



# RI Innovation Evaluation & Support System

Student Learning Pilot  
2017 - 18





## Why Pilot? *How did we get here?*

- Innovation Leaders, Evaluators and Evaluatees have raised numerous concerns about the current Student Learning Objectives (SLO) model
- Innovation leaders have long advocated for a way to account for student learning already represented in the language of the rubric
- Innovation leaders, representatives from RI Model districts and RIDE staff engaged in a collaborative effort to “solve the problem”
- Three possible “solutions” were proposed
- Innovation leaders decided that the “Embedded Model” most closely represented our idea of a “Rubric Based” method of accounting for Student Learning in Educator Evaluation



# Student Learning Pilot

- Three methods being piloted in 2017-18
  - Embedded Model
  - Portfolio Model
  - Student Learning Goals Model
- 4 Innovation Districts participating in Embedded SL Pilot
  - Cranston, Pawtucket, Providence, Woonsocket
- A small number of RI Model districts piloting each model, with the majority piloting the Embedded Model



# The Purpose

The purpose of piloting the **Embedded Model** is to determine whether or not this approach, rather than SLOs, can be used to account for Student Learning in Teacher Evaluation. *We will be checking in with evaluators and evaluatees throughout the year to gather feedback on strengths and challenges of this model.*





# Embedded Model

- The Embedded SL Model leverages the existing work that teachers are doing in their classroom with regard to measuring student learning through short and long term cycles of instruction. It highlights on-going data discussions that drive instructional decisions related to the prioritized content area.
- Data discussions highlight teachers' daily instructional practices as a means of communicating student learning.





# Pilot Process

- Follow Regular Evaluation Process
- Participants **WILL NOT** write **SLOs**
- Use Regular Evaluation Rubric with Additional 3.5 Element (Demonstrating Instructional Outcomes)
- Focus on Student Learning / Student outcomes is naturally embedded throughout all evaluator / evaluatee interactions :
  - Beginning of the Year Conference / Pre-Conference
  - Post Observation Conference
  - Summative Conference
- Guided by 3.5 lang & Degree of Anticipated Outcomes
- Final Evaluation Rating based on average of 35 Elements





# 3.5

**The Innovation Rubric already contains elements related to Student Learning such as:**

- 1.1b: Knowledge of Students,
- 1.2: Establishing Instructional Outcomes,
- 1.3.c: Instructional Groups
- 1.4: Designing Student Assessment
- 3.1a: Expectations for Learning
- 3.3a: Projects, Activities and Assignments
- 3.4a: Assessment Criteria
- 3.4b: Monitoring Student Learning
- 3.4.c: Providing Feedback to Students

**However, for purposes of the SL Pilot, RIDE added an additional element to any rubric being used in the pilot:**

- 3.5 (NEW): Demonstrating Instructional Outcomes

***Innovation pilot sites will use this additional element along with the original 34 Innovation Rubric Elements and average all 35 to determine a Final Effectiveness Rating. For study purposes, we will also run scores with 3.5 weighted at 30% and the other 34 elements at 70% to be able to compare results with RI Model districts.***



# An Example

- During a Beginning of the Year or Pre-Observation Conference, the Evaluator and Evaluatee would discuss the make-up of the class, the instructional priorities(standards) being addressed and expectations for student learning.
- During an observation the Evaluator might see evidence of targeted instruction related to expectations, or evidence of student learning, but the observation DOES NOT need to be specially scheduled to ensure such evidence collection can take place during the observed class. In most cases, evidence will be collected / discussed during conferences.
- During a Post-Observation conference or check-in, the Evaluator and Evaluatee should discuss student learning progress as part of their “authentic dialogue”. As always, the language of the Rubric is helpful in guiding these discussions.
- At the Summative Conference the Evaluator and Evaluatee should discuss student learning in the context of the Rubric language, with a focus on 3.5, but not limited to 3.5. The educator can provide sample evidence, such as student work samples. **A rating on 3.5 will be determined and averaged with ratings from the other 34 elements to determine an overall Effectiveness Rating.**



# Determining Instructional Outcomes

To determine a rating for 3.5 the evaluator and evaluatee should:

Be guided by the 3.5 rubric language with attention to the words:

- Minimal
- Moderate
- Sufficient
- Significant

Use the [Degree of Achieved Expectations\\*](#) to help demonstrate / clarify the progress made by students in relation to the rubric language:

- Minimal = Very few students reached expectations
- Moderate = Some students reached expectations while some did not
- Sufficient = Most students reached expectations
- Significant = Most students reached and some exceeded expectations
- *The Degree of Achieved Expectations language is supplemental to the rubric and intended as guidance.*
- *The evaluator will collect evidence for 3.5 during conferences and POSSIBLY during*



# Demonstrating Instructional Outcomes

	Ineffective	Developing	Effective	Highly Effective
<b>3.5 Demonstrating Instructional Outcomes</b>	At the end of the cycle(s) of instruction, evidence demonstrates <b>minimal or no</b> student progress (i.e., growth or mastery) according to established district guidance.	At the end of the cycle(s) of instruction, evidence demonstrates <b>moderate</b> student progress (i.e., growth or mastery) according to established district guidance.	At the end of the cycle(s) of instruction, evidence demonstrates <b>sufficient</b> student progress (i.e., growth or mastery) according to established district guidance.	At the end of the cycle(s) of instruction, evidence demonstrates <b>significant</b> student progress (i.e., growth or mastery) according to established district guidance.

	Minimal or No(ne)	Moderate	Sufficient	Significant
<b>Degree of Achieved Expectations (Qualified)</b>	Very few students reached expectations.	Some students reached expectations, while some did not.	Most students reached expectations	Most students reached <i>and some exceeded</i> expectations.



# REMEMBER

This is a **PILOT** and we will be learning together throughout the year. The evaluation process will be the same as the regular Innovation evaluation process and the **focus on Student Learning should be a natural part of conversations between evaluators and evaluatee**. Some of the language in 3.5 is vague and the “Degree of Expectations” language is *supplemental* to the rubric language and one of a number of suggestions for 3.5 developed by RIDE as *guidance* for evaluators and evaluatees. It was selected for use in the pilot by the Innovation Consortium to allow for maximum flexibility in discussing / demonstrating student outcomes.





# Thank You

Thank you for participating in this pilot. We hope your participation and feedback will enable us to find an alternative to the current SLO system and more effectively, authentically, and fairly demonstrate teachers' impact on student learning.

