

**Ohio District (DVAS) & Community (CVAS)
Value-Added Specialist Survey**

Anirudh V. S. Ruhil

(Associate Professor)

ruhil@ohio.edu

Marsha S. Lewis

(Assistant Professor)

lewism5@ohio.edu

The Voinovich School of Leadership and Public Affairs

Ohio University

Building 21, The Ridges

Athens, OH 45701

Tel: (740) 597-1949

Fax: (750) 597-3057

June 11, 2009

This page intentionally contains only this sentence.

Acknowledgements

The authors are indebted to the Regional Value-Added Specialists for helping shape the survey instrument, and to *Matt Cohen* and *Chris Wollard* at the Ohio Department of Education, *Joanne Geiler*, *Mary Peters*, and *Mike Thomas* at Battelle for Kids for their invaluable input.

Vladislav Pascal and *Nicole R Yandell* at the Voinovich School oversaw the survey deployment.

This page intentionally contains only this sentence.

Table of Contents

1	Executive Summary	1
2	Introduction	5
3	Survey Findings	9
4	Appendix A: The DVAS/CVAS Survey Instrument	25
5	Appendix B: DVAS Interview Questions	33
6	Appendix C: List of Most Difficult Questions from Teachers and Administrators	37

This page intentionally contains only this sentence.

List of Tables

- 2.1 Response Rates 6
- 3.1 DVAS Training Experience 10
- 3.2 How often do you consult with RVAS? 10
- 3.3 Do all teachers in your district (grades 4-8) have access to VA data through the Ohio EVAAS website? 11
- 3.4 What % of teachers with access have logged into the EVAAS site? 12
- 3.5 When you meet teachers/data teams, how useful are the following Ohio EVAAS reports for guiding school improvement efforts? 12
- 3.6 To what extent do the following factors hinder effective use of value-added Ohio EVAAS data in your district or community school? 14
- 3.7 When you meet teachers/data teams, how useful are the following value-added support resources? 16
- 3.8 How would you rate your district in terms of effectively using VA data? 17
- 3.9 How effective do you feel in your role as an Ohio DVAS? 19
- 3.10 How confident are you in your ability to support interpretation/use of VA? 19
- 3.11 DVAS' Perceptions of District/Individual Effectiveness (by Employee Type) 19
- 3.12 If there was ONE thing that would most help you be more effective as a DVAS, what ONE thing would you choose? 20

Chapter 1

Executive Summary

The 2009 Ohio District Value-Added Specialist (DVAS) Survey was designed to gauge the status of the statewide implementation of Value-Added Analysis (VAA) two years since Ohio EVAAS' inception. Researchers at Ohio University's Voinovich School of Leadership and Public Affairs worked with Battelle for Kids and the Ohio Department of Education staff to develop (a) a survey instrument and (b) a set of structured interview questions for Ohio DVAS and Community School Value-Added Specialists (CVAS). The online survey was in the field from February 2009 through April 2009, and the interviews were conducted in April and May of 2009. All Ohio DVAS and CVAS trained for the statewide implementation of VAA were invited to participate in the survey. While the K-12 district response rate was excellent (63 percent of all K-12 districts contacted had at least one DVAS respond to the survey), the response rate was lower for the CVAS (23 percent [N = 16] of the CVAS contacted responded to the survey).

Personnel serving as DVAS/CVAS

- Thirty-five percent of the respondents were district central office personnel other than the superintendent; 27 percent were principals or assistant principals; 21 percent were teachers; 9 percent were superintendents or assistant superintendents; and the remaining 8 percent served in other capacities such as building-level coaches or consultants.

Training Experiences

- Most respondents (92 percent) reported having participated in regional value-added trainings, while some 65 percent reported having participated in district-organized trainings. Approximately 40 percent indicated they had used self-paced support tools such as the *Understanding and Using Value-Added Analysis Toolkit* to train themselves.
- Approximately three-quarters of the respondents report consulting with their RVAS twice a year or more often, while almost one-third of the respondents indicated that they also consult with other RVAS.

District Access and Use of Value-Added Data

- Respondents were asked about the range of teachers (grades 4 through 8) who had access to value-added data through the Ohio EVAAS website. The majority of respondents (58 percent) indicated that all classroom teachers in grades 4-8 had access to the data.

- DVAS were also asked about the percentage of teachers with access to the data who had actually logged into the Ohio EVAAS website. Only three respondents reported that none of their teachers had logged in to look at the data. Approximately 30 percent of the DVAS responding to this item reported that more than half of the teachers with access to the value-added data had logged in to look at the data.
- DVAS were also asked to rate the usefulness of the various reports available through the EVAAS portal. The reports cited most often for their usefulness included the *Summary Report*, the *Diagnostic Summary Report*, the *School Diagnostic Report*, and the *School Value-Added Report (Mean Gain Approach)*.

Hindrances to the Effective Use of Value-Added Data

- More DVAS ranked the lack of time as a “great” or “moderate” hindrance than any other factor, followed by issues with student-level data, such as lack of data on students who are new to the district and privacy restrictions around student-level data. One in every two respondents ranked teachers’ lack of skills or experience with analyzing data as a great or moderate hindrance.
- A large percentage of DVAS, both in the open-ended survey responses and in the interviews, indicated that the lack of student names on the student-level reports as a critical barrier to effectively using value-added. The survey asked DVAS to indicate whether or not their district had linked the student data contained in the EVAAS reports to individual students. Approximately one-fourth of the respondents indicated that they had a way to link student names to the student-level data, while some 60 percent said they did not have a way to link student names, and 18 percent of the respondents did not know if their district had the means to do this.
- DVAS were asked to describe the types of questions most often asked by teachers and administrators related to value-added. The most frequent questions reported were similar across teachers and administrators and included:
 1. Getting student names in place of SSID numbers;
 2. How value-added is calculated and how valid/reliable it is;
 3. What specifically should be done to improve results; and
 4. How to grow the already high achievers.

Frequently-asked questions from administrators also included how best to use the data with staff.

Effectiveness and Supports

- Approximately 70 percent of the respondents rated their districts as doing a fair or good job in effectively using value-added data. One quarter of the respondents gave their districts a poor rating. The most frequently-cited explanations for fair or poor ratings were inadequate time to work with teachers and with the data, as well as difficulty in understanding the value-added metric.
- More respondents rated the RVAS as very useful when meeting with teachers or data teams about value-added than any other support or materials.

- DVAS were also asked to rate their own effectiveness. While only 39 percent felt moderately or very effective in their role as an Ohio DVAS, 68 percent indicated they were confident in their own abilities to support the interpretation and use of the data.

This page intentionally contains only this sentence.

Chapter 2

Introduction

This study's purpose was to gauge the status of the statewide implementation of Value-Added Analysis (VAA) after two full years of implementation. The main research questions to be addressed by this study were:

1. Are districts using value-added data to inform practice?
2. What is the role of the District Value-Added Specialist (DVAS) or the Community School Value-Added Specialist (CVAS) in the implementation of value-added analysis at this point in the statewide rollout?
3. What conditions and supports seem to make the DVAS role more or less effective?

All Ohio DVAS and CVAS trained for the statewide implementation of VAA comprised the population of interest. The DVAS were chosen because they are trained to be the experts within their districts on VAA and, in turn, should have the most detailed information on if and how their districts are using VAA, what the challenges are, and what ODE and Battelle for Kids can do to support the use of VAA statewide.

It is important to note that approximately one-sixth of the public school districts surveyed also participate in Battelle for Kids' long-running Schools' Online Access to Records (SOAR) program. As a result, some respondents serve both as Ohio and SOAR DVAS/CVAS, and this dual role may bias their responses to survey questions probing familiarity with VAA, confidence in their abilities to work with VAA, etc. While this is unavoidable, note that (a) the survey items are worded to reflect the fact that the context for responses ought to be their work as an Ohio DVAS; and (b) we disaggregate and analyze responses by SOAR status. Finally, the survey instrument was designed to include a few items targeting SOAR districts in order to assess the use of SOAR VAA versus Ohio VAA reports, and likewise a few questions were restricted to CVAS. In addition to the survey data analysis, this study also utilizes information gleaned from structured telephone interviews conducted with seventeen DVAS selected from across the state.

Methodology

Researchers at Ohio University's Voinovich School of Leadership and Public Affairs worked with Battelle for Kids and Ohio Department of Education (ODE) staff to develop a survey instrument and a set of structured interview questions for Ohio DVAS. Once a draft instrument was developed, Ohio University conducted a conference call with selected Regional Value-Added Specialists (RVAS)

from across the state.¹ The purpose of this conference was to sharpen the survey instrument based on feedback received from these RVAS. The finalized survey instruments (as deployed) are listed in Appendices A and B.

Statewide Survey

A web-based survey suite was utilized to conduct the online survey. Paper copies were mailed to six DVAS who indicated that technical difficulties precluded them from completing the online version of the survey. All Ohio DVAS and CVAS comprised the survey population. Battelle for Kids provided the Voinovich School with a database of all Ohio DVAS and CVAS by school district or community school, complete with last known email address. Most Ohio K-12 public school districts had two DVAS trained as part of the statewide rollout of VAA. Some districts chose to send more than two DVAS for training at their own expense. Because all trained DVAS were eligible to participate, districts with more than one DVAS were more likely to respond to the survey invitation than districts with only one DVAS.

The online survey was originally deployed on February 19, 2009 via a personalized email to each Ohio DVAS and CVAS in the database, asking them to access the survey via a link imbedded in the body of the email. There were some email address errors, but almost all were corrected within the first two weeks of deployment. The survey window remained open until April 6, 2009, with four periodic reminders sent via email to non-respondents. In addition to the reminders to DVAS and CVAS from Ohio University, Battelle for Kids sent reminders to RVAS, asking them to encourage DVAS in their region to respond to the survey. ODE also included information on the survey in correspondence to superintendents during the study period, asking them to encourage their DVAS to complete the survey. These reminders were staggered to cover the duration of time the survey was in the field.

Response Rate Overall, 529 individuals completed the Spring 2009 DVAS/CVAS Survey. Response rates are presented separately for K–12 school districts and community schools and are calculated based on both individual DVAS surveyed and K–12 school districts surveyed, as districts may have had more than one DVAS contacted for the survey. Overall, the K–12 district response rate was good (63 percent of all K-12 districts contacted had at least one DVAS respond to the survey), but the CVAS response rate was low (23 percent [$N = 16$] of the CVAS contacted responded to the survey).

Table 2.1: Response Rates

	% Responding
K-12 districts	63%
Individual DVAS	41%
Individual CVAS	23%

Telephone Interviews

In addition to the statewide online survey, researchers conducted one-on-one telephone interviews with 17 District Value-Added Specialists selected randomly from a list of web survey participants

¹In the Ohio statewide VAA model, the RVAS are trained by Battelle for Kids to train the Ohio DVAS and provide ongoing technical support as school districts utilize VAA

and stratified by district type (urban, suburban, rural) and SOAR/non-SOAR status. The interviews were conducted during April and May of 2009. The structured interview questions (Appendix B) were designed to elicit additional detail on the use of value-added data in districts and the role of the DVAS, including challenges to and support for effective district use of VAA.

This page intentionally contains only this sentence.

Chapter 3

Survey Findings

DVAS' Role and Training

The respondents were asked to indicate how many years they had been in the role of Ohio DVAS and whether they had been in that role from the beginning of the district's participation in VAA or if they had replaced someone else. The average number of years respondents indicated they had served as Ohio DVAS was 2.7 years, with 84 percent indicating they had been an Ohio DVAS for two or three years. Eleven percent indicated they had been an Ohio DVAS for four or more years. Only 9 percent of the respondents indicated they had taken over the role of DVAS from someone else, indicating continuity of the Ohio DVAS role at this point in the statewide rollout.

Personnel Servings as DVAS

Thirty-five percent of respondents were district central office personnel other than the superintendent – for example, curriculum coordinators, special services directors, and so forth; 27 percent were principals or assistant principals; 21 percent were teachers; 9 percent were superintendents or assistant superintendents; and the remaining 8 percent served other roles such as building-level coaches or consultants. If average daily membership (ADM) is taken as the measure of district size, small districts (with enrollment between 70 and 1,281) were more likely to have a teacher serving as the DVAS while in large districts (with enrollment between 2,384 and 52,894) the DVAS was more likely to be a district-level administrator. Medium size districts (enrollment between 1,282 and 2,376) appear to gravitate towards principals/assistant principals as DVAS.

DVAS' Training Experience

Table 3.1 outlines respondents' self-reported training for their role as DVAS. Most respondents reported participation in regional and district-specific training opportunities, and approximately 40 percent described using self-paced support tools such as the Understanding and Using Value-Added Analysis Toolkit to teach themselves. Only one respondent listed being self-taught as her only training experience while two respondents indicated no training whatsoever. Other training resources mentioned by the DVAS/CVAS included additional training offered by Educational Service Centers, additional Battelle for Kids'-sponsored offerings, and training as part of postgraduate study or teaching college courses. Table 3.2 displays the frequency of consultation with the Regional Value-Added Specialist that the DVAS reported working with most often. Approximately three-quarters of the respondents report consulting with their RVAS twice a year or more often, and almost one-third of the respondents indicated they also consult with other RVAS.

Table 3.1: DVAS Training Experience

Training	Frequency	Percent
Participated in Regional Trainings	489	91.9
Participated in District-Organized VA PD	343	64.5
Self-Taught	207	38.9
Participated in National VA Conf	119	22.4
Other Types of Trainings	26	4.9
Participated in No Trainings	2	0.4

Table 3.2: How often do you consult with RVAS?

	Frequency	Percent
Never	142	28
Weekly	9	2
2–3 times per month	28	6
Once a month	42	8
Once every three months	132	26
Once every six months	154	30

Interview Responses Regarding DVAS Role

Most of the 17 DVAS who participated in the telephone interviews describe their role as evolving. Initially, DVAS see their role as training staff and over time being able to help staff engage, interpret, and use the data to inform practice.

When [we] first started three years ago, we presented grades three through five. We met one evening. We showed teachers and administrators what it was ... we were raw on how to use it ... Last school year, on the report card, more training occurred.

This year, we just began looking at what it was and what it does. Our hope is to really develop the system to improve student learning and to really make growth a focus.

When first rolled out, I was the person who went to the elementary and middle school staff about what it was and why it was important. Then I followed-up annually. This year, we broke down by grade level to look at individual students.

About half of the DVAS report meeting with both administrative and building-level data teams. About a quarter meet only with administrative teams, and the other quarter do not have formal data teams. Most of the DVAS feel confident in their role with the majority having held the position of DVAS for three years. Answering questions and assisting with data interpretation is a key role for DVAS. For example, a frequently asked question one DVAS mentioned is:

What am I looking at? How do I understand what I am looking at? Probably them understanding the whole piece of the standard deviation and looking at those charts and trying to understand the number and then clicking on the number and what exactly does this mean.

Some DVAS are trying to build trust with the data, “How do you know that it is not just the kids?” Among the more difficult or challenging issues is “people are just trying to work their way around data to disprove it and not want to believe it. Those questions that are always leading towards an evaluation component – will this be my evaluation and you can see people’s insecurities with that.” Another DVAS describes a district’s evolution in engaging the data:

This year we broke [the data] down by grade level to look at individual students [We asked] why teachers are doing well and what practices they are using to learn best practices. [We are] sensitive about [looking at individual teachers], but we talk about practices to help share.

District Access and Use of Value-Added Data

Respondents were asked about the range of teachers (grades 4 through 8) who had access to value-added data through the Ohio EVAAS website. The majority of respondents indicated that all classroom teachers in grades 4-8 had access to the data.

Table 3.3: Do all teachers in your district (grades 4-8) have access to VA data through the Ohio EVAAS website?

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	297	58
No	214	42
Total	511	100
IF NO, what % have access to VA data?		
	Frequency	Percent
None	4	8
1%–25%	5	10
26%–50%	1	2
51%–75%	7	14
76%–100%	24	47
Don’t know	10	20

Note that, of the 214 respondents who answered “no” to the item asking if all teachers have access, only 51 responded to the follow-up item asking them to report the percentage who have access.

DVAS were also asked about the percentage of teachers with access to the data who had actually logged into the Ohio EVAAS website. Only three respondents reported that none of their teachers had logged in to look at the data. One fourth of the respondents reported a small percentage (1–25%) had. One third of the respondents did not know the percentage of teachers who had logged in.

DVAS’/CVAS’ Perspectives on Usefulness of EVAAS Reports

The survey included detailed questions probing DVAS perceptions on the utility of various value-added reports available through the Ohio EVAAS web portal. Table 3.5 summarizes the respondents’ perceptions of the utility of various EVAAS reports.

Table 3.4: What % of teachers with access have logged into the EVAAS site?

	Frequency	Percent
None	3	1
1%-25%	76	26
26%-50%	36	12
51%-75%	34	12
76%-100%	51	17
Don't know	92	32

Table 3.5: When you meet teachers/data teams, how useful are the following Ohio EVAAS reports for guiding school improvement efforts?

	Don't know what this is	Not Used	Not Useful	Somewhat	Very	Total
Feeder Pattern Reports	118	172	46	94	37	467
Other custom reports prepared by you or other district staff	28	213	13	98	65	417
Diagnostic Student List	16	97	45	165	149	472
Student Projection Report	9	112	59	185	112	477
Custom Student Reports	7	145	36	163	124	475
Summary Reports	5	40	7	213	216	481
Student Report	3	100	49	185	133	470
School Value-Added Report (Mean Gain Approach)	3	53	15	195	211	477
School Performance Diagnostic	3	52	26	198	196	475
District Performance Diagnostic Reports	3	46	22	202	195	468
Diagnostic Summary Reports	3	45	8	192	231	479
School Diagnostic Report	2	43	12	173	247	477

A relatively large proportion of DVAS reported not using the student-level reports, likely due to difficulties in identifying individual students by name. The survey asked DVAS to indicate whether or not their district had linked the student data contained in the EVAAS reports to individual students. Approximately one-fourth of the respondents indicated that they had a way to link student names to the student-level data, approximately 60 percent said they did not have a way to link student names, and 18 percent of the respondents did not know if their district had the means to do this.

SOAR Districts' Use of Ohio EVAAS and SOAR Reports

DVAS from SOAR districts were asked which value-added data source their district used more for school improvement purposes. Forty-seven percent of the DVAS from SOAR districts indicate that the district relied more on the SOAR value-added data, and 39 percent indicated using both SOAR and Ohio EVAAS data in equal proportions. Those that indicated using SOAR reports more cited reasons such as the availability of student names as well as more grade levels and content areas. Those who used both equally indicated that, although they prefer the SOAR reports because of familiarity and availability of student names, they realize that the EVAAS reports are impacting their district rating so it is important to pay attention to both. The accountability factor was cited most by those who said they use the Ohio EVAAS reports more often.

Hindrances to the Effective Use of Value-Added Data

When asked to indicate whether certain factors hinder the effective use of value-added data, more DVAS ranked lack of time as a great or moderate hindrance than any other factor, followed by issues with student-level data, such as lack of data on students new to the district and privacy restrictions around student-level data (see Table 3.6). One in every two respondents ranked teachers' lack of skills or experience with analyzing data as a great or moderate hindrance, while a smaller proportion also pointed towards the lack of building-level staff skilled in data analysis and interpretation as a hindrance.

Questions from Teachers and Administrators

Approximately 90 percent of respondents indicated that either principals or teachers had asked them questions about value-added data in the current academic year, while roughly 70 percent reported that district-level administrators had asked them value-added questions this year. DVAS were asked to indicate the "most frequently-asked" and the "most difficult" questions regarding value-added data from teachers and from administrators. The most often-cited topics were similar between teachers and administrators and included:

1. getting student names in place of SSID numbers;
2. how value-added is calculated and how valid/reliable it is;
3. what specifically should be done to improve results; and
4. how to grow the already high achievers.

Frequently-asked questions from administrators also included how best to use the data with staff. Appendix C includes detailed examples of the questions DVAS receive from teachers and administrators, respectively.

Table 3.6: To what extent do the following factors hinder effective use of value-added Ohio EVAAS data in your district or community school?

	Great	Moderate	Slight	Not a hindrance	Total
Insufficient time to examine and interpret results carefully	206	124	93	49	472
Student privacy restrictions on ability to share data with others	156	88	91	135	470
Teachers' lack of skills or experience with analyzing data	76	159	171	65	471
Lack of data on students who are new to the school district	75	137	146	109	467
Lack of building-level staff skilled in data analysis and interpretation	72	125	160	112	469
The number of students in a given grade or subject or subgroup is too small for data analysis	58	78	142	193	471
Lack of central office staff skilled in data analysis	53	85	102	232	472
Lack of information dissemination (from central office) to buildings	42	63	113	253	471
Lack of guidance, training, or support to use value-added	41	93	141	197	472
Lack of support from the superintendent and district offices	39	36	65	329	469
Quality of training offered to schools	35	73	141	217	466
Difficult-to-understand reports or displays of results	33	120	178	140	471
Insufficient technology (e.g., computers, software)	20	54	90	303	467

Interview Responses Regarding Use of Data

Districts participating in the telephone interviews vary in their use of value-added data with all of the SOAR and some non-SOAR districts describing some engagement at the teacher level (about half of all districts interviewed). However, districts differ in terms of using the data to inform practices:

Mostly what we are doing right now is training teachers to understand what it is that they are looking at . . . for them to understand the standard deviations, and all these different things, there is definitely some learning curve there.

Right now, I would call us in the beginning stage. We look at it, and kind of go over why is it working in one class and not in another and to try to figure that out.

We are using value-added to see the overall patterns at grade levels and whether we have holes in curriculum at various grade levels.

When we get value-added data, we look at the predictions and ask how we have done. We look at subgroups to see where we are directing our instruction. Where are we most successful with instruction? Then we start to think, what are we doing for kids at the top? Why are we showing gains? What about kids at the bottom?

In our math department we found that they were missing some of the standards because they were misinterpreting what one of the standards was. They changed that and our score went up a lot, like 15 points or something.

One large school district notes the use of value-added varies within their district by principal. This DVAS reports some principals do not even look at value-added data while others “are so good at it themselves and their teachers are so good at it, they can go through it themselves.” One district participates in an annual county-wide data analysis day with many other school districts. At the county-wide meeting, all subject teachers for a particular grade get together, look at the OAT data, and drill down to the test questions. They look at benchmarks and discuss which districts did well and compare practices.

Less engaged districts report a reluctance to invest too much time in value-added data and some are unsure how to convince administrators or principals of its value. DVAS with new superintendents or principals express optimism that they will engage value-added data more. One DVAS believes it will take time for administrators to use data to inform instructional practice:

Well, it’s fairly new, and it’s hard to get people to change. It’s also hard because data collection is new to educators. It’s a hard transition to make, and they really have to be a part of it to support their staff. And I think that the building admin role changing is going to take a little time to be an instructional leader instead of a management kind of thing.

Most DVAS see the potential for additional uses: “I really don’t think we are using it nearly as well as we need to. We use it in a general way in analyzing curriculum.” On the other hand, several DVAS say administrators and teachers feel they are “drowning in data.” One DVAS says, “Over the last 3 years, especially, we have seen an increase in the number of resources that provide OAT data— it starts to become very cumbersome when you have multiple resources.” Another DVAS

says, “I don’t think we lack support . . . we are wallowing in so much data, we require more time to discuss, respond and retool to be able to work with data. We don’t have time to work with students.” Finally, one DVAS notes, “. . . now the big push from the ESC is the Ohio Improvement Process. There are so many things that have been passed down. I don’t think people are even thinking about value-added.” Two DVAS suggested consolidating state reporting into one web site (e.g., add value-added to the Success page.) Three of the SOAR districts use SOAR data more than the state’s because more information is available to them. The other two SOAR districts say they use both for different purposes.

DVAS Effectiveness and Supports

Table 3.7 summarizes the responses related to the usefulness of various resources for DVAS in their work with school personnel regarding value-added. The two toolkits were ranked as somewhat or very useful by the largest proportion of respondents, followed by the value-added information on ODE’s website.

Table 3.7: When you meet teachers/data teams, how useful are the following value-added support resources?

	Don’t know what this is	Not used	Not useful	Somewhat	Very	Total
Value-Added Portal provided by BFK	36	147	16	167	107	473
Understanding Value-Added Analysis & Ohio’s Accountability System Toolkit (distributed statewide to superintendents and principals in August 2008)	24	126	11	231	88	480
Ohio Department of Education Website (public value-added information on: www.ode.state.oh.us)	6	104	47	236	86	479
Your Regional Value-Added Specialist (RVAS)	4	176	8	108	180	476
Online value-added courses via Ohio Learn (formally called the Value-Added Learning Network)	4	262	16	151	45	478
Understanding & Using Value-Added Analysis Toolkit (distributed statewide to DVAS in 2006-2007)	2	54	12	262	145	475

DVAS Rating of District and Self-Efficacy with Value-Added Data

Several survey items asked DVAS to rate the district’s effectiveness in using value-added, as well as their own confidence in supporting the use of value-added and their effectiveness in their role as an Ohio DVAS. Approximately 70 percent of the respondents rated their districts as doing a fair or good job in effectively using value-added data. One quarter gave their districts a poor rating.

Table 3.8: How would you rate your district in terms of effectively using VA data?

	Frequency	Percent
Poor	114	25
Fair	211	46
Good	111	24
Excellent	18	4

When asked to briefly explain why they gave their district or community school the rating indicated in Table 3.8, those who rated their district's use as good or excellent included comments such as:

We have looked at it as a building and District. We have tried to use the data to change instruction to ensure that all students receive a better value for their education.

It is shared with the teachers and aggregated by classroom and subgroup.

Value-added scores have become just as important as the percentage of students scoring in the proficient, accelerated, and advanced ranges. The scores are used as criteria for placement in advanced/accelerated courses.

We have reviewed the data for classes as a whole, for students as individuals, and then looked for patterns that may impact those scores, i.e. instruction.

We got on board at the beginning for training and have administrators who are trained also.

We have done some regrouping with students based on the data and have met once a month for the past three months for discussion of it.

We use the data to help us define our yearly curriculum and improvement plans.

It is used for professional development and for the teachers to see what still needs to be addressed.

The most frequently-cited explanations for fair or poor ratings concerned time to work with teachers and with the data, as well as the difficulty in understanding the value-added metric. For those who rated their district or community school fair or poor in terms of effectively using value-added data, explanations included:

Without knowledge of the students in the subgroups it is difficult for staff to use the data to help students. Time is the limiting factor to determining the students who are in the sub groups.

With two in-service days and three waiver days available to us we have only so much time. Then the state sends new info mandating training in child abuse by the end of March, and they sucked out what little time we set aside.

With the change of superintendent - we have not taken the time to look at our value added data.

When training is done, people are very interested but the data is just confusing enough that when they go back to it, I think there is a lack of confidence in knowing what each report means. I think that teachers feel so overwhelmed by all their responsibilities.

We've really tried; it's just too abstract and disconnected from teacher's daily practice (curriculum and instruction)

Nobody can answer what the data means. We all know how to read the charts, but how does this data impact instruction? What are schools doing? It is difficult at this point because the VA data is only for grades 4 and up. What about early intervention?

We use the information well, but the subjects (Reading and Math) that are affected are a minority. This data only applies to Reading and Math teachers.

Very little attention is given to value added from top down.

We need to make the value-added data central to our improvement efforts. While we do investigate and attempt to use the data, it is often secondary to passage percentages and grade-card ratings.

We need better training, and we need access to people who have spent a great deal of time with value-added data and processes to come in and train our staff.

Big process - few trained.

We just haven't made the time to revisit it regularly in order to gain benefit from the data because of all of the other initiatives. We have spent a great deal of time working with the data on the Success website.

Very few teachers in the district actually know what Value Added is about. Even fewer understand what Value Added means. The District level personnel have not informed the classroom teachers about Value Added.

At the end of our DVAS training we were giving training on an effective way to have teachers look at data and develop plans around what they discover. It was very good and very rushed, but I believe it is the most important part of the training.

The survey contained two related items asking DVAS to rate their effectiveness in their role as DVAS and confidence in their ability to support the use of value-added. The pattern of responses was slightly different for the two items. While only 39 percent felt moderately or very effective in their role as an Ohio DVAS, 68 percent indicated they were confident in their own abilities to support the interpretation and use of the data. The fact that more than two-thirds of the respondents felt confident in their skills is a positive reflection on the training up to this point. The structural hindrances described by DVAS, including time, teachers' lack of skills and experience with data, and student privacy restrictions may drive effectiveness no matter how confident a DVAS feels in his or her abilities.

Table 3.9: How effective do you feel in your role as an Ohio DVAS?

	Frequency	Percent
Not at all	78	17
Somewhat	195	43
Moderately	142	31
Very	38	8

Table 3.10: How confident are you in your ability to support interpretation/use of VA?

	Frequency	Percent
Not at all	15	3
Somewhat	131	29
Moderately	178	40
Very	126	28

Table 3.11: DVAS' Perceptions of District/Individual Effectiveness (by Employee Type)

	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent
DVAS' rating of District/Community School effectiveness using value-added data				
Teacher	30%	45%	23%	2%
District Personnel	23%	46%	26%	5%
Principal/Asst. Principal	25%	48%	24%	3%
DVAS' rating of their own effectiveness				
	Not at all	Somewhat	Moderately	Very
Teacher	27%	39%	29%	5%
District	11%	45%	33%	11%
Principal/Asst. Principal	18%	45%	30%	7%
DVAS' confidence in their ability to support value-added use				
	Not at all	Somewhat	Moderately	Very
Teacher	7%	36%	33%	24%
District	1%	25%	40%	34%
Principal/Asst. Princ.	6%	31%	45%	19%

Examining effectiveness and confidence ratings by employee type, a slightly lower percentage of teachers think their district is effectively using value added, and a lower percentage rank themselves as effective and confident (see Table 3.11).

When asked to choose one thing that would be the most helpful to their effectiveness as a DVAS, the clear choice was time, with close to half of the respondents choosing that support, followed by “other,” (17%) more knowledge of value-added data (13%), and more buy-in from teachers (12%).

Table 3.12: If there was ONE thing that would most help you be more effective as a DVAS, what ONE thing would you choose?

	Frequency	Percent
More time to work with teachers and administrators	208	47
Other	75	17
More knowledge of value-added data	57	13
More buy-in from teachers about the value of data to inform instruction	55	12
More buy-in from principals about the value of data to inform instruction	29	7
More support from your district administration	15	3
More support from your RVAS	7	2

DVAS who chose “other” in response to the question about supports were asked to describe the specific support. Examples of other supports that DVAS reported would help them be more effective included:

Names of students, time to interpret and use the data to help develop plans. Not having to be a full-time teacher and DVAS as well. Time to interpret and use-help develop plans and incorporate into the OIP process.

Early availability of data (August).

More refresher courses. If I don’t meet and discuss it, I forget a lot.

Understanding the differences in some of the state vs. SOAR reports. For example, how 95 percent of the state was below expected growth in 5th grade reading and how over 70 percent of the state is above expected growth in 8th grade math.

More knowledgeable RVAS who are closer geographically.

District support with principal expectations to implement at the building level; buy in from the superintendent.

More paraprofessionals and staffing to reform the structure for instruction and intervention. It is not the VA measure that is the problem. It is the fact that we can’t impact all kids under the 100-year-old model of whole class instruction. Being able to manipulate the data in Excel, download to incorporate in other reports.

DVAS Understanding of Impact of Value-Added on District Rating

The DVAS survey assessed DVAS self-reported confidence and efficacy with value-added data. No interpretation items were included. However, one item offered some information on DVAS understanding of the impact of value-added on the district's Report Card status. DVAS were asked: "Thinking back to your district or community school's 2007-2008 Local Report Card, did the inclusion of value-added in the LRC improve your district rating?" Approximately one in every two DVAS who answered "Yes" to this question was, in fact, in a district whose rating had not been improved by the inclusion of value-added.

Interview Responses Regarding Conditions and Supports for DVAS

There are a number of conditions which impact the DVAS role and the use of value-added data in school districts. Participants hold a variety of positions and duties in their school districts including: assistant superintendents, curriculum coordinators, test coordinators, educational consultants, elementary or middle school principals and teachers, and those working with staff development. All participants articulated how their role as a DVAS complements their other roles. However, some feel less empowered to affect change because of their qualifications and express concern in engaging administrators. In addition, DVAS who are currently teachers describe the benefit of being able to talk to other teachers because they are peers, but note feeling uncomfortable taking a position of authority to discuss modifying instruction.

Most DVAS report spending more time in the fall analyzing value-added data after district report cards come out. Many discuss either convening a team to analyze the data or having an existing team engage it. A couple of DVAS inquired whether data could be provided sooner. For example, one says, "It would be much more effective if [the] results were more timely. The teachers get their rosters in August but it is September/October before we drill down the data."

Districts want more information and training. For example, several districts express needing best practices on successful teaching methods: "We need to provide [teachers] with more specific information about what to do to help kids, how to differentiate the model in the classroom to teach a diverse group of kids." One district plans to use professional learning communities to help teachers be more collaborative and is looking for information on them.

Most DVAS perceive the past trainings to be high quality and relevant. In particular, they appreciate the train-the-trainer method and mention using materials/lessons later as a reference tool for answering challenging questions or as a refresher to prepare for analyzing data. Some have sought additional support from the ESC or RVAS and characterize them as responsive and helpful when needed. Additional trainings would be desirable, especially if they covered updated responses to difficult questions, best practices, explaining the data/interpreting graphs (e.g., lack of growth, predictions and quintiles) and how to customize reports. Several suggested continuing the free online courses or offering webinars based on grades/subjects to reach more teachers.

Nearly all of the districts mention wanting more easy access to student-identified data: "In concept we use it, but to really make it useful to us and the teachers, we need the student names. I can get teachers to buy into the data . . . but they do not find the data useful at all because they cannot tell which student is which easily." One DVAS says, "We need the names, until names are there, this information is not going to be used for what it is intended." Another DVAS says, "I don't feel [state value-added] lends itself because we are not a SOAR district, so we don't get any teacher or student level data." Although some have linked the data, others think it is too time consuming: "Even though I have an SSID number, I will not ask teachers to do it . . ." One DVAS suggested finding a way to provide information about students who relocate.

Finally, nearly half of the DVAS interviewed mentioned feeling the least confident explaining the methodology/algorithm of how the data has been calculated because it is copyrighted. One says, “The biggest trouble I end up having with value-added is the fact that it is sort of a black box as far as how it is calculated. We place a lot of trust in a complicated formula.”

Conclusion and Recommendations

The DVAS survey was motivated by the need to answer three questions:

1. Are districts using value-added data to inform practice?
2. What is the role of the District Value-Added Specialist (DVAS) or the Community School Value-Added Specialist (CVAS) in the implementation of value-added analysis at this point in the statewide rollout?
3. What conditions and supports seem to make the DVAS role more or less effective?

The excellent response rate to the online survey, coupled with information gleaned from the structured telephone interviews conducted with seventeen DVAS, sheds considerable light on these questions. Below we highlight the key findings.

First, while the plurality (46 percent) of the DVAS/CVAS rated their district’s effectiveness at using value-added data as “fair”, it is important to note that a substantial number (25 percent) rated their district’s use as “poor”. Not all 4th through 8th grade teachers in the districts have access to value-added data, and not all those with access log on to the EVAAS website to look at their data. Teachers and principals do seem to be asking DVAS questions related to value-added data, primarily related to getting student names in lieu of SSIDs on the reports, the computations underlying value-added data, what specific things could be done to improve results, and how to grow the high-achievers.

Second, it is important to note that approximately two-thirds of the respondents felt confident in their ability to support the interpretation and use of value-added. This is a positive indication of the structure and content of the trainings and support thus far. However, a significant proportion of DVAS/CVAS are not very confident and do not feel very effective in these positions. Specifically, one-third of the respondents said they were somewhat or not at all confident about their ability to interpret/use value-added data, and 60 percent indicated that they felt somewhat or not at all effective as an Ohio DVAS/CVAS.

Of course, while some of these perceptions may be related to a natural lack of confidence given the complexity of value-added data per se, it is clear from the survey responses that a few structural issues hinder effective use of VAA. In particular, (i) difficult-to-understand reports or displays of results, (ii) lack of time to examine and interpret results carefully, (iii) lack of teacher and building-level staff skilled in data analysis/interpretation, and (iv) student privacy restrictions lead the list of hindrances. These concerns were also reflected in the interviews.

Finally, the interviews and open-ended responses to the survey questions illuminated some practices that DVAS deemed successful in engaging teachers and administrators in the use of value-added data to inform practice. These practices included more time to engage with VAA data, ways to synthesize value-added data with other information, structured conversations about specific next steps, and directions on how the data can better inform curriculum and instruction.

Recommendations:

On the basis of the available survey and interview data, the following actions may increase both the use and the effectiveness of value-added data in the districts.

1. Assist DVAS with resources and processes to lead teachers and administrators through the "What do I do now that I know this?" question. For example, where do districts start if they are not growing their highest-achieving students? What would the process look like? What are the curriculum questions, instructional questions, support questions? How can they access other, similarly-resourced districts that have successfully addressed this issue?
2. Additional talking points (or perhaps even a FAQ) addressing specific, frequently-asked questions about the value-added metric. While there is an argument that there is no real need for end users to understand the intricacies of the metric, some users will not accept the data at face value without a more complete understanding of the statistical processes and the validity/reliability of the measurement.
3. Make clearer that the value-added metric is integral to school reform processes such as the Ohio Improvement Process. If teachers and administrators continue to compartmentalize the various requirements and initiatives, little may be achieved by such piecemeal approaches. Rather, demonstrate to the districts how and why value-added fits not only into the school improvement process but also for accountability. It is evident from the data that not all DVAS understand if and how value-added impacts their district's local report card. Perhaps specific modules (online preferably) designed to work with a district's existing report card, and showing how changes in value-added impact their LRC may be useful for eliminating this confusion.
4. Provide student names in the student reports. This is clearly a barrier to teachers engaging with the data. Although many DVAS report that their districts have created workarounds in order to link student names, it is time consuming and must be done every year. Since time is one of the most frequently-mentioned barriers to the effective use of value-added, any process that saves time on the user end is likely to increase utilization.
5. Finally, engage principals and superintendents to ensure that the district's administrative leadership not only understands the importance and utility of value-added data, but also pushes this understanding through the buildings and into all classrooms and provides necessary resources such as time. Without such district-level leadership, value-added data use may not diffuse as widely or rapidly as would be desirable.

This page intentionally contains only this sentence.

Chapter 4

Appendix A: The DVAS/CVAS Survey Instrument

Survey of Ohio District Value-Added Specialists

- 1. What is your title/position in your current school district or community school?**
 - Teacher
 - Curriculum Coordinator
 - Counselor
 - Principal/Assistant Principal
 - Superintendent/Assistant Superintendent
 - Other _____
- 2. How many years have you been employed in your current school district or community school?**
Number of years _____
- 3. How many years have you been an Ohio District Value-Added Specialist (DVAS)?**
Number of years _____
- 4. Did you take over an Ohio DVAS position previously held by another staff member, or have you been an Ohio DVAS since the beginning of your district's work with value-added?**
 - I took over the Ohio DVAS position from someone else
 - I have been an Ohio DVAS since the beginning of our district's value added work

5. As an Ohio DVAS, I have participated in the following value-added training (*Check all that apply along with the number of days spent with each training*):

	Check if applicable	Number of days I participated
Regional trainings provided by RVAS		
District-Organized Value-Added Professional Development		
National Value-Added Conference, The Power of Two: Progress & Achievement (hosted by Battelle for Kids)		
Self-taught value-added training by using self-paced support tools (i.e. online courses, the Understanding & Using Value-Added Analysis Toolkit, the Understanding Value-Added Analysis & Ohio's Accountability System Toolkit, etc.)		
No Training		
Other		

If you marked "Other," please describe: _____

6. A. Who is the Regional Value-Added Specialist (RVAS) that you work with the most?

Name: _____

B. How often do you consult with this RVAS?

- Never
 Weekly
 2-3 times per month
 Once a month
 Once every three months
 Once every six months

C. Do you also seek input from any other RVAS?

- Yes
 No

7. A. Do all of the classroom teachers in your district or community school (grades 4-8) have access to value-added data through the Ohio EVAAS website?

- Yes
 No

B. IF NO: What percentage of classroom teachers in your district or community school (grades 4-8) would you say have access to value-added data through the Ohio EVAAS website?

- None
 1% - 25%
 26% - 50%
 51% - 75%
 76% - 100%
 I don't know

-
8. What percentage of classroom teachers in your district or community school (grades 4-8) with access have logged into the Ohio EVAAS website to look at their value-added data?
- None
 - 1% - 25%
 - 26% - 50%
 - 51% - 75%
 - 76% - 100%
 - I don't know
9. A. In the current academic year to date, have principals or teachers asked you questions about value-added data?
- Yes
 - No
- B. IF YES, approximately how often have they asked these questions?
- | Principals: | Teachers: |
|---|---|
| <input type="radio"/> Once | <input type="radio"/> Once |
| <input type="radio"/> Twice | <input type="radio"/> Twice |
| <input type="radio"/> Three or more times | <input type="radio"/> Three or more times |
10. A. In the current academic year to date, have district-level or community school-level administrators asked you questions about value-added data?
- Yes
 - No
- B. IF YES, approximately how often have they asked these questions?
- Once
 - Twice
 - Three or more times

11. When you meet with either teachers or school-based data teams, how useful are the following Ohio EVAAS reports for guiding school improvement efforts? (Please mark "Have not used," if you haven't used the specific data.)

Type of Ohio EVAAS value-added report	I don't know what this is	Have not used	Not useful	Somewhat useful	Very useful
Summary reports					
Diagnostic Summary reports					
District Performance Diagnostic reports					
Feeder Pattern reports					
School Value-added Report (Mean Gain Approach)					
School Diagnostic Report					
Diagnostic Student List					
School Performance Diagnostic					
Custom Student Reports					
Student Report					
Student Projection Report					
Other custom reports prepared by you or other district staff					

12. When you meet with either teachers or school-based teams, how useful are the following value-added support resources? (Please mark "Have not used," if you haven't used the specific data.)

Resource	I don't know what this is	Have not used	Not useful	Somewhat useful	Very useful
Your Regional Value-Added Specialist (RVAS)					
Online value-added courses via Ohio-Learn (formally called the Value-Added Learning Network)					
Understanding & Using Value-Added Analysis Toolkit (distributed statewide to DVAS in 2006-2007)					
Understanding Value-Added Analysis & Ohio's Accountability System Toolkit (distributed statewide to superintendents and principals in August 2008)					
Value-Added Portal provided by BFK					
Ohio Department of Education Website (public value-added information on: www.ode.state.oh.us)					

13. To what extent does each of the following factors hinder the effective use of value-added (Ohio EVAAS) data in your district or community school?

	Great hindrance	Moderate hindrance	Slight hindrance	Not a hindrance
Difficult-to-understand reports or displays of results				
Insufficient technology (e.g., computers, software)				
Insufficient time to examine and interpret results carefully				
Lack of central office staff skilled in data analysis				
Lack of data on students who are new to the school district				
Lack of guidance, training, or support to use value-added				
Lack of information dissemination (from central office) to buildings				
Lack of building-level staff skilled in data analysis and interpretation				
Lack of support from the superintendent and district offices				
Quality of training offered to schools				
Student privacy restrictions on ability to share data with others				
Teachers' lack of skills or experience with analyzing data				
The number of students in a given grade or subject or subgroup is too small for data analysis				

14. What is the most frequently asked question about value-added data reports you get from:

Teachers: _____

Administrators: _____

15. What is the most difficult or challenging question about value-added data or reports you have received from:

A Teacher: _____

An Administrator: _____

16. Does your district or community school provide a means to display student names in the student-level Ohio EVAAS reports?

- Yes
 No
 I don't know

17. A. Overall, how would you rate your district or community school in terms of effectively using value-added data?

- Poor
- Fair
- Good
- Excellent

B. Please briefly explain why you gave your district or community school this rating.

18. A. Thinking back to your district or community school's 2007-2008 Local Report Card (LRC), did the inclusion of value-added in the LRC improve your district's rating?

- Yes
- No
- I don't know

B. What was the reaction of district or community school administrators to the value-added results included on the 2007-2008 Local Report Card for your district? Please briefly describe.

19. How effective do you currently feel in your role as an Ohio DVAS?

- Not at all
- Somewhat
- Moderately
- Very

20. How confident are you in your ability to support the interpretation and use of value-added data in your district or community school?

- Not at all
- Somewhat
- Moderately
- Very

21. Approximately how many hours would you say you spend per month, on average, working with value-added data?

- 0-5 hours
- 6-10 hours
- 11-15 hours
- 16 or more hours

22. If there was ONE thing that would most help you be more effective as a DVAS, what ONE thing would you choose to ask for? Check only one.

- More support from your district administration
- More knowledge of value-added data
- More support from your RVAS
- More buy-in from principals about the value of data to inform instruction
- More buy-in from teachers about the value of data to inform instruction
- More time to work with teachers and administrators
- Other: _____

23. Are you the DVAS for a school district or a community school?

- School district (Skip to question #26.)
- Community school (Go to question #24.)

24. If you are the DVAS for a community school, do you work directly for the community school or with a community school sponsoring organization?

- Community school
- Community school sponsoring organization

25. If you work for a community school sponsoring organization, how many community schools do you work with?

Number of community schools: _____

26. Are you a SOAR district?

- Yes (Go to question #27.)
- No (You are finished with this survey. Thank you.)

27. Which value-added data source does your district or community school use more for school improvement purposes?

- SOAR EVAAS reports
- Ohio EVAAS reports
- Both equally

28. Why does your district or community school use this value-added data source more often?

29. Which source of value-added data (SOAR EVAAS or Ohio EVAAS) do you refer to more often in your role as an Ohio DVAS?

- SOAR EVAAS reports
- Ohio EVAAS reports
- Both equally

Why?

Thank you for completing this survey.

Chapter 5

Appendix B: DVAS Interview Questions

1. What is your title/position in your current school district?
2. How long have you been employed in your current school district?
3. How many years have you been a DVAS?
4. What experiences or qualifications do you hold that are relevant to the job of DVAS?
5. As a DVAS, what do you do to help implement effective value-added data use in your district? Describe.
6. Describe how your role as DVAS fits with your other duties in the school district. Would you describe it as a good fit/a conflict? Why?
7. Approximately how many hours would you say you spend per month, on average, in your role as a DVAS?
(0-5 hours) (6-10 hours) (11-15 hours) (16 or more hours)
8. Is the time you spend in your DVAS role spread evenly throughout the year or more some months than others? Describe.
9. How is your district currently using value-added data? If the district is using it, describe some specific ways.
10. How confident are you in your ability to support the interpretation and use of value-added data? In what areas do you feel the most confident? In what areas do you feel the least confident?
11. How would you rate the support you get from district/building leadership related to your role as a DVAS?

High Medium Low None
12. What are some of the most frequently-asked questions teachers pose to you about value-added data? What is the most difficult or challenging question you have received from a teacher?
13. What are some of the most frequently-asked questions administrators pose to you about value-added data? What is the most difficult or challenging question you have received from an administrator?
14. Does your district have a data team? What is your role on that team? How does the team work? Are there building-level data teams? How do they work?

15. Beyond value-added data, are you responsible for any other data-driven activities in your district? What are they? How well do you think your role as a DVAS fits with these other data activities?
16. What other types of data does your district use for school improvement (e.g. OAT, interim assessment, short-cycle, etc.)?
17. Describe your ESC's involvement with/support of value-added implementation.
18. Do you use the Regional Value Added Specialist (RVAS) as a resource? If so, describe how. How many RVAS do you know/consult?
19. What additional support would help you do your job as DVAS better? This could be at district, state, or regional level.
20. Based on your experience and situation, what should the next steps be in implementing value-added analysis in Ohio? What should next year look like in terms of training, technical assistance, information, other supports?

FOR SOAR DISTRICT DVAS ONLY:

21. Which value-added data source (SOAR or Statewide EVAAS) does your district use more for school improvement purposes?
22. Why does your district use this value-added data source more often?
23. Which source of value-added data (SOAR or statewide EVAAS) do you refer to more often in your role as DVAS? Why?

This page intentionally contains only this sentence.

Chapter 6

Appendix C: List of Most Difficult Questions from Teachers and Administrators

In the Spring 2009, Statewide Ohio DVAS Survey, the 529 respondents were asked, “What is the most difficult or challenging question about value-added data or reports you have received from teachers . . . from administrators?” The most often-cited topics were similar between teachers and administrators and included questions about: (1) getting student names in place of SSID numbers; (2) how value-added is calculated and how valid/reliable it is; (3) what specifically should be done to improve results; (4) how to grow the already high achievers. Frequently-asked questions from administrators also included how to best use the data with staff.

Examples of the most difficult or challenging questions from teachers:

Why can't we see the students' names?

Why can't we get the data for our current students?

What does this tell me about what I am doing?

How do I use the reports effectively?

What should I do now, for improvement? What should be our plan for results? What can I do to improve my value-added scores? I understand the data. What can I do to improve the data?

What am I doing wrong? My kids' scores dropped.

Why aren't the gifted kids growing? It is hard to move a group of high achieving students into the green. Is there enough room for growth on the high end of the test for gifted students to show progress?

Is it reasonable to expect a year's growth? Is a year's growth really the same for individual students?

How do I best utilize the student projections- share with students, parents?

How can we truly differentiate instruction to meet all quintiles with our limited time and resources?

How can I keep students in Advanced while doing interventions for RTI? Where is the time?

How to interpret a decline in results for a very good student.

How can we be the best in the county and NOT make value-added?

How does a child in the 99th percentile show more than a year's growth?

How do you know what each individual must score to get value-added?

Explaining how socioeconomics do not impact.

How does value-added relate to the state report card?

My students' scores are already outstanding, so why is VAA important?

What are other schools doing to meet value-added?

What is the VAA formula? What is involved in determining the standard error, etc.?
How do they determine growth?

How do you get the normal curve equivalent?

Questions regarding mean gain and student projections. Mean vs. predicted.

How valid is this? How reliable are the results?

What are the whiskers and what do they mean?

What different assessments go into making these reports?

What happens if a student is experiencing a traumatic experience and bombs the test-is this accurate?

What exactly does a specific student need for a year's growth? What constitutes a year's growth?

Why do we do this?

Will this be used in my evaluation?

Who will eventually be able to see my data?

Who said we can't see our own class value-added data?

How is the statistical analysis conducted?

When do I get the time to study the data?

Why should I care about value-added, I do not teacher reading/math in grades 4-8?

Why isn't student progress more important than achievement?

Why are my kids not making growth?

Why is this measure used when our overall scores are so high?

Why is there such variance in student growth within the same class?

Why is so much emphasis placed on only one snapshot (2 hour period) of a student's 180 day year in school?

Why don't the scores match the passing rate on the OAT?

Why do we need to improve our score even though we are passing the OAT at such a high percentage rate?

Why do high-performing schools show negative growth?

Why are you pointing the finger at me?

Why are we including special education?

Why are we fooling with value-added if it doesn't impact our AYP status?

How is this relevant to K-3 teachers?

How does this fit with all the other data we use?

How will this affect how you assign kids to my classes?

How do we know that How mean gain doesn't penalize districts if all districts improve?
(How baseline state data year impacts mean gain approach)

Examples of the most difficult or challenging questions from administrators:

Why can't we see student names?

Why should I promote the use of these data when I am hounded to make AYP?

How does this affect AYP?

Why do the reports vary so much from year to year?

Is this valid? The seventh grade VA data cannot be accurate.

How reliable are the results?

Are the tests aligned from year to year?

How do they determine the quintiles?

Is this applicable for special education students?

How to make time for teacher professional development and team meetings.

Why did these scores drop? We had the exact same staff.

How can there be such variance in growth within a teacher's class?

Can we disaggregate by classroom?

Can I readjust my teaching assignments based on value-added data?

How did we receive an overall rating of "exceeded growth" when we have so many grades in the red?

How can our gifted kids grow when they are already in the 99th percentile?

How does the value-added measure account for the fact that the majority of our students are high achievers, and there is little to no room for some of them to grow?

How can I more quickly find patterns and use in decision making?

How can I get parents to understand negative gains when their student is in the highest quintile?

Explaining the difference between Battelle for Kids reports and state reports.

Explaining why we look good in SOAR and not in the state data.

Does VAA just hurt high performing schools?

Why can't I see the data based on specific teachers?

Why can no one at ODE tell us how to access our data?

Why are there so many reports and sites? i.e. Success site, D3 site, and value-added.

Why after a high growth year does it appear there is a low growth year? Is this related?

Which report is the most important for me to look at/review?

What information from value-added is best to share with staff?

Isn't there an easier way to get classroom value-added data?

What report is the one I need to know most about?

Where do we go from here? How do we use this to improve instruction?

What are some strategies to meet the needs of the students performing below the one year gain?

What are some other districts doing to meet value-added?

Understanding the standard error.

Understanding how we got value-added or not.

Using the data to address our district needs.

Too much data-how do we use it?

When do we have time to analyze/use this?

What should we look at changing? What needs to be changed and how can we be sure these changes will improve opportunities for our students?

What is the formula? How is growth actually determined? How is a year's growth calculated?

How does this fit with all the other data we use?

What is the difference between ODE and Project SOAR data?

What is the difference between the diagnostic and performance diagnostic report?

What does this tell me about a teacher?

What does this mean for our report card?