

Measures of Student Learning



TEACHER



The contents of this guidebook were developed under a Race to the Top grant from the Department of Education. However, those contents do not necessarily represent the policy of the Department of Education, and you should not assume endorsement by the Federal Government.

Table of Contents

Introduction	2
How to Use the Guidebook.....	2
Measures of Student Learning	3
Student Learning Objectives	3
Approving Student Learning/Outcome Objectives	16
Reviewing Student Learning/Outcome Objectives at the Mid-Year Conference ..	16
Scoring Individual Student Learning/Outcome Objectives	17
The Rhode Island Growth Model.....	19
Appendix 1: Student Learning Lookup Tables	20

Introduction

How to Use the Guidebook

The purpose of this Guidebook is to describe the process and basic requirements for the student learning measures that are used as part of the teacher evaluation and support process. For aspects of the process that have room for flexibility and school/district-level discretion, we have clearly separated and labeled different options with a ***Flexibility Factor***.

To help educators better understand how to best implement various aspects of student learning process, additional resources are available on the Rhode Island Department of Education (RIDE) website, including online training modules, sample Student Learning/Outcome Objectives, and a suite of calibration protocols designed to help school and district leaders facilitate ongoing calibration exercises.

Flexibility Factor

Boxes like this one will be used throughout the guidebook to highlight where schools and LEAs have an opportunity to customize aspects of the process and establish policies to meet their local needs.

The ***Online Resource*** icon (shown on the right) will be used throughout the Guidebook to indicate that a corresponding resource is available on the RIDE website. Please note additional resources will be developed over time. Educators can directly access the educator evaluation pages on the RIDE website at www.ride.ri.gov/EdEval.



Measures of Student Learning

Improving student learning is at the center of our work and measuring student learning is a critical part of the teacher evaluation process. Depending on the teacher's specific assignment, teachers use one or more of the following measures to assess the teacher's impact on student learning: Student Learning Objectives (SLOs), Student Outcome Objectives (SOOs), and the Rhode Island Growth Model (RIGM).

Measures of student learning are included in teacher evaluations because:

- Student learning measures, when combined with classroom observations and evidence of Professional Responsibilities, improve the accuracy of the Final Effectiveness Ratings for teachers¹.
- Analyzing student learning data is a best practice for self-reflection and increased collaboration around student learning.
- Student learning is a critical indicator of teacher effectiveness.

Student Learning Objectives

An SLO measures a teacher's impact on student learning through demonstrated progress toward academic goals. The SLO process is student-centered and curriculum-focused. It recognizes the impact teachers have in their classrooms, is based on research, and supports best-practices like prioritizing the most important learning standards, implementing curriculum, and planning assessments. Additionally:

- **The SLO process respects the diversity of all grades, subjects, and courses.** The best way to measure student learning differs from one course or grade to another (e.g., measuring student learning in a third grade art class vs. a tenth grade chemistry class). SLOs present an opportunity for teachers to be actively involved in deciding how to best measure the learning of their specific population of students while providing a consistent process for all teachers across the state.
- **SLOs utilize the assessment process teachers think are best for their specific purposes.** SLOs require teachers to identify the most important learning that occurs within their grade or subject. Such learning should be measured by a high-quality, authentic assessment. When written well, SLOs should include assessments that require students to produce evidence of their learning. However, the primary purpose of that assessment should be to measure what the teacher is teaching and the students are learning. **No assessment should be used just to collect evidence for an SLO.**


NOTE: Some special education teachers may use SOOs in place of one or more of their SLOs. An SOO is a long-term goal focused on an outcome that increases access to learning or creates conditions that facilitate learning. Additional information about SOOs for special education teachers, including an SLO/SOO Decision Tree, can be found on page 14.

¹ Kane, T.J., McCaffrey, D.F., Miller, T., & Staiger, D.O. (2013). *Have we identified effective teachers?* Measures of Effective Teaching project. Retrieved from http://www.metproject.org/downloads/MET_Validating_Using_Random_Assignment_Research_Paper.pdf.

The Student Learning Objective Process

Teachers should, whenever possible, work collaboratively with grade, subject area, or course colleagues to develop SLOs. Teams of teachers can craft SLOs together, but should differentiate their targets according to the students' baseline data. The SLO process is meant to foster reflection and conversation about the essential curriculum, targeted outcomes, and assessment tools used in classrooms across the state.

The SLO process mirrors a teacher's planning, instruction, and assessment cycle as described in the chart below:



The Anatomy of a Student Learning Objective

The SLO Form is designed to elicit answers to three essential questions:

- 1. What are the most important knowledge/skills I want my students to attain by the end of the interval of instruction?**
- 2. Where are my students now (at the beginning of instruction) with respect to the objective?**
- 3. Based on what I know about my students, where do I expect them to be by the end of the interval of instruction and how will they demonstrate their knowledge/skills?**

Anatomy of a Student Learning Objective (Form)

Title – A short name for the SLO		
Content Area – The content area(s) to which this SLO applies		
Grade Level – The grade level(s) of the students		
Students – The number and grade/class of students to whom this SLO applies		
Interval of Instruction – The length of the course (e.g., year, semester, quarter)		
Main Criteria	Element	Description
Essential Question: What are the most important knowledge/skills I want my students to attain by the end of the interval of instruction?		
Priority of Content	Objective Statement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identifies the priority content and learning that is expected during the interval of instruction Should be broad enough that it captures the major content of an extended instructional period, but focused enough that it can be measured If attained, positions students to be ready for the next level of work in this content area
	Rationale	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides a data-driven and/or curriculum-based explanation for the focus of the Student Learning Objective
	Aligned Standards	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Specifies the standards (e.g., CCSS, Rhode Island GSEs, GLEs, or other state or national standards) to which this objective is aligned
Essential Question: Where are my students now (at the beginning of instruction) with respect to the objective?		
	Baseline Data/ Information	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Describes students' baseline knowledge, including the source(s) of data/ information and its relation to the overall course objectives
Essential Question: Based on what I know about my students, where do I expect them to be by the end of the interval of instruction and how will they demonstrate their knowledge/skills?		
Rigor of Target	Target(s)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Describes where the teacher expects all students to be at the end of the interval of instruction Should be measurable and rigorous, yet attainable for the interval of instruction In most cases, should be tiered to reflect students' differing baselines
	Rationale for Target(s)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Explains the way in which the target was determined, including the data source (e.g., benchmark assessment, historical data for the students in the course, historical data from past students) and evidence that indicate the target is both rigorous and attainable for all students Should be provided for each target and/or tier
Quality of Evidence	Evidence Source(s)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Describes how student learning will be assessed and why the assessment(s) is appropriate for measuring the objective Describes how the measure of student learning will be administered (e.g., once or multiple times; during class or during a designated testing window; by the classroom teacher or someone else) Describes how the evidence will be collected and scored (e.g., scored by the classroom teacher individually or by a team of teachers; scored once or a percentage double-scored)


Number and Scope of Student Learning Objectives

Educators and evaluators should work together to determine how many SLOs are appropriate for their instructional area and teaching load. The minimum number of SLOs an educator may set is two. Educators should discuss their rationale for selecting a particular course or subject area with their evaluators at the beginning of the school year.

While ideally all courses or subjects the teacher instructs would be included in his or her set of SLOs, sometimes the most effective strategy is to begin by focusing on a specific area of need and expanding over time.

Students

An individual SLO must include all students on the roster for the course or subject area with which the objective is aligned. An example for a High School Math Teacher is below:



Furthermore, percentages or particular groups of students may not be excluded. For example, **students with IEPs in a general education setting must be included in the general educator’s SLO.** In addition, teachers may not include absenteeism clauses into SLOs (e.g. “for students who are present 80% of the time) because these potentially exclude students. However, an evaluator can take extreme absenteeism into account when scoring the SLO.

Setting tiered targets according to students’ starting points, whether they are measuring mastery or progress, is recommended because students may begin at varying levels of preparedness. However, the expectation is that all students should make academic gains regardless of where they start. For example, students who begin below grade-level may be expected to make substantial progress toward course/grade objectives by the end of the instructional interval, reducing the gap between their current and expected performance, while students who begin on grade level may be expected to meet or exceed proficiency by the end of the instructional period.

Baseline Data/Information

Data is information, and educators collect information from students every day in order to help them plan effectively, adjust instruction, monitor progress, and assess student performance. In order to set appropriate long-term goals for students, educators must understand where their students are at the beginning of instruction. When determining which baseline data are available and how they might be used, consider the following:

- Student data or information from prior years in many cases can be used to inform the teacher’s understanding of students’ starting points.

- If students have never been exposed to course content (e.g. students taking Spanish), it may be more accurate to gather information on the students' performance throughout the first few weeks of the course.
- Baseline data from a pre-test may be helpful when it is important to understand students' skill or knowledge level at the beginning of the course. These tests could include a teacher-created or commercial assessment and focus on either the current or previous grade's standards and content.

Baseline data/information can be used in two ways for SLOs. It can inform the Objective Statement and contribute to setting Targets. In all scenarios baseline data/information is a must; however, **a pre-test/post-test model is not required and, in some cases, might be inappropriate.**

The function of the baseline assessment is to provide information about where students are starting in order to set appropriate targets. This does not mean it is necessary to pinpoint projected student growth, since some targets may focus on reaching a specific level of proficiency. Teachers should gather information that helps them understand how prepared their students are to access class material.

For more resources and best practices on gathering baseline data/information, see the online Module: *Using Baseline Data/Information to Set SLO Targets* on the RIDE website at: www.ride.ri.gov/EdEval-OnlineModules.



Aligning Student Learning Objectives

SLOs should be horizontally and vertically aligned, when applicable. When SLOs are *horizontally aligned*, all teachers in the same grade level who teach the same course collaborate to set SLOs and then each teacher sets specific targets based upon his or her own students' baseline knowledge and skills.

Vertical alignment means that SLOs build on one another across a school, reflecting the scope of the larger curriculum and comprehensive assessment system from grade to grade or course level to course level. This requires significant collaboration and requires time for a faculty to develop.

There may be instances in which teachers and building administrators collaborate to align their SLOs as well. In these cases, teachers can have direct or supportive alignment. There are some instances when it may not make sense for a teacher to align their SLOs with an administrator's SLOs or with a LEA goal or improvement plan.

There are three ways to think about alignment between teacher SLOs and building administrator SLOs:

- **Direct alignment** is when the focus of the objective statement, targets, and evidence sources are shared. The teacher's SLOs mirror the building administrator's SLOs.
- **Supportive alignment** is when the content or skills addressed in the teacher's SLO relates to the content or skills of the building administrator's SLO, **but is not identical** and may be assessed using different evidence sources.
- **No alignment** is when the teacher's SLO authentically reflects the most important content or skills of his/her discipline and grade level, but do not align with the content or skills of the building administrator's SLO.

An example of each type of alignment can be seen below.

Type	Example
<p style="text-align: center;">Direct Alignment</p>	<p>In a K-5 school, multiple sources indicate that students struggle with literacy in the earlier grades and numeracy in the upper grades. The principal set the focus for K-2 on increasing the number of students reading on grade level and for 3-5 increasing the number of students who are proficient in math. The K-2 teachers collaborated to write and share an SLO focused on increasing the number of students reading on grade level and differentiated their <i>Targets</i> according to the students in their individual classes. The 3-5 teachers did the same with their own shared focus on numeracy. The teachers SLOs were directly aligned with the principal's SLOs.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Supportive Alignment</p>	<p>A middle school principal has set the focus on writing across the curriculum and students' ability to respond to informational text in their transition to the Common Core literacy standards. While some teachers' SLOs might directly align to the building administrator's SLO, others might focus more on complimentary skills. For example, an English teacher might write an SLO on reading and responding to informational text, while a social studies teacher might focus on synthesizing various primary and secondary sources focused on the social studies content. The skills that the building administrator, English teacher, and social studies teacher focus on are very similar, but the SLOs are tailored to the content of the course and the Evidence Sources are particular to each discipline.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">No Alignment</p>	<p>The school principal has written an SLO focused on math and one on literacy. While the music teacher often incorporates math and literacy into her classroom and could align her SLOs to support the two building administrator SLOs, the main focus of the curriculum at the middle school is music performance. Given this focus, the LEA music teacher's evaluator did not feel alignment would be appropriate.</p>

NOTE: It is essential that a teacher's SLOs authentically reflect the most important content or skills of the discipline and grade level they teach. We encourage LEA administrators, school administrators, and teams of teachers to work together toward common objective statements when appropriate, but we do not recommend forcing alignment.

Rigor of Target

When setting the target(s) for an SLO, the teacher should start by considering the most important content/skills the students need to attain by the end of the interval of instruction (objective statement), and where the students are with respect to the objective statement (baseline data).




While the default target for any SLO should reflect mastery of the relevant course or grade-level standards, the reality is that not all students begin with the same level of preparedness. Therefore, targets may be tiered to reflect differentiated expectations for learning.

Setting tiered targets based on students' prerequisite knowledge and skills helps to ensure that the targets are rigorous and attainable for all students. Students entering a course with high proficiency or robust prerequisite skills will need to be challenged by a higher target. For students entering a course with lower proficiency or lacking prerequisite skills, a more modest target may be appropriate in order to ensure that it is reasonably attainable in the interval of instruction.

However, it is also important to consider the support a student or groups of students receive. For example, students may enter a course lacking prerequisite skills in reading, but they have a personal literacy plan and receive significant support from a reading specialist and a special education teacher. In this scenario, it may make sense to raise expectations for what the students will be able to learn or be able to do by the end of the interval of instruction because of the intensity of support provided.

The intent of tiered targets is not to calcify achievement gaps. The needs for fairness and appropriateness should be balanced by the need to challenge lower-achieving students to catch up to their peers. Additionally, while students in lower tiers may have a lower absolute target, reaching it may require them to make *more progress* than students with higher targets, resulting in a closing or narrowing of the achievement gap(s).

The following graphic shows one example of how to tier targets based on students' preparedness for the content:



Teachers who collaborate on SLOs should also confer about targets; however the targets for each individual teacher must reflect the actual students in their class(es).

More detailed information about SLO target setting, including the online module *Using Baseline Data and Information to Set SLO Targets*, is available on the RIDE website at www.ride.ri.gov/EdEval-OnlineModules.



Quality of Evidence

High-quality assessments are essential for accurately measuring student learning. **In Rhode Island, a teacher may use a variety of summative assessments as evidence for SLOs, including performance tasks, extended writing, research papers, projects, portfolios, unit assessments, final assessments, or a combination.** Teachers may use assessments purchased from a commercial vendor or created by individual teachers, teams of teachers, LEA leaders. However, all assessments must be reviewed by evaluators.

In most cases, teachers of the same course should share an SLO that includes the same source(s) of evidence. Using a common source of evidence ensures that students across the school or LEA in each course are required to demonstrate their understanding in the same way and presents an opportunity for teachers to collaborate in the creation or selection of the assessment, scoring, as well as in reviewing and analyzing assessment results. This collaboration promotes consistency and fairness, and can make the process more efficient for teachers and evaluators.

Selecting the right evidence source is about finding the best assessment for the purpose. In order to make this determination, the question to ask is, “Is this evidence source *aligned* to what is being measured?” Alignment of evidence source refers to:

- **Content** (e.g., SLO focuses on reading informational text and the evidence source focuses on informational text)
- **Coverage** (e.g., SLO includes five standards and all five of those standards are addressed by the evidence source)
- **Complexity** (e.g., SLO addresses a variety of DOK² levels and the evidence source includes items/tasks aligned with those DOK levels).

An assessment may be high-quality for a particular purpose, but if it is not aligned to the content standards of the SLO, it is not the best choice. Additionally, the use of a single evidence source can be problematic if it does not capture the full breadth of skills and knowledge identified in the Objective Statement. The following example describes an example where the teacher uses multiple sources of evidence in the SLO:

The Objective Statement says that students will improve their reading accuracy, fluency, and comprehension of literary and informational text, and their ability to convey information about what they’ve read. One assessment might be used to measure reading accuracy, fluency, and some comprehension of both literary and information text. Another assessment might be used to measure deeper reading comprehension and their ability to convey information about what they’ve read.

² DOK refers to Webb’s (2002) Depth of Knowledge Framework, which includes four levels of cognitive demand: Level 1: Recall, Level 2: Skill/Concept, Level 3: Strategic Thinking, Level 4: Extended Thinking. See CAS Criteria & Guidance p. 15.

Other considerations for determining the quality of an evidence source include format, item type, and administration and scoring procedures. In most cases, the evidence source(s) should be as authentic as possible without being impractical to administer and score.

More information about creating and selecting assessments can be found in the *Comprehensive Assessment System Criteria & Guidance* document, available on the RIDE website at: www.ride.ri.gov/CAS.



RIDE has also developed an **Assessment Toolkit** to support educators with assessment literacy. The Assessment Toolkit contains four resources:

1. **Creating & Selecting High-Quality Assessments Guidance**
2. **Using Baseline Data and Information Guidance**
3. **Collaborative Scoring Guidance**
4. **Assessment Review Tool**

Educators can access the Assessment Toolkit on the RIDE website at: www.ride.ri.gov/EdEval-OnlineModules.

The table below includes further guidance on selecting high-quality evidence sources. These Assessment Quality Descriptors represent some of the most important aspects of an assessment to consider. Some of the criteria are inherent to the assessment (e.g., the purpose), while others relate to an educator's use of the assessment (e.g., the scoring process).

Assessment Quality Rubric

High Quality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Assessment is aligned with its intended use. ▪ Assessment measures what is intended. ▪ Items represent a variety of DOK levels. ▪ Assessment includes a sufficient number of items to reliably assess content. ▪ Assessment includes some higher-level DOK constructed response items at least one very challenging item. ▪ Assessment is grade level appropriate and aligned to the curriculum. ▪ Scoring is objective (includes scoring guides and benchmark work), and uses a collaborative scoring process.
Moderate Quality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Assessment is loosely aligned to its intended use. ▪ Assessment mostly measures what is intended. ▪ Items represent more than one level of DOK. ▪ Assessment includes a sufficient number of items to reliably assess most content. ▪ Assessment is grade level appropriate. ▪ Scoring may include scoring guides to decrease subjectivity, and/or may include collaborative scoring.
Low Quality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Assessment is not aligned to its intended use. ▪ Assessment does not measure what is intended. ▪ Items represent only one level of DOK. ▪ Assessment includes an insufficient number of items to reliably assess most content. ▪ Assessment is not grade level appropriate. ▪ Scoring is open to subjectivity, and/or not collaboratively scored.

English Language Learners

General educators should incorporate English Learners (ELs) in their SLOs. Teachers may set differentiated targets to ensure that all students are meeting a rigorous, yet attainable, target. In some cases, evidence may need to be differentiated for ELs to account for how they currently demonstrate content skills and knowledge (this can be found in the WIDA CAN-DO Descriptors by domain and grade level cluster). All teachers should ensure their content targets for ELs are informed by students' language comprehension and communication skills.

There are **two alignment options** for teachers working with ELs:

- **Content-related SLO** – English Language Learning (ELL) teachers whose primary responsibility is content-related support should align their SLOs to general educators' content-focused SLOs. Since the group(s) of students may differ on each teacher's caseload, targets should be tailored accordingly.
- **English-Language Development SLO** – ELL teachers whose primary responsibility is students' language development may set SLOs using English Language Development (ELD) goals based on WIDA growth charts. Evidence should include ACCESS for ELs, the WIDA Model, or locally developed assessments based on the WIDA standards (speaking, writing rubrics, WIDA summative ELPS, ACCESS released items, etc.).

For more information on WIDA growth charts, download the Growth Report User Guide here: <https://www.wida.us/get.aspx?id=694>

To access the CAN-DO descriptors, visit: https://www.wida.us/standards/CAN_DOs/



Students with Disabilities

Special educators provide specially designed instruction in a variety of settings and delivery models to meet the diverse needs of their students. Because of the unique needs of the students, special educators' impact on their students' learning **may be measured through the use of SLOs and/or Student Outcome Objectives (SOOs).**

SLOs for students with disabilities should be based on Common Core standards or other appropriate content standards, historical data, and other academic information. Although there may be overlap in the content, assessments, or evidence used, Individualized Education Program (IEP) goals cannot be used as SLOs. **SLOs include a complete roster of students, whereas IEP goals are independently crafted for each student.** IEPs can inform a teacher's or an instructional team's SLOs by providing data to inform Baseline Data/Information and Targets. IEP goals, assessments, and other evidence may inform SLOs if the focus is in content areas of English Language Arts or mathematics, for example, and reflects student academic performance consistent with the general education curriculum at grade level.

SOOs for students with disabilities are long-term goals set by special educators that are focused on outcomes that increase access to learning. The focus of an SOO is to foster academic success for students. SOOs could be set for the full academic year or the length of time services are provided. An SOO must be specific and measurable, and should be aligned to standards or school or LEA priorities, when applicable. For example, evidence-based instructional strategies in the area of functional, organizational or social emotional skills necessary for students' access to the general education curriculum may be used for SOOs because they focus on outcomes that increase access to learning.

Special educators should tier their SLO or SOO targets based on various baseline data/information to ensure the targets are rigorous, yet attainable for all students included within the SOO. There is no maximum amount of tiers an educator can create for a set of students. Some educators with smaller caseloads may write SLOs/SOOs in which each student has his or her own target based on individualized starting points and rate of progress. This data may be found within the IEP. Special educators and general educators should collaborate when setting targets for students with disabilities.


"Specially designed instruction" means adapting, as appropriate, to the needs of an eligible child under this part, the content, methodology, or delivery of instruction— (i) To address the unique needs of the child that result from the child's disability; and (ii) To ensure access of the child to the general curriculum, so that the child can meet the educational standards within the jurisdiction of the public agency that apply to all children.
Regulation 300.39

To determine when an SLO or an SOO would be appropriate, special educators and their evaluators should use the SLO/SOO Decision Tree on the following page. RIDE has an online module, *Special Education and SLOs/SOOs*, which further explains which students should be included in an SLO versus an SOO. The module can be found at: www.ride.ri.gov/EdEval-OnlineModules.



SLO/SOO Decision Tree

This decision tree is a guide to assist special educators and support professionals in determining whether they should set an SLO, SOO, or a combination of both. The determination of an educator's student learning options is based upon that educator's role. LEAs need to determine what type of student learning measure is most appropriate for the specific positions in their LEA.



Anatomy of a Student Outcome Objective (Form)

<p>Title – A short name for the SOO</p> <p>Content Area – The service area(s) to which this SOO applies</p> <p>Grade Level – The grade level(s) of the students</p> <p>Students – The number of students to whom this SOO applies</p> <p>Interval of Service – The interval of service defines the period to which the SOO applies. It should mirror the length of time in which the educator is actively working with students, typically one academic year, one semester or a shorter timeframe, as justified by the duration of the service(s) being delivered.</p>		
Main Criteria	Element	Description
<p>Essential Questions: What is the most important outcome that will enable students to have better access to education through your services?</p>		
Priority of Content	Objective Statement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Describes the specific outcome that the support professional is working to achieve. ▪ Is specific enough to clarify the focus on the SOO, even though the depth and breadth of the objective statement may vary depending on the Support Professional's role and assignment, but should be specific enough to clarify the focus of the SOO
	Rationale	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Provides a data-driven explanation for the focus of the SOO and indicates if it is aligned with a school or LEA priority
<p>Essential Questions: Where are my students now with respect to the objective?</p>		
	Baseline Data/ Information	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Includes information that has been collected or reviewed to support the overall reasoning for the student outcome objective ▪ Includes data from sources such as survey data, statistics, participation rates, or references to historical trends or observations
<p>Essential Questions: Based on what I know about my students, where do I expect them to be by the end of the interval of service? How will I measure this?</p>		
Rigor of Target	Target(s)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Describe where it is expected for groups of students or the school community as a whole to be at the end of the interval of service ▪ Should be measurable and rigorous, yet attainable
	Rationale for Target(s)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Explains the way in which the target was determined, including the baseline information sources and why the target is appropriate for the group of students or the school community ▪ Explains the way in which the target was determined, including the data source (e.g., benchmark assessment, trend data, or historical data from past students) and evidence that indicate the target is both rigorous and attainable for all students. ▪ Should be provided for each target and/or tier.
Quality of Evidence	Evidence Source(s)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Describes how the objective will be measured and why the evidence source(s) is appropriate for measuring the objective (e.g. logs, scoring guides, screening procedures, surveys) ▪ Describes how the measure of the student outcome will be collected or administered (e.g., once or multiple times; during class time or during a designated testing window; by the support professional or someone else) ▪ Describes how the evidence will be analyzed and/or scored (e.g., scored by the support professional individually or by a team of support professionals; scored once or a percentage double-scored)
	Strategies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Describe the method, strategies or plan that will be used to achieve your goal

Approving Student Learning/Outcome Objectives

In order for an SLO/SOO to be approved, it must be rated as acceptable on three criteria:

1. **Priority of Content**
2. **Rigor of Target(s)**
3. **Quality of Evidence**

Some SLOs/SOOs will be approvable upon submission, while others will require revisions. An SLO and an SOO Quality Review Tool have been developed to further clarify expectations and help teachers and evaluators determine if an SLO is acceptable or needs revision. The SLO and SOO Quality Review Tools are available on the RIDE website at: www.ride.ri.gov/EdEval-Best-Practices-Resources.



Reviewing Student Learning/Outcome Objectives at the Mid-Year Conference

The Mid-Year Conference offers an opportunity for teachers to review and discuss their students' learning progress with their evaluators. Teachers and evaluators should work together to ensure students' learning needs are effectively addressed through instructional practice and supports. If students are not progressing as expected, the teacher and evaluator should collaborate to revise the supports and interventions in place to help accelerate student progress.

At the Mid-Year Conference, if it has become clear that an SLO/SOO is no longer appropriate, it may be revised. Revisions should be rare, but adjustments may be made if:

- **The teaching schedule or assignment has changed significantly.**
- **Class compositions have changed significantly.**
- **New, higher-quality sources of evidence are available.**
- **Based on new information gathered since they were set, objectives fail to address the most important learning challenges in the classroom/school.**

NOTE: There may be extenuating circumstances that do not fit these four categories in which the evaluator must use professional judgment.

Scoring Individual Student Learning/Outcome Objectives

The process for scoring individual SLOs/SOOs begins with a review of the available evidence submitted by the teacher, including a summary of the results. Evaluators will score each individual SLO/SOO as *Exceeded* (4), *Met* (3), *Nearly Met* (2), or *Not Met* (1).

Exceeded	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• This category applies when all or almost all students met the target(s) and many students exceeded the target(s). For example, exceeding the target(s) by a few points, a few percentage points, or a few students would not qualify an SLO/SOO for this category. This category should only be selected when a substantial number of students surpassed the overall level of attainment established by the target(s).
Met	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• This category applies when all or almost all students met the target(s). Results within a few points, a few percentage points, or a few students on either side of the target(s) should be considered “Met.” The expectation for this category should be high and it should only be selected when it is clear that the students met the overall level of attainment established by the target(s).
Nearly Met	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• This category applies when many students met the target(s), but the target(s) was missed by more than a few points, a few percentage points, or a few students. This category should be selected when it is clear that students fell short of the level of attainment established by the target(s).
Not Met	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• This category applies when the results do not fit the description of what it means to have “Nearly Met.” If a substantial proportion of students did not meet the target(s), the SLO/SOO was not met. This category also applies when results are missing, incomplete, or unreliable.

Additional Student Learning/Outcome Objective Scoring Guidance


To help further clarify the definitions of *Exceeded*, *Met*, *Nearly Met*, and *Not Met*, RIDE has developed the following scoring guidelines that LEAs can choose to adopt.

Not Met	Nearly Met	Met	Exceeded
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• <70% of students met their target	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 70-89% of students met their target	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• At least 90% of students met their target	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• At least 90% of students met their target AND• 25% of students exceeded their target

NOTE: The additional SLO/SOO scoring guidance above does not eclipse local LEA policy. LEAs have the flexibility to adopt the additional SLO/SOO scoring guidance, create their own guidance, or choose to continue to use the *Exceeded*, *Met*, *Nearly Met*, and *Not Met* descriptions exclusively. For example, LEAs may want to create specific guidance for scoring SLOs that represent a small number of students.

Student Learning/Outcome Objective Scoring Process Map

The SLO/SOO Scoring Process Map below outlines the specific steps an evaluator should take to determine if individual SLOs/SOOs are *Exceeded*, *Met*, *Nearly Met*, or *Not Met*.



The Rhode Island Growth Model

The Rhode Island Growth Model (RIGM) is a statistical model that measures students' achievement in reading and mathematics by comparing their growth to that of their academic peers. It does not replace the proficiency data from state assessments. Rather, the RIGM enables us to look at growth in addition to proficiency to get a fuller picture of student achievement.

Using this model, we can calculate each student's progress relative to their academic peers on Statewide Assessments. Academic peers are students who have scored similarly on Statewide Assessments in the past. Because all students' scores are compared only to those of their academic peers, students at every level of proficiency have the opportunity to demonstrate growth in their achievement.

In the past, RIGM scores were based on NECAP & PARCC assessments and were released via the Educator Performance and Support System (EPSS) to provide teachers and school and district leaders with a critical piece of information to improve teaching and learning. Although, these scores did not factor into the Final Effectiveness Rating, they were released so they could be used for self-reflection and to improve teaching and learning.

Looking ahead, RIGM scores will be based on RICAS & SAT assessments beginning in 2018-19.

Resources on the Rhode Island Growth Model can be accessed on the RIDE website at:
www.ride.ri.gov/RIGM.



Appendix 1: Student Learning Lookup Tables

Table 1: SLO/SOO Scoring Lookup Table for 2 SLOs/SOOs

SLO/SOO 1	SLO/SOO 2	Final
Exceeded	Exceeded	Exceptional Attainment
Exceeded	Met	Full Attainment
Exceeded	Nearly Met	Full Attainment
Met	Met	Full Attainment
Met	Nearly Met	Full Attainment
Exceeded	Not Met	Partial Attainment
Met	Not Met	Partial Attainment
Nearly Met	Nearly Met	Partial Attainment
Nearly Met	Not Met	Minimal Attainment
Not Met	Not Met	Minimal Attainment

Table 2: SLO/SOO Scoring Lookup Table for 3 SLOs/SOOs

SLO/SOO 1	SLO/SOO 2	SLO/SOO 3	Final
Exceeded	Exceeded	Exceeded	Exceptional Attainment
Exceeded	Exceeded	Met	Exceptional Attainment
Exceeded	Exceeded	Nearly Met	Full Attainment
Exceeded	Exceeded	Not Met	Partial Attainment
Exceeded	Met	Met	Full Attainment
Exceeded	Met	Nearly Met	Full Attainment
Exceeded	Met	Not Met	Partial Attainment
Exceeded	Nearly Met	Nearly Met	Partial Attainment
Exceeded	Nearly Met	Not Met	Partial Attainment
Exceeded	Not Met	Not Met	Minimal Attainment
Met	Met	Met	Full Attainment
Met	Met	Nearly Met	Full Attainment
Met	Met	Not Met	Partial Attainment
Met	Nearly Met	Nearly Met	Partial Attainment
Met	Nearly Met	Not Met	Partial Attainment
Met	Not Met	Not Met	Minimal Attainment
Nearly Met	Nearly Met	Nearly Met	Partial Attainment
Nearly Met	Nearly Met	Not Met	Partial Attainment
Nearly Met	Not Met	Not Met	Minimal Attainment
Not Met	Not Met	Not Met	Minimal Attainment

Table 3: SLO/SOO Scoring Lookup Table for 4 SLOs/SOOs

SLO/SOO 1	SLO/SOO 2	SLO/SOO 3	SLO/SOO 4	Final
Exceeded	Exceeded	Exceeded	Exceeded	Exceptional Attainment
Exceeded	Exceeded	Exceeded	Met	Exceptional Attainment
Exceeded	Exceeded	Exceeded	Nearly Met	Full Attainment
Exceeded	Exceeded	Exceeded	Not Met	Full Attainment
Exceeded	Exceeded	Met	Met	Full Attainment
Exceeded	Exceeded	Met	Nearly Met	Full Attainment
Exceeded	Exceeded	Met	Not Met	Partial Attainment
Exceeded	Exceeded	Nearly Met	Nearly Met	Partial Attainment
Exceeded	Exceeded	Nearly Met	Not Met	Partial Attainment
Exceeded	Exceeded	Not Met	Not Met	Partial Attainment
Exceeded	Met	Met	Met	Full Attainment
Exceeded	Met	Met	Nearly Met	Full Attainment
Exceeded	Met	Met	Not Met	Partial Attainment
Exceeded	Met	Nearly Met	Nearly Met	Partial Attainment
Exceeded	Met	Nearly Met	Not Met	Partial Attainment
Exceeded	Met	Not Met	Not Met	Partial Attainment
Exceeded	Nearly Met	Nearly Met	Nearly Met	Partial Attainment
Exceeded	Nearly Met	Nearly Met	Not Met	Partial Attainment
Exceeded	Nearly Met	Not Met	Not Met	Minimal Attainment
Exceeded	Not Met	Not Met	Not Met	Minimal Attainment
Met	Met	Met	Met	Full Attainment
Met	Met	Met	Nearly Met	Full Attainment
Met	Met	Met	Not Met	Partial Attainment
Met	Met	Nearly Met	Nearly Met	Partial Attainment
Met	Met	Nearly Met	Not Met	Partial Attainment
Met	Met	Not Met	Not Met	Partial Attainment
Met	Nearly Met	Nearly Met	Nearly Met	Partial Attainment
Met	Nearly Met	Nearly Met	Not Met	Partial Attainment
Met	Nearly Met	Not Met	Not Met	Minimal Attainment
Met	Not Met	Not Met	Not Met	Minimal Attainment
Nearly Met	Nearly Met	Nearly Met	Nearly Met	Partial Attainment
Nearly Met	Nearly Met	Nearly Met	Not Met	Partial Attainment
Nearly Met	Nearly Met	Not Met	Not Met	Minimal Attainment
Nearly Met	Not Met	Not Met	Not Met	Minimal Attainment
Not Met	Not Met	Not Met	Not Met	Minimal Attainment