

# HB 2680 Case Study Proposal

## Purpose

ODE plans to engage with selected schools in a case study that will provide evidence that will inform the HB 2680 work group’s identification of adjustments in instruction necessary to address student learning gaps and the development of the work group’s recommendations. Through the case study, we hope to identify those local conditions and best practices in place in schools that have demonstrated high degrees of success in closing gaps for students.

## Methodology

1. ODE will analyze the 2014-15 Smarter Balanced results to identify those schools that “beat the odds” for all students as well as disaggregated student groups compared with other “like” schools. In selecting schools to participate in the case study, ODE will also strive to engage a representative sample of schools in terms of geographical distribution, size, and student demographics.
2. Participating schools will be expected to include a range of participation, including appropriate district level administrators, federal program staff, principals, department chairs, teachers, and instructional coaches. Broad participation is needed to enable us to obtain an accurate understanding of those local conditions that contributed to each school’s success (or where a breakdown may have occurred).
3. Participating schools will initially submit information via a survey or phone interview designed to capture those strategies and practices the school team feels contributed to their success. The survey (or phone interview) will also be designed to take into account (and build upon) the data ODE already collects (e.g., via Indistar, CIPs, etc) so we can engage participating schools in the specific context of their data. Questions will be designed to pull out the impact across programs, looking at additional aspects such as resource allocation, equity, teacher engagement, and teacher perception of how well the assessment results reflect what they see going on in their classrooms. Participating schools will also be expected to submit supporting artifacts.
4. The case study may also include a second round of information gathering as needed to respond to the information gathered through the initial survey or phone interview. This follow-up method might include a combination of site visits, phone interviews, focus groups, or an additional set of survey questions depending on the nature of the follow-up questions.

## Areas for Exploration

### 1. Standards Implementation

- Work with standards
- When adopted
- What implementation strategy used
- Comprehensive shifts vs. flavors of the day
- What roles were involved
- How did it change protocols

### 2. Leadership Structure/Involvement

- Teachers
- Administrators
- Community engagement/communication
- Buy in

### 3. Tools Used

- Assessments purchased/used
- Data teams convened

### 4. PD Offered

- Data usage

### 5. Educator Evaluation Model

- Term on their own or together
- Artifacts used
- Staff cohesiveness

## Timeline

**Jan/Feb:** refine case study methodology; engage with external partner to help facilitate and document

**Late Feb:** present refined case study methodology to HB 2680 work group (Meeting 2)

**March:** conduct case study and perform preliminary analysis

**Late March:** case study participants present to HB 2680 work group (Meeting 3)

**April:** Finalize Analysis and synthesize results; develop draft report

**Late April:** Present draft report to HB 2680 work group and finalize