

# OPPORTUNITY MEASURE CONSORTIUM

## Addendum: Updates from the Opportunity Measure Spring Reviews

The second round of panel reviews were conducted for five schools in March of 2018. Below we outline the project improvements that were made between the fall and spring reviews and the observed difference in outcomes between the two rounds. We then highlight further improvements that will be made for the next iteration of the Opportunity Measure Demonstration Project—based on feedback from participating panel reviewers and Momentum’s project team and external reviewer.

### Project Improvements: Fall to Spring

The project team implemented significant changes to the review process this spring based on feedback received from panel member surveys, an independent reviewer, and project team discussions. The adjustments are outlined below along with a brief summary of their impact and additional observations that were made throughout the Demonstration Project.

1. Each school was asked to provide a ***theory of change*** along with their description of programming and outcome data. Guidance for submitting the theory of change asked participating schools to provide the following:
  - a) What is the need;
  - b) How is the school identifying students that have the need;
  - c) How does the school’s programming addressing the need;
  - d) What are the intended outcomes of the programming (i.e. what are the short and long-term goals); and
  - e) How does the school know that the programming is producing those intended outcomes (i.e. how is the school measuring the effectiveness of the programming at meeting the stated goals)?

The submitted theory of change documents provided a strong baseline of information for the external panelists and frame of reference for the importance of the Opportunity Measure to the school, their mission, and their unique students.

2. Finding individuals to participate and fill out a full five-member panels (including experts and peers) for each school’s review continued to be a challenge. Moving forward, providing an honorarium to a higher percentage of reviewers may be helpful. Thus far panelists receiving an honorarium have been considerably more attentive and reliable than unpaid panelists; moving from one paid panelist to perhaps 3 out of 5 would provide a higher level of consistency in ratings and reduce the challenge involved in finding so many volunteers.

It was also helpful to have panelists serve on multiple panels - in this first pilot year, some panelists who served on first round panels also served on second round panels. These repeat panelists were able to see the changes and improvements made from the first round, with respect to the quality of the data and information provided by the schools—which was helpful for both the overall process and the within panel consistency of the ratings.

3. Second round submissions included stronger data and information, specifically in regards to the theory of change and the step-by-step details requested about the programming. However, as with the first round, the outcome data reported by schools was minimal. This may be due to the fact that these second round reviews (more so than the first round) tended to be from schools that were either still developing the measurement systems to track students' progress or were only recently implemented. Most of the schools did include identified processes they are currently putting in place to start collecting data.

### Final Ratings for the 2017-2018 Demonstration Project

The table below outlines the final ratings for each school that participated in the Demonstration Project, including schools that were reviewed by Opportunity Measure panels in the Fall of 2017 and the Spring of 2018.

<b>Average Opportunity Measure Ratings for all Pilot Participants</b>			
<b>School</b>	<b>Avg. Evidence Rating</b>	<b>Avg. Impact Rating</b>	<b>Total Avg. Rating</b>
1	3	3.25	3.13
2	1.5	2	1.75
3	2.75	3.25	3
4	2.5	2	2.13
5	3.75	1.8	2.35
6	1.6	2.4	2
7	0.67	1	0.83
8	3.7	3	3.3
9	3.3	4	3.7
10	1.7	0.3	1
11	1.8	1.9	1.8
12	2.67	0	1.3
<b>Avg. of All Schools</b>	<b>2.4</b>	<b>2.1</b>	<b>2.2</b>

In general, the changes made to the process between the first and second round of reviews seemed to have improved the quality of the data and information presented to the panel reviewers. In addition, the panelists seemed to better differentiate between the two ratings, Strength of Impact and Strength of Evidence, as a result of the changes made. This is reflected in the difference between the average ratings for Evidence and Impact in reviews 8-12 (the Spring reviews), compared to reviews 1-7 (the Fall reviews).

## Project Improvements for 2018-19

1. Continue emphasizing the theory of change as the foundation of the Opportunity Measure submission reporting and provide applicable guidance to schools as early as possible;
2. Expand the number of panelists receiving an honorarium for participation and build a reliable, regular cohort of reviewers for panels;
3. Focus first year activities and school participation on external feedback and school improvement—recognizing that “accountability ready” data and reporting is a multi-step process;
4. Provide participating schools with a completed template that shows what a quality response from a real school looks like (as opposed to our fictional example);
5. Work with participating schools so that they understand the need to better show how their uniquely transformative programming *changed* outcomes for the student(s). Linking the intervention/program to a change in outcomes will show the effectiveness and relevance of the unique Opportunity Measure.