

Scoring Student Learning Objectives

■ Handouts

NOVEMBER 2014



PROFESSIONAL LEARNING MODULE

About This Booklet

This *Scoring Student Learning Objectives: Handouts* is intended for use with the following additional resources:

- *Scoring Student Learning Objectives: Facilitator's Guide*
- Sample agenda
- Slide presentation

These online resources are available for download on the *Professional Learning Modules* webpage of the Center on Great Teachers and Leaders website. Please visit the webpage at <http://www.gtlcenter.org/technical-assistance/professional-learning-modules/>.

Adapting This Booklet

This booklet is designed so that facilitators can adopt it as written or modify the content to reflect state and local context, needs, and priorities. If modifications to content are made, the GTL Center requests that the following disclaimer be included in the revised materials:

This booklet was modified in whole or in part with permission from the Center on Great Teachers and Leaders.

Scoring Student Learning Objectives: Handouts

November 2014

Center on
GREAT TEACHERS & LEADERS
at American Institutes for Research ■

1000 Thomas Jefferson Street NW
Washington, DC 20007-3835
877-322-8700
www.gtlcenter.org

Copyright © 2014 American Institutes for Research. All rights reserved.

This work was originally produced in whole or in part by the Center on Great Teachers and Leaders with funds from the U.S. Department of Education under cooperative agreement number S283B120021. The content does not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the Department of Education, nor does mention or visual representation of trade names, commercial products, or organizations imply endorsement by the federal government.

The Center on Great Teachers and Leaders is administered by American Institutes for Research and its partners: the Council of Chief State School Officers and Public Impact.



www.air.org

3545_11/14

Contents

	Page
Activity 1: Identifying Guiding Principles	1
Activity 2: Scoring Individual SLOs	2
Activity 3: Combining SLO Scores	6

Activity 1: Identifying Guiding Principles

Rank which features of student learning objective (SLO) scoring are the most important for your state or district (1 is for the most important, 2 is for the second most important, etc.). Please write your reasoning for the ranking in the table.

Feature	Reasoning	Ranking
Flexibility for teachers (i.e., granting teachers greater ownership of the SLO process)		
Flexibility for evaluators (i.e., valuing educators professional judgment)		
Comparability across schools		
Comparability across districts		
Easy to communicate to teachers and evaluators		
Addresses high stakes for teachers with small class sizes		

Activity 2: Scoring Individual SLOs

Using the following sample student performance data, determine what would be the score for this teacher's student learning objective (SLO) using one of the three scoring approaches: holistic, benchmark, and percentage.

Student	Pretest (out of 100)	Posttest (out of 100)	Growth Target	Met Growth Target?
Student A	52	78	80	No
Student B	56	81	80	Yes
Student C	42	71	70	Yes
Student D	35	55	65	No
Student E	66	85	85	Yes
Student F	68	89	85	Yes
Student G	49	73	70	Yes
Student H	35	60	65	No
Student I	72	90	85	Yes
Student J	55	80	80	Yes
Student K	49	72	70	Yes
Student L	60	87	85	Yes
Student M	59	82	80	Yes
Student N	63	87	85	Yes
Student O	51	78	80	No
Student P	43	71	70	Yes
Student Q	36	60	65	No
Student R	49	71	70	Yes
Student S	65	89	85	Yes
Student T	42	73	70	Yes
Student U	68	91	85	Yes
Student V	39	65	65	Yes
Student W	55	81	80	Yes

Holistic Approach (Using Rhode Island’s Rubric)

Using the sample student performance data, determine what score the teacher’s SLO would receive using the holistic approach. Use the following definitions and rating levels from Rhode Island to determine your score.

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/student outcome objective (SOO) for this category. This category should be selected only 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 bar 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.

Source: Rhode Island Department of Education, 2014, p. 18

Benchmark Approach

Using the sample student performance data, determine what score the teacher’s SLO would receive using the benchmark approach. Use the following benchmark levels from New York to determine your score.

Benchmark Scale

HIGHLY EFFECTIVE			EFFECTIVE									DEVELOPING					INEFFECTIVE			
20	19	18	17	16	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
95-100%	91-94%	85-90%	84%	83%	82%	81%	80%	78-79%	76-77%	74-75%	70-73%	64-69%	57-63%	50-56%	43-49%	37-42%	30-36%	21-29%	11-20%	0-10%

Source: New York State Education Department, 2013, p. 25

Percentage Approach

Using the sample student performance data, determine what score the teacher's SLO would receive using the simple percentage approach. Use the following scoring matrix from Hawaii to determine your score.

SLO Scoring Matrix

Highly Effective	Effective	Developing	Ineffective
At least 90% to 100% of students met or exceeded expected target	At least 75% to 89% of students met or exceeded expected target	At least 60% to 74% of students met or exceeded expected target	Fewer than 60% of students met or exceeded expected target

Source: Hawaii Department of Education, 2014, p. 38

Activity 3: Combining SLO Scores

Using the following sample student performance data, determine what would be the summative student learning objective (SLO) score for this teacher using one of the three scoring approaches: matrix, averaging, and weighting.

Data for SLO 1

Student	Pretest (out of 100)	Posttest (out of 100)	Growth Target	Met Growth Target?
Student A	52	78	80	No
Student B	56	81	80	Yes
Student C	42	71	70	Yes
Student D	35	55	65	No
Student E	66	85	85	Yes
Student F	68	89	85	Yes
Student G	49	73	70	Yes
Student H	35	60	65	No
Student I	72	90	85	Yes
Student J	55	80	80	Yes
Student K	49	72	70	Yes
Student L	60	87	85	Yes
Student M	59	82	80	Yes
Student N	63	87	85	Yes
Student O	51	78	80	No
Student P	43	71	70	Yes
Student Q	36	60	65	No
Student R	49	71	70	Yes
Student S	65	89	85	Yes
Student T	42	73	70	Yes
Student U	68	91	85	Yes
Student V	39	65	65	Yes
Student W	55	81	80	Yes
Percentage of students who met target = 78%				

Data for SLO 2

Student	Pretest (out of 100)	Posttest (out of 100)	Growth Target	Met Growth Target?
Student A	52	78	80	No
Student B	56	81	80	Yes
Student C	42	71	70	Yes
Student D	35	55	65	No
Student E	66	85	85	Yes
Student F	68	89	85	Yes
Student G	49	73	70	Yes
Student H	35	60	65	No
Percentage of students who met target = 75%				

Matrix Approach

Using the sample student performance data, determine the score for each SLO using the Individual SLO Scoring Guidance table. Then, combine both SLO scores using the matrix approach to determine this teacher’s summative SLO score. Use the following definitions and rating levels from Rhode Island to determine your score.

Individual SLO Scoring Guidance

Not Met	Nearly Met	Met	Exceeded
Less than 70% of students met their target	70% to 80% of students met their target	At least 90% of students met their target	At least 90% of students met their target AND 25% of students exceeded their target

Source: Rhode Island Department of Education, 2014, p. 19

Combining SLO Scoring Guidance

SLO 1	SLO 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

Source: Rhode Island Department of Education, 2014, p. 26

Averaging Approach

Using the sample student performance data, determine the teacher's summative SLO score using the averaging approach. Use the following scoring matrix from Ohio to determine your score for each individual SLO and then average the two scores. Complete the table to help facilitate your calculations.

SLO Scoring Matrix

Percentage of Students Who Met or Exceeded Growth Target	Numerical Rating
90% to 100%	5
80% to 89%	4
70% to 79%	3
60% to 69%	2
59% or less	1

Source: Ohio Department of Education, 2013, p. 7

Calculation Table

	Numerical Rating	Weight	
SLO 1		× .50	
SLO 2		× .50	
		Total	

Weighting Approach

Using the sample student performance data, determine the teacher’s summative SLO score using the weighting approach. Use the sample benchmark scale from New York to determine the individual SLO scores for each individual SLO. Then, use the calculation table to help you combine the SLO scores.

Benchmark Scale

HIGHLY EFFECTIVE			EFFECTIVE									DEVELOPING					INEFFECTIVE			
20	19	18	17	16	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
95-100%	91-94%	85-90%	84%	83%	82%	81%	80%	78-79%	76-77%	74-75%	70-73%	64-69%	57-63%	50-56%	43-49%	37-42%	30-36%	21-29%	11-20%	0-10%

Source: New York State Education Department, 2013, p. 25

Calculation Table

	SLO 1	SLO 2
Step 1: Assess the results of each SLO separately.	<i>Insert total points</i>	<i>Insert total points</i>
Step 2: Weight each SLO proportionately.	<i>Students in this SLO/total students = percentage</i>	<i>Students in this SLO/total students = percentage</i>
Step 3: Calculate proportional points for each SLO.	<i>Points × percentage of students</i>	<i>Points × percentage of students</i>
Overall growth component score		<i>Add total points</i>

Source: New York State Education Department, 2013, p. 19

References

- Hawaii Department of Education. (2014). *2014–15 educator effectiveness system manual for evaluators and participants*. Honolulu, HI: Author. Retrieved from <http://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/DOE%20Forms/Educator%20Effectivness/EESManual.pdf>
- Indiana Department of Education. (2013). *RISE evaluation and development system: Student learning objectives handbook (Version 2.0)*. Indianapolis, IN: Author. Retrieved from [http://www.riseindiana.org/sites/default/files/files/Student%20Learning%20Objectives%20Handbook%202%200%20final\(4\).pdf](http://www.riseindiana.org/sites/default/files/files/Student%20Learning%20Objectives%20Handbook%202%200%20final(4).pdf)
- New York State Education Department. (2013). *Guidance on the New York state districtwide growth goal-setting process for teachers: Student learning objectives*. Retrieved from <https://www.engageny.org/sites/default/files/resource/attachments/slo-guidance.pdf>
- Rhode Island Department of Education. (2014). *Measures of student learning*. Providence, RI: Author. Retrieved from http://www.ride.ri.gov/Portals/0/Uploads/Documents/Teachers-and-Administrators-Excellent-Educators/Educator-Evaluation/Guidebooks-Forms/Measures_of_Student_Learning-TEACHER.pdf

Center on
GREAT TEACHERS & LEADERS

at American Institutes for Research ■

1000 Thomas Jefferson Street NW
Washington, DC 20007-3835
877.322.8700

www.gtcenter.org



AMERICAN INSTITUTES FOR RESEARCH

www.air.org

Copyright © 2014 American Institutes for Research. All rights reserved.

This work was originally produced in whole or in part by the Center on Great Teachers and Leaders with funds from the U.S. Department of Education under cooperative agreement number S283B120021. The content does not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the Department of Education, nor does mention or visual representation of trade names, commercial products, or organizations imply endorsement by the federal government.

The Center on Great Teachers and Leaders is administered by American Institutes for Research and its partners: the Council of Chief State School Officers and Public Impact.