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**Introduction**

The purpose of the Philomath Educator Evaluation System is to promote educator growth through reflection, collaboration, and regular feedback. Oregon law requires that districts have in place evaluation systems that are rigorous and that are designed to support professional growth, accountability, and student learning and growth. To ensure such systems, the following criteria are essential:

1. **Standards of Professional Practice:** The state adopted Model Core Teaching Standards and Educational Leadership/Administrator Standards define what teachers and administrators should know and be able to do to ensure that every student is ready for college, careers, and engaged citizenship in today’s world.
2. **Differentiated (4) Performance Levels:** Teacher and administrator performance on the standards of professional practice are measured on four performance levels. ODE will provide districts approved research-based rubrics aligned to the state adopted standards.
3. **Multiple Measures:** Multiple sources of data are used to measure teacher and administrator performance on the standards of professional practice. Evaluators look at evidence from three categories: professional practice, professional responsibilities, and student learning and growth.
4. **Evaluation and Professional Growth Cycle:** Teachers and administrators are evaluated on a regular cycle of continuous improvement that includes self-reflection, goal setting, observations, formative assessment, and summative evaluation.
5. **Aligned Professional Learning:** Relevant professional learning opportunities to improve professional practice and impact on student learning are aligned to the teacher’s or administrator’s evaluation and his/her need for professional growth.

According to The Oregon Framework for Teacher and Administrator Evaluation and Support Systems (2013), “Effective principals in the state of Oregon integrate principles of cultural competency and equitable practice and promote the success of every student through visionary leadership, instructional improvement, effective management, inclusive practice, ethical leadership, and the socio-political context of their building and district. By demonstrating proficiency in the adopted educational leadership/administrator standards, effective principals improve teacher effectiveness and student learning and growth. They also lead by modeling ethical and competent behavior according to all standards set for administrators by the Teacher Standards and Practices Commission.

“As the school’s instructional leader, effective principals enable critical discourse and data-driven reflection and decisions about curriculum, assessment, instruction, and student progress, and create structures to facilitate instructional improvement. Effective principals ensure their staff receives support, assistance, and professional growth opportunities necessary to strengthen teacher knowledge, skills, dispositions, and instructional practices in mutually-identified areas of need. By creating a common vision for equity and excellence and articulating shared values, effective principals lead and manage their schools in a manner that promotes collaboration and equity, creates an inclusive and safe, efficient, and effective learning environment, and improves the school’s positive impact on students, families, and community members.”

Further, by adopting the Educational Leadership/Administrator Standards, the state requires that administrators are evaluated on systems that include:

**Standard #1: Visionary Leadership**

An educational leader integrates principles of cultural competency and equitable practice and promotes the success of every student by facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a vision of learning that is shared and supported by stakeholders.

Educational Leaders:

1. Collaboratively develop and implement a shared vision and mission;
2. Collect and use data to identify goals, assess organizational effectiveness, and promote organizational learning;
3. Create and implement plans to achieve goals;
4. Promote continuous and sustainable improvement; and
5. Monitor and evaluate progress and revise plans.

**Standard #2: Instructional Improvement**

An educational leader integrates principles of cultural competency and equitable practice and promotes the success of every student by sustaining a positive school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth.

Educational Leaders:

1. Nurture and sustain a culture of collaboration, trust, learning and high expectations;
2. Create a comprehensive, rigorous and coherent curricular program;
3. Create a personalized and motivating learning environment for students;
4. Supervise and support instruction;
5. Develop assessment and accountability systems to monitor student progress;
6. Develop the instructional and leadership capacity of staff;
7. Maximize time spent on quality instruction;
8. Promote the use of the most effective and appropriate technologies to support teaching and learning; and
9. Monitor and evaluate the impact of instruction.

**Standard #3: Effective Management**

An educational leader integrates principles of cultural competency and equitable practice and promotes the success of every student by ensuring management of the organization, operation, and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment.

Educational Leaders:

1. Monitor and evaluate the management and operational systems;
2. Obtain, allocate, align and efficiently use human, fiscal and technological resources;
3. Promote and protect the welfare and safety of students and staff;
4. Develop the capacity for adaptive leadership; and
5. Ensure teacher and organizational time is focused to support quality instruction and student learning.

**Standard #4: Inclusive Practice**

An educational leader integrates principles of cultural competency and equitable practice and promotes the success of every student by collaborating with faculty and community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources in order to demonstrate and promote ethical standards of democracy, equity, diversity, and excellence, and to promote communication among diverse groups.

Educational Leaders:

1. Collect and analyze data pertinent to equitable outcomes;
2. Understand and integrate the community’s diverse cultural, social and intellectual resources;
3. Build and sustain positive relationships with families and caregivers; and
4. Build and sustain productive relationships with community partners.

**Standard #5: Ethical Leadership**

An educational leader integrates principles of cultural competency and equitable practice and promotes the success of every student by acting with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner.

Educational Leaders:

1. Ensure a system of accountability for every student’s academic and social success;
2. Model principles of self-awareness, reflective practice, transparency and ethical behavior;
3. Safeguard the values of democracy, equity and diversity;
4. Evaluate the potential ethical and legal consequences of decision-making; and
5. Promote social justice and ensure that individual student needs inform all aspects of schooling.

**Standard #6: Socio-Political Context**

An educational leader integrates principles of cultural competency and equitable practice and promotes the success of every student by understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context.

Educational Leaders:

1. Advocate for children, families and caregivers;
2. Act to influence local, district, state and national decisions affecting student learning; and
3. Assess, analyze, and anticipate emerging trends and initiatives in order to adapt leadership strategies.

During the 2012-13 school year, the Philomath School District’s Educator Effectiveness team met to create the District’s new evaluation tool. Based on state requirements, the team considered multiple district models and opted for a system that most met the needs of the Philomath School District’s educators. To that end, the District adopted the Salem-Keizer LEGENDS rubric and created an evaluation cycle to ensure that the District is meeting state accountability requirements as well as encouraging educator growth. Within the rubric, each standard is defined in terms of four differentiated performance levels: Does Not Meet Standard (DNM), Developing Proficiency Toward Standard (DP), Proficient Relative to Standard (PR), and Exceeds Standard (E).

| **Performance Level** | **Definitions of Performance as Applied to Standards of Professional Practice** |
| --- | --- |
| Does Not Meet Standard | Does not meet standards; performs below the expectations for good performance under this standard; requires direct intervention and support to improve practice. |
| Developing Proficiency Toward Standard | Making sufficient progress toward meeting this standard; meets expectations for good performance most of the time and shows continuous improvement; expected improvement through focused professional learning and growth plan. |
| Proficient Relative to Standard | Consistently meets expectations for good performance under this standard; demonstrates effective practices and impact on student learning; continues to improve professional practice through ongoing professional learning. |
| Exceeds Standard | Consistently exceeds expectations for good performance under this standard; demonstrates highly effective practices and impact on student learning; continued expansion of expertise through professional learning and leadership opportunities. |

The primary purpose of the Philomath Educator Evaluation System is to improve student learning. This handbook is intended to provide the structure for administrators to improve their professional practice and responsibilities through a reflective professional improvement cycle. The process is also designed to encourage more meaningful conversations around student learning and growth, and relies on the premise that all education professionals are committed to improving their performance and elevating the profession.

Philomath School District SB 290 Team: Dan Forbess (Superintendent), Don Cruise (School Board Member), Steve Bell (Administrator), Cindy Golston (Administrator), Michael McDonough (Teacher), Janine Luta (Teacher), Ben Silva (Teacher)

**Evaluation Cycle Overview**

**Evaluation Cycle**

In the first three years of employment in an administrative position within the District, administrators will be placed on a review schedule. Following this, administrators will be on a two-year evaluation cycle in which they will be on a review schedule every other year.

***Steps Required of Administrators on a review year:*** Self-Assessment & Initial Growth Conference; Goal Setting; Observation Phase One; Interim Growth Conference; Observation Phase Two; Collection of Artifacts; Self-Reflection; Summative Growth Conference.

***Steps required of an Administrator on a non-review year:*** Self-Assessment & Initial Growth Conference; Goal Setting; Interim Goal Reflection; Self-reflection; End of the Year Conference

**Self-Assessment & Initial Professional Growth Conference**

**(Forms Required: Licensed Initial Self-Assessment Rubric Worksheet)**

***Self-Assessment***

At the beginning of each school year, all administrators must complete a self-assessment using the administrator evaluation rubric. This allows reflection on their professional practices and responsibilities. Self-reflection should help guide the development of the administrator’s Professional Growth Goal as well as their professional learning. The self-assessment must be submitted to the evaluator prior to the Initial Professional Growth Conference.

***Initial Professional Growth Conference***

During the Initial Professional Growth Conference, the administrator meets with their evaluator to discuss the administrator’s self-assessment, focusing on strengths and opportunities for growth. At this time, the evaluator and administrator also collaborate on potential Professional and School Growth Goals. If applicable, the evaluator and administrator also discuss PDU requirements for license renewal.

**Goal Setting**

**(Forms Required: School Growth and Professional Goals – Goal Setting)**

***School Growth Goals***

Administrators, in collaboration with their evaluator, will establish at least two school growth goals from the two categories. One goal must be related to student learning and growth using state assessment (Category 1) as a measure (e.g., building- level data on proficiency and growth in reading and math, including all subgroups).

**Types of Measures for School Learning and Growth for Administrator Evaluations**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Category** | **Types of Measures** | **Guidance** |
| **1** | * Oregon’s state assessments\*   + SMARTER Balanced (formerly OAKS)   + Extended Assessments1 | * Same assessment and administration guidelines are used statewide   *\*Required beginning in the 2015-16 school year* |
| **2** | * Commercially developed assessments that include pre- and post-measures * Locally developed assessments that include pre- and post-measures * Results from proficiency-based assessment systems * Locally-developed collections of evidence, i.e. portfolios of student work that include multiple types of performance | * Same assessment and administration guidelines are used district-wide or school-wide * Assessments meet state criteria |

1Used by special education teachers who provide instruction in ELA or math for those students who take extended assessments

School growth goals and measures should align with Achievement Compact indicators where applicable:

* Grade 3 proficiency in reading and math, as measured by meeting or exceeding benchmark on the Oregon Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (OAKS);
* Grade 6 on-track, as measured by rates of chronic absenteeism;
* Grade 9 on-track, as measured by rates of credit attainment and chronic absenteeism;
* Earning college credit in high school, through Advanced Placement (AP), International Baccalaureate (IB), dual enrollment, or college enrollment;
* Four- and five-year cohort graduation and completion rates; and
* Post-secondary enrollment, as collected through the National Student Clearinghouse.

***Professional Growth Goal***

Using their self-assessment as a guide, and in collaboration with their evaluator, each administrator must develop a professional growth goal that spans the entire school year. The ultimate decision for the professional growth goal is up to the administrator; however, during the Initial Professional Growth Conference, they should discuss with their evaluator what evidence they plan to provide to demonstrate progress towards completion of the goal. The PGG will be scored in Standard 5.2 of the Administrator Rubric.

**Observation Phase One**

This phase of observations will consist of a minimum of two observations, each being at least twenty minutes in length. Each observation requires written feedback from the evaluator. One of the observations requires a face-to-face conference to discuss the feedback.

**Interim Professional Growth Conference**

**(Forms Required: School Growth and Professional Goals – Interim Conference)**

This meeting provides an opportunity for the administrator to sit with their evaluator and discuss progress on Professional and School Growth Goals. At this time, any additional support needed to meet the goals or any required adjustments in strategies can be discussed. Prior to this meeting the administrator must complete the interim goal reflection.

**Observations Phase Two**

This phase of observations follows the same format as Phase One with a minimum of two observations, each spanning at least twenty minutes. Each observation requires written feedback from the evaluator. One of the observations requires a face-to-face conference to discuss the feedback.

**Artifacts**

**(Artifacts submitted through TalentEd)**

Administrators must compile evidence that demonstrates their effectiveness in line with the performance standards.

**Summative Professional Growth Conference**

**(Forms Required: School Growth and Professional Goals – Summative Conference)**

Evaluators will assess each administrator using The Oregon Matrix for Summative Evaluations for Teachers and Administrators, which draws from the evaluation of the administrator in regards to their professional practices and responsibilities and their progress in school learning and growth. Evaluators will use a combination of the multiple measures (observations, artifacts, and goals) to complete the evaluation. The evaluator then meets with the administrator to review and finalize the summative evaluation. At this time, all components of the evaluation should be discussed, as well as the administrator’s year end reflection.

Using the summative evaluation and year end reflection as a guide, the administrator’s professional growth plan implications can be discussed. This also provides an opportunity to discuss Professional Development Units for license renewal. Prior to this meeting, the administrator must submit the summative self-reflection and all data associated with goals.

**Appendix A**

**Timelines and Forms**

| Check mark | COMPLETED BY: | **Administrator Timeline**  (Review Year)  MILESTONE AND DETAILS: |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | NOVEMBER 4 | **INITIAL PROFESSIONAL GROWTH CONFERENCE**   * Discuss Self-Assessment of Administrator Rubric Worksheet * Discuss potential Professional/School Growth Goals * Discuss PDUs for License Renewal (if applicable) |
|  | NOVEMBER 11 | **PROFESSIONAL/SCHOOL GROWTH GOALS FINALIZED**   * Must be submitted to evaluator electronically |
|  | FEBRUARY 28 | **OBSERVATIONS – PHASE ONE**   * Minimum of 2 Observations completed   (for a combined minimum of 4 Observations annually)   * Each a minimum of 20 minutes in length * All Observations require written feedback * At least 1 Observation during this phase requires a face-to-face conference to discuss feedback |
|  | MARCH 15 | **INTERIM PROFESSIONAL GROWTH CONFERENCE**   * Review progress toward Professional/School Growth Goals * Discuss additional support needed to meet Professional Growth Goal |
|  | MAY 30 | **OBSERVATIONS – PHASE TWO**   * Minimum of 2 Observations completed (for a combined minimum of 4 Observations annually) * Each a minimum of 20 minutes in length * All Observations require written feedback * At least 1 Observation during this phase requires a face-to-face conference to discuss feedback |
|  | JUNE 30 | **ARTIFACTS**   * Artifacts to be submitted to evaluator |
|  | AUGUST 15 | **SUMMATIVE PROFFESSIONAL GROWTH CONFERENCE**   * Review evidence of growth in Effective Practice * Discuss Summative Evaluation * Discuss End of Year Data * Discuss Reflection on Results * Discuss Professional Growth Plan implications * Discuss PDUs for License Renewal (if applicable) |

| Check mark | COMPLETED BY: | **Administrator Timeline**  (Non-Review Year)  MILESTONE AND DETAILS: |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | NOVEMBER 4 | **INITIAL PROFESSIONAL GROWTH CONFERENCE**   * Discuss Self-Assessment of Administrator Rubric Worksheet * Discuss potential Professional/School Growth Goals * Discuss PDUs for License Renewal (if applicable) |
|  | NOVEMBER 11 | **PROFESSIONAL/SCHOOL GROWTH GOALS FINALIZED**   * Must be submitted to evaluator electronically |
|  | MARCH 15 | **INTERIM GOAL REFLECTION**   * Must be submitted to evaluator electronically |
|  | AUGUST 15 | **END OF YEAR CONFERENCE**   * Discuss End of Year Data * Discuss Reflection on Results * Discuss Professional Growth Plan implications * Discuss PDUs for License Renewal (if applicable) |

**Administrator Rubric**

**Standard 1: The Vision of Learning**

A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a vision of learning that is shared and supported by the school community.

| **PERFORMANCE LEVEL** | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Indicators** | **Does Not Meet Standard (DNM)** | **Developing Proficiency Toward Standard (DP)** | **Proficient Relative to Standard (PR)** | **Exceeds Standard (E)** |
| **1.1 Belief that all students can learn** | Interacts with others and comments negatively or makes excuses about the ability of students to be successful. | Commitment to student achievement is evident, however ongoing proactive communication regarding the needs of struggling students is lacking. Recognizes gaps in knowledge and understanding both within self and in staff members. Pursues the necessary supports, carries on reflective conversations with staff, engages them in self-reflection and develops an understanding of the needs of all students. | Demonstrates a clear belief in the ability of all children to learn regardless of poverty, race, social economic status, learning disabilities, etc. Engages in courageous conversations regarding race and poverty. Recognizes gaps in knowledge and understanding both within self and in staff members. Pursues the necessary supports and carries on reflective conversations with staff in order to engage them in self-reflection and help them develop an understanding of the needs of all students. | Communicates a shared vision that all students can learn and holds staff accountable for rigorous instruction for all students. Leads school staff in an ongoing, systematic process to identify gaps in knowledge and understanding with respect to the needs of all students. Facilitates positive learning experiences for staff around the issues of race and class. Conducts ongoing examination of school culture and practices that cultivatean organization where race, ethnicity and socio-economic status are not a predictor of success or failure. |
| **Suggested Evidence:**  Site Visits;  Conversations;  Observations;  Academic Conferences;  Staff Feedback;  Student Achievement Results;  Master Schedule |
| **1.2 Stakeholders are actively engaged in developing, implementing, communicating, monitoring and evaluating the school mission and vision.** | Has not provided evidence of a mission statement for the school nor is there evidence of the staff, parents and extended community participating in the school’s decision-making processes. | Has established a school mission/vision statement based on conversations and input from stakeholders and school performance data. | Has established a solid vision/mission statement. All staff know the part they play and take responsibility working to attain the vision/mission of the school. Data collection is utilized actively and effectively to monitor and adjust the mission and vision. | Engages all stakeholders in the part they play and takes responsibility for attaining the school’s mission/vision. Data collection is utilized actively and effectively to monitor and adjust the mission/vision on a regular basis. |
| **Suggested Evidence:**  Site Visits;  Observations;  Balanced Leadership Survey;  Academic Conferences;  Attendance at PTC/PTA Meeting |
| **1.3 The CSIP (including assessment calendar, PD plan and SMART goals) target the areas of need and is connected to the District Strategic Plan. It is designed to improve the achievement of all students and close the achievement gap.** | Writes a CSIP that is poorly aligned to instructional behaviors and/or the District Strategic Plan and not reflective of student needs. | Introduces the CSIP to staff and stakeholders and input is sought to develop the plan and make adjustments. Links to the District Strategic Plan are evident. | Has in place a CSIP that is developed with stakeholder and staff input and is the driving force in the school for student improvement. Internal stakeholders regularly review the plan, and monitor its effectiveness for all students. The CSIP is clearly linked to the District Strategic Plan. | Has in place a CSIP that is a dynamic plan that is strongly connected to the District Strategic Plan. The Plan is responsive to the academic and organizational needs of the school, and has been adapted/revised based on student progress or lack thereof toward established learning targets. Student achievement results, especially for those students who comprise the subgroups in the school, demonstrate effective monitoring and implementation by internal and external stakeholders. |
| **Suggested Evidence:**  CSIP;  District Strategic Plan;  Data Plan - Results and Subgroup Data;  Balanced Leadership Survey;  Academic Conferences;  Intervention Plan |

**Standard 2: The Culture of Teaching and Learning**

A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by advocating, nurturing, and sustaining a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth.

| **PERFORMANCE LEVEL** | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Indicators** | **Does Not Meet Standard (DNM)** | **Developing Proficiency Toward Standard (DP)** | **Proficient Relative to Standard (PR)** | **Exceeds Standard (E)** |
| **2.1 Principal as the Instructional Leader** | There is little or no evidence of the leader’s performance being linked to his/her execution of McREL’s Balanced Leadership Responsibilities. | Is beginning to lead and or facilitate professional development aligned to the school’s CSIP. At times reviews assessment data with internal stakeholders and conducts observations in classrooms. | Engages in monitoring and evaluating the use of research-based best practices, curriculum materials, and formative/summative assessment data, for the purpose of informing a continuous cycle of growth and improvement in order to raise student achievement. Conducts required number of observations, both in classrooms and in PLCs. | Engages in monitoring and evaluating the use of research-based best practices, curriculum materials, and formative/summative assessment data for the purpose of promoting continuous growth as a means of raising student achievement. Conducts required number of observations, both in classrooms and in PLCs. Positive results indicate that appropriate differentiated professional development is matched to staff and student needs. |
| **Suggested Evidence:**  Site Visits;  Observation Schedule/Plan for Staff;  Staff Feedback;  Observations;  Academic Conferences;  IL-PLCs;  Balanced Leadership Survey;  Schoolwide PD Plan;  Balanced Assessment Plan;  Observations of Staff |
| **2.2 Teacher Growth and Professional Development** | Does not require staff to develop and implement measurable professional development goals. Does not follow contractual evaluation procedures. | Demonstrates limited ability to support professional growth and development of individual teachers. Follows established contractual evaluation procedures. | Promotes and supports teachers’ professional development aligned with the school’s comprehensive improvement plan. Ensures contractual evaluation obligations are followed. Seeks additional resources to strengthen the performance and development of marginal teachers. Collaborates with teacher(s) to develop a plan for success. | Identifies and utilizes the strengths of the teaching staff including support professionals.  Integrates a shared vision that aligns and supports the District’s Professional Development and Career Pathways Blueprint Design. Provides opportunities for challenging and relevant staff growth and development.  Analyzes the impact of marginal performers and seeks additional resources to strengthen their performance. Collaborates with teacher(s) to develop a plan for success. |
| **Suggested Evidence:**  Site Visits;  Observation Schedule/Plan for Staff;  Staff Feedback;  Observations;  Academic Conferences;  IL-PLCs;  Balanced Leadership Survey |
| **2.3 Teacher Collaboration/Guaranteed Viable Curriculum** | Does not provide teachers with organized time to work together and/or does not articulate the expectation that staff members collaborate on instructional planning, assessment and data work and debrief of practice. | Provides teachers time through any means available to collaborate and have norms and/or protocols in place. Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) are beginning to develop. | Arranges for teachers to meet regularly to discuss curriculum and instructional strategies and analyze student data through the use of common assessments. Teachers leave the collaboration with plans to further develop lessons and create interventions for students needing additional help. PLC meetings operate effectively under an agreed upon set of norms and protocols. | Arranges for teachers to meet weekly to discuss what they will teach, how they will teach it, develop common assessments, review data, and create interventions for students who need additional help. Teachers leave these collaborations with plans for further developing lessons. PLC meetings operate effectively under an agreed upon set of norms and protocols.  Student achievement data indicates an effective use of collaborative time. |
| **Suggested Evidence:**  PLC Plans and Protocols;  Observation of PLCs;  Observations;  Instructional Coach Model/Data;  Mentor Model/Data;  Staff Professional Growth Goal(s);  Student Achievement Data;  Peer Observations |
| **2.4 Effective Professional Development** | Plans professional development however it is a “one-size fits all”, e.g. tends to be topical, not always aligned to school improvement plan; data driven or based on best practices. | Attempts to provide staff with Professional Development activities that reflect current best practices focused on needs based on school wide student data. There is an intentional connection to the CSIP and the District Strategic Plan. Coaching is occurring, but does not follow an established instructional coaching model. | Links professional development to the CSIP plan based on student and staff assessed needs especially the needs of identified subgroups. Training is embedded in the day-to-day work of the school and instructional coaching is a functional model of support for most teachers. Administrator and staff members regularly dialogue about the staff member’s professional growth. | Demonstrates investment in a continuous improvement process by addressing identifying factors leading to under-performance and/or successes of students. Plans for professional development address those factors and are differentiated to meet the varying needs of the staff. Instructional coaching is a valued model of support for teachers. Administrator and staff members regularly dialogue about personal/professional growth for the staff. |
| **Suggested Evidence:**  Professional Development Agenda;  Academy of Teaching and Learning Records by Location;  Balanced Leadership Survey;  Site Visits;  Observations;  Coaching Log;  Student Achievement Results;  Aggregate Data – LEGENDS;  Diagnostic Surveys |
| **2.5 Use of Academic Expectations** | Does not clearly articulate academic expectations so that staff and students understand. This results in expectations not being used for purposes of improving student performance or as a basis for instruction.  Teachers work in isolation when grading student performance and there is no clearly articulated grading practice. There may or may not be evidence of celebrations of student academic achievement. | Clearly articulates academic expectations to staff and parents, however while students are aware of expectations, there is little correlation to improving student performance. Staff discuss goals and core standards inconsistently. Monitoring is primarily through annual state testing. Some teachers use common grading practices. Celebrations of student academic achievement are not consistent. | Clearly articulates academic expectations to staff, students and parents. Expectations along with core standards are discussed by staff frequently with students and are the basis for instruction. Data suggests student improvement is being made and is correlated to the core standards. School-wide grading practices are implemented. Celebrations of student academic achievement are scheduled regularly throughout the school year. | Clearly articulates academic expectations and posts them in student-friendly language. Staff and students refer to them consistently. Data demonstrates that there is growth towards those academic expectations or they are being met. Staff discuss goals and core standards regularly. Results are monitored and evaluated through multiple measures. Schoolwide grading practices are implemented. Honoring and recognizing of academic achievement are both regularly scheduled and spontaneous throughout the year. |
| **Suggested Evidence:**  Site Visits;  Observations;  Academic Conferences;  Student Achievement Results;  Content IL-PLCs;  Students taking ownership  drive reliability;  Honor and recognition of faculty and students |
| **2.6 Assessment Plan and Proficiency Based Grading System** | Facilitates the initial introduction to a balanced assessment plan that includes formative and summative data tied to core standards.  *A few teachers may be experimenting with proficiency based instruction, assessment, and grading.* | Supports teachers in the utilization of balanced assessment plans that include formative and summative data tied to core standards resulting in the modification of instruction.  *Some groups of collaborating teachers are implementing proficiency based instruction, assessment and grading.* | Promotes and supports leadership in the utilization of balanced assessment plans tied to core standards. Research-based strategies are regularly applied to targeted needs and modification of instruction.  *Many curriculum areas/teachers implement a common proficiency based model of instruction, assessment and grading.* | A schoolwide balanced assessment plan is evident and not dependent upon the leader to sustain it (it is business as usual).  The assessment plan is integrated into the CSIP. Staff plan, implement and analyze formative and summative student data with frequent feedback and full participation in the process with the administrator.  *Curriculum areas or teachers have implemented a proficiency based model of instruction, assessment and grading.* |
| **Suggested Evidence:**  Balanced Assessment Plan;  CSIP;  Academic Conferences;  Site Visits;  Data Plan;  Student Achievement Results;  Schoolwide PD Plan;  PLC Notes and Protocols |
| **2.7 Use of State and District Standards** | Has knowledge of district and state common core standards. Introduces and provides them to teachers, but there is little or no evidence of explaining and supporting the use of standards to guide instruction with students. | Implements a program where teachers understand the importance of a coherent curriculum program aligned to common core state standards. Standards are used with lessons as learning targets but may not be clearly evident or articulated by students. | Establishes a comprehensive, rigorous and a clearly coherent curricular program aligned to standards.  Standards have been deconstructed and are used with lessons. Students recognize standards as learning targets and can communicate their progress toward the target. | Implements a sustainable comprehensive, rigorous and coherent curricular program aligned to district and state common core standards. Teachers regularly use fully deconstructed standards that are aligned both vertically and horizontally. Students consistently communicate their progress toward the standards. |
| **Suggested Evidence:**  Observations;  Site Visits;  IL-PLCs;  Curriculum Maps;  Deconstructed Standards;  Minutes – Staff Meetings;  Common Formative Assessments;  Individual Student Achievement Data |
| **2.8 Set of common effective instructional strategies to meet the needs of all learners** | Provides little if any direction to staff on the use of research-based instructional strategies targeted to meet student needs. | Facilitates the introduction of research based instructional strategies for teachers and staff. Little evidence of implementation is available and few students are able to identify the learning strategy. | Monitors and evaluates planned instruction regularly to ensure that it is targeted to meet student needs. Most students can identify the learning strategies used during instruction and are beginning to use and/or work with the instructional strategies independently themselves. | Monitors and evaluates instruction for planned use and implementation is targeted to student needs. Leader demonstrates knowledge of research based instructional strategies. Leader monitors student applications of strategies in independent/individualized learning situations. |
| **Suggested Evidence:**  Individual Student Achievement Data: SpEd, Edusoft, OAKS, ELPA;  Teacher Team and PLC Notes;  Student Interviews;  Peer Observations;  Teacher Interviews;  Instructional Coach & Mentor  Forums;  Observations;  Lesson Plans;  Schoolwide PD Plan/Agenda |
| **2.9 Ensures effective management of student data** | Demonstrates a weak understanding of student data and/or the district tools used to capture and analyze data. Limited processes are in place at the school site. | Conducts an ongoing review of student data using district tools with some support from staff. Leader shares data with teachers and provides teachers with opportunities through data teams and PLCs to review and improve data analysis. | Demonstrates strong facility in the use of data and uses district tools to monitor and share student progress with teachers. Uses technology to support data management and has the school data analysis and assessment team in place with clearly defined roles appropriate for building size and level. | Puts processes and training in place to develop the assessment and data literacy of all teachers. Demonstrates strong facility in the use of data and uses district tools to monitor and share student progress with teachers. Promotes use of technology as a data management tool and has the school data analysis and assessment team in place with clearly defined roles as appropriate for building size and level. |
| **Suggested Evidence:**  Data Plan;  PLC Notes and Protocols;  Schoolwide PD Plan;  Balanced Assessment Plan;  Site Visits;  Observations;  Academic Conferences;  Student Achievement Results |
| **2.10 Instructional Initiatives Implementation** | Attends trainings associated with the initiative, but lacks the knowledge and/or ability to successfully implement the instructional initiative(s). | Possesses the knowledge of the initiative(s) and provides the training and resources to staff; however consistent monitoring and continuing support are insufficient and result in the lack of quality, fidelity, intensity and consistency in the school-wide implementation of the initiative(s).  - | Possesses the knowledge of, provides ongoing training for, and ensures sufficient resources for the implementation of instructional initiative(s). Provides ongoing monitoring and continuing support for and assists in teacher revisions and refinement of instructional initiative(s). Quality, fidelity, intensity and consistency are progressing in the implementation of the initiative and are verified by clear and consistent data. | Possesses the knowledge of, provides ongoing training for, and ensures sufficient resources for the implementation of instructional initiative(s). Provides ongoing monitoring and continuing support for and assists in teacher’s revisions and refinement of instructional initiative(s). Quality, fidelity, intensity and consistency in the delivery of the initiative(s) are ensured and verified by clear and consistent data. |
| **Suggested Evidence:**  IL-PLCs  Instructional Coaching Plan;  Schoolwide PD Plan;  Evaluation Schedule;  Student Achievement Results;  Observations;  Site Visits;  Academic Conferences;  Budget worksheet that shows how funds are allocated to support instruction. |

**Standard 3: The Management of Learning**

A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by ensuring management of the organization, operations, and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment.

| **PERFORMANCE LEVEL** | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Indicators** | **Does Not Meet Standard (DNM)** | **Developing Proficiency Toward Standard (DP)** | **Proficient Relative to Standard (PR)** | **Exceeds Standard (E)** |
| **3.1 District Protocols and Procedures** | Is unsure of district protocols, procedures and supports. Crisis management plan that is in place is inadequate. Does not always respond appropriately in crisis situations. | Is learning district protocols and procedures. Basic crisis management plan in place.  Learning to remain calm and manage crisis situations. | Understands and follows district protocols and procedures. Accesses support quickly, especially in crisis situations. Has a satisfactory crisis management plan which is reviewed regularly with staff and students. Facilitates leadership decisions appropriately in crisis situations. | Understands and follows district protocols and procedures. Accesses support quickly in crisis situations. Has a well-developed crisis management plan that is reviewed regularly with staff and students. Demonstrates ability to remain calm and exercise responsive leadership and decision-making, especially in crisis situations. |
| **Suggested Evidence:**  Crisis Management Plan;  Balanced Leadership Survey;  Incident Reports;  Site Visits;  Staff Feedback;  Parent Feedback;  Monthly Fire and Safety Reports |
| **3.2 Budget Management** | Possesses inadequate understanding of budget management and procedures and requires significant levels of support. Budget reflects inadequate thought and planning and lack of understanding of how funds are allocated and spent. | Manages budget for building according to district budget procedures. Requires support in managing multiple funds to support CSIP priorities. At times has difficulty adhering to original budget plan. Overall budget is on target and records are complete. | Manages budget for building according to district budget procedures. Demonstrates the ability to manage multiple funds to support CSIP priorities. Consistently reviews actual spending and budgeting. Demonstrates adherence to original plan or executes appropriate revisions or transfers. Budget is on target and records and reporting are timely, accurate and complete. | Manages budget for building according to district budget procedures. Demonstrates the ability to manage multiple funds, creatively leveraging dollars to support CSIP priorities and school/department needs. Consistently reviews actual spending and budgeting. Demonstrates adherence to original plan or executes appropriate revisions or transfers. Budget is on target and records and reporting are timely, accurate and complete. |
| **Suggested Evidence:**  Building Budget;  Building Records;  Financial Reports |
| **3.3 Facility Management** | Does not ensure that facility is maintained adequately in terms of cleanliness, safety and order. Does not communicate expectations to staff and students about their role nor engage with facilities services staff. Facility is not well maintained and has numerous safety issues. | Supports and ensures that facility is maintained at a basic level of cleanliness, safety and order. Communicates expectations to students from time to time but does not regularly reinforce. Is at times beginning to take a more active role in managing the facility and engaging with facilities service staff. | Supports and ensures that the facility is maintained in a clean and orderly fashion with attention to safety. Clearly communicates expectations to staff and students regarding their role in maintaining the facility and collaborates closely with facilities service staff and supports their efforts. | Supports and ensures that facility is maintained in a clean and orderly fashion with attention to safety. Clearly communicates expectations to staff and students regarding their role in maintaining the facility. Collaborates closely with and supports facilities services staff and encourages and initiates community/ volunteer support for care of the facility and grounds. |
| **Suggested Evidence:**  Site Visits;  Observations;  Balanced Leadership Survey;  Monthly Safety Reports |
| **3.4 Compliance** | Building is out of compliance in multiple areas and administrator is slow to respond to address issues. | Demonstrates awareness of state and federal requirements in key areas but compliance is not always timely or thorough. | Is attentive to and requests support to ensure that the building is in compliance with key state and federal requirements. When an audit reveals a problem the leader responds to the correction of the problem. Leader has a sufficient understanding of key state and federal requirements. | Is attentive to and requests support to ensure that the building is in compliance with key state and federal requirements. When an audit reveals a problem the leader responds to the correction of the problem. Demonstrates a strong understanding of federal and state requirements. |
| **Suggested Evidence:**  District Reports;  Fire Marshall Inspections;  Monthly Fire Drills;  Site Visits;  Observations;  Balanced Leadership Survey |
| **3.5 Behavior Expectations** | Does not articulate or facilitate expectations for behavior of students, staff and the school community. Behavior data is not used. | Facilitates the setting of behavior expectations, however they are not clearly understood by all of the school community, and are inconsistently administered. Interventions are more punitive than instructive and preventive.  Behavior data is inconsistently monitored and evaluated only periodically. | Facilitates and implements a school wide behavior/discipline plan where behavior expectations are clear, supported and followed by school community – staff, students and parents. Behavioral data is monitored and evaluated regularly.  Interventions are well established to ensure student success. | Facilitates and implements a school wide behavior/discipline plan where behavior expectations are clear, supported and followed by school community – staff, students and parents. Behavioral data is monitored and evaluated regularly.  Interventions are well established to ensure student success. Plans are in place or implemented for recognition of behavior accomplishments. |
| **Suggested Evidence:**  Student Discipline Data;  Referral Information;  Schoolwide Discipline and Behavior Plan;  Site Visits;  Observations;  Balanced Leadership Survey |
| **3.6 Use of Instructional Time** | Does not engage staff in planning effective use of instructional time. Instructional time for core content varies from classroom to classroom. State requirements may not be met. | Ensures that instructional time meets state requirements, but it is not necessarily protected and/or staff are not engaged to maximize its use. | Ensures that instruction is focused, and time is protected to support quality, intensity and student learning. Engages staff in planning instruction in order to maximize the available time. for instruction. | Ensures that all instruction is focused and protected to support quality instruction and student learning, engages staff in planning instruction in order to maximize time available which leads to high levels of student achievement.  . |
| **Suggested Evidence:**  Schedule;  Site Visits;  Observations;  Balanced Leadership Survey;  Bell-to-Bell Learning |
| **3.7 Use of Staff Time** | Allows staff time to be self- directed and there are few opportunities for staff for professional development, meetings and collaboration time with a focus on instruction. | Works with staff to provide a predictable schedule for meetings, professional development and collaboration time. Many meetings are focused on operational issues and are not related to instruction nor are there planned agendas. | Works with staff to provide a predictable schedule with adequate advanced notice and planned agendas for meetings, professional development and collaboration time that have a focus on instruction.  Staff has a method for obtaining information, a professional development plan is established and teachers are in the beginning stages of collaboration. | Works with staff to provide a predictable schedule with adequate advanced notice and planned agendas for meetings, professional development and collaboration time. Intentionally promotes a culture of professional use of work time and teacher collaboration that is focused on instruction. |
| **Suggested Evidence:**  PLC Notes and Protocols;  Staff Meeting Schedule;  Balanced Leadership Survey;  Peer Observations;  Planned Agenda |

**Standard 4: Relationships with the Broader Community to Foster Learning:** A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by collaborating with families and community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources.

| **PERFORMANCE LEVEL** | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Indicators** | **Does Not Meet Standard (DNM)** | **Developing Proficiency Toward Standard (DP)** | **Proficient Relative to Standard (PR)** | **Exceeds Standard (E)** |
| **4.1 Responds to and Provides Outreach to a Diverse Community** | Has little understanding and/or takes little interest in the changing diversity and demographics of the community served. | Is developing an understanding of the changing diversity and demographics of the school and community served. Organization structures (parent groups and committees) do not necessarily reflect this diversity.  Relationships with community members and outside organizations are beginning to develop. Diversity is celebrated at times. Parent communication, calendars and activities are at times not culturally sensitive. | Develops processes to stay in touch with the changing diversity and demographics of the school and community served. Diversity is regularly celebrated. Parent organization, site council, booster clubs and/or advisory committees are in place and reflect this diversity. In addition parent communication, school activities, and calendars are structured in a culturally sensitive manner. School activities are open to the broader community. Relationships are being built with community members and outside organizations to support the needs of the school. | Develops processes to stay in touch with the changing diversity and demographics of the school and community served. Diversity is regularly celebrated. Parent organization, site council, booster clubs and/or advisory committees are in place and reflect this diversity. Parent communication, school activities, and calendars are structured in a culturally sensitive manner. School activities are open to the broader community. Builds effective relationships with community members and outside organizations to support the needs of the school and various student and parent groups. |
| **Suggested Evidence:**  Parent Survey;  Attendance at PTA/PTC Meeting;  Site Visit by Director to one PTA/PTC meeting a year;  Copies of Demographic data over time that tracks changes;  Copy of parent involvement flyers/brochures for parent nights, family dinners, etc;  CSIP;  Parental Involvement;  Climate Survey -  Staff & Student;  Attendance at Math/Reading Nights |
| **4.2 Use of Parent, Family, & Community Participation** | Does little to coordinate parent and family participation in school activities, programs or volunteerism in the school. | Promotes parent attendance at student programs and activities and parent volunteerism in the school. | Promotes parents, family, and community participation in the meaningful instructional processes of the school. These groups are routinely involved in the school through volunteerism and activities associated with their students. Parents create volunteer events and activities. In addition they support the school staff in instruction of students and promotion of student achievement. There is some business partnership involvement in the school. | Promotes parents, family, and community meaningful participation in the instructional processes of the school. These groups are routinely involved in the school through volunteerism and activities associated with their students. Parents and community create volunteer events and activities. In addition they support the school staff in instruction of students and promotion of student achievement. The community is involved through business partnerships that further the school’s work. |
| **Suggested Evidence:**  Parent Survey;  Attendance at PTA/PTC Meeting;  Site Visit by Director to one PTA/PTC meeting a year;  Volunteer Reports;  Parent Involvement Plan;  Business Partners |

**Standard 5: Integrity, Fairness and Ethics in Learning:** A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by acting with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner. The school leader is the leader of learning in the school and conducts himself/herself in this manner.

| **PERFORMANCE LEVEL** | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Indicators** | **Does Not Meet Standard (DNM)** | **Developing Proficiency Toward Standard (DP)** | **Proficient Relative to Standard (PR)** | **Exceeds Standard (E)** |
| **5.1 Guiding Norms –**  **Commitments to positive professional behavior, to act or behave in a certain way with regard to professionalism** | Ineffectively promotes and monitors the professional and ethical competencies for Oregon Educators and the Government Standards and Practices Act. There is no modeling or evidence of professional norms to guide staff. | Models and monitors the professional and ethical competencies for Oregon Educators and the Government Standards and Practices Act. Professional norms are beginning to emerge and be communicated, however there is not a concerted effort to ensure that they are followed by staff. Concerns are often communicated to an office outside of the school for resolution. | Models and monitors the professional and ethical competencies for Oregon Educators and the Government Standards and Practices Act. Facilitates and reinforces staff agreements of professional norms and behaviors. Models the principles of self-awareness, reflective practice, transparency and ethical behavior. Most conflicts are resolved at the building level. | Models and holds him/herself and others to the professional and ethical competencies for Oregon Educators and the Oregon Government Standards and Practices Act. Facilitates and reinforces staff agreements of professional norms and behaviors. Models the principles of self-awareness, reflective practice, transparency and ethical behavior and expects staff to do the same. Conflicts are resolved at the building level. |
| **Suggested Evidence:**  Staff Climate Survey;  Site Visits;  Observations |
| **5.2 Lead Learner** | Processes and practices do not demonstrate commitment as a lifelong learner. | Rarely positions him/herself as a lifelong learner and mostly conducts him/herself as an expert, rather than a learner. Rarely attends professional learning activities with staff. Occasionally makes his/her learning public. | Models lifelong learning by demonstrating new processes and practices he/she has acquired during the conduct of district business, participates in professional learning activities with the staff, and consistently makes his/her personal learning public. | Models lifelong learning by demonstrating new processes and practices he/she has acquired during the conduct of district business, participates in professional learning activities with the staff, and consistently makes their personal learning public. At times conducts professional development his or herself and interacts with staff using research-based best practices. |
| **Suggested Evidence:**  Professional Growth Goal(s);  Attendance at Staff training and IL-PLC;  Schoolwide PD Plan;  Site Visits;  CSIP – Professional Development;  PLC Notes Reviewed;  Participation in teacher PLCs |
| * 1. **Promoting Social Justice** | Does not set a tone for valuing diversity in the school nor does he or she ensure that social justice and individual student learning inform all aspects of schooling. Fails to provide opportunities for all stakeholders to be involved in the school. Does not demonstrate an understanding, appreciation, and need for cultural, social and intellectual diversity of the school community. | Acknowledges community’s cultural, social, and intellectual resources. Engages in open democratic dialogue with limited stakeholder involvement. | Facilitates processes and engages in activities that ensure open democratic dialogue with stakeholders across cultural, social, and economic populations.  Formulates a building-level leadership platform grounded in ethical standards and practices that promotes a sense of urgency for increasing achievement for every student.  Regularly embeds the community’s cultural, social, and intellectual resources into the learning environment. | Knows, understands, and articulates the relationships among social justice, culture and student achievement and promotes programs to address inequities within the school community. Models activism by critically analyzing and exploring social injustices within the school as well as standing up against the status quo. |
| **Suggested Evidence:**  Observation and reports of:  Acquisition of advocacy skills in order to support the needs of staff & students, and the ability to communicate those needs in ways that are heard and respected;  Employment of multiple communication strategies to engage and collaborate effectively with all stakeholders;  Acting with justice and fairness in applying federal, state laws and district policies as related to educational issues;  Modeling the principles of self-awareness, reflective practice, transparency, and ethical behavior. |
| **5.4 Encourages Multiple points of view, recognizes thoughtful dissent and uses multiple opinions to form solutions** | Seldom considers the unintended consequences of his/her own actions. Discourages dissent, creates a climate where people are reluctant to raise issues. | Generally adjusts behavior according to environment and occasionally needs coaching to respond appropriately in a given situation. In certain situations encourages multiple opinions and is successful on occasion in reaching win-win solutions. | Considers consequences of own actions, anticipates possible responses and adjusts behavior to the environment. Encourages multiple points of view, using dissent to inform decisions and improve the quality of his/her decision-making. Majority of situations involve win-win solutions. | Considers consequences of own actions, anticipates possible responses and adjusts behavior to the environment. Encourages multiple points of view, recognizing thoughtful dissent and using multiple opinions to inform solutions. Transforms negative energy into an opportunity for reflection and win-win solutions. |
| **Suggested Evidence:**  Balanced Leadership Survey;  Staff Feedback;  IL-PLCs;  Site Visits;  Observations;  Staff Climate Survey |
| **5.5 Leader Resilience** | Demonstrates little or no emotional fortitude and perseverance in the face of obstacles. May lose mental focus and energy. May back down from tough decisions. Recognizes own emotions and tries to manage them but may become defensive or defeated in the face of resistance, setbacks or failures. | Regularly perseveres and is effective in less complex situations, but has limited results in more challenging situations. Understands and manages own emotions, reactions and assumptions, but may take resistance or failure personally at times. | Is effective at adapting to obstacles and achieving results in all situations. Leader models resiliency and anticipates and overcomes resistance and guides others through adversity and challenges. Leader remains calm, constructive and optimistic. Does not take negativity or dissent personally and quickly transitions from emotional to strategic response. Effectively makes tough decisions and engages in difficult conversations. Focuses on the solution and stays the course. | Creates a schoolwide culture around relentless drive and perseverance and is able to develop this behavior in others. Leader is highly effective at adapting to obstacles and achieving results in all situations. Leader models resiliency and skillfully anticipates and overcomes resistance. Guides others through adversity and challenges. Teaches others to make tough decisions.  Capitalizes on challenges and models and uses resistance, setbacks and opportunities to learn and grow. |
| **Suggested Evidence:**  Site Visits; Conversations;  Academic Conferences;  Observations;  Staff Feedback;  Balanced Leadership Survey |

**Standard 6: The Context of Learning:** A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context.

| **PERFORMANCE LEVEL** | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Indicators** | **Does Not Meet Standard (DNM)** | **Developing Proficiency Toward Standard (DP)** | **Proficient Relative to Standard (PR)** | **Exceeds Standard (E)** |
| **6.1 Effective Collaborator with Service Providers and Decision Makers** | Interaction and collaboration with outside organizations and decision makers is not evident or at best is ineffective. | Interacts with outside organizations and decision makers to enhance their support for educational outcomes and maintain existing education programs. Does not keep pace with emerging trends and initiatives. | Interacts and collaborates with outside organizations and decision makers. Understands the importance of the political processes impacting education and responds to community needs through development of educational programs. Responds to requests for support from service providers and decision makers. | Interacts and collaborates with outside organizations and decision makers. Demonstrates the responsibility of outreach and is an advocate and spokesperson for the school for all stakeholders. Fully engages the community in the educational process within the school/district. | |
| **Suggested Evidence:**  Site Visits;  Conversations;  Balanced Leadership Survey;  Staff Feedback;  Academic Conferences;  Parent and Community Feedback |
| **6.2 Responds in a positive and strategic way to the factors that influence student success that are social, political and legal.**  **Suggested Evidence:**  Site Visits;  Conversations;  Balanced Leadership Survey;  Staff Feedback;  Academic Conferences;  Parent and Community Feedback | Does not attend to the factors beyond the school that are soft factors that may influence student success. | Discusses and appears to understand the soft factors and their effect on student success. Does not take an active stance when it comes to intervening in areas outside the school that effect student achievement. | Attends to and takes an active role both in terms of studying the factors and their influence on success and takes an active advocacy stance when needed. | Attends to and takes an active role in terms of studying the factors and their influence on student success, taking an active advocacy role and leading efforts to influence a change in the factors through funding, legislation or educating others. | |

**Administrator Rubric Worksheet**

|  | **DNM** | **DP** | **PR** | **E** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **1.1** |  |  |  |  |
| **1.2** |  |  |  |  |
| **1.3** |  |  |  |  |

**St. 1:** **The Vision of Learning**

* 1. Belief that all students can learn
  2. Stakeholders are actively engaged in developing, implementing, communicating, monitoring, and evaluating the school mission and vision.
  3. The Continuous School Improvement Plan (including assessment calendar, Professional Development Plan and SMART goals) target the areas of need and is connected to the District Strategic Plan. It is designed to improve the achievement of all students and close the achievement gap.

|  | **DNM** | **DP** | **PR** | **E** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **2.1** |  |  |  |  |
| **2.2** |  |  |  |  |
| **2.3** |  |  |  |  |
| **2.4** |  |  |  |  |
| **2.5** |  |  |  |  |
| **2.6** |  |  |  |  |
| **2.7** |  |  |  |  |
| **2.8** |  |  |  |  |
| **2.9** |  |  |  |  |
| **2.10** |  |  |  |  |

**St. 2: The Culture of Teaching and Learning**

* 1. Principal as the Instructional Leader

2.2 Teacher Growth and Professional Development

2.3 Teacher Collaboration/Guaranteed Viable Curriculum

2.4 Effective Professional Development

2.5 Use of academic expectations

2.6 Assessment Plan and Proficiency Based Grading System

2.7 Use of State and District Standards

2.8 Set of common effective instructional strategies to meet the needs of all learners

2.9 Ensures effective management of student data

2.10 Instructional Initiatives implementation

|  | **DNM** | **DP** | **PR** | **E** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **3.1** |  |  |  |  |
| **3.2** |  |  |  |  |
| **3.3** |  |  |  |  |
| **3.4** |  |  |  |  |
| **3.5** |  |  |  |  |
| **3.6** |  |  |  |  |
| **3.7** |  |  |  |  |

**St. 3: The Management of Learning**

3.1 District Protocols and Procedures

3.2 Budget Management

3.3 Facility Management

3.4 Compliance

3.5 Behavior Expectations

3.6 Use of Instructional Time

3.7 Use of Staff Time

|  | **DNM** | **DP** | **PR** | **E** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **4.1** |  |  |  |  |
| **4.2** |  |  |  |  |

**St. 4: Relationships with the Broader Community to Foster Learning**

4.1 Responds to and provides outreach to a diverse community

4.2 Use of parent, family, & community participation

**St. 5: Integrity, Fairness and Ethics in Learning**

|  | **DNM** | **DP** | **PR** | **E** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **5.1** |  |  |  |  |
| **5.2** |  |  |  |  |
| **5.3** |  |  |  |  |
| **5.4** |  |  |  |  |
| **5.5** |  |  |  |  |

5.1 Guiding Norms – Commits to positive professional behavior, to act or behave in a certain way with regard to professionalism

5.2 Lead Learner

5.3 Promoting Social Justice

5.4 Encourages multiple points of view, recognizes thoughtful dissent, and uses multiple opinions to form solutions

5.5 Leader Resilience

**St. 6: The Context of Learning**

|  | **DNM** | **DP** | **PR** | **E** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **6.1** |  |  |  |  |
| **6.2** |  |  |  |  |

6.1 Effective collaborator with service providers and decision makers

6.2 Responds in a positive and strategic way to the factors that influence student success that are social, political, and legal

**Administrator SGG Goal Setting template**

**Administrator: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Contract Status: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**School: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ School Year: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**Evaluator: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **SGG GOAL 1** | | |
| **Goal-Setting Conference** | **Content Standards/Skills** |  |
| **Assessments** | ❑ Category 1 \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  ❑Category 2 \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ |
| **Context/Students** |  |
| **Baseline Data** |  |
| **School Growth Goal (Targets)** |  |
| **Rationale** |  |
| **Strategies** |  |
| **Professional Learning and Support** |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **SGG GOAL 2** | | | |
|  | **Content Standards/Skills** |  | |
| **Assessments** | ❑ Category 1 \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  ❑Category 2 \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ | |
| **Context/Students** |  | |
| **Baseline Data** |  | |
| **School Growth Goal (Targets)** |  | |
| **Rationale** |  | |
| **Strategies** |  | |
| **Professional Learning and Support** |  | |
| **Sign-Off at Initial Collaborative Meeting: Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Administrator: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Evaluator: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_** | | | |
|  | **Professional Growth Goal(s)** | |  |
|  | **Strategies** | |  |
|  | **Professional Learning and Support** | |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Mid-Year Review** | **Collaborative Mid-Year Goal Review** |  | | |
| **Strategy Modification** |  | | |
| **Administrator Signature:** | **Date:** | **Evaluator Signature:** | **Date:** |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Year-End Goal Conference** | **End-of-Year Data** |  | | |
| **Reflection on Results** |  | | |
| **Professional Growth Plan Implications** |  | | |
| **Administrator Signature:** | **Date:** | **Evaluator Signature:** | **Date:** |

**Self-Reflection Tool**

At the end of the school year, each educator is asked to reflect on their professional learning, growth, and performance.

Carefully reflect on your Professional Learning and your performance on the Professional Standards.

1. What have you learned or re-learned from the observations and the professional learning activities in which you have taken part this year?
2. Describe a standard in which you have demonstrated substantial competence.
3. Based on the analysis of your performance, what goals will you be focusing on as you move toward with your professional growth, or what new goals do you anticipate including in your professional goals for next year?
4. Describe how you have supported the school’s improvement plan.

**The Oregon Matrix for Summative Evaluations for Teachers and Administrators**

Beginning in the 2014-15 school year, all districts will use the Oregon Matrix Model for their summative evaluations. In the Oregon Matrix, Professional Practice (PP) and Professional Responsibilities (PR) intersect with Student Learning and Growth (SLG) culminating in a Professional Growth Plans (Facilitative, Collegial, Consulting, Directed) and summative performance level. When there is a discrepancy between the PP/PR level and SLG level, further inquiry is triggered to explore and understand the reasons for the discrepancy in order to then determine the Professional Growth Plan and corresponding summative performance level.

| **Y-AXIS: Combined Rating on Professional Practice and Professional Responsibilities (PP/PR)** | **LEVEL 4**  *(Highest)* | **COLLEGIAL**  Focus on SLG Goals  **\**SLG INQUIRY***  *due to* ***LOW*** *level of fidelity between measures*  **3** | **FACILITATIVE *or* COLLEGIAL**  Focus on SLG Goals  Determined post inquiry  **\**SLG INQUIRY***  *due to only* ***SOME*** *level of fidelity between measures*  **3 or 4** | **FACILITATIVE**  **GOOD** level of fidelity between measures  **4** | **FACILITATIVE**  **HIGHEST** level of fidelity between measures  **4** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **LEVEL 3** | **COLLEGIAL *or* CONSULTING**  Focus on SLG Goals  Determined post inquiry  **\**SLG INQUIRY***  *due to* ***SOME*** *level of fidelity between measures*  **2 or 3** | **COLLEGIAL PLAN**  **GOOD** level of fidelity between measures  **3** | **COLLEGIAL**  **HIGHEST** level of fidelity between measures  **3** | **COLLEGIAL**  **GOOD** level of fidelity between measures  **3** |
| **LEVEL 2** | **CONSULTING**  **GOOD** level of fidelity between measures  **2** | **CONSULTING**  **HIGHEST** level of fidelity between measures  **2** | **CONSULTING**  **GOOD** level of fidelity between measures  **2** | **COLLEGIAL *or* CONSULTING**  Determined post inquiry  **\**PP/PR INQUIRY***  *due to only* ***SOME*** *level of fidelity between measures*  **2 or 3** |
| **LEVEL 1**  *(Lowest)* | **DIRECTED**  **HIGHEST** level of fidelity between measures  **1** | **DIRECTED**  **GOOD** level of fidelity between measures  **1** | **CONSULTING *or* DIRECTED**  Determined post inquiry  ***\*PP/PR INQUIRY*** *due to only* ***SOME*** *level of fidelity between measures*  **1 or 2** | **CONSULTING**  **\**PP/PR INQUIRY***  *due to only* ***LOW*** *level of fidelity between measures*  **2** |
|  |  | **LEVEL 1**  *(Lowest)* | **LEVEL 2** | **LEVEL 3** | **LEVEL 4**  *(Highest)* |
| **X-AXIS: Rating on Student Learning and Growth** | | | |

\*Ratings in these areas require an inquiry process in order to determine a summative performance level and Professional Growth Plan.

**STATEWIDE COMPONENTS OF THE OREGON MATRIX**

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

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

First, the evaluator will need to determine the combined performance level for PP/PR based on data from the district’s rubric. The evaluator will already have gauged the educator’s performance on each standard/performance indicator on the rubric with four performance levels. For example, in a Danielson rubric, educators will have received a performance level for all 22 components (for Marshall rubrics, 60 components; for LEGENDS 29 components; etc.). The evaluator will then:

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

3.6 - 4.0 = 4 PP/PR

2.81-3.59 =3 PP/PR

1.99 – 2.8 = 2 PP/PR\*

< 1.99 = 1 PP/PR

**\*PP/PR Scoring Rule**: If the educator scores two 1’s in any PP/PR component and

his/her average score falls between 1.99-2.499, the educator’s

performance level cannot be rated above a 1.

1. Find the PP/PR performance level (1-4) on the Y-axis of the matrix.
2. **X-Axis: Student Learning and Growth (SLG)**

After the educator’s PP/PR performance level is determined, their Professional Growth Plan and summative performance level is then found by looking at the educator’s rating on SLG goals. The level of performance on SLG will be determined by scoring the SLG goals using the Oregon SLG Goal scoring rubric (see page 4). All educators will set two SLG goals annually. Educators on a two year evaluation cycle will select two of the four goals collaboratively with their evaluator to be included in their summative evaluation. *Math and ELA teachers (grades 3-8 and 11) and administrators must use Category 1 assessments for one of the two goals.*

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

| **Level 4** | **Level 3** | **Level 2** | **Level 1** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| You must score:   * 4 on both goals | You could score:   * 3 on both goals, or * 3 on one goal & 4 on one goal, or * 4 on one goal & 2 on one goal | You could score:   * 2 on both goals, or * 2 on one goal & 3 on one goal, or * 3 on one goal & 1 on one goal, or * 4 on one goal & 1 on one goal | You could score:   * 1 on both goals, or * 1 on one goal & 2 on one goal |

1. **Scoring Student Learning and Growth (SLG) Goals**

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

The following tools are used to score SLG goals to determine the educator’s impact on SLG in the summative evaluation.

**SLG Quality Review Checklist**

Before SLG goals are used in teacher and administrator evaluations, this checklist should be used in in order to approve them. For an SLG goal to be approved, all criteria must be met.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Baseline Data** | **Yes** | **No** |
| Is baseline data used to make data-driven decisions for the SLG goal, including the most recent student information from past assessments and/or pre-assessment results? |  |  |
| **Student Learning and Growth Goals** |  |  |
| Is the SLG goal written as a “growth” goals vs. “achievement” goal? (i.e. growth goals measure student learning between two or more points in time and achievement goals measure student learning at only one point in time.) |  |  |
| Does the SLG goal describe a “target” or expected growth for all students, tiered or differentiated as needed based on baseline data? |  |  |
| **Rigor of Goals** |  |  |
| Does the goal address relevant and specific knowledge and skills aligned to the course curriculum based on state or national content standards? |  |  |
| Is the SLG goal measurable and challenging, yet attainable? |  |  |

**SLG Scoring Rubric**

This SLG scoring rubric is used for scoring individual SLG goals based on evidence submitted by the teacher and supervisor/evaluator. This rubric applies to both teacher and administrator evaluations.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Level 4  *(Highest)* | This category applies when approximately 90% of students met their target(s) and approximately 25% of students exceeded their target(s). This category should only be selected when a substantial number of students surpassed the overall level of attainment established by the target(s). Goals are very rigorous yet attainable, and differentiated (as appropriate) for all students. |
| Level 3 | This category applies when approximately 90% of students met their 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 all or almost all students met the overall level of attainment established by the target(s). Goals are rigorous yet attainable and differentiated (as appropriate) for all students. |
| Level 2 | This category applies when 70-89% of students met their target(s), but those that missed the target missed by more than a few points, a few percentage points or a few students. Goals are attainable but might not be rigorous or differentiated (as appropriate) for all students. |
| Level 1  *(Lowest)* | This category applies when less than 70% of students meet the target(s). If a substantial proportion of students did not meet their target(s), the SLG was not met. Goals are attainable, but not rigorous.  This category also applies when results are missing or incomplete. |

1. **Final Summative Performance Level and Professional Growth Plan**

Taking the performance levels for professional practice and professional responsibilities (PP/PR) and student learning and growth (SLG) find where the X-Axis intersects with the Y-Axis on the matrix. The PP/PR will then be compared to the SLG to determine the educator’s Professional Growth Plan and overall summative performance level. The four types of Professional Growth Plans are defined as follows:

**Facilitative** - The educator leads the conversation and with the evaluator chooses the focus of the Professional Growth Plan and professional goal(s) as the educator and evaluator collaborate on the plan/professional growth goal(s). If the educator had a SLG performance level 2, the plan/professional goal(s) must also include a focus on increasing the educator’s overall aptitude in this measure.

**Collegial** - The educator and evaluator collaboratively develop the educator's Professional Growth Plan/professional goal(s). If the educator had a SLG performance level 1 or 2, the plan/professional goal(s) must also include a focus on increasing the educator’s overall aptitude in this measure.

**Consultative** - The evaluator consults with the educator and uses the information gathered to inform the educator's Professional Growth Plan /professional goal(s). If the educator had a SLG performance level 1 or 2, the plan/professional goal(s) must also include a focus on increasing the educator’s overall aptitude in this measure.

**Directed** - The evaluator directs the educator's Professional Growth Plan /professional goal(s). This plan should involve a focus on the most important area(s) to improve educator performance. If the educator had a SLG performance level 1 or 2, the plan/professional goal(s) must also include a focus on increasing the educator’s overall aptitude in this measure.

The local collaborative evaluation design team will ensure that the Professional Growth Plan resulting from the Matrix is included in the design of the professional growth and evaluation system. The Matrix summative rating is to be used for state reporting purposes as required by the ESEA Flexibility Waiver.

1. **Inquiry Processes**

**Student Learning and Growth Inquiry Process (SLG Inquiry)**:

In order to determine an educator’s Professional Growth Plan and resulting summative performance level, the following must be initiated by the evaluator to determine the summative performance level. With the educator:

* Collaboratively examine student growth data in conjunction with other evidence including observation, artifacts and other student and teacher information based on classroom, school, school district and state-based tools and practices; etc.
* Collaboratively examine circumstances which may include one or more of the following: Goal setting process including assessment literacy; content and expectations; extent to which standards, curriculum and assessment are aligned; etc.

The evaluator then decides the respective Professional Growth Plan and if the summative performance level is a 2 or 3; or a 3 or 4.

**Professional Practice and Professional Responsibility Inquiry Process (PP/PR Inquiry):**

To determine an educator’s Professional Growth Plan and resulting summative performance level, the following must be initiated by the evaluator to determine the summative performance level. With the educator:

* Reexamine evidence and artifacts and an outside evaluator (Supervisor, VP, other district administer) may be called in
* Educator has the opportunity to provide additional evidence and/or schedule additional observations with focus on area of need
* Evaluator’s supervisor is notified and inter-rater reliability protocols are revisited

The evaluator then decides the respective Professional Growth Plan and if the summative performance level is a 2 or 3; or a 3 or 4.

1. **Aligned Professional Learning**

All educators Professional Growth Plans should include aligned professional learning tailored to meet their individual growth needs.

**Appendix B**

**Support Materials**

## Administrator: School Growth Goals (SGG) Template Checklist

*This checklist should be used for both writing and approving SGGs.*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Baseline Data** | **Context** | **Interval** | **Content** | **School Growth Goal Statement** | **Professional Growth Goal** | **Strategies for Improvement** |
| *What information is being used to inform the creation of the SGG and establish the amount of growth that should take place within the time period?* | *Which students will be included in this SGG? Include grade level and number of students.* | *What duration will the SGG span?* | *What content will the SGG target? To what related standards is the SGG aligned?* | *Considering all available data and content requirements, what growth target(s) can students be expected to reach?*  *What assessment(s) will be used to measure student growth for this SGG?* | *Considering both student data and the administrator’s self-reflection on the rubric, what would be an aligned professional growth goal that will support my instructional and/or professional improvement?* | *How will I help students attain the SGG? What specific actions will lead to goal attainment? What strategies will the administrator incorporate into his/her methodology and professional practice?* |
| * Identifies sources of information about the school (e.g., test scores from prior years, results of pre-assessments) * Summarizes the administrator’s analysis of the baseline data by identifying school strengths and weaknesses | * School-wide * Describes the student population and considers any contextual factors that may impact school-wide growth * Does not exclude subgroups of students that may have difficulty meeting growth targets | * Matches the length of the year | * Specifies how the SGG will address applicable standards from the following: (1) Common Core State Standards, (2) Oregon Content Standards, or (3) curriculum guides/planned course statements. * Represents the big ideas or domains of the content taught during the interval of instruction * Identifies core knowledge and skills students are expected to attain as required by the applicable standards | * Ensures all students have a growth target * Uses baseline or pretest data to determine appropriate growth * Identifies assessments that will effectively measure content and reliably measure student learning as intended * Creates tiered targets when appropriate so that all students may demonstrate growth * Sets ambitious yet attainable targets | * Administrator has used their self-reflection on the rubric to determine their professional goal * Achievement of the administrator’s professional growth goal will improve student learning and engagement * Administrator includes ways to team with colleagues to successfully achieve his/her goal | * Specific strategies to assisting students to meet the SGG are included * Specific strategies are listed that will assist the administrator in meeting their professional growth goal * The strategies to assist students and the professional growth strategies are aligned |

**Administrator Artifact Checklist**

|  | **Observed** | **Artifact** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **1.1** |  |  |
| **1.2** |  |  |
| **1.3** |  |  |

**St. 1:** **The Vision of Learning**

* 1. Belief that all students can learn
  2. Stakeholders are actively engaged in developing, implementing, communicating, monitoring, and evaluating the school mission and vision.
  3. The Continuous School Improvement Plan (including assessment calendar, Professional Development Plan and SMART goals) target the areas of need and is connected to the District Strategic Plan. It is designed to improve the achievement of all students and close the achievement gap.

|  | **Observed** | **Artifact** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **2.1** |  |  |
| **2.2** |  |  |
| **2.3** |  |  |
| **2.4** |  |  |
| **2.5** |  |  |
| **2.6** |  |  |
| **2.7** |  |  |
| **2.8** |  |  |
| **2.9** |  |  |
| **2.10** |  |  |

**St. 2: The Culture of Teaching and Learning**

* 1. Principal as the Instructional Leader

2.2 Teacher Growth and Professional Development

2.3 Teacher Collaboration/Guaranteed Viable Curriculum

2.4 Effective Professional Development

2.5 Use of academic expectations

2.6 Assessment Plan and Proficiency Based Grading System

2.7 Use of State and District Standards

2.8 Set of common effective instructional strategies to meet the needs of all learners

2.9 Ensures effective management of student data

2.10 Instructional Initiatives implementation

|  | **Observed** | **Artifact** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **3.1** |  |  |
| **3.2** |  |  |
| **3.3** |  |  |
| **3.4** |  |  |
| **3.5** |  |  |
| **3.6** |  |  |
| **3.7** |  |  |

**St. 3: The Management of Learning**

3.1 District Protocols and Procedures

3.2 Budget Management

3.3 Facility Management

3.4 Compliance

3.5 Behavior Expectations

3.6 Use of Instructional Time

3.7 Use of Staff Time

|  | **Observed** | **Artifact** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **4.1** |  |  |
| **4.2** |  |  |

**St. 4: Relationships with the Broader Community to Foster Learning**

4.1 Responds to and provides outreach to a diverse community

4.2 Use of parent, family, & community participation

**Administrator Artifact Checklist**

**St. 5: Integrity, Fairness and Ethics in Learning**

|  | **Observed** | **Artifact** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **5.1** |  |  |
| **5.2** |  |  |
| **5.3** |  |  |
| **5.4** |  |  |
| **5.5** |  |  |

5.1 Guiding Norms – Commits to positive professional behavior, to act or behave in a certain way with regard to professionalism

5.2 Lead Learner

5.3 Promoting Social Justice

5.4 Encourages multiple points of view, recognizes thoughtful dissent, and uses multiple opinions to form solutions

5.5 Leader Resilience

**St. 6: The Context of Learning**

|  | **Observed** | **Artifact** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **6.1** |  |  |
| **6.2** |  |  |

6.1 Effective collaborator with service providers and decision makers

6.2 Responds in a positive and strategic way to the factors that influence student success that are social, political, and legal
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**INTRODUCTION**

Since the passage of Senate Bill 290 in 2011 and the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) Flexibility waiver in 2012, Oregon has begun implementing a new educator evaluation and support system with the primary goal of promoting professional growth and continuous improvement of all educators’ practice leading to improved student achievement. The new system clearly defines effective practice and promotes collaboration and shared ownership for professional growth.

Oregon’s educator evaluation system requires the use of multiple measures of performance, including evidence of professional practice, professional responsibilities, and impact on student learning and growth. In order to measure teachers’ contribution to student academic progress at the classroom level and administrators’ contribution at the school or district level, Oregon is using the Student Learning and Growth (SLG) goals process.

**PURPOSE OF THE GUIDE**

The purpose of this guidebook is to provide assistance to districts as they implement the SLG goals process. This guidance outlines required SLG goal components and processes to ensure consistency and quality across schools and districts. This updated guidebook (April 2014) clarifies the SLG goal process as a result of piloting the SLG goal process in 2013-14 and reflects Oregon’s final state guidelines for educator evaluation and support systems submitted to the U.S. Department of Education as a requirement of the ESEA waiver. This document designed to replace the *Guidance for Setting Student Learning and Growth Goals* released in September 2013.

Please note the following revisions and requirements for SLG goals:

1. Required components for SLG goals (page 53)
2. Categories of measures for SLG goals (page 61)
3. Required SLG scoring rubric and quality checklist for all SLG goal (page 63)

**STUDENT LEARNING AND GROWTH GOALS OVERVIEW**

**What are Student Learning and Growth Goals?**

SLG goals are detailed, measurable goals for student learning and growth developed collaboratively by educators and their evaluators. They are based on student learning needs identified by a review of students’ baseline skills. SLG goals are aligned to standards and clearly describe specific learning targets students are expected to meet. Goals are rigorous, yet attainable.

SLG goals define which students and/or student subgroups are included in a particular goal, how their progress will be measured during the instructional time period, and why a specific level of growth has been set for students.

SLG goals are growth goals, not achievement goals. Growth goals hold all students to the same standards but allow for various levels of learning and growth depending on how students’ are performing at the start of the course/class.

**Who Should Set Student Learning and Growth Goals?**

All teachers and administrators, as defined in state statute (ORS 342.815 & ORS 342.856), must use the new educator evaluation system requirements described in the Oregon Framework (SB290/ESEA waiver). This includes all Teacher Standards and Practices Commission (TSPC) licensed educators. See Appendix A for definitions and exceptions as they relate to SB290.

**Why Use Student Learning and Growth Goals?**

SLG goals offer a clear connection between instruction, assessment, and student data. Educators employ a range of instructional strategies, skills, and techniques to affect outcomes for student academic learning, critical thinking, and behavior. The SLG goal process measures student learning and growth through various types of assessments (e.g., state tests, interim assessments, projects, or portfolios based on state criteria for quality and comparability). The SLG goal process also helps educators focus on broader priorities within the school, district, or state. For example, SLG goals can specifically include evidence-based practices that reinforce the expectations for all students to be college and career ready.

**Advantages of SLG Goals**

There are a number of advantages of using SLG goals as a mechanism for monitoring student growth:

* **Reinforce evidence-based instructional practice**. Effective instruction begins with assessing student learning needs. The SLG goal process aligns with good instructional practice in which educators assess student needs, set goals for their students, use formative and summative data to monitor student progress, and modify instruction based on student needs.
* **Focus on student learning.** SLGs are an opportunity for educators to craft clear goals for student learning and document students’ progress toward those goals. The SLG goals process allows all educators the opportunity to focus on the specific objectives they believe are important to achieve with their students.
* **Help develop collaborative communities.** Ideally, SLG goals are developed by teams of educators rather than individuals. Educators should, wherever possible, work collaboratively with grade, subject area, or course colleagues to develop SLG goals. The process encourages districts and schools to create official time for collaboration and use existing opportunities, such as professional learning communities and staff meetings for collaboration. Teachers who do not have a team of peers within their building should consider collaborating with similarly-situated teachers in another school or district.

**REQUIRED COMPONENTS FOR SLG GOALS**

The following components are essential for high quality SLG goals and are required for all educators’ goals. See Appendix B for examples and blank templates for teacher and administrator goals.

1. **Content Standards/Skills** - Based on the relevant content and skills students should know or be able to do at the end of the course/class, a clear statement of a specific area of focus is selected. These should be specific state or national standards (a statement such as “Common Core State Standards in Math” is not specific enough).

**Example**:

8.3S.2 Organize, display, and analyze relevant data, construct an evidence-based explanation of the results of a scientific investigation, and communicate the conclusions including possible sources of error. Suggest new investigations based on analysis of results.

2. **Assessments** - Describes how student learning and growth will be measured. In Oregon, two categories of assessments are used for SLG goals (see page 13). Assessments must be aligned to state or national standards and meet state criteria.

3. **Context/Students** - Description of the demographics and learning needs of all students in the class or course. This should include relevant information that could include, but is not limited to: the number of students and their gender, race/ethnicity, socioeconomic status, and any students with diverse learning needs (e.g., EL, IEP, 504 plans). For those educators who do not meet with students on a regular basis, including contact time (e.g., one 50 minute period per day, two 90 minute blocks per week, etc.) provides additional context for the goals developed by the educator. The context will affect the development of your tiered targets and instructional strategies

**Example**:

“There are currently 247 students enrolled in grade 8 at EFG Middle School; 115 students are female and 132 are male. Listed below is the ethnic breakdown of students in the school:

• Asian—less than 1 percent

• Native Hawaiian/Pacific—less than 1 percent

• Black or African American—less than 1 percent

• Hispanic—11 percent

• Two or more [ethnicities]—10 percent

• White – 75 percent

Ten percent of the grade 8 student population is on an IEP and five percent of students have 504 plans. 45 percent of students live in poverty and receive free and/or reduced lunch.”

4. **Baseline Data** - Provides information about the students’ current performance at the start of course/class. It is generally the most recent data available and can include the prior year’s assessment scores or grades, results from a beginning of the year benchmark assessment, a pre-test, or other evidence of students’ learning. Determine students’ strengths and areas of weaknesses that inform the goal. Data is attached to the goal template.

**Example:**

Only 53 % of our grade 4 students met or exceeded the state assessment benchmark in reading for the 2012–13 school year. 35% of our economically disadvantaged students, 32% of our students who have limited English proficiency, and 40% of our students with disabilities met the benchmarks. 30% of students who identify as black, 43% of students who identify as Hispanic, 48%of our students who identify as Native [American], and 50% of our students who identify as multiracial met or exceeded benchmarks.

Additionally, all subgroups performed lowest in the strand area of Locating Information.

5. **Student Learning and Growth Goal (Targets)** - Describes rigorous yet realistic growth goals or targets for student achievement that are developmentally appropriate. The targets should be rigorous yet attainable. The target can be tiered for specific students in the class/course to allow all students to demonstrate growth.

**Example**:

100% of students will demonstrate growth toward mastery of the content of Visual Arts as measured by performance on a range of performance tasks.

* Students who earned a 2 first quarter will earn at least a 3 or 4 on a similar performance task in the 4th quarter
* Students who earned a 3 first quarter will earn at least a 4 on a similar performance task in the 4th quarter.
* Student who earned a 4 first quarter will earn at least a 4 on a more complex performance task in the 4th quarter.

**Example that does not meet criteria**:

80% of students will earn at least a 3 on a visual arts performance task.

*This example does not include all students, does not reference baseline data, and includes the same targets for all students.*

6.  **Rationale** - Provides a detailed description of the reasons for selecting this specific area for a goal. Includes a discussion of baseline data as well as current practice within the school and/or classroom. The rationale must also include language for the importance of the selected content/standards. Includes a rationale for the expected growth and how the target is appropriate and rigorous for students.

7. **Strategies** - Describes the instructional strategies the educator will use relevant to learning specific content and skills to accomplish the goal. These strategies can be adjusted throughout the year based on data about student progress.

**Example**: This example is from an administrator SLG goal focused on mathematics in grades 6-8.

*“I’ve built a school-wide schedule that establishes Individual Needs Classes for all students, organized and provided each team of teachers with data on their students that show state assessment scores from 3rd grade on and establishes assessment growth target scores for each student. Additionally, I provided data to teachers showing which students received grades below a C while at XYZ Middle School (1-2 years of data disaggregated by trimester) as well as which students received intervention classes during the first and second trimesters. This data will also be provided to the Child Study Team so they can work with teams to focus interventions to meet student needs. I’ve also established an Academic Support Center and have worked with the coordinator to track and analyze ASC students’ performance prior to and while place in the ASC so that we can ensure that the ASC is effectively supporting the students it serves.”*

1. **Professional Learning and Support** – Opportunity for the educator to identify areas of additional learning and support needed to meet student learning and growth goals. Self-reflection and identification of professional learning needs can help focus efforts to provide meaningful professional learning opportunities to educators.

**Example:**

*“I need to attend more trainings as well as research and gather more resources on formative assessment. I need to evaluate the data from the assessment more often and to try different types of formative assessments throughout the year. The Skillful Teacher is one training that will help me with this goal. The chapter in the Skillful Teacher text on assessment will be helpful in creating valid and measureable formative assessments, such as exit tickets, think-alouds, and making sure students understand the learning target every day by posting it on the board during each class period.”*

**Goal Setting Conferences**

Educators and their supervisors/evaluators must work collaboratively in setting SLG goals. They periodically review available data/evidence toward goal attainment and make necessary adjustments (e.g. professional learning needs, resources, strategies). Conferences must occur at least three times during the school year:

1. Beginning of the year (course/class) when SLG goals are prepared, reviewed, and approved;
2. Mid-point to check for progress and/or make adjustments in strategies; and
3. End-point of the course/class to analyze results.

**Professional Growth Goals**

As part of the district’s evaluation and professional growth cycle, all educators are required to set professional growth goals. Professional goals are based on the standards of professional practice described in the district’s rubric. Through the completion of a self-assessment against the district rubric, educators identify areas of strength and need relative to the standards for professional practice and determine strategies and supports needed to help them elevate their practice.

**COLLABORATIVE SLG GOAL SETTING PROCESS**

Setting SLG goals is a collaborative process in which educators and evaluators enter into a conversation to create a rigorous, yet realistic goal that examines the educator’s impact on student learning and growth. The educator and evaluator work together to ensure quality goals through a discussion of the rigor and rationale of each goal, standards addressed, appropriate evidence-based strategies, and quality of assessments and evidence.

Goals originate with the educator after an analysis of their students’ data. The collaborative process includes guiding questions to inform revisions, such as:

* How was the baseline data used to inform the growth goal?
* How are growth targets appropriate for the student population? If applicable, are targets differentiated based on students’ baseline data?
* Are the expectations for growth rigorous yet realistic?
* How will this goal address student needs?
* How will goal attainment help the student succeed in this class/course or future class/course?

Educators are encouraged to collaborate with other educators to establish SLG goals (e.g. grade level, departments, curricular or administrative teams). Collaborative goal setting for teachers could take various forms:

* A team of teachers responsible for the same grade and/or content (e.g., 9th grade English or 4th grade team) write a team-level goal with each teacher only accountable for their individual intact group of students.
* A team of teachers who share students between classrooms (e.g., RTI, Walk to Read), write a team-level goal where teachers are accountable for all students.
* An individual teacher accountable for an intact group of students writes a classroom or course-level goal in collaboration with their evaluator.

Districts are encouraged to provide opportunities for educators to collaborate and share information across schools or districts. For example, teachers who do not have a team of peers within their school or district may benefit from collaborating with similarly-situated teachers in another school or district.

**Steps for Setting Student Learning and Growth Goals**

**STEP 1: Determine Needs**

To begin the process, educators gather baseline data to better understand how to prepare students for the standards addressed by the class or course. This data could include end-of-year data from the previous year, baseline data from district assessments, pretests, or student work samples. Educators conduct an analysis of the baseline data and set goals for all students based on that data.

**Conduct a self-reflection.** To set truly meaningful goals that enhance practice and support professional growth, educators engage in self-reflection as part of the process in determining student needs. This step is often left out of cycles of improvement because “there just isn’t enough time;” however, the omission of this step often leaves goals without any relevant connection to an educator’s day-to-day practice. The self-reflection includes time for an educator to look at student level data, reviewing student work from the previous year, reviewing past units of study, as well as information concerning their practice offered by their evaluator

The self-reflection process:

* Establishes a continuous improvement plan for every educator
* Promotes professional growth and continuous learning
* Keeps student learning at the core of all instructional, leadership, and professional practice decisions
* Builds consistency across the school and district

To be targeted and effective, self-reflection includes:

* Analysis of evidence of SLG under the educator's responsibility
* Assessment of practice against performance standards
* Proposed goals to pursue to improve practice and SLG

**STEP 2: Create Specific Learning and Growth Goals**

In this step the educator sets specific learning goals based on their self-reflection and students’ baseline data. The SMART goal process is used in the development of SLG goals (SMART = Specific; Measureable; Appropriate; Realistic; and Time-bound). See SMART graphic on page 60.

**Determine the students and time period.** The educator sets two annual SLG goals between which all students in a classroom or course are included. A course is considered a content and/or grade-specific class (or a school for administrators). The instructional period will vary depending on staff assignment. For example, Algebra I SLG goal would span the length of an Algebra I course (e.g. year, semester, or trimester).

For most secondary teachers (including middle school) goals must cover all the students instructed by the teacher in a particular course or class. For example, a high school math teacher who teaches four Algebra I courses, a Geometry course, and a Calculus course might set one goal for students in their Algebra I courses and another for students in their Geometry course. It is not necessary for a secondary teacher to set goals that cover all students they teach. This would also be true for other TSPC licensed personnel such as PE teachers, reading teachers, special education teachers, etc.

For most elementary teachers goals must cover all the students in their class over the course of a year. For example, a third grade teacher might set a tiered goal for reading that describes the expected growth of all students.

Administrators may limit their goals to one or more grade levels or subjects, if baseline data indicates the need for such a focus.

**Determine the specific standards and content addressed by the SLG goal**. Identify specific state or national standards to which the SLG goal is aligned. The content or skills should be selected based on identified areas from the data analysis.

**Set student learning growth goal (targets).** Write a brief yet specific growth goal (target) for students that aligns to the standards. These growth targets should include specific indicators of growth; such as percentages or questions answered correctly that demonstrate learning between two points in time. The targets should be rigorous yet attainable. They can be tiered for specific students in the course/class to allow all students to demonstrate growth. The educator provides a rationale for why the goal is important and achievable for this group of students.

**Identify assessments**. Identify the appropriate assessment that will be used to measure student learning and growth toward the goal(s). See page 13 for guidance on assessments for SLG goals.

**STEP 3: Create and Implement Teaching and Learning Strategies**

Teachers identify specific instructional strategies that are appropriate for the learning content and students’ skill level, and continually examine and adjust those strategies based on data about student progress and student needs.

**STEP 4: Monitor Student Progress through Ongoing Formative Assessment**

Steps 3 and 4 are a continuous cycle throughout the life of the goal. Over the course of the school year, educators implement the instructional strategies that are appropriate for students to meet their targets as stated in the SLG goals. They collect student data and monitor student progress through ongoing formative assessments.

The educator and evaluator meet mid-course to check on progress towards the goals. They may determine that an adjustment in instructional strategies is warranted, or that there are immediate support/resources available to help the educator with a particular need (e.g., observing another educator or collaborating with a mentor). If the growth goal has already been met by the mid-course, the educator and evaluator may determine the need to revise the goal for increased rigor.

**STEP 5: Determine Whether Students Achieved the Goal**

At the end of the course or school year, educators meet with their evaluators for a final review of the educators’ progress on the SLG goals. They will examine the end-of-year data, reflect on student learning results, discuss what worked and what did not, and identify professional learning needs and available resources to support the educator’s continued professional growth.

The following diagram illustrates the process for developing SMART goals.

**Step-By-Step SMART Goal Process**

\*In step 3, administrators would include leadership strategies that reflect their school or district responsibilities.

**SELECTING ASSESSMENTS FOR SLG GOALS**

Selecting and/or developing assessments may be one of the most important steps in the SLG goal process. These measures enable educators to determine growth toward and attainment of the SLG goal. There are two categories of measures for SLG goals outlined in Table 1. Category 1 is the Oregon state assessment for ELA and Math. Category 2 measures include both commercially developed and locally developed assessments.

All assessments must be aligned to state or national standards and meet criteria to ensure quality. ODE will provide guidelines and criteria for selecting or developing valid and reliable assessments by June 1, 2014. Valid assessments measure what they are designed to measure. Reliable assessments are those that produce accurate and consistent results. ODE will also provide a list of commercially developed assessments that meet this criteria by June 1st.

Each district will determine if the assessments that are used to measure SLG goals need to be comparable across just a school or across all schools within the district.

**Table 1. Categories of Measures for SLG Goals**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Category** | **Types of Measures** | **Guidance** |
| **1** | * Oregon’s state assessments\*   + SMARTER Balanced (formerly OAKS)   + Extended Assessments1 | * Same assessment and administration guidelines are used statewide   *\*Required beginning in the 2015-16 school year* |
| **2** | * Commercially developed assessments that include pre- and post-measures * Locally developed assessments that include pre- and post-measures * Results from proficiency-based assessment systems * Locally-developed collections of evidence, i.e. portfolios of student work that include multiple types of performance | * Same assessment and administration guidelines are used district-wide or school-wide * Assessments meet state criteria2 |

1Used by special education teachers who provide instruction in ELA or math for those students who take extended assessments

2ODE will provide state criteria by June 1, 2014

**Teachers in Tested Grades and Subjects**

As a requirement of the ESEA Waiver, teachers who teach in tested grades and subjects (ELA and Math, grades 3-8 and 11) must use a Category 1 state assessment for one of their SLG goals and measures from Category 2 or 1 for their second goal.

**Teachers in Non-Tested Grades and Subjects**

Teachers in non-tested grades and subjects may use measures from Category 2 for both of their goals. They may also use Category 1 measures as an option.

**Administrators**

Administrators must use Category 1 state assessments for one SLG goal and may use measures from Category 2 or 1 for their second goal. Data is aggregated at the school or district level.

**Note: Districts will not have to use Category 1 state assessments to measure SLG goals during the 2014-15 school year as Oregon transitions from OAKS to SMARTER. Educators will use measures from Category 2 for both SLG goals.**

**SCORING STUDENT LEARNING AND GROWTH GOALS**

This section addresses the step toward the end of the SLG goal setting process, when all student progress data are in and before the final evaluation conference. Educators score their SLG goals and review and finalize the score with their supervisor/evaluator. Evaluators are responsible for determining the final score.

Once SLG goals are approved, educators start collecting the information needed to measure student progress as defined in the SLG goal. The collection and analysis of data continues throughout the course or school year to monitor student progress towards goals. The educator is responsible for collecting and organizing documentation, including the approved SLG goals and evidence of progress defined within it, in a way that is easy for them to reference and for the evaluators to review. At the end of the course or school year, educators meet with their evaluator to review results.

As a requirement of SB290 and the ESEA waiver, student learning and growth must be included as a significant factor of educators’ summative evaluations. SLG goals are scored and the SLG performance level is determined. To ensure consistency in evaluations across the state, all districts must use the **SLG Quality Review Checklist** and **Oregon SLG Scoring Rubric** to score SLG goals.

**SLG Goal Quality Review Checklist**

Before SLG goals are used in teacher and administrator evaluations, this checklist should be used in in order to approve them. For an SLG goal to be approved, all criteria must be met.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Baseline Data** | **Yes** | **No** |
| Is baseline data used to make data-driven decisions for the SLG goal, including student information from past assessments and/or pre-assessment results? |  |  |
| **Student Growth Goal (Targets)** |  |  |
| Is the SLG goal written as a “growth” goals v. “achievement” goal? (i.e. growth goals measure student learning between two or more points in time and achievement goals measure student learning at only one point in time.) |  |  |
| Does the SLG goal describe a “target” or expected growth for all students, tiered or differentiated as needed based on baseline data? |  |  |
| **Rigor of Goals** |  |  |
| Does the goal address specific knowledge and skills aligned to the course curriculum and based on content standards? |  |  |
| Is the SLG goal measurable and challenging, yet attainable? |  |  |

**SLG Goal Scoring Rubric**

This SLG scoring rubric is used for scoring individual SLG goals based on evidence submitted by the teacher and administrator. This rubric applies to both teacher and administrator evaluations.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Level 4  *(Highest)* | This category applies when approximately 90% of students met their target(s) and approximately 25% of students exceeded their target(s). This category should only be selected when a substantial number of students surpassed the overall level of attainment established by the target(s). Goals are very rigorous yet attainable, and differentiated (as appropriate) for all students. |
| Level 3 | This category applies when approximately 90% of students met their 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 all or almost all students met the overall level of attainment established by the target(s). Goals are rigorous yet attainable and differentiated (as appropriate) for all students. |
| Level 2 | This category applies when 70-89% of students met their target(s), but those that missed the target missed by more than a few points, a few percentage points or a few students. Goals are attainable but might not be rigorous or differentiated (as appropriate) for all students. |
| Level 1  *(Lowest)* | This category applies when less than 70% of students meet their target(s). If a substantial proportion of students did not meet their target(s), the SLG was not met. Goals are attainable, but not rigorous.  This category also applies when results are missing or incomplete. |

The checklist ensures the goals are complete for scoring. The scoring process is facilitated by using the scoring rubric to determine whether each student exceeded, met, or did not meet the target; and the percentage of students in each category. These two tools must be used to score SLG goals to determine the educator’s impact on student learning and growth in the summative evaluation.

**APPENDIX A**

**WHO IS REQUIRED TO SET STUDENT LEARNING AND GROWTH GOALS?**

All teachers and administrators, as defined in state statute (ORS 342.815 & ORS 342.856), must use the new educator evaluations system requirements described in the Oregon Framework (SB290/ESEA waiver). The following definitions apply to Senate Bill 290:

**Teacher:** Any individual holding a Teacher Standards and Practices Commission (TSPC) teaching license or registration (ORS 342.125 & 342.144) or who is otherwise authorized to teach in the public schools of this state and who is employed as an instructor at .5 FTE and at least 135 consecutive days of the school year (as per ORS 342.840).

**Instructor:**  Includes those individuals who meet the definition used in ORS 342.121 “Instruction includes direction of learning in class, in small groups, in individual situations, in the library and in guidance and counseling, but does not include the provision of related services, as defined in ORS 343.035(15), to a child identified as a child with a disability pursuant to ORS 343.146 when provided in accordance with ORS 343.041-343.065 and 343.221.” Instruction does include provision of specially designed instruction (special education) provided in accordance with 343.035(19). 1

**Administrator:** Any individual holding a TSPC Administrator license includes any licensed educator (ORS 342.125 & 342.144), the majority of whose employed time is devoted to service as a supervisor, principal, vice principal or director of a department or the equivalent in a fair dismissal district but shall not include the superintendent, deputy superintendent or assistant superintendent of any such district or any substitute or temporary teacher employed by such a district.

Superintendents who also serve as principals are evaluated by their local school board and are not required to be evaluated under SB290 requirements.

TSPC licensed personnel including special education teachers, counselors, speech language pathologists\* and library/media and technology specialists are required to set SLG goals. These educators may use measures of learning specific to academic subjects as well as to social, emotional, behavioral, or skill development. For example, a school-wide writing assessment may be used for a library/media specialist SLG goal.

Teachers who only provide instruction in English Language Proficiency for English Learners (often called ELD teachers) are not considered teachers in “tested grades and subjects” because they are not providing instruction in the content areas of ELA and math, but rather the language skills necessary to access those content areas. Consequently, they would not be required to set a goal using a Category 1 measure (state assessments). Sheltered instruction

1For additional definitions of related services and special education see [ORS 343.035(15)(a) and ORS 343.035(18)](http://www.leg.state.or.us/ors/343.html).

\* Includes speech-language pathologists providing specially designed instruction rather than related services.

teachers who provide both instruction in ELA or math content and language proficiency would be required to set a goal using Category 1.

**Exceptions**

Staff members in those positions that are licensed by an agency other than TSPC (e.g. school psychologists, social workers, occupational therapists, physical therapists) are not obligated to be evaluated under the requirements of SB290 and therefore need not set SLG goals. However, it is recommended that they participate in the evaluation system and include measures of their impact on students related to their job responsibilities.

Teachers who do not instruct students directly, such as Teachers on Special Assignment (TOSAs), instructional coaches, or mentor teachers, are not required to set SLG goals. However, it is recommended that their evaluation include measures of their impact on school-wide and district-wide goals for student achievement.

**APPENDIX B**

**EXAMPLE OF TEACHER SLG GOAL: Science, 8th Grade**

Grade Level:  Elementary  Middle School  High School

Goal Type:  Individual Goal  Team Goal

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Goal-Setting Conference** | **Content Standard(s)/Skills**  *(e.g., 8.3S.2 [science] PE.03.EE.04 (Physical Education])* | 8.3S.1 Based on observations and science principles, propose questions or hypotheses that can be examined through scientific investigation. Design and conduct a scientific investigation that uses appropriate tools, techniques, independent and dependent variables, and controls to collect relevant data.  8.3S.2 Organize, display, and analyze relevant data, construct an evidence-based explanation of the results of a scientific investigation, and communicate the conclusions including possible sources of error. Suggest new investigations based on analysis of results.  8.3S.3 Explain how scientific explanations and theories evolve as new information becomes available. |
| **Assessments** | x Category 1 state Science assessment  x Category 2 district science assessment |
| **Context/Students**  *(Include number of students, gender, race/ethnicity, socioeconomic status, diverse learners, contact time* | * 143 8th grade students 68 boys/75 girls * 14 TAG students * 19 IEP students * 28% of students live in poverty * Science class is 45 minutes long |
| **Baseline Data**  *(Summary of student strengths and weaknesses based on data analysis)* | * Students need guided practice and repeated opportunities to perform inquiry tasks with emphasis on analysis. * Inquiry activities will be used as sources of evidence   The fall 2013 district-wide pretest assessment scores were evaluated to yield the following results in the area of analyzing and interpreting results:   |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | Score | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | | Total: 143 Students | 13 | 49 | 58 | 16 | 7 | |
| **Student Growth Goal (Targets)**  *(Goals must address* ***growth*** *for* ***all*** *students, not proficiency)* | For the 2013-14 school year, 100% of students will make measurable progress as assessed using the state scoring guide for Scientific Inquiry. Each student will improve by at least one performance level in all dimensions (forming a question or hypothesis, designing and investigation, collecting and presenting data and analyzing and interpreting results). Students in levels 4 and 5 will reach level 3 or above on the 9th grade district Science assessment. |
| **Rationale**  *(Describe how the focus of the goal was determined)* | The science team has determined that for MS to continue to grow in science, emphasis must be placed on inquiry. For students scoring at a 1 or 2, they must show significant progress if they are to meet College and Career Readiness targets. |
| **Strategies**  *(Include strategies used by the educator to support meeting the needs for student growth)* | * Repeated practice with various data/information to analyze and evaluate. * Posting of essential questions * Peer tutoring * Familiarize students with state scoring guide and break it down into student friendly language * Students practice in self-assessment using the scoring guide |
| **Professional Learning and Support**  *(Identify areas of additional learning and support needed by the educator to meet SLG)* | * Classroom time to implement activities * Classroom budget for supplies to perform authentic inquiry tasks |

**EXAMPLE OF TEACHER SLG GOAL: Math, 1st Grade**

Grade Level:  Elementary  Middle School  High School

Goal Type:  Individual Goal  Team Goal

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Content Standard(s)/Skills Addressed**  *(e.g., 8.3S.2 [science] PE.03.EE.04 (Physical Education])* | Common Core State Standards for Mathematics 1.OA 6  Add and subtract within 20, demonstrating fluency for addition and subtraction within 10. Use strategies such as counting on; making ten; decomposing a number leading to a ten; using the relationship between addition and subtraction and creating equivalent but easier or known sums. |
| **Assessments** | Category 1 \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  X Category 2 District developed math assessment. |
| **Context/Students**  *(Include number of students, gender, race/ethnicity, socioeconomic status, diverse learners, contact time)* | My first Grade class has 28 students. 2 students are English Language Learners, 13 are male and 15 female, and 10 students receive Free and Reduced Lunch.  Our mathematics block occurs for 60 minutes right after lunch. |
| **Baseline Data**  *(Summary of student strengths and weaknesses based on data analysis)* | End of the year 2012-2013 data showed that 80% of the kindergarten students scored at least 80% on the End-of- year kindergarten assessment. However, analysis of data for specific sections of that test showed that only 60% of students showed mastery of the fact fluency through 5. Students during the first grade are expected to have fluency through all the facts to ten. Fluency and automaticity are important skills as students move forward.  .   1. Analyze Pretest of fact fluency to 5. 2. Use the first grade EOY test given at the beginning of the year as a pretest. 3. Use the second grade EOY test given at the beginning of the year as a pretest for Above Grade Level first grade students. |
| **Student Growth Goal (Targets)** | 100% of the first grade students will demonstrate growth in fluency of the mathematics basic facts through 10 as measured by performance on the basic fact assessments for quarters 1, 2, 3, and 4 and End-of-Year Assessment.  Above grade level students will demonstrate proficiency on basic facts through 20.   * All students who demonstrated mastery of 0-30% of the basic facts on the Beginning-of-the-Year baseline data will increase mastery to at least 50% on the End-of-the-Year Assessment. * All students who demonstrated mastery of 31-45% of the basic facts on the Beginning-of-the-Year baseline data will increase mastery to at least 65% on the End-of-the-Year Assessment. * All students who demonstrated between 46 and 55% mastery of basic facts on baseline data will increase mastery to at least 70% on the End-of-the-Year Assessment. * All students who demonstrated between 56 and 69% mastery of basic facts on baseline data will increase mastery to at least 75% on the End-of-the-Year Assessment. * All students who demonstrated between 70 and 79% mastery of basic facts on baseline data will increase mastery to at least 80% on the End-of-the-Year Assessment. * All students who demonstrated 80% mastery of basic facts on baseline data will increase mastery to at least 90% on the End-of-the-Year Assessment.   \*Please note: Students identified by IEP teams as having significant cognitive disabilities will have individual targets. |
| **Rationale**  *(Describe how the focus of the goal was determined)* | This area was selected as it was 20% lower in overall performance on the district assessment. As a team, it was decided that fluency must increase at earlier grades for students to master math skills at the upper grades. The tiers for specific performance levels are made to facilitate interventions and focus to bring students performing at lower levels on track with their peers by the end of 3rd grade. |
| **Strategies**  *(Include strategies used by the educator to support meeting the needs for student growth)* | * Be purposeful when planning lessons to include challenging mathematical tasks that elicit the Mathematics Practices in their students. * Focus on decomposition of number and mental math strategies. * Refer to Teaching Addition and Subtraction Fact strategies to ensure students have strategies to find the basic facts prior to building fluency. * Focus team data conversations on sharing data and analyzing student progress on classroom-based lessons to develop fact fluency. * Differentiate instruction based on use of formative assessments throughout the year. * Provide flexible grouping and the use of small skill groups (run by interventionists) to address individual and small group learning needs. |
| **Professional Learning and Support**  *(Identify areas of additional learning and support needed by the educator to meet SLG)* | * Teaching partner, educational assistants * Professional development on developing common formative assessments |

**EXAMPLE OF ADMINISTRATOR SLG GOAL: Elementary**

Grade Level:  Elementary  Middle School  High School

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Goal-Setting Conference** | **Content Standards/Skills** | |  | | --- | | The following Grade 3 Common Core State Standards for Mathematics will be included in this SLG:  3.NBT.1 Use place value understanding to round whole numbers to the nearest 10 or 100.  3.NBT.2 Fluently add and subtract within 1000 using strategies and algorithms based on place value, properties of operations, and/or the relationship between addition and subtraction.  3.NBT.3 Multiply one-digit whole numbers by multiples of 10 in the range 10–90 (e.g., 9 × 80, 5 × 60) using strategies based on place value and properties of operations. | |
| **Assessments** | X Category 1 State Smarter Balanced Assessment  X Category 2 District developed math assessment. |
| **Context/Students**  *(Include number of students, gender, race/ethnicity, socioeconomic status, diverse learners, contact time)* | |  | | --- | | 3rd Grade: 105 students  Gender: 48 males, 57 Females  23% EL  42% Free/Reduced Lunch  15% IEPs  21% 504s  42% Hispanic, 50% White/Non-Hispanic 8% other  Math instruction occurs for 30 minutes after reading before lunch, and 45 minutes after lunch | |
| **Baseline Data**  *(Summary of student strengths and weaknesses based on data analysis)* | |  | | --- | | Pre-assessments: Students demonstrated the following levels of performance on the district-developed pre-assessments:  a. Second Grade: In relation to the above standards, students were 35% proficient on average, with a range of 20% to 53%.  2. Historical Performance Trends: In reviewing historic performance on the assessments, our students have historically scored an average of 79% proficient on the Kindergarten summative assessment, 70% on the Grade 1 summative assessment, and 75% on the Grade 2 summative assessment. | |
| **Student Growth Goal (Targets)** | By May 2015, all 3rd grade students at ABC Elementary School will demonstrate growth according to their starting levels on the pre-assessment using the following differentiated tiers outline in the table below. The final assessment will be the Smarter Balanced summative math assessment:   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Pre-Assessment | Target | | 20%-29% | 75%-79% | | 30%-39% | 80%-84% | | 40%-49% | 85%-89% | | 50%-53% | 90%-100% | |
| **Rationale**  *(Describe how the focus of the goal was determined)* | The learning content standards and focus areas are derived from the required Common Core standards for math, and they are the foundation needed for successful transition to subsequent grades. While all Common Core standards for math are the basis of this principal SLG, our data results have helped us determine a few key areas for cross-curricular focus in mathematics: Place Value and Operational Understanding, and Problem Solving. These key areas are essential for success in subsequent math courses where the basic skills must be used but where a general sense of the meaning of numbers and application to real world situations is essential. We have included real-world, multi-step problems. |
| **Strategies**  *(Include strategies used by the educator to support meeting the needs for student growth)* | 1. In-service for all 3rd Grade teachers in Place Value, Operational Understanding, and Problem Solving with an added focus on embedding these processes within the curriculum.  2. Follow up opportunities throughout the year during PLC time for teachers to collaborate and focus on targets. Additional supports to be provided as determined by teacher need through classroom observation and data review. |
| **Professional Learning and Support**  *(Identify areas of additional learning and support needed by the educator to meet SLG)* | Support and training is needed on classroom observation strategies focused on highlighting teacher strengths and weaknesses in the above areas. Support could include observations conducted with a colleague determined to have a skill set in these areas |

**Appendix C**

**Board Policy—Evaluation**

For most current School Board Policies, visit:

http://www.philomath.k12.or.us/policies/index.php

**Philomath School District 17J**

Code: **CCG**

Adopted: 5/14; 6/13; 4/06; 1986

Orig. Code (s): 2102

**Licensed Evaluation - Administrators**

The superintendent will implement and supervise an evaluation system for administrative personnel. He/She will report to the Board annually on the performance of all administrators and make recommendations regarding their employment and/or salary status.

Formal evaluations will be made at least biennially by August 15. They shall be conducted according to the following guidelines:

1. Evaluative criteria for each position will be in written form and made available to the administrator;
2. Evaluations will be made by the superintendent and/or designee;
   1. Feedback from staff will be solicited to develop a portion of the evaluation summary.
3. Evaluations will be in writing and discussed with the administrator by the person who makes the evaluation;
4. The administrator being evaluated will have the right to attach a memorandum to the written evaluation and the right of appeal through established grievance procedures, if applicable.

Administrators’ evaluations shall be customized based on collaborative efforts and include the educational leadership-administrator standards1 adopted by the State Board of Education. The standards include:

1. Visionary leadership;
2. Instructional improvement;
3. Effective management;
4. Inclusive practice;
5. Ethical leadership;
6. Socio-political context.

Evaluations must attempt to:

1. Strengthen the knowledge, skills, disposition and administrative practices of administrators;
2. Refine the support, assistance and professional growth opportunities offered to an administrator, based on the individual needs of the administrator and the needs of the school and district;

1These standards are aligned with the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) and the Educational Leadership Constituents Council (ELCC) standards for Education Leadership.

1. Allow the administrator to establish a set of administrative practices and student learning objectives that are based on the individual circumstances of the administrator;
2. Establish a formative growth process for each administrator that supports professional learning and collaboration with other administrators; and
3. Use evaluation methods and professional development, support and other activities that are based on curricular standards and are targeted to the needs of the administrator.

END OF POLICY
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