

LOUISIANA



DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

PAUL G. PASTOREK | STATE SUPERINTENDENT

Key Decision Points:

Implementation of Act 54's Value Added Requirements

George Noell, Ph.D.

Outstanding Recommendations to be Made

1. Minimum students to include a teacher
 - a) What to do for teachers with insufficient students

2. Combining results across content areas
 - a) Value Added
 - b) Non-tested grades/subjects

3. Should poverty be included in the assessment



1. Minimum Students for a Value-Added Result

The common number of students is ten

- Tennessee
- New York City
- Washington, DC

What is the implication for teachers who end up with no students or too few?

- How will their evaluation be completed?

Number of Teachers with Student Thresholds

2009-2010

Students	Mathematics Teachers	ELA Teachers
1	7013	7939
2	6741	7672
3	6608	7481
4	6479	7339
5	6398	7228
6	6304	7145
7	6229	7051
8	6160	6971
9	6087	6889
10	6005	6806
20	4897	4386

Correlation of scores across years

2008-2009 with 2009-2010

Students	Mathematics Teachers	ELA Teachers
1	.495	.389
5	.505	.404
10	.509	.406
20	.528	.425

2. Combining results across content areas

Policy Question

- How do we handle the situation in which a teacher has students in multiple content areas?



Setting the Framework for Multiple Content Teachers

- How should we incorporate and/or integrate results for teachers with results in multiple content areas?
- This will be exceedingly common in the elementary grades.
- This framework will set the stage for how we think about standard setting.

An Illustration of a Mixed Result

	Value Added Result	Percentile	Descriptor
<i>English</i>	<i>-18</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>Serious Concern</i>
<i>Mathematics</i>	<i>+26</i>	<i>98</i>	<i>Fantastic</i>
Science	-1	48	Typical
Social Studies	+1	53	Typical

Average Outcome: +2 positive, but typical

3. Should we ask to remove poverty

Reaching consensus

There are strong and contradictory feelings about whether to include poverty (free/reduced lunch) in value added assessments.



The Arguments

- **Is excluding free and reduced lunch fair to teachers?**

They reflect real disadvantages that are beyond teachers' control.

- **Is including free and reduced lunch fair to students?**

Including poverty accepts lower expectations for teachers who have poor students and as a result it sets lower expectation for their students. It institutionalizes the poverty gap and is bad public policy.

Free/Reduced Lunch & Teacher Results

How big a change is a big change?

Approximate percentage of teacher scores:

- 75% within -/+10
- 95% within -/+20

Subject	Less than 1 Point	1-2 points	2+ points
ELA	91.7%	8.5%	0.2%
Mathematics	98.0%	1.8%	0.2%

Contrast Free Lunch with Disability

Free/Reduced Lunch

Subject	Less than 1 Point	1-2 points	2+ points
ELA	91.7%	8.5%	0.2%
Mathematics	98.0%	1.8%	0.2%

Disability

Subject	Less than 1 Point	1-2 points	2+ points
ELA	58.9%	28.4%	12.7%
Mathematics	70.5%	23.4%	6.1%

Moderated Discussion

Key Decision Points

Dan Weisberg, Ph.D.



ACEE Recommendation RE: Minimum Students

1. Should there be a minimum number?
2. If so what number?
3. What should the process be for teachers who do not meet the minimum number threshold?

2. ACEE Recommendation RE: Multiple Value Added

1. Take the average?
2. Anchor to the weakest result?
3. Anchor to the strongest result?
4. A third alternative?

3. Student Poverty

1. Ask the legislature to remove it from the law
2. Leave the model as is for now.