

# SLO Process & Scoring Guide (May 2014)


## Guidance on Student/School Learning Objectives (SLOs)

Every year, Wisconsin educators must conduct the [SLO process](#)—selecting, monitoring, and scoring SLOs collaboratively with evaluators and/or peers. The dialog within the SLO process provides an opportunity to strengthen SLOs, identify quality evidence/assessments, and discuss academic growth for students, thereby supporting professional growth for the educator and, ultimately, student learning. For more information on SLOs, visit the [SLO Toolkit](#).

### SLO PROCESS

To support Wisconsin educators and evaluators through the annual SLO process, DPI developed this SLO Process Guide. A quality SLO process is characterized by several critical features—the Process Guide lists these features and aids formative conversations associated with the creation and ongoing monitoring of SLO implementation and progress. Additionally, this Process Guide can also support final SLO scoring discussions, as final SLO scores now incorporate the impact of quality SLO processes. Educators and evaluators can use the third column within the Process Guide to record their collaborative conversations or to document self-reflections.

#### SLO PROCESS GUIDE

SLO Quality Indicators		Reflections/Feedback/Notes for Improvement
<b>Baseline Data and Rationale</b>		
The educator used multiple data sources to complete a thorough review of student achievement data, including subgroup analysis.		
The data analysis supports the rationale for the SLO goal.		
The baseline data indicates the individual starting point for each student included in the target population.		
<b>Alignment</b>		
The SLO is aligned to <a href="#">specific content standards</a> representing the critical content for learning within a grade-level and subject area.		
The standards identified are appropriate and aligned to support the area(s) of need and the student population identified in baseline data.		
The SLO is stated as a SMART goal.		
<b>Student Population</b>		
The student population identified in the goal(s) reflects the results of the data analysis.		
<b>Targeted Growth</b>		
Growth trajectories reflect appropriate gains for students, based on identified starting points or benchmark levels.		
Growth goals are rigorous, yet attainable.		
Targeted growth is revisited based on progress monitoring data and adjusted if needed.		
<b>Interval</b>		
The interval is appropriate given the SLO goal.		
The interval reflects the duration of time the target student population is with the educator.		
Mid-point checks are planned, data is reviewed, and revisions to the goal are made if necessary.		
Mid-point revisions are based on strong rationale and evidence supporting the adjustment mid-course.		
<b>Evidence Sources</b>		
The assessments chosen to serve as evidence appropriately measure intended growth goals/learning content.		
Assessments are valid, reliable, fair, and unbiased for all		

students/target population.		
The evidence reflects a <a href="#">balanced use of assessment data</a> .		
Progress is continuously monitored and an appropriate amount of evidence can be collected in time for use in the final scoring conference.		
Teacher-created rubrics, if used to assess student performance, have well crafted performance levels that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clearly define levels of performance;</li> <li>Are easy to understand;</li> <li>Show a clear path to student mastery.</li> </ul>		
<b>Instructional (for teachers) and Leadership (for principals) Strategies and Support</b>		
Strategies reflect a differentiated approach appropriate to the target population.		
Strategies were adjusted throughout the interval based on formative assessment and progress monitoring data.		
Collaboration with others—teachers, specialists, instructional coaches, Assistant Principals—is indicated when appropriate.		
Appropriate professional development opportunities are addressed.		
<b>Scoring</b>		
Accurately and appropriately scored the SLO.		
Score is substantiated by student achievement data.		

### Beginning of Year

Working collaboratively with their evaluator or a peer, educators draw upon the SLO Process Guide to develop a minimum of one SLO and document the goals within Teachscape (or an alternative online system). In Rating Years, educators must conduct this process with their evaluators. (*Note: evaluators no longer approve SLOs or EEPs, but instead provide formative feedback.*)

### Middle of Year

Working collaboratively with their evaluator or a peer, educators draw upon the SLO Process Guide to monitor progress towards an SLO across the year and adjust instructional strategies accordingly. Educators can also use the Process Guide to consider a mid-year adjustment to an SLO based on data collected through the progress monitoring process. In Rating Years, educators must conduct this process with their evaluators.

### End of Year

At the end of the SLO interval, educators draw upon all available evidence of their SLO implementation and progress, including the criteria listed in the Process Guide, to inform the selection of a self-score. Using the revised SLO Scoring Rubric (see page 3) for the SLO, educators will self-score their SLO and document the score in Teachscape. In Rating Years, educators must conduct this process with their evaluators. Additionally, evaluators will review all SLOs (from rating and non-rating years) and the supporting documentation prior to the Final Evaluation Conference as evidence towards a final, holistic SLO score. Evaluators draw upon the SLO Process Guide to inform the determination of the holistic score using the SLO Scoring Rubric (page 3). Evaluators document the holistic score into Teachscape (or an approved alternative system). During the Final Evaluation Conference, evaluators discuss collaboratively with educators the SLO implementation and progress across the rating cycle and the resulting holistic score. The holistic score is the final SLO score that will factor into an educator's Student Outcomes Summary Score, instead of an average of an educator's individual SLOs, as originally proposed.

## SLO RUBRIC OVERVIEW

Both educators and evaluators will use the revised SLO Scoring Rubric (see below) to determine SLO scores. Educators will self-score their individual SLO in all years (rating and non-rating). Evaluators will assign a holistic SLO score considering all SLOs—the SLO implementation and student progress. Using the SLO Scoring Rubric, evaluators determine an educator’s holistic SLO score by identifying the rubric level which best describes the educator’s SLO implementation process and student growth, drawing upon the preponderance of evidence. This method of scoring ensures a holistic approach is taken. It allows evaluators to recognize student growth as well as professional growth across the SLO cycle, which aligns with the purpose of the Wisconsin EE System. The holistic score is the final SLO score that will factor into an educator’s Student Outcomes Summary Score, instead of an average of an educator’s individual SLOs, as originally proposed.

### SLO SCORING RUBRIC

Score	Criteria	Description (not exhaustive)
4	<p>Student growth for SLO(s) has <b>exceeded</b> the goal(s).</p> <p>Educator engaged in a comprehensive, data-driven SLO process that resulted in exceptional student growth.</p>	<p>Evidence indicates the targeted population’s growth exceeded the expectations described in the goal.</p> <p>Educator set rigorous superior goal(s); skillfully used appropriate assessments; continuously monitored progress; strategically revised instruction based on progress monitoring data.</p>
3	<p>Student growth for SLO(s) has <b>met</b> goal(s).</p> <p>Educator engaged in a data-driven SLO process that resulted in student growth.</p>	<p>Evidence indicates the targeted population met the expectations described in the goal.</p> <p>Educator set attainable goal(s); used appropriate assessments; monitored progress; adjusted instruction based on progress monitoring data.</p>
2	<p>Student growth for SLO(s) has <b>partially met</b> the goal(s).</p> <p>Educator engaged in a SLO process that resulted in inconsistent student growth.</p>	<p>Evidence indicates the targeted population partially met expectations described in the goal.</p> <p>Educator set a goal; used assessments; inconsistently monitored progress; inconsistently or inappropriately adjusted instruction.</p>
1	<p>Student growth for SLO(s) has <b>not met</b> the goal(s).</p> <p>Educator engaged in a SLO process that resulted in minimal or no student growth.</p>	<p>Evidence indicates the targeted population has not met the expectations described in the goal.</p> <p>Educator set inappropriate goal(s); inconsistently or inappropriately used assessments; failed to monitor progress; failed to adjust instruction based on progress monitoring data.</p>