

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 educator. 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) Paths are explained in II below.

STATEWIDE COMPONENTS OF THE OREGON MATRIX

How does an evaluator determine level 1-4 on the Y-axis and X-axis of the matrix and a final summative performance level at the end of an educator's evaluation cycle?

I. Y-Axis: Professional Practice and Professional Responsibilities (PP/PR)

First, the evaluator will need to determine the combined performance level for PP/PR based on data from the district's rubric. The evaluator will already have gauged the educator's performance on each standard/performance indicator on the rubric with four performance levels. For example, in the Danielson rubric, educators will have received a performance level for all 22 components. The evaluator will then:

1. Add up all component scores to get the total points possible;
2. Divide by the number of components (based on the # of components in the rubric);
3. Get a rating between 1 and 4 for PP/PR;
4. Use the following thresholds to determine PP/PR level:
 - 3.6 - 4.0 = 4 PP/PR
 - 2.81-3.59 = 3 PP/PR
 - 1.99 - 2.8 = 2 PP/PR*
 - < 1.99 = 1 PP/PR

***PP/PR Scoring Rule:** If the educator scores two 1's in any PP/PR component and his/her average score falls between 1.99-2.499, the educator's performance level cannot be rated above a 1.

5. Find the PP/PR performance level (1-4) on the Y-axis of the matrix.

II. X-Axis: Student Learning and Growth (SLG)

After the educator's PP/PR performance level is determined, their Professional Growth Path and summative performance level is then found by looking at the educator's rating on SLG goals. The level of performance on SLG will be determined by scoring the SLG goals using the Oregon SLG Goal scoring rubric (see page 60). All educators will set two SLG goals annually. Educators on a two year evaluation cycle will select two of the four goals collaboratively with their evaluator to be included in their summative evaluation, beginning in the 2014-15 school year. *Math and ELA teachers (grades 3-8 and 11) and administrators must use Category 1 assessments for one of the two goals.*

1. Score the SLG goals using the SLG Scoring Rubric;
2. Get a rating between 1 and 4 for SLG;
3. Use the thresholds below to determine SLG level;
4. Find the SLG performance level (1-4) on the X-Axis of the matrix.

| Level 4 | Level 3 | Level 2 | Level 1 |
|---|--|---|---|
| You must score: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4 on both goals | You could score: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 on both goals, or • 3 on one goal & 4 on one goal, or • 4 on one goal & 2 on one goal | You could score: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2 on both goals, or • 2 on one goal & 3 on one goal, or • 3 on one goal & 1 on one goal, or • 4 on one goal & 1 on one goal | You could score: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 on both goals, or • 1 on one goal & 2 on one goal |

III. Scoring Student Learning and Growth (SLG) Goals

SLG goals are detailed, measurable goals for student academic growth aligned to standards and developed by educators and their supervisors. They are rigorous, yet attainable goals. SLG goals define which students and/or student subgroups are included in a particular goal, how their progress will be measured during the instructional time period. SLG goals are growth goals, not achievement goals. Growth goals hold all students to the same standards but allow for various levels of learning and growth depending on where the students' performance level is at the start of the course/class. The educator sets two annual SLG goals between which all students in a class or course are included.

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 <i>(Highest)</i> | 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 <i>(Lowest)</i> | 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. |

IV. Final Summative Performance Level and Professional Growth Paths

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 Path 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 educator leads the conversation and chooses the focus of the professional goal(s) as the educator and evaluator collaborate on the professional growth goal(s). If the educator had a SLG performance of Basic, the professional goal(s) should also include a focus on increasing the educator's overall aptitude in this measure.

(B) Collegial Growth Path - The educator and evaluator collaboratively develop the educator's professional goal(s). The educator and evaluator have an equal voice 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 educator'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 educator's overall aptitude in this measure.

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

The Matrix summative rating is to be used for state reporting purposes as required by the ESEA Flexibility Waiver.

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 on a program of assistance for improvement if, in the judgment of the superintendent or designee, a program of assistance for improvement is needed.

V. 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 educator:

- 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
- Educator has the opportunity to provide additional evidence or 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.

VI. Aligned Professional Learning

All educators 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 educators in their professional growth; in other words, depending on what Professional Growth Path an educator is on, other parts of the evaluation and support systems should differ to accommodate an educator's growth needs.

It is highly recommended that additional supports be provided for educators with Directed or Consulting Professional Growth Paths. Additionally, it is important to differentiate supports for educators 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/medium of aligned professional learning opportunities (as identified via rubric)