Adding Value to the Mathematics and Science Partnership Evaluations

February 17-18, 2005

Norman Webb, Paula White and Rob Meyer
Wisconsin Center for Education Research
University of Wisconsin-Madison

Project Principles

- Build on what has been learned about evaluating large-scale systemic reform
- Develop a *learning community* among the MSP evaluators

Project Activities

- Provide technical assistance
- Two-day semiannual meetings
- Teleconference meetings
- Site visits
- Tools for value-added and alignment analyses

Agenda

February 17-18, 2005

Thursday

8:45	Site Round Robin
10:15	Archetype Models for Judging Effects
12:15	Lunch
1:15	Case Study Design
3:30	Reporting
5:00	Rathskeller and Dinner

Agenda

February 17-18, 2005

Friday	
8:30	Evaluation Strategies and Data Analysis
10:45	Benchmarking
Noon	Lunch
1:00	Mathematics and Science Content
3:15	Specific Evaluation Challenges
4:00	Adjourn

Expense Forms and Regulations

Adding Value Conference Attendance

Conference	Newcomers	Returnees	Adding Value Team Members	Additional Presenters	Total Guests	Total Attendees	Total MSP Evaluators
1	17	NA	3	0	17	20	14
2	2	13	4	1	15	20	15
3	20	9	5	1	29	35	27
4	5	6	4	3	14	18	11

Benchmarking: Monitoring, Feedback, and Overall Evaluation

Some benchmarks indicate the process the MSPs will be using:

Benchmark 2b-1.

Principals and supervisors from each district will participate yearly in professional learning programs for mathematics and science provided by the Institute for Learning and district leadership

Some benchmarks describe what program features will be produced:

Benchmark 1a-9.

By December 2007 each district will have a coherent K-12 mathematics program for all students in place, with an aligned system of professional learning, monitoring and individual student adaptation.

Benchmark 2a-3.

By December 2004, SCALE will develop tools, including rubrics for assessing the quality of coaches and lead teachers in mathematics and science.

Other benchmarks indicate the product or outcome that is to be produced:

Benchmark 4b-1.

K-8 Mathematics: Proportion of students at proficiency levels:

2002-2003 Baseline
2003-2004 target: 5% increase at each proficiency level
2004-2005 target: 5% increase at each proficiency level
2005-2006 target: 5% increase at each proficiency level
2006-2007 target: 5% increase at each proficiency level

High School Mathematics:

2002-2003 Baseline
2004-2005 target: 5% increase at each proficiency level
2006-2007 target: 5% increase at each proficiency level