Scoring Student Learning and Growth Goals (SLGG's)

In the Oregon Matrix, Professional Practice (PP) and Professional Responsibilities (PR) intersects with Student Learning and Growth (SLG) culminating in a summative performance level which leads to a Professional Growth Path for each instructional leader. When there is a discrepancy between the PP/PR level and SLG level, further inquiry is triggered to explore and understand the reasons for the discrepancy.

Table 3. Oregon Matrix for Summative Evaluations for Teachers and Administrators

Y AXIS: Combined Rating on Professional Practice and Professional Responsibilities (PP/PR)					
	DISTINGUISHED	*(B) PROFICIENT	*(A or B) PROFICIENT or DISTINGUISHED	(A) DISTINGUISHED	(A) DISTINGUISHED
	PROFICIENT	*(B or C) BASIC or PROFICIENT	(B) PROFICIENT	(B) PROFICIENT	(B) PROFICIENT
	BASIC	(C) BASIC	(C) BASIC	(C) BASIC	**(B or C) BASIC or PROFICIENT
	UNSATISFACTORY	(D) UNSATISFACTORY	(D) UNSATISFACTORY	**(C or D) UNSATISFACTORY or BASIC	**(C) BASIC
		UNSATISFACTORY	BASIC	PROFICIENT	DISTINGUISHED
	X AXIS: Rating on Student Learning and Growth				

*Ratings in these areas require an SLG inquiry process in order to determine a summative performance level and Professional Growth Path.

** Ratings in these areas require a PP/PR inquiry process in order to determine a summative performance level and Professional Growth Path.

(A, B, C, D) Professional Growth Paths are explained in II below.

I. Scoring Student Learning and Growth (SLG) Goals

The following tools are used to score SLG goals to determine the educator' impact on SLG in the summative evaluation.

Table 4. SLG Quality Review Checklist
This checklist should be used in approving SLG goals before being used in teacher and administrator evaluations. For an SLG goal to be approved, all criteria must be met.

Baseline Data	Yes	No
Is baseline data used to make data-driven decisions for the SLG goal, including the most recent student information from past assessments and/or pre-assessment results?		
Student Learning and Growth Goals		
Is the SLG goal written as a "growth" goals vs. "achievement" goal? (i.e. growth goals measure student learning between two or more points in time and achievement goals measure student learning at only one point in time.)		
Does the SLG goal describe a "target" or expected growth for all students, tiered or differentiated as needed based on baseline data?		
Rigor of Goals		
Does the goal address relevant and specific knowledge and skills aligned to the course curriculum based on state or national content standards?		
Is the SLG goal measurable and challenging, yet attainable?		

Table 5. SLG Scoring Rubric
This SLG scoring rubric is used for scoring individual SLG goals based on evidence submitted by the teacher and supervisor/evaluator. This rubric applies to both teacher and administrator evaluations.

Distinguished (Highest)	This category applies when 90% of students met their target(s) and approximately 25% of students exceeded their target(s). This category should only be selected when a substantial number of students surpassed the overall level of attainment established by the target(s). Goals are very rigorous yet attainable, and differentiated (as appropriate) for all students.
Proficient	This category applies when 90% of students met their target(s). The bar for this category should be high and it should only be selected when it is clear that all or almost all students met the overall level of attainment established by the target(s). Goals are rigorous yet attainable and differentiated (as appropriate) for all students.
Basic	This category applies when 70-89% of students met their target(s). Goals are attainable but might not be rigorous or differentiated (as appropriate) for all students.
Unsatisfactory (Lowest)	This category applies when less than 70% of students meet the target(s). If a substantial proportion of students did not meet their target(s), the SLG was not met. Goals are attainable, but not rigorous. This category also applies when results are missing or incomplete.

II. Final Summative Performance Level and Professional Growth Plans

Taking the performance levels for PP/PR and SLG find where the X-Axis intersect with the Y-Axis on the matrix. The PP/PR will then be compared to the SLG to determine the educator's Professional Growth Plan and overall summative performance level.

The four types of Professional Growth Paths (A, B, C, D) are defined as follows:

(A) Facilitative Growth Path - The instructional leader leads the conversation and chooses the focus of the professional goal(s) as the instructional leader and evaluator collaborate on the professional growth goal(s). If the instructional leader had a SLG performance of Basic, the

professional goal(s) should also include a focus on increasing the instructional leader's overall aptitude in this measure.

(B) Collegial Growth Path - The instructional leader and evaluator collaboratively develop the instructional leader's professional goal(s). The instructional leader and evaluator have an equal voice in developing the professional goal(s). If the instructional leader was Unsatisfactory or Basic in SLG performance, the professional goal(s) should also include a focus on increasing the instructional leader's overall aptitude in this measure.

(C) Consultative Growth Path - The evaluator consults with the educator and uses the information gathered to inform the educator's professional goal(s). This path is more evaluator directed but does take into consideration the voice of the educator in developing the professional goal(s). If the educator was Unsatisfactory or Basic in SLG performance, the professional goal(s) should also include a focus on increasing the instructional leader's overall aptitude in this measure.

(D) Directed Growth Path - The evaluator directs the instructional leader's professional goal(s). This path should involve a focus on the most important area(s) to improve instructional leader performance. If the instructional leader was Unsatisfactory or Basic in SLG performance, the professional goal(s) should also include a focus on increasing the instructional leader's overall aptitude in this measure.

NOTE: In compliance with ORS 342.850, 342.895(4)(b), and any applicable school board policy/ARs and/or applicable collective bargaining provisions, the superintendent or designated evaluator may place any teacher or administrator on a program of assistance for improvement if, in the judgment of the superintendent or designee, a program of assistance for improvement is needed.

III. Inquiry Processes

*Student Learning and Growth Inquiry Process (SLG Inquiry):

In order to determine an educator's Professional Growth Path and resulting summative performance level, the following must be initiated by the evaluator to determine the matrix placement is valid with the instructional leader:

- Collaboratively examine student growth data in conjunction with other evidence including observation, artifacts and other student and teacher information based on appropriate classroom, school, school district and state-based tools and practices; etc.
- Collaboratively examine circumstances which may include one or more of the following: Goal setting process including assessment literacy; content and expectations; extent to which standards, curriculum and assessment are aligned; etc.
- The evaluator then decides the respective Professional Growth Path (A, B, C, or D) and if the summative performance level is Basic or Proficient, or Proficient or Distinguished.

**Professional Practice and Professional Responsibility Inquiry Process (PP/PR Inquiry):

In order to determine an educator's Professional Growth Path and resulting summative performance level, the following must be initiated by the evaluator to determine if the matrix placement is valid. With the educator:

- Reexamine evidence and artifacts and an outside evaluator (Supervisor, VP, other district administrator) may be called in
- Instructional Leader has the opportunity to provide additional evidence
- Schedule additional observations with focus on area of need
- Evaluator's supervisor is notified and inter-rater reliability protocols are revisited
- The evaluator then decides the respective Professional Growth Path and if the summative performance level is Unsatisfactory or Basic, or Basic or Proficient.

IV.   Aligned Professional Learning

All instructional leaders' Professional Growth Paths should include aligned professional learning tailored to meet their individual growth needs.

Other Systemic Differentiated Supports

Best practice would include other systemic differentiations in order to support instructional leaders in their professional growth; in other words, depending on what Professional Growth Path an instructional leader is on, other parts of the evaluation and support systems should differ to accommodate an instructional leader's growth needs.

It is highly recommended that additional supports be provided for instructional leaders with Directed or Consulting Professional Growth Paths. Additionally, it is important to differentiate supports for instructional leaders who are meeting or exceeding standards. Some local customizations could include, but are not limited to:

- Frequency/duration of check-in meetings with evaluator
- For SLG Goals focused options, additional training may be necessary on how to set strong SLG goals, how to utilize assessment data, how to progress monitor, etc.
- Number of professional growth goals
- Number of observations (for example, more observations and/or longer observations, if desired or as needed, as the level of plan becomes more supported or directed)
- Number of artifacts for performance level substantiation
- Participation in a mentorship program (as a mentor or mentee) or participation in peer observation structures for formative feedback
- Length of or required number of professional goals could change and adapt based on needs, etc.
- Self-reflection practices (self-assessment, reflection, etc.)
- Frequency/media of aligned professional learning opportunities (as identified via rubric)