effectiveness for Educators

The number of categories of effectiveness for differentiating educator evaluations is a fundamental matter for the design and implementation of educator effectiveness systems. This choice has implications for (1) the kind of feedback provided to educators, (2) the ability of districts to differentiate support and interventions, (3) the specifications for cut-scores for all measures and how they are combined to support overall determinations, (4) incentives for evaluators, (5) and overall perceptions of credibility. Concerns about widespread national use of dichotomous (unsatisfactory/satisfactory) ratings, where nearly all teachers tended to be evaluated as satisfactory, were an important catalyst for reform of teacher evaluation systems.

Maryland's RTTT plan specifies three categories of effectiveness: highly effective, effective, and ineffective. This produces a system with one kind of "unsatisfactory" rating and two kinds of "satisfactory" ratings. Several districts raised concerns about this and recommended that the state move to a four-category system that also corresponds to the number of categories used in their professional practice rubrics. For example, the Danielson's Framework uses four categories. Some districts are nevertheless using four categories locally for their pilots and considering how to re-categorize their information for state reporting purposes into three. The four-category approaches generally add a "developing" or "approaching" category between ineffective and effective, thus eliminating a middle category and providing balanced differentiation that also aligns with observational rubrics.

2. Qualitative Measures of Educator Effectiveness: Local Education Agency (LEA) Measures of Professional Practice

Each of the pilot districts is developing qualitative measures consistent with recommendations of the Council in their interim report. The Council recommended that four domains be used for teachers (planning and preparation, classroom environment, instruction, and professional responsibilities) and any other measures chosen by the LEA and approved by MSDE. For

principals, the Maryland Instructional Leadership Framework is to be used together with any other metrics chosen by the LEA, subject to approval by MSDE.

Observations of Teaching and Leadership

Among all of the measures involved in the pilot process, districts expressed the most confidence in their progress to date with their frameworks for evaluating professional practice, particularly through observations. Most of the pilot districts are using or adapting the Danielson's Framework as their primary criteria for evaluating professional practice. Several districts already have extensive experience in its use. At least one district has developed its own framework that is, according to district staff, closely aligned to the Danielson framework.

Districts expressed an interest in assistance in identifying models or best practices for testing and monitoring the inter-rater reliability of school leaders using the frameworks to observe and rate teachers on their professional practice. They also noted that efforts to establish quantifiable criteria and weighting of the different elements of professional practice were at a very early stage and an area of desired technical assistance.

Regarding the evaluation of principals, pilot districts reported being at an earlier stage than that for teachers. Two districts reported being at a relatively more advanced stage but others did not anticipate making much progress on the design of principal evaluation systems during this school year. At the beginning of the pilot process, the districts decided to focus on the teacher evaluation component because the use of assessment scores for principals was a more common practice.

Other Tools such as Student Surveys

The use of student perception surveys to inform evidence of professional practice is gaining interest nationally. Perhaps most prominently, the Measures of Effective Practice (MET) study, sponsored by the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation includes use of a student perception survey known as Tripod. Several pilot districts expressed an interest in using such surveys or have already chosen to include them in their systems. These districts expressed an interest in learning about best practices in the use of surveys and greater insight into the activities of the MET study. MSDE does not plan to produce a statewide student survey. Since the Council's framework includes an LEA option, pilots and other LEAs are able to include these surveys if they reach mutual agreement with their bargaining agents.

3. Quantitative Measures of Educator Effectiveness: LEA and State Growth Measures

Each of the pilot districts is developing quantitative measures consistent with recommendations of the Council in its interim report. For the determination of the rating for LEA growth measures (20 percent), the Council recommended that the measures that serve as the basis for the

evaluation is chosen *"by the LEA from a menu of available options. The LEA follows guidelines determined by the LEA and approved by MSDE" (p.14).*

For the determination of the rating for statewide growth measures (30 percent), the Council recommended that the LEA select *"measures from the list of multiple measures with one requirement: if a statewide assessment exists the LEA must select it as one of the multiple measures between two points in time (p.15)."*

According to the Council's interim report, *"[t]he two measures of student growth (State and Local) must be combined in a ratio of 3 to 2 for State Growth to LEA Growth. Maintaining the 3 to 2 ratio, LEAs must decide the Overall Student Growth Measure (p.15)."*

Maryland School Assessment (MSA) and High School Assessment (HSA) are available as statewide measures. Since the Council recommended multiple measures for the State's student growth portion, guidance has been given by MSDE to allow local assessments to count as a part of the State 30 percent portion.

Local Growth Measures: Subjects Untested Statewide

Each of the pilot districts saw a great challenge in determining how to measure student academic growth in "untested" subjects – subjects not assessed on a statewide basis. This was consistently the area that districts expressed the greatest concerns about their pilot activities and desired additional support and guidance and opportunities to collaborate with other pilot districts.

The pilot districts are generally using the pilot phase as an opportunity to explore with teachers the growth measures for untested subjects they find most useful. One respondent noted that they are engaging teachers to find out what assessments for student growth they use in their classrooms, and develop measures informed by that perspective. Collaboration in this area was often cited as a strength of the pilot process.

In considering the use of different local measures, districts indicated that they were grappling with tradeoffs related to validity, reliability, fairness, usefulness, and potential unintended consequences. One respondent noted that "*the policy is way out in front of the research on this issue*," characterizing the sentiments of a number of local and national respondents.

Some measures under consideration were originally designed for diagnostic and formative purposes and some districts were deliberating over how and whether to use them as part of a summative body of evidence for evaluating educator effectiveness. A number of districts were examining Student Learning Objectives (SLOs) as a means for integrating the use of multiple measures in a manner strongly connected to teaching and learning.

One concern raised by some districts was that consultants encouraged or discouraged them to use certain measures, rather than how to best use measures they were interested in. This occurred in the area of Student Learning Objectives and student grades.

State Growth Measures: Statewide Tested Subjects

For statewide growth measures, the Council's interim report recommended that the LEA select from a list of multiple measures with the requirement that if a statewide assessment exists, the LEA must select it as one of the multiple measures (p.15).

Maryland has not yet officially adopted an approach for measuring student growth for grades and subjects in which assessments are administered on a statewide basis. The current pilot is being used to inform this work. However, MSDE has calculated and furnished a measure of student academic growth on statewide assessments to districts for use in the pilot phase. This measure is calculated using a growth model known as Student Growth Percentiles (SGP) or The Colorado Growth Model. It has been adopted for statewide use by 12 states with another 8, including Maryland, considering adoption.

A student growth percentile (SGP) defines how much growth a student made relative to other students with an equivalent achievement history ("academic peers"). An SGP of 60, for example, indicates the student grew as well or better than 60 percent of his/her academic peers. The median SGP is used to describe the growth rates of groups of students. By controlling for students' starting points, the SGP statistical model provides an "apples to apples" comparison of student growth rates, one in which students with high or low beginning achievement status can also show high or low growth. This model can also be used to determine how much growth a student or group of students needs to make to reach a desired achievement level in a specified amount of time.

Each pilot district is exploring the use of SGPs and has indicated that they plan to use them in their evaluation systems. At least one district has also developed a different value-added model and is examining the respective merits of each approach to measuring student growth. However, each district also expressed a strong interest in receiving technical assistance in the appropriate use of SGPs and how to establish cut points for different categories of effectiveness. Some pilots expressed misunderstandings or confusion about the properties of SGPs. Several districts expressed an interest in using SGPs for district-developed assessments, which would require tests of sufficient quality and a large enough number of students tested at each grade.

Several districts also expressed a desire to incorporate other student performance data (e.g. attendance, suspensions, graduation rates) in teacher evaluations, but were uncertain about how to go about it. One approach that was of interest is the use of a multi-measure institutional accountability framework for annual determinations of schoolwide performance. Advantages of such an approach include promoting coherence and consistency in measures used for institutional

and teacher and principal evaluations. Such frameworks are being proposed by a number of states currently seeking Federal waivers through the U.S. Secretary of Education's ESEA Flexibility Initiative.

4. Attribution of Responsibility for Student Outcomes.

States and districts across the country are considering several approaches for making attribution decisions that connect student outcomes to individual or groups of teachers. Pilot districts were generally focused on attributing the outcomes of students assigned to a single "teacher of record" for a specific subject or course they were responsible for teaching. To promote collaboration and ownership of broader patterns of student outcomes, several pilot districts were also considering how to attribute the outcomes of students associated with a team of teachers or associated with school wide performance.

A key policy and design consideration is establishing a consistent definition of teacher of record, which establishes when a teacher "owns" all or a portion of a student's results. None of the pilot districts had completed their work in this area and the topic is one that may benefit from assistance and consistency.

5. Assembling the Evidence: Determination of the Overall Evaluation

To assemble evidence from multiple measures and arrive at an overall determination of effectiveness, school districts and states around the country are considering at least three approaches:

- **Decision matrix**, in which a panel of components is arrayed with professional practice on one axis and student academic growth on the other and decision rules are used to determine which component trumps another to produce a rating.
- **Compensatory index**, in which components are combined to produce a single score and where a low score in one area can be compensated for by a high score in another area.
- **Conjunctive decisions**, in which a minimum threshold for a rating on each component is required, for example to reach a judgment of effective.

The Council's interim report and MSDE require that a teacher or principal must be effective in the student growth component to receive an overall rating of effective or highly effective. This implies integration of one feature of a decision matrix, such as that recommended by the Council in its interim report (p. 17).

All of the pilot districts are considering how they might approach determinations of the overall rating but none have determined how to do this. Several stated that they intend to use a compensatory index. Most expressed a desire to ensure appropriate professional judgment on the part of principals in determining the final rating of effectiveness. Several districts also expressed a desire for technical assistance on testing different approaches before making a final decision.

6. Evaluation Cycles & Differentiation

The expectation of annual evaluations for teachers presents a challenge to school and district capacity and Maryland's pilot districts recognize this challenge. Each pilot district expressed an interest in finding an approach to differentiate the elements of annual evaluations so they could allocate staff time to providing greater scrutiny and targeted support to novice and less-effective teachers than to experienced teachers with a track record of demonstrated effectiveness.

Differentiation considerations included the number of observations per year for different teachers and the use of data reviews in lieu of observations for teachers with a strong track record. Several districts also expressed a desire to use multi-year accumulations of evidence as part of a differentiated system, for example combining student outcomes over multiple years in analyzing academic growth.

7. System Research, Development, and Evaluation

The pilot districts and MSDE recognize the complexity of the design work they have undertaken. Each pilot district was involved in efforts to collect the perspectives of participating teachers and principals about the use of different measures.

Pilots described highly variable capacity to evaluate measures and conduct necessary data analyses, including testing scenarios involving multiple measures, establishing cut points and weights, as well as combining measures into overall determinations. Pilots consistently expressed an interest in technical assistance related to the analytics required for their design efforts and look forward to opportunities to collaborate with other pilot districts. MSDE is cognizant of the requests for technical assistance and is working to address them.