# SLO and Outcome Summary
## Process & Scoring Guide
### Guidance on Creating the Outcome Summary Score

Starting with the 2015-16 school year, there is a shift in scoring student outcomes in the Wisconsin Educator Effectiveness System. The System will utilize the same data and measures as before–including principal and teacher value-added (when available), graduation data, and school-wide reading. However, the method of incorporating this data into the System will change in order to better align to best practice and support continuous improvement. Currently, as standalone scores, these measures inform educators of whether they did well (or not) on a given measure, but provide no information regarding why they performed the way they did or how to improve. The shift addresses this issue by incorporating these measures in a way which informs goal-setting and provides specific feedback regarding the educator's implementation progress and its impact on student progress.

## SLOS INFORMING THE OUTCOME SUMMARY SCORE

### Beginning of Year
Working collaboratively with their evaluator or a peer, educators draw upon the SLO and Outcome Summary Process Guide (see page 2) to develop a minimum of one SLO. The development of the SLO now must include the review of teacher and principal value-added, as well as graduation rates or schoolwide reading value-added (as appropriate to the role of the educator). Educators continue to document the goal within the appropriate online data management system (e.g., Teachscape or MyLearningPlan). Collaborative learning-focused conversations are required as part of the process, but flexibility exists in whom educators collaborate with in Supporting Years. However, in Summary Years, educators must conduct this process with their evaluators.

### Middle of Year (or Mid-Interval)
Working collaboratively with their evaluator or a peer, educators draw upon the SLO and Outcome Summary Process Guide (see page 2) to monitor progress towards an SLO across the year and adjust instructional strategies accordingly. Educators can also use the Process Guide to consider a mid-year adjustment to the goal based on data collected through the progress monitoring process. Educators should document evidence of their SLO implementation progress and SLO implementation process to date within the appropriate online data management system (e.g., Teachscape or MyLearningPlan). Collaborative learning-focused conversations are required as part of the process, but flexibility exists in whom educators collaborate with in Supporting Years. However, in Summary Years, educators must conduct this process with their evaluators.

### End of Year (or End of Interval)
At the end of the SLO interval, educators draw upon all available evidence of their implementation process, as defined within the SLO and Outcome Summary Process Guide (see page 2), and the impact on student progress to inform the selection of a self-score. Using the Scoring Rubric (see page 4), educators will self-score their goal and document the score within the appropriate online data management system (e.g., Teachscape or MyLearningPlan). Collaborative learning-focused conversations are required as part of the process, but flexibility exists in whom educators collaborate with in Supporting Years. However, in Summary Years, educators must conduct this process with their evaluators.

### Outcome Summary Score
At the end of the Effectiveness Cycle, evaluators will review all SLOs (from the Supporting and Summary Years) and the supporting documentation prior to the End of Cycle Summary Conference as evidence towards a final, holistic Outcome Summary Score. Evaluators draw upon the SLO and Outcome Summary Process Guide (see page 2) to inform the determination of the holistic score using the Scoring Rubric (page 4). Evaluators document the holistic score into the appropriate online data management system (e.g., Teachscape or MyLearningPlan). During the End of Cycle Summary

Conference, evaluators discuss collaboratively with educators the implementation process and progress across the Effectiveness Cycle and the resulting holistic score as part of a learning-focused conversation. The holistic score is the final Outcome Summary Score.

## SLO AND OUTCOME SUMMARY PROCESS GUIDE

| Quality Indicators | ✅ | Reflections/Feedback/Notes for Improvement |
|---|---|---|
| **Baseline Data and Rationale** | | |
| The educator used multiple data sources to complete a thorough review of student achievement data, including subgroup analysis. | | |
| The educator examined achievement gap data and considered student equity in the goal statement. | | |
| The data analysis included the following data sources, as appropriate to the educator's role: principal value-added, teacher value-added, schoolwide reading value-added, and graduation rates. (*See guidance on page 3 regarding the use of these data sources*)[*] | | |
| The data analysis supports the rationale for the chosen SLO. | | |
| The baseline data indicates the individual starting point for each student included in the target population. | | |
| **Alignment** | | |
| The SLO is aligned to specific content standards representing the critical content for learning within the educator's grade-level and subject area. | | |
| The standards identified are appropriate and aligned to support the area(s) of need and the student population identified in baseline data. | | |
| The SLO is stated as a SMART goal. | | |
| **Student Population** | | |
| The student population identified in the goal(s) reflects the results of the data analysis. | | |
| **Targeted Growth** | | |
| Growth trajectories reflect appropriate gains for students, based on identified starting points or benchmark levels. | | |
| Growth goals are rigorous, yet attainable. | | |
| Targeted growth is revisited based on progress monitoring data and adjusted if needed. | | |
| **Interval** | | |
| The interval is appropriate given the SLO. | | |
| The interval reflects the duration of time the target student population is with the educator. | | |
| Mid-point checks are planned, data is reviewed, and revisions to the goal are made if necessary. | | |
| Mid-point revisions are based on strong rationale and evidence supporting the adjustment mid-course. | | |
| **Evidence Sources** | | |
| The assessments chosen to serve as evidence appropriately measure intended growth goals/learning content. | | |
| Assessments are valid, reliable, fair, and unbiased for all students/target population. | | |
| The evidence reflects a balanced use of assessment data. | | |
| Progress is continuously monitored and an appropriate amount of evidence can be collected in time for use in the End of Cycle Summary conference. (Note: The amount of evidence available may vary by educator role). | | |
| Teacher-created rubrics, if used to assess student performance, have well crafted performance levels that:<br>• Clearly define levels of performance; | | |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| • Are easy to understand;<br>• Show a clear path to student mastery. | | |
| **Instructional (for teachers) and Leadership (for principals) Strategies and Support** | | |
| Strategies reflect a differentiated approach appropriate to the target population. | | |
| Strategies were adjusted throughout the interval based on formative assessment and progress monitoring data. | | |
| Collaboration with others—teachers, specialists, instructional coaches, Assistant Principals—is indicated when appropriate. | | |
| Appropriate professional development opportunities are addressed. | | |
| **Scoring** | | |
| Accurately and appropriately scored the SLO. | | |
| Score is substantiated by student achievement data and evidence of implementation process. | | |

*Note*: Teacher value-added data is still scheduled for first release in 2017-18. Additionally, due to the switch in assessments and assessment schedules in 2014-15, as well as the building of new statewide data systems, 2014-15 state assessment data (i.e., principal value-added and schoolwide reading value-added) will not be available at the beginning of the 2015-16 school year. As such, educators should rely on historical state assessment and value-added data from prior years that *IS* available to them to identify trends when setting goals at the beginning of the 2015-16 school year. DPI expects that the data reporting process will occur earlier in the year beginning in 2016-17.

## DATA ANALYSIS INFORMING THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE SLO

Educators review all available data when setting goals for their professional practice and improvements in student outcomes. A holistic approach is taken to data analysis and professional reflection. In addition to reviewing data collected by the educator, the educator must also review the following data provided by DPI, as appropriate to their individual role.

### PRINCIPALS

In setting an SLO, principals must not only review data collected by their educators or themselves across the school-year, but also the following data provided by DPI:
- Principal, Teacher, and Schoolwide Reading Value-Added: When developing SLOs, principals must review individually, as well as with other district principals (where available) and teachers, principal value-added data, as well as teacher value-added data aggregated at both the grade level and content area (e.g., schoolwide reading value-added), to identify trends (i.e., strengths and areas for growth) across time. These trends can inform SLOs or professional practice goals, based on areas of need. Working in teams with other principals or administrators could inform the development of an SLO that aligns to district improvement plans and/or goals. Value-added trends may also illuminate strategies that have worked well, based on areas of strength, and can support ongoing instructional efforts. Working in teams with other principals or administrators could provide the opportunity to share best practices and successful strategies which support district improvement plans and/or goals.
- Graduation Rate: When developing SLOs, high school principals must review graduation rate data across time to identify positive or negative trends regarding the matriculation of their students. This analysis can inform the development of SLOs if graduation rates are an area needing growth and professional practice goals to support the improvement of graduation rates. This review can also illuminate the success of various college and career ready strategies implemented by teachers and across the school to be modified or duplicated.

### TEACHERS

- Teacher Value-Added and Schoolwide Reading: When developing SLOs, teachers must review individually, as well as with teacher teams at both the grade level and across the content area (e.g., schoolwide reading value-added), to identify trends (i.e., strengths and areas for growth) across time. These trends can inform SLOs or professional practice goals, based on areas of need. Working in teams with other teachers could inform the development of a team SLO that may align to a School Learning Objective identified by the principal. Value-added trends may also illuminate strategies that have worked well, based on areas of strength, and can support ongoing instructional efforts. Working in teams with other teachers could provide the opportunity to share best practices and successful strategies which support school improvement plans and/or goals.

- Graduation Rate: When developing SLOs, high school teachers must review graduation rate data across time to identify positive or negative trends regarding the matriculation of their school's students. During this review, teachers should reflect on how their practice has supported the trends within the graduation rate data. Teachers should also review the data in vertical and horizontal teams to review school (and district) practices which positively and negatively impact graduation rates. This analysis can inform the development of SLOs, as well as professional practice goals, to support the improvement of graduation rates of the educator's students. This review can also illuminate the success of various college and career ready strategies implemented by teachers and across the school to be modified or duplicated.

**Educators are not required to develop a goal based on these data or to develop a goal with the intention to improve these data, unless the data indicates that is necessary**. *As always, the purpose of the Educator Effectiveness System is to provide information that is meaningful and supports each individual educator's growth in their unique roles and contexts*. By reviewing multiple data points, including those listed above, the educator has access to a more comprehensive view of their practice and a greater ability to identify areas of strength and need—both of which can inform the development of goals, as well as instructional/leadership strategies which can support progress towards goals.

*Note: Due to the lag in data provided by DPI to districts, as well as the date in the year in which the data is provided to the districts (i.e., the following year), educators should only use the data to review trends across time when developing an SLO. Educators should not use the data to score SLOs.*

## RUBRIC OVERVIEW

Both educators and evaluators will use the Scoring Rubric (below) to determine SLO and Outcome Summary Scores, respectively. Educators will self-score their individual SLOs in all years (Supporting and Summary Years). Evaluators will assign a holistic score considering all SLOs across the cycle—the implementation process and its impact on student progress. Drawing upon the preponderance of evidence and using the Scoring Rubric, evaluators determine an educator's holistic Outcome Summary Score by identifying the rubric level which *best describes* the educator's implementation process and student growth. This process of holistic scoring offers flexibility based on professional discretion. It allows evaluators to recognize student growth as well as professional growth across the Effectiveness cycle, which aligns with the purpose of the Wisconsin Educator Effectiveness System.

**SCORING RUBRIC**

| Score | Criteria | Description (not exhaustive) |
|-------|----------|------------------------------|
| 4 | Educator engaged in a comprehensive, data-driven process that resulted in exceptional student growth. | Based on evidence aligned to the SLO and Outcome Process Guide, the educator set rigorous, superior goal(s) based on a comprehensive analysis of all required and supplemental data sources; skillfully used appropriate assessments; continuously monitored progress; strategically revised instruction based on progress monitoring data; and reflected on the process across the year/cycle in a consistent, accurate, and thoughtful way. |
| | Student growth has **exceeded** the goal(s). | Evidence indicates the targeted population's growth exceeded the expectations described in the goal. |
| 3 | Educator engaged in a data-driven process that resulted in student growth. | Based on evidence aligned to the SLO and Outcome Process Guide, the educator set attainable goal(s) based on a comprehensive analysis of all required and supplemental data sources; used appropriate assessments; monitored progress; adjusted instruction based on progress monitoring data; and reflected on the process across the year/cycle in an accurate or consistent way. |
| | Student growth has **met** goal(s). | Evidence indicates the targeted population met the expectations described in the goal. |
| 2 | Educator engaged in a process that resulted in inconsistent student growth. | Based on evidence aligned to the SLO and Outcome Process Guide, the educator set a goal; used assessments; inconsistently monitored progress; inconsistently or inappropriately adjusted instruction; and reflected on the process across the year/cycle in an inconsistent |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | and/or inaccurate way. |
| | Student growth has **partially met** the goal(s). | Evidence indicates the targeted population partially met expectations described in the goal. |
| **1** | Educator engaged in a process that resulted in minimal or no student growth. | Based on evidence aligned to the SLO and Outcome Process Guide, the educator set inappropriate goal(s); inconsistently or inappropriately used assessments; did not monitor progress; did not adjust instruction based on progress monitoring data; and did not reflect on the process across the year/cycle in a consistent, accurate, and thoughtful way. |
| | Student growth has **not met** the goal(s). | Evidence indicates the targeted population has not met the expectations described in the goal. |