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Introduction

The Center on Great Teachers and Leaders (GTL Center) developed this module on scoring student learning objectives (SLOs) to assist regional comprehensive centers, state education agencies, and, as appropriate, districts in their decisions on how to score SLOs. This module provides participants with an overview of the common approaches to scoring SLOs, examples from other states, and the strengths as well as considerations for each approach.

At the conclusion of this module, participants will be able to do the following:

- Identify state and district guiding principles related to scoring SLOs.
- Learn the various approaches to scoring an individual SLO and the benefits and considerations of each approach.
- Explore different approaches to combining SLO scores.

Facilitators should be able to do the following:

- Support colleagues in understanding the basic components of the SLO scoring process.
- Understand the benefits and considerations for the SLO scoring approaches.
- Use materials to facilitate preliminary SLO scoring discussions with colleagues.

Audience

This facilitator’s guide is designed as a blueprint to support states new to SLOs and in the early stages of considering the implementation of SLOs. The module is intended to assist states in making policy decisions concerning SLO scoring. It can be led by state leadership and can be cofacilitated by regional comprehensive center and GTL Center staff. This GTL Center module, one in a series of modules, provides initial knowledge building that can serve as the basis for state decision making.

SLO scoring decisions are often made at different levels; however, it is the state’s responsibility to ensure that SLOs are scored fairly and comparably between districts and schools. To that end, states will find this module useful for internal decision making and, in some cases, may wish to modify this module for meetings or workshops with districts.
Timing

The materials provided have been developed for a three-hour session, but they can be modified to fit alternative schedules. These materials also can be presented as an additional section or follow-up to the Introduction to Student Learning Objectives Professional Learning Module. For participants who are new to SLOs, the GTL Center highly recommends covering all training materials, with ample time for discussion and reflection. Please refer to the sample agenda included in the module for the recommended order of the module components and time allotted for each component.

Resources

The following resources are provided for use in delivering the SLO training module:

- Facilitator’s guide (this document)
- Slide presentation
- Participant handouts, including one for each activity

These materials may be used and adapted to fit the needs of the state context. To cite the content, please use the following statement: “These materials have been adapted in whole or in part with permission from the Center on Great Teachers and Leaders.”

Materials

The following materials are recommended for training and associated activities:

- Chart paper
- Permanent markers for chart paper
- Regular markers at each table for name cards
- Sticky notes
- Pens at each table

In This Guide

The rest of the guide provides a script (the text contained within quotation marks) to support facilitators as they present the content and learning activities included in this module. Along with the script, time stamps and guidance are included to support streamlined and organized facilitation. Reviewing the entire guide prior to facilitation is highly recommended.
Scoring Student Learning Objectives

Welcome and Introductions

Including introductions, Slides 1–7 will take approximately 20 minutes to review. If you are conducting this module as an additional section to Introduction to SLOs, begin with Slide 4.

To kick off the session, allow the hosts of the training to introduce themselves and the facilitators. Prior to the start of the day, ask the hosts to share their hopes and goals for the day—explaining to participants why this training is important enough to request that they break away from their busy schedules to attend.

During this slide, facilitators should introduce themselves and discuss their relevant background experiences to build participant confidence in their skills as facilitators. Ask participants to introduce themselves and include their titles so that their perspectives can be taken into account by the group.

Slides 2–4 acknowledge that the Center on Great Teachers and Leaders authored the training content.

Explain:

“The training slides and materials for today’s session were developed by the Center on Great Teachers and Leaders (GTL Center), a national content center led by American Institutes for Research. The GTL Center is dedicated to fostering a network of policymakers, practitioners, researchers, and innovators into a system of support for states to ensure great teachers and leaders in all schools.”

During this slide, it may be valuable also to acknowledge your organization’s history in working with the GTL Center.

Explain:

“The GTL Center is one of seven content centers that support the work of 15 regional centers. This map shows the different regional comprehensive centers that the content centers support. Other content centers include the College and Career Readiness and Success Center, as well as the Center on Standards and Assessment Implementation. These centers work collectively to support state education efforts.”
Using Slide 4, review the agenda for the day, making note of specific break times that are not noted on the slide. Ask participants if they have any questions before moving on to the next slide.

**Slide 4**

**Explain:**

“We have three outcomes for today’s meeting. First, you will learn how to identify state and district guiding principles related to scoring SLOs. Second, you will learn multiple approaches to scoring individual SLOs. And finally, we will explore different approaches to combining SLO scores.”

**Outcomes**

- Participants will do the following:
  - Identify state and district priorities related to scoring SLOs.
  - Learn multiple approaches to scoring individual SLOs.
  - Explore different approaches to combining SLO scores.

**Slide 5**

**Explain:**

“Scoring SLOs requires thinking about how to score SLOs individually and how to combine SLOs for a summative SLO score. For SLOs to be an objective and comparable measure of student growth, evaluators and teachers need a clear understanding of the scoring process. The scoring methodology should be simple, transparent, and fair. It also should foster consistent ratings across teachers and evaluators, and produce scores that can be combined with other measures to create a final summative score.”

**SLO Scoring Process**

- States and districts need to consider how to score an individual SLO and how to combine SLOs for a summative SLO score.
- Evaluators and teachers need a clear understanding of the SLO scoring process.
- The SLO scoring process should have the following characteristics:
  - Be simple, transparent, and fair
  - Foster consistent and fair ratings across teachers and evaluators
  - Produce scores that can be easily combined with other measures.
Explain:

“Before we examine the different scoring approaches, let’s start with a warm-up activity. The purpose of this activity is to initiate the problem-solving and decision-making process of identifying the elements of SLO scoring that are of greatest priority for your state and to examine their connection with the priorities within the overarching educator evaluation system. This process will help determine the most appropriate SLO scoring approach given the state or district context.

Using the handout titled Activity 1: Identifying Guiding Principles, work with a partner to discuss each of the features of SLO scoring, such as flexibility or comparability, and rank which, in your view, resonates as most critical for your state. In the ranking column, put a ‘1’ down for the most important feature, a ‘2’ for the second most important, and so on. In the reasoning column, jot down the rationale for each ranking. Next, reflect with your partner on your state’s priorities for the teacher evaluation system overall. For example, are there any priorities or guiding principles within the educator evaluation as a whole that are applicable for SLOs? Then, discuss how the educator evaluation system guiding principles connect and/or align with the features identified as essential for the SLO scoring process.”

“After you finish, we will have a few groups share out which feature they ranked first and why, and discuss the connections between the guiding principles.”

After a few groups have shared their first-ranked feature, tell the participants that these rankings will be revisited later in the training as they will serve as the foundation or guiding principles to selecting the SLO scoring process. For example, if teacher buy-in and ownership of the SLO process is of utmost priority, then you might choose a scoring process that allows for more professional judgment. However, if the priority is accountability to which high-stakes decisions are made, then selecting a scoring process that allows for a significant degree of professional judgment may not be the best option. We will revisit this again.
Approaches to Scoring Individual SLOs

This section serves as an introduction to the approaches to scoring individual SLOs. Slides 8–22 present a general overview of four approaches, an example from a state using each approach, and the strengths and considerations of each approach. The objectives of this section are to develop participants’ understanding of the approaches to scoring SLOs, including both the associated benefits and challenges.

Covering this section will take approximately 45 minutes.

**Explain:**

“Within the next 45 minutes or so we will examine four approaches to scoring an individual SLO. This will include an overview and description of each scoring approach, a state example, and the benefits and considerations of each approach. You also will have an opportunity to engage with each scoring approach using sample student performance data.”
Explain:

“It is essential to consider state and district contexts that impact the selection of the SLO scoring process. For example, state regulations may prevent or dictate the use of certain SLO scoring approaches. Some state regulations are very prescriptive; this is usually the case in which comparability is of utmost importance. In such cases, the state—through regulations—dictates the process by which all districts must abide. In other cases specific regulatory requirements are absent when local decisions can guide the process. Or the state may disseminate nonregulatory guidance in support of district implementation, but allow for local decisions. These contexts are important to consider in this decision-making process.. Who sets the scoring expectations—the state, the district, or the teacher and evaluator? The scoring expectations could include guidance, templates, rules, or examples. The scoring expectations may be set by multiple stakeholders, with the state providing some guidance and templates, but the evaluator and teacher determining the percentage of students needed to meet growth targets for each teacher rating.”

“In the case of SLOs, business rules are often warranted as they provide for a consistent approach to SLO development, implementation, and accountability. For example, consider questions such as: What teachers are responsible for completing SLOs? Do teachers need to be teachers of record to include students within their SLOs? Is there a minimum number of students that should be included within an individual teacher’s SLO? How will student absenteeism or mobility be addressed? What happens when more than one teacher holds responsibility for student learning (e.g., a coteaching, consulting, and/or resource room delivery model)? Next, we will examine some considerations for business rules that impact SLO scoring.”

Key Questions Associated With Scoring Individual SLOs

- What approach will the state require or allow?
- Who sets scoring expectations?
  - The state
  - The district
  - The teacher and evaluator
- What business rules are needed?
Explain:

“For SLOs to be a fair and accurate measure of a teacher’s impact on student growth, SLOs must focus only on the students who are present in the teacher’s classroom. If a student is chronically absent or no longer in the classroom, the SLO can be adjusted to address this change. States and districts create business rules to consistently address issues of student absenteeism and mobility.”

“Some business rule options to address absenteeism include the following:

- Require a threshold for student attendance. For example, requiring that students are present a specific number of days in the school year.
- Permit teachers to adjust their SLO to account for student attendance, which would typically occur during the midyear check-in. The teacher could create a unique student growth target for students who are absent a certain number of days.
- Evaluator’s can take into account evidence of chronic absenteeism when determining final SLO scores.”

Business Rules: Absenteeism

- Require a threshold for student attendance.
- Permit teachers to adjust their SLO(s) to account for student attendance.
- Have evaluators take into account evidence of chronic absenteeism when determining final SLO scores.

Explain:

“Creating business rules regarding student mobility also can impact scoring. Students no longer enrolled in a teacher’s classroom should not be included in the teacher’s SLO score.”

“Some example business rule options to address the issue of student mobility include the following:

- Allow teachers to exclude students from their SLO(s) who were not enrolled during a certain period. For example, requiring that the students must be enrolled from October to April.
- Permit teachers to adjust their SLOs to account for changes in their roster, which would typically occur during the midyear check-in. The teacher could create a unique student growth goal for any new students and remove any students who unenrolled.
- Require that the SLO score be weighted by the number of days a student was enrolled.
- Specify that students must be present for both the pre- and posttest to be included in the SLO.”

Business Rules: Mobility

- Allow teachers to exclude students from their SLO who were not enrolled during a particular period.
- Permit teachers to adjust their SLO(s) to account for changes in their student roster.
- Require that SLO scores be weighted by the number of days a student was enrolled.
- Specify that students must be present for both the pre- and posttest to be included in the SLO.
**Explain:**

“Now that we’ve discussed some of the key questions, let’s explore the different approaches to scoring an individual SLO. The first approach is the descriptor-based model. In this approach, teachers submit evidence of student growth to their evaluator. The evaluator reviews that evidence and determines if students met their SLO targets. The evaluator uses his or her professional judgment when examining all of the evidence within the context of the teacher’s classroom and school and then assigns a rating based on his or her understanding of each rating level.”

“This slide highlights an example of the descriptor-based scoring approach. The rubric is from Rhode Island and includes a set of criteria that must be evident for each of Rhode Island’s performance-level ratings. Based on the evidence submitted by the teacher and the performance-level descriptions, the evaluator determines the teacher’s SLO performance rating.”

*Click the slide to circle the following phrases on the slide.*

“Places where the evaluator exercises judgment include the description for the number of students who met their targets, such as ‘all or almost all,’ ‘many students,’ or a ‘substantial proportion of students.’”

*Click the slide to circle the next set of phrases.*

“The evaluator also is using his or her judgment for the description on the number of points or percentage points students exceeded or missed their targets, such as in places that state a ‘few points.’”
**Explain:**

“One benefit to using this approach is that it provides greater flexibility in how an evaluator scores the teacher’s SLO. However, this additional flexibility also can lead to less comparability across teachers, schools, and districts. For example, a principal in one school may have a different understanding of what constitutes ‘many students’ or ‘many points’ than a principal in another school. The same principal also may have a different interpretation of ‘many points’ for each of his or her teachers, depending on the assessment used in the SLO. This lack of comparability can make it difficult to compare teacher effectiveness across schools in a district as well as across districts.”

“Another consideration for this approach is that it could require more training for evaluators to ensure a common understanding of the performance-level descriptions and the evidence implied by the definitions. Finally, this approach can be less transparent for teachers because it may be unclear to teachers how their SLOs are scored and what they need to achieve to be rated ‘effective.’ For example, in the Rhode Island example, a teacher may not know what an evaluator considers to be ‘many students’ or a ‘few points.’ The meaning of these amounts could vary depending on the number of students a teacher has included in his or her SLO or the type of assessment used.”

---

**Supplemental Scoring Guidance—Example From Rhode Island**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not Met</th>
<th>Nearly Met</th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Exceed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 70% of students met their target</td>
<td>70% to 69% of students met their target</td>
<td>At least 80% of students met their target</td>
<td>At least 90% of students met their target AND 75% of students exceeded their target</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Src: Rhode Island Department of Education (2016, p. 7)
Explain:

“The second approach to scoring an individual SLO is using a rubric developed by the teacher and evaluator. This approach is based on the number of students who met the student growth target and uses a rubric developed collaboratively by the teacher and the evaluator. This slide is an example from Indiana. As teachers develop their SLOs, they write the goals to include the numerical details needed to attain each rating level. The SLO growth targets are linked directly to a specific rating level specified by the teacher in collaboration with his or her evaluator. In this example, the teacher needs at least five of eight English learner students to maintain or increase one or more proficiency levels on the assessment to earn an ‘effective’ rating on her SLO.”

Explain:

“The benefit of using a rubric developed by the teacher and evaluator is that it gives greater flexibility to teachers in how their SLOs are scored because teachers play a key role in target setting. This approach gives teachers greater ownership of their goals within the SLO process. In addition, teachers know at the beginning of the school year how their students need to perform to receive an ‘effective’ or ‘highly effective’ score. One consideration with this approach is that teachers and evaluators will have to set their growth scores at the beginning of the year, and those targets might not be well-informed when the process is new. Another consideration for states and districts is that this approach requires extensive training and guidance to help teachers and evaluators understand how to set appropriate growth scores.”

Explain:

“States such as Hawaii, South Carolina, Arizona, and Oklahoma use the percentage approach. This method identifies the percentages of students meeting their growth scores for districts and aligns those percentages to performance levels. The example on this slide is from Hawaii and illustrates how the percentage of students who met their growth targets corresponds to a teacher rating of ‘highly effective’ to ‘ineffective.’ In this example, if 80 percent of a teacher’s students met or exceeded their growth targets, then she will receive a score of ‘effective’ on her SLO.”
Explain:

“A strength of the percentage approach is that it provides consistency within a state or district because all teachers have the same percentages for the performance levels. This approach also is more straightforward and transparent for teachers and evaluators, and sets clear expectations for what must be achieved at each performance level.”

“One consideration for using this approach is that ratings can be easily affected if the class size is small. In the next couple of slides, we’ll discuss this issue more closely and present strategies other states use to mitigate this risk.”

Explain:

“To illustrate the impact of a small class size, let’s look at an example. In this data set, there are eight students in the classroom, and 63 percent of the teacher’s students met their growth targets.”

Click the slide to make the text box appear.

“If one more student met their target, then the teacher would receive a score of 75 percent. If we use Ohio’s scoring matrix, this would be the difference of receiving an ‘approaching average’ and an ‘average’ score. Now, let’s imagine the teacher instead has a class of 125 students, with 64 percent meeting their growth. If one additional student does not meet his growth target, then the total percentage decreases to 63 percent. Using Ohio’s scoring matrix again, this score would still remain ‘approaching average.’”

Pause to let the audience review the slide.

Explain:

“To address this challenge of small class sizes, Hawaii has developed a more holistic rubric specifically for small class sizes. This rubric, seen on the slide here, is for teachers with a class size of four or fewer students. Having an approach to address small class sizes also may benefit teachers of students with disabilities or English language learners where a teacher is working with just a few students across multiple grade bands.”

Pause to let the audience review the slide.
Explain:

“The third approach to scoring an individual SLO is the benchmark approach. With this approach, the rating is derived from the percentage of students who meet their growth target. New York uses this scoring approach, and districts use the rating scale seen on this slide to score SLOs. In New York, a teacher’s final summative rating is based on a 100-point scale, with 40 of those points for student growth. Teachers are required to write at least two SLOs, and an individual SLO is awarded a number of points (1–20) based on the percentage of students who met their growth targets. Districts have some flexibility in choosing the range of points for each SLO rating that does not use a state assessment.”

“This slide includes an example of a completed rating scale. According to this scale, the teacher would need 70 percent to 84 percent of her students to meet their growth target for the SLO to be rated as ‘effective.’ However, if the teacher has 84 percent of her students meet the target, then she will earn 17 points toward her final summative rating versus only 9 points if 70 percent of her students meet their targets.”

“These scales offer a standardized process while also recognizing that achievement targets may differ based on the assessment used and the grade level of students. For example, with this approach, a district could create a common scoring scale for teachers in a similar grade or subject because they use a similar assessment.”

Explain:

“The benchmark approach has similar strengths as the percentage approach in that scoring is more consistent across the state, it is straightforward to communicate to teachers and evaluators, and it sets clear expectations for what must be achieved at each performance level. However, it may be difficult to set percentages or benchmarks for all grades and subjects in a district because teachers may not be able to use the same assessments for their SLOs. If there are not common assessments across grades and subjects, then it will be difficult for a district to set common benchmarks as student performance will be measured against different tools.”

This point might be a good time to pause for any questions from participants. If you have time, ask participants to reflect on what you just shared. For example, what pros and cons for each approach would you anticipate for your state or district?
Activity: Scoring Individual SLOs

This activity was developed to allow participants to apply three of the approaches to scoring SLOs. Participants will have an opportunity to practice scoring a sample SLO using one of the approaches. It corresponds with the handout titled Activity 2: Scoring Individual SLOs.

For Slides 23–25, give participants 15 minutes to read and work on the handout. End the activity with a 10-minute group discussion, prompted by the reflection questions.

**Explain:**
“Our next activity is going to support your growing understanding of how to score an individual SLO.”

---

**Explain:**
“Take a look at the handout titled Activity 2: Scoring Individual SLOs. The handout includes sample student performance data and three of the approaches to scoring SLOs. We will divide everyone into three groups. Each group will be assigned one approach for scoring an SLO and will use the sample data in the handout to score the SLO. We will spend 15 minutes working on scoring and another 10 minutes discussing your thoughts at the end of the activity.”
“As you work on scoring, consider these questions on the slide. We will use these questions to guide our discussion at the end of the activity.”

At the end of the 15 minutes, have each group share out about their experience scoring an SLO using their approach. Have each group respond to the guiding questions on the slide.

Seventy-eight percent of students met their growth targets. For the group using the holistic approach, the score should be “nearly met” but also could be argued to be “met.” The score for the benchmark approach is 12 points, and the score for the percentage approach is “effective.”

After this activity, give participants a 10-minute break before beginning the next section. This break is flexible and may need to occur earlier in the module.
Approaches to Combining SLOs

This section serves as an introduction to the approaches to combining multiple SLO ratings into one overall SLO score. The purpose of this section is to provide an overview of three approaches to combining SLO scores and the benefits and challenges to each approach.

Allow 30 minutes to discuss Slides 26 through 33.

**Explain:**

“Combining SLOs is important because, in many cases, teachers will have more than one SLO as part of their evaluation. In these instances, teachers will need to know how to combine multiple SLO ratings into one overall SLO score. However, there are a couple of key questions that states and districts should consider associated with combining SLOs.”

“Another key question to consider is: What is your state’s summative scoring process? It is essential to think about how each of the teacher evaluation measures are scored and combined to determine a final summative score because the SLO scoring process should fit with your overall evaluation scoring. After we discuss the different approaches to combining SLOs, we will revisit how the SLO scores fit into the overall evaluation summative scoring process.”
**Explain:**

“The first approach to combining SLOs is called the matrix approach. After rating each individual SLO, the evaluator uses a matrix or table to determine the overall SLO score. On the slide is an example of this approach from Rhode Island. To create a score using this approach, the evaluator first scores each individual SLO using the holistic approach. The evaluator then uses the matrix to combine the individual SLOs into one summative score. Using the Rhode Island example on the slide, a teacher who received a score of ‘met’ on her first SLO and a score of ‘nearly met’ on the second SLO would receive a final summative score of ‘full attainment.’”

**Explain:**

“One of the strengths in using the matrix approach to combining SLOs is that it provides consistency. Rhode Island did not have this matrix the first year it implemented SLOs; the matrix is the result of one of the state’s lessons learned. Developing this matrix was the state’s solution to providing more consistency for combining scores while maintaining principals’ autonomy in scoring individual SLOs. Another benefit to this approach is that the process for combining scores is transparent to teachers and evaluators. This approach necessitates clear guidance on the number or range of SLOs required, as the state or district will need to develop matrices for each number of SLOs used. The example from Rhode Island is for two SLOs, but the state also has a matrix for a teacher with three and four SLOs.”

**Explain:**

“A second approach is called averaging. In this approach, all SLOs are weighted the same, and the evaluator averages individual SLO scores. The evaluator scores each SLO individually using the rubric, benchmark, or percentage approach. This example from Indiana weights the class SLO and targeted SLO equally and then averages the two to create a final score.”
Explain:

“A benefit of using this approach is that it is easy for evaluators to do and is transparent for teachers. In Indiana, the class and the targeted SLO are weighted equally. A targeted SLO often focuses on a particular group of students that may be struggling in one area. By weighting the targeted SLO equally, Indiana has prioritized closing the achievement gap. However, this method weights all SLOs equally, regardless of the content or student population size.”

Explain:

“The final approach to combining SLOs into one summative score is called the weighting approach. In this approach, the evaluator takes the individual SLO scores, weights them, and then calculates a summative score.

Click the slide to make the first row of the table appear.

“In this example from New York, the evaluator first assesses the results of each SLO separately. The state of New Jersey also uses this approach and has similar guidance available for its educators.”

Click the slide again to make the second row of the table appear.

“Then each SLO is weighted by the number of students. So, the first SLO includes 80 of the teacher’s total 100 students, and the second SLO includes the remaining 20 students.”

Click the slide to make the remainder of the table appear.

“To calculate the proportional points for each SLO, the points are multiplied by the percentage of total students. In this example, the 13 points for the first SLO is weighted 80 percent, and the second SLO’s 19 points is weighted 20 percent. The weighted points are rounded to the nearest whole number and added, for a final score of 14 points.”
Explain:

“One strength of this approach is that it can be considered fairer by teachers because each SLO is weighted by the number of students. SLOs including fewer students are less high-stakes. However, this approach does require some calculation, which can be time-consuming for teachers and evaluators.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weighting Approach to Combining</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strengths</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Can be considered more fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Activity: Combining SLO Scores

This activity provides participants with an opportunity to engage with different approaches for combining SLOs. This activity corresponds with the handout titled *Activity 3: Combining SLO Scores*. The objective is for participants to practice combining SLOs using the different approaches to create a summative SLO score and to discuss which approach may work best in their local context.

Allow *60 minutes* to discuss Slides 34–44.

**Similar to the last activity, participants will work together in three teams to practice combining SLOs into one summative score using each of the approaches: matrix approach, averaging approach, and weighting approach.**

**Explain:**

“For our next activity, you will have the opportunity to practice combining SLOs to create a summative score using one of the three approaches. Take a look at the handout titled *Activity 3: Combining SLO Scores*. The handout includes sample student performance data for two SLOs and three approaches to combining SLOs. Each group will be assigned one of the three approaches and will use the sample data in the handout to combine the SLOs. We will spend 20 minutes working on scoring and another 10 minutes discussing your thoughts at the end of the activity.”

**Explain:**

“As you work on scoring using your approach, consider these questions on the slide. We will use these questions to guide our discussion at the end of the activity.”

At the end of 10 minutes, have each group share out about their experience combining SLOs using their approach. Have each group respond to the guiding questions on the slide.

For the group using the matrix approach, the score should be “partial attainment.” The summative score using the averaging approach is 3. For the weighting approach, the score should be 11.4 points, or an “effective” rating.
Explain:

“The examples provided are some of the most common approaches for scoring individual SLOs and combining multiple SLOs into a summative score. Each approach has different strengths, such as greater transparency for teachers and evaluators, educator autonomy, and comparability across teachers. Determining which approach will work best for your state or district may depend on your summative scoring process for the evaluation system as a whole.”

“States and districts are developing teacher evaluation systems that include multiple measures. These include student growth measures such as SLOs and value-added, and measures of teacher practice such as observations, surveys, and portfolios. How these different measures are combined into a summative rating will have bearing on the SLO scoring process. It is critical to consider how the educator evaluation system will combine all of its measures when choosing an SLO scoring approach. We will spend time discussing some approaches to combining multiple measures into one summative evaluation rating to help participants think about which SLO scoring approach fits with their evaluation system overall.”

Explain:

“There are three common approaches to combining multiple measures into a summative rating. They are holistic, numeric, and profile (Leo & Lachlan, 2012). In some cases, states and districts adopt a hybrid of these approaches.”

“The first common approach to summative scoring is the holistic approach. Similar to the holistic approach to scoring SLOs, it relies of the evaluator’s professional judgment. The evaluator will review all of the teacher’s evidence and data and determine a performance rating based on a rubric or some performance criteria. If your state or district is using this approach for its summative scoring process, it may not make sense to use a more formulaic SLO scoring process.”

---

Explain:

“On the slide is an example of the numeric approach, which quantifies each of the evaluation measures and then either adds or averages the numbers to create a final rating. In this example, each measure received a numeric score and then was weighted by a specified percentage. These weights are often determined by state or district law, particularly student growth measures. The numeric approach for summative scoring aligns with the averaging and weighting approach for combining SLOs. It also could work with a holistic approach if the descriptions for scoring an individual SLO were aligned with a numeric score instead of a descriptive score like in the Rhode Island example.”

Explain:

“Another common approach to summative scoring is profile, which also is referred to as a ‘look-up table.’ With this approach, each evaluation measure is scored separately and then combined using a matrix. In the example on the slide from Rhode Island, the student learning measures, such as SLOs or value-added, were scored as a ‘3,’ and the professional practices measures were scored as a ‘3.’ Using the matrix, this teacher’s final summative rating would be ‘effective.’ The profile approach for could work for most SLO scoring approaches because each measure is first scored separately.”

Explain:

“Now that we’ve explored the summative scoring approaches, let’s connect how those types relate to choices around SLO scoring. With a partner, discuss which summative scoring approach you are using for the evaluation system and discuss how that relates or could impact your options for scoring individual SLOs and combining SLOs.”

“Now, with the same partner, let’s revisit the warm-up activity we did at the beginning of today’s presentation. Look at what features you ranked as most important originally. With the same partner, discuss whether you would like to change which feature is the most important. After you’ve reexamined your rankings, discuss with your partner the following questions:

- Would you change any of your rankings and why?
- Based on what you have learned today and your rankings, which approach do you think would work best for your state or district and why?
- Which of these scoring approaches fits best with how you score your other evaluation measures?”
It would be helpful to become familiar with each of these resources prior to the discussion so that you can describe the capacity of each resource as you walk the participants through the discussion.

**Explain:**

“This slide offers a list of some of the more recent publications that highlight a variety of ways to implement SLOs. All are free and easily accessible on the Internet.”

“American Institutes for Research created a white paper on implementation elements needed to support the rigor, comparability, and sustainability of the SLO process. The elements discussed include assessing the culture change, providing supporting materials, training and rater calibration, the SLO scoring process, and monitoring and evaluating SLO implementation.”

“The Reform Support Network SLO toolkit walks users through the SLO process. Resources in this toolkit include a slide presentation, an accompanying slide script, a blank SLO template, a rubric for rating the quality of SLOs, an example SLO, and an accompanying annotated SLO.”

“The GTL Center has developed an online repository of state and district SLO resources. It allows you to review publications, guidebooks, SLO examples, webinars, and presentations on SLOs. Users can search by the type of resource as well as by the state, so if you wanted to see the resources developed by Ohio, for example, you could do that on this page.”

“One of these resources on the GTL Center site is an Ask-the-Team brief titled *Flexibility for Fairness: Crafting Business Rules for Student Learning Objectives*. This document lists considerations for states when they are crafting business rules concerning SLOs.”

“The final resource we are highlighting is an SLO toolkit from the Reform Support Network. This toolkit outlines a four-stage quality control framework; describes how states and districts are addressing common challenges related to quality SLO implementation; and provides links to templates, guidance documents, and other tools.”
Explain:
“This slide provides links to all the references, guidebooks, and examples discussed today.”

Explain:
“Thank you, and please be in touch with any questions. Our mission is to advance state efforts to grow, respect, and retain great teachers and leaders for all students. We look forward to working with you in this partnership!”