

Scoring Guidance for the New Student Learning Models 2019-20

The *Embedded Practice* and *Student Learning Goals* models for measuring student learning in Rhode Island are grounded in six guiding principles: *students, standards, timeframe, evidence, strategies, and expectations*. It is through these guiding principles that LEAs must make decisions regarding both the student learning process and outcomes, and how each can be measured through local evaluation practices. Each model for student learning presents an opportunity for teachers to identify the needs of an entire class or a subset of students as the focal point, providing a more flexible structure through which to showcase instructional practices and their impact on student learning. Educators should consider a thoughtful choice of one or more content standards that are appropriately aligned to the course of study. The timeframe through which to measure student learning can include both long- and short-term cycles of instruction as determined by both the model and the LEA. During this agreed-upon timeframe, teachers will collect multiple, and varied sources of standards-aligned evidence to drive focused data discussions between the evaluator and the teacher. These conversations should support the planning and application of various instructional strategies through which expectations for student learning are articulated and monitored by both teachers and evaluators.

3e Rubric: Demonstrating Instructional Outcomes

Evidence of Instructional Processes*	Level	Demonstrating Instructional Outcomes	Level
Through <u>focused</u> data discussions, the teacher communicates his/her expectations for student learning as well as a <u>deep understanding</u> of students' differing learning needs. Evidence demonstrates that the teacher <u>persists</u> in seeking effective data-driven instructional strategies that result in measurable student progress based on appropriate content standard(s). Furthermore, evidence demonstrates that the teacher provides <u>frequent and meaningful</u> opportunities for students to both reflect upon and communicate their own progress.	4	At the end of the cycle(s) of instruction, evidence from the included group of students demonstrates significant measurable progress (i.e., growth or mastery) according to established district guidance.	4
Through data discussions, the teacher communicates his/her expectations for student learning as well as students' differing learning needs. Evidence demonstrates that the teacher seeks effective data-driven instructional strategies that result in measurable student progress based on appropriate content standard(s). Furthermore, evidence demonstrates that the teacher provides opportunities for students to both reflect upon and communicate their own progress.	3	At the end of the cycle(s) of instruction, evidence from the included group of students demonstrates sufficient measurable progress (i.e., growth or mastery) according to established district guidance.	3
Through data discussions, the teacher <u>attempts to</u> communicate his/her expectations for student learning as well as students' differing learning needs. Evidence demonstrates that the teacher seeks <u>some</u> data-driven instructional strategies that <u>may</u> result in measurable student progress based on appropriate content standard(s).	2	At the end of the cycle(s) of instruction, evidence from the included group of students demonstrates moderate measurable progress (i.e., growth or mastery) according to established district guidance.	2
The teacher <u>does not consistently</u> communicate his/her expectations for student learning and/or students' differing learning needs. Evidence demonstrates that the teacher seeks <u>little or no</u> effective data-driven instructional strategies that result in measurable student progress based on appropriate content standard(s).	1	At the end of the cycle(s) of instruction, evidence from the included group of students demonstrates minimal or no measurable progress (i.e., growth or mastery) according to established district guidance.	1

**When scoring Evidence of Instructional Processes, evaluators should score holistically by selecting the level descriptor where there is a preponderance of evidence. This is the same approach evaluators already use when scoring the eight Professional Practice components in the RI Model.*

Guidance for Evidence of Instructional Processes

Each LEA's District Evaluation Committees (DECs) has the flexibility to determine what evidence will be used to measure *Evidence of Instructional Processes*. In many cases, this will likely be a combination of observation of practice (i.e., what teachers do) and artifacts (i.e., the work students did). First, local teams should work collaboratively to answer critical questions at the beginning of the evaluation cycle to understand where, how, and when these foundational process elements will be captured, and then communicated, to teachers in the district:

- ✓ *What data are available in your LEA through which to measure student learning? Is there a common understanding of how the data represent student learning at the school and district levels?*
- ✓ *During which meetings do you discuss student learning (i.e. PLCs, RTI, Data Team, CPT, etc.)? Are there protocols in place to structure these discussions?*
- ✓ *How often is student learning discussed, and with whom? Will the evaluator be present for these discussions about student learning?*
- ✓ *How will expectations for student learning be communicated between teachers and evaluators? And between teachers and their students? Is there a common format that will be followed?*

The key criterion for selecting artifacts is to provide evidence of student learning in order to show *instructional effectiveness*. Data of practice, both through informal and formal observations and natural interactions throughout the school year, offer opportunities for evaluators to see how teachers apply instructional strategies, collect and analyze data, and communicate student learning with colleagues and students. Teachers should also choose artifacts that show student understanding of grade-level appropriate learning standards prior to, during, and after instruction. The assumption is that *significant* measurable progress from the included group of students on these assessments will demonstrate both student learning *and* instructional effectiveness. The artifacts to be used as evidence could include pre-assessments, reflections on how the teacher modified or adapted instruction based upon formative assessments throughout the cycle of instruction, and evidence of student growth at the end of the cycle of instruction. In general, the emphasis should be on the *quality* of the representative evidence rather than *quantity*, based upon how it supports the claim about the teacher's overall instructional effectiveness. The following five prompts will help an educator select quality artifacts to discuss with their evaluator throughout the cycle(s) of instruction in order to show evidence of their instructional effectiveness:

- ✓ *Describe the problem or area targeted, including grade level and subject area.*
- ✓ *Explain the content standards(s) addressed and justify why this is meaningful content for the designated grade level and subject area.*
- ✓ *Explain which students will be targeted (all, subset) and on what basis was that decision made.*
- ✓ *Explain what evidence will be collected over the cycle of instruction to demonstrate instructional effectiveness and on what basis these decisions were made. Be sure to address how the evidence collected will provide evidence prior to, during, and after instruction in order to modify instruction and track student progress over time.*
- ✓ *Explain how the evidence elicits students' deeper understanding of the content standards.*

DECs should consider additional local guidance to support teachers who will need to present an evidence set that shows *how students demonstrated progress as a direct result of instruction*. Likely, this will include multiple documents that show *how the teacher's instructional decisions impacted student learning*. An artifact set, comprised of various documents, will ideally contain the following:

- ✓ **Task, assessment data, rubric, and/or student samples**
 - *It is clear from these documents that the content being assessed is standards-aligned, meaningful, and deep*
- ✓ **Teacher reflection(s)**
 - *Shows insight into the teachers' thought processes and how they used information about student learning to inform their future instructional plans for individuals or groups of students*
 - *It is clear from this reflection that teachers' instructional intent and how student data allows them to engage in improving their practice will ultimately affect student outcomes*

Guidance for Measuring Instructional Outcomes

In order to best support conversations about student learning, artifacts should measure the extent to which students have learned within the cycle(s) of instruction. After answering the critical questions regarding the discussion of artifacts, DECs should engage in the following planning activities in order to define a teacher’s impact on student learning:

1. **Identify acceptable measures/evidence of student progress (i.e., growth or mastery).** DECs, or an identified team of educators (admins and teachers) should complete an inventory of existing evidence/measures used in the district/school that are well aligned to the critical content students are learning for a particular grade/subject:
 - a. Is the measure/evidence aligned to content?
 - b. Does it assess what is most important for students to learn and be able to do?
 - c. Does it assess what the teacher intends to teach?
 - d. Is the measure/evidence informative?
 - Do the results inform teachers about curriculum, instruction, and practice?
 - Does it provide valuable information to teachers about their students, helping them to identify whether students are making *significant, sufficient, moderate, or minimal* progress?

2. **Define the terms for acceptable measures of student progress.** Have the team determine what *significant, sufficient, moderate, or minimal* progress will look like with respect to the measures identified. Consider the following critical questions when framing these qualifiers locally:
 - a. Are they appropriate expectations for *all* students?
 - b. Are the terms communicated up front to all teachers?
 - c. Have you included quantitative and/or qualitative descriptions?
 - The table below provides examples that local decision-making teams may consider using as a frame for quantifying, qualifying, or using a combination to represent agreed-upon measures of student progress.

Possible approaches for LEAs to consider for measuring student learning (i.e., Demonstrating Instructional Outcomes):

APPROACHES	PROGRESS DESCRIPTORS			
	Significant	Sufficient	Moderate	Minimal or No(ne)
Degree of Achieved Expectations	Most students reached <i>and</i> exceeded expectations	Most students reached expectations	Some students reached expectations, while some did not	Very few students reached expectations
Time-Referenced Growth	Achieved more than a year’s growth in a year’s time (or equivalent)	Achieved a year’s growth in a year’s time (or equivalent)	Achieved somewhat less than a year’s growth in a year’s time (or equivalent)	Achieved much less than a year’s growth in a year’s time (or equivalent)
Depth of the Standard(s)	Evidence demonstrates standard is learned in full, with learning beyond the expectations	Evidence demonstrates standard is learned in full	Evidence demonstrates most parts of the standard were learned	Evidence demonstrates learning of some or no parts of the standard
Consistency of Performance	Consistently demonstrates learning of the standard(s)	Frequently demonstrates learning of the standard(s)	Sometimes demonstrates learning of the standard(s)	Rarely demonstrates learning of the standard(s), if at all
Percentage of Students	90% of students or more reached learning expectations	75% - 89% of students reached learning expectations	60% -69% of students reached learning expectations	Less than 60% of students reached learning expectations

These approaches and measures of student learning are suggestions intended to frame local conversations.