TEACHER EVALUATION GUIDEBOOK

2012-13
Dear Colleagues:

As I have communicated in recent months in advance of the implementation of Compass and the Common Core State Standards, our priorities and efforts at the Louisiana Department of Education are rooted in the fundamental idea that if we believe in children, we must believe in the adults closest to them. This message is at the heart of our Louisiana Believes plan, which aspires to academic pre-K for all students, raises standards for students at all levels, and increases the rigor of career and college prep education in the state.

Louisiana has seen many changes in policy in recent years that will result in significant refocusing in your work with students. Our department’s Network Teams will assist you with digesting and tailoring these initiatives, and your districts will play a significant role in training and preparing you for the work that lies ahead – work that will help us ensure the success of students.

Compass, our state’s trailblazing system of educator support and evaluation, is a clear example of both our commitment to higher expectations and the shifts in practice that are ahead for you. It is also a further example of our philosophy in action: change will come by empowering those closest to children, rather than through rules and bureaucracies telling people what to do.

Our work over the past year, supported by the hard work and valuable guidance of the Compass pilot districts, has resulted in a lean set of requirements related to Act 54 that will support the work of those closest to students. The components of the Compass system are not a list of compliance exercises. Rather, this system provides a foundation upon which local districts and schools will build their own practices to support teachers and meet the needs of their students and local contexts.

I am looking forward to the years ahead and to working with you to make our belief in what students can achieve a reality. I am confident that Compass will play a crucial role in leading us there.

As always, thanks for all you do for our children.

John

John White
Louisiana Department of Education
Twitter @LouisianaSupe
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LOUISIANA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
INTRODUCTION

The goal of the Louisiana Department of Education (LDOE) is to support improved teacher practice that will, in turn, ensure that Louisiana's students are college and career ready. As we raise our expectations for student learning and the rigor of classroom instruction in the 21st century, we (at the state, district, and school level) must also rethink how we support teachers. Compass is a key tool in beginning this process, and this guidebook is a starting point for our shared journey on the path to instructional excellence.

This guidebook has been developed and published by the LDOE to provide a clear explanation of the purpose, components, and requirements of Louisiana’s new teacher support and evaluation system: Compass. State policy and LDOE guidance are presented and explained to provide clarity on statewide system requirements and identify available resources that will support educators as they implement this new system.

While the LDOE is focused on supporting this effort, the success of Compass is dependent on local districts and schools, who have the autonomy to tailor this system to meet the needs of their students, educators, and communities. To that end, this guidebook covers several scenarios that illustrate the different components of the system. The guidebook, however, does not provide an exhaustive list of potential situations that may be encountered within every local context. It is not intended to be a comprehensive, technical manual but rather a reference guide to Compass’s major components and requirements specific to teachers in the state.

Louisiana’s Priorities: Compass and the Common Core State Standards

Because we believe that Louisiana’s children can achieve at higher levels, we must raise our expectations for students and instruction. The Common Core State Standards, which Louisiana will phase into its standards and assessments beginning in 2012-13, provide a clearer understanding of what students are expected to learn and will better prepare them to be college and career ready upon leaving high school. The Common Core State Standards are aligned to standards in the highest performing states and countries and will prepare our students to compete in a global economy.

With these higher expectations for students’ work come higher expectations for educators’ work. In the world of Common Core, the baseline definition of an effective teacher is one who can successfully prepare students for college and career by highlighting and prioritizing the skills required for students to master the new standards. The use of Common Core aligned resources, curricula and assessments will help teachers achieve this end and, as a result, improve their effectiveness as measured by Compass. Given the inherent connection between students’ success with Common Core and teachers’ success with Compass, these two initiatives represent one singular effort to raise the bar for students and educators in Louisiana.

Our Focus: The Five Core Elements

Common Core and Compass will require difficult work and some significant changes in practice, but they represent powerful opportunities to produce gains in student achievement and will guide our work to ensure that all children in Louisiana are ready for college and careers. In order to support this transition, the LDOE has identified five key practices for instructional improvement that will help teachers and leaders prioritize their time and energy on efforts that are the most likely to lead to improved student outcomes. The Core Elements (see Figure 1) are meant to be the starting point for deeper conversations between districts and LDOE Network Teams about what it looks like to implement Common Core and Compass. Changes such as those required by Common Core and Compass can be overwhelming. These five straightforward, yet complex and highly meaningful, activities can guide the work of teachers and leaders and make the changes ahead clearer and more actionable. By focusing on these activities, educators and their students will be prepared to succeed with Compass and Common Core.
Louisiana schools have achieved unprecedented academic growth over the last decade. Yet the reality is that more than one-third of our students are not grade-level proficient, and only seven out of ten students graduate from high school on time. To achieve our vision of all students being on track to attain a college degree or succeed in a professional career, our teachers and principals must lead the way. That compels us to ensure they have what all professionals deserve: regular opportunities to be recognized for their accomplishments and meaningful feedback and support to grow.

In 2010, Louisiana lawmakers enacted Act 54 as a commitment to recognizing educators’ successes and providing educators with information on how to improve their performance. In December 2011 and April 2012, the Board of Elementary and Secondary Education (BESE) approved revisions to BESE Bulletin 130: Regulations for the Evaluation and Assessment of School Personnel to align state policy with the new statute.

Act 54 calls for student growth measures to comprise at least 50 percent of all educator evaluations and incorporates other professional practice measures in the remaining 50 percent. To provide educators with consistent feedback, the law requires this process to be administered annually, instead of every three years. Act 54 also ensures intensive support for teachers who are identified as struggling.

Educator Involvement in the Development of Compass

In response to Act 54, the LDOE has engaged thousands of educators across the state through pilot programs, presentations, workgroups, and focus groups to collectively develop and refine Compass, Louisiana’s new educator support and evaluation model. This collaborative effort was aimed at building a system that would not simply rate teachers’ performance but would provide teachers with the important feedback and development opportunities they need to improve their professional practice and ultimately lead their students to achieve at higher levels.

One group that provided critical input into the development of Compass was the Advisory Committee on Educator Evaluation (ACEE) – a committee of 33 individuals established by Act 54 and charged with

Development of Compass

| Goal-Setting | Teachers in all subjects will set quantifiable achievement goals for students. |
| Assessment and Content | Teachers in all subjects will select assessments and curricular materials that align with skills students are expected to demonstrate on new Common Core assessment items. |
| Feedback | Principals and other instructional leaders will observe all teachers and will provide feedback based on a Common Core-aligned rubric. |
| Collaboration | Teachers will work in teams to examine student work and to articulate specific changes in instructional practice that will align student performance to Common Core standards. |
| Identifying Leaders | Districts will use Compass effectiveness ratings to identify teacher leaders who can take on new responsibilities to support these Core Elements in their schools. |
providing recommendations to BESE regarding the student growth measures to be incorporated into teachers’ evaluations and the standards of effectiveness to be used in rating educators’ overall performance. By law, ACEE’s membership included 50 percent practicing classroom teachers and representatives from several educator unions and associations, as well as parents and BESE board members.

In addition to ACEE, about 250 teachers informed the development of Compass through participation in workgroups and focus groups; nearly 10,000 educators participated in Act 54 briefings; and more than 2,600 educators participated in online surveys to provide input on the design and development of the new performance model.

Perhaps the most intensive educator engagement in the development of Compass occurred in the nine districts and one charter school that participated in the Compass Pilot Program during the 2011-12 school year. Participants dedicated significant time to training teachers and leaders on the draft Compass tools; engaging in goal-setting, observation, and annual evaluation processes with educators; and providing valuable feedback on how tools and processes could be improved prior to statewide implementation. Based on feedback from the pilot, the LDOE made refinements to Compass in an effort to:

- Strengthen and streamline the teacher and leader professional practice rubrics;
- Simplify the goal-setting process for measuring student growth; and
- Minimize process requirements.

These refinements resulted in the adoption of a slimmer teacher professional practice rubric (a modified version of Charlotte Danielson’s Framework for Effective Teaching); revisions to the LDOE’s guidance around setting learning goals for students; enhancements to the Human Capital Information System (HCIS) (the web-based data system which enables teachers and leaders to engage in the Compass process electronically); and the removal of several interim deadlines and process requirements.

Another important recommendation that emerged from the pilot sites was that local districts must have significant discretion in their administration of the evaluation system. For this reason, the LDOE has been minimally prescriptive beyond the requirements enumerated in Act 54 and Bulletin 130.

Figure 2: Note on Implementation Variations

It is important to note that with Compass, the LDOE has provided Local Education Agencies (LEAs) with a set of core requirements and model tools for teacher support and evaluation; however, Compass implementation will look different across the state. School districts and charter schools are encouraged to build upon the framework provided by the LDOE to make Compass work for their own professional and organizational needs. This approach is not intended to create more work for LEAs but to ensure that they have the autonomy needed to best meet the needs of their teachers, leaders, and students.
Effectiveness Ratings

At the end of each school year, teachers earn an effectiveness rating that maps to one of four performance levels. This rating is based on the overall Compass score derived from two scoring components: Professional Practice and Student Growth. The effectiveness ratings are: Highly Effective, Effective: Proficient, Effective: Emerging and Ineffective.

Figure 3: Effectiveness Ratings Definitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highly Effective (4)</td>
<td>A Highly Effective teacher consistently and considerably surpasses expectations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective: Proficient (3)</td>
<td>An Effective: Proficient teacher consistently meets expectations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective: Emerging (2)</td>
<td>An Effective: Emerging teacher only partially meets expectations but shows potential for improvement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ineffective (1)</td>
<td>An Ineffective teacher consistently performs below expectations. Ineffective teachers must complete an intensive assistance plan and demonstrate improvement within a year or be subject to separation from the LEA.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COMPONENTS: OVERVIEW

Teachers will receive a final Compass score and effectiveness rating based on their performance in two areas: Professional Practice and Student Growth. Each area is equally weighted at 50 percent of a teacher’s final Compass score.

Figure 4: Components and Ratings

Professional Practice is a measure of effectiveness based on ratings on each component of the professional practice rubric. All teachers will receive a professional practice score, ranging from 1.00 to 4.00, based on at least two observations using Louisiana’s Compass Teacher Rubric or an approved alternative rubric. The Professional Practice score should be the average of scores received on each observation.

Note: LEAs using an approved five-point rubric will convert ratings to a four-point scale in order to arrive at a final professional practice score for each teacher between 1.00 and 4.00. The conversion scale to be used in schools using the Teacher and Student Advancement Model (TAP) instructional rubric will be provided to TAP schools by the LDOE. LEAs using other five point evaluation rubrics must have a conversion process approved by the LDOE through the Teacher Rubric Waiver Process.

Student Growth is a quantitative measure of effectiveness based on students’ academic performance. As described further in the sections of this handbook that address Student Learning Targets (SLTs), all teachers should engage in the goal-setting process and set measurable SLTs for their students. All teachers will receive
a student growth score, ranging from 1.00 to 4.00, based on attainment of the SLT or on the Value-Added Model, when it is available.

**Compass Teacher Profiles**

This guidebook references five fictional teachers as examples of Compass in practice. Please note, Compass will look different across LEAs and the modifications to the system that the Compass example teachers encounter in their respective LEAs are not the only ones possible.

**Figure 5: Compass Teacher Profiles**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ms. Mason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Ms. Mason teaches 1st grade in a large, suburban district. She is in her seventh year of teaching.  
| Most of the 22 students in Ms. Mason’s class are entering the year on or above grade level in reading and mathematics.  
|  
| Mr. Albert |  
| Mr. Albert teaches Visual Arts at a high school in a large, urban district. He is a veteran teacher with 15 years of experience teaching art to 6th through 12th graders.  
| The 84 students in Mr. Albert’s 9th and 10th grade classes showed varying abilities at the beginning of the semester based on the rubric that he will use to evaluate their performance.  
|  
| Ms. Zenobia |  
| Ms. Zenobia teaches Algebra II in a rural parish. She has five years of experience teaching high school math.  
| Ms. Zenobia has identified that the 56 students in her Algebra II sections have difficulty retaining information from their prior math classes and she is focused on ensuring that she prepares them for the ACT exam.  
|  
| Mr. Davis |  
| Mr. Davis teaches 6th grade English Language Arts at a middle school in the northwest corner of the state. He recently graduated and is in his first year of teaching.  
| Most of Mr. Davis’s students are beginning sixth grade slightly below grade level as measured by a standardized assessment of reading. A few students are above grade level and a few are well below grade level.  
|  
| Ms. Boudreaux |  
| Ms. Boudreaux teaches elementary special education in a resource setting. She is in her third year of teaching in a mid-sized district.  
| Ms. Boudreaux is working with six students in grades 2-4 this year. All have significant cognitive disabilities and most have complex communication needs. She is working with all of them on literacy development, but each student started the year at a different level.  

These example teachers will help to illustrate each component of Compass in more depth in the following sections.

**PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE**

The professional practice component of Compass is closely linked to the Core Element of feedback. In order to improve their professional practice, teachers need feedback on the common expectations held for teachers across the state using the common language that an evaluation rubric can provide.
With Compass, all teachers will be observed at least twice per year. Some LEAs may choose to require more frequent observations, and each LEA can determine when observations will occur during the school year.

One observation must be a formal observation that lasts for the entire duration of a lesson and is preceded by a pre-observation conference and followed by a post-observation conference between the teacher and evaluator. The second required observation is an informal observation and does not require a pre-observation or post-observation conference. Evaluators must provide feedback after each observation and include areas for commendation and improvement. In LEAs using the Compass Teacher Rubric, all five components of the rubric should be rated in each observation.

**Evaluators**

Teachers are observed and evaluated by their principal, assistant principal or other designated supervisor. Since observation of professional practice is subject to professional judgment, evaluators will participate in ongoing training opportunities to ensure that they develop a common understanding of what teacher performance looks like at different levels of effectiveness and to maintain consistency in evaluations across the state.

**Observers**

Teachers may also be observed by other staff for developmental purposes. Like evaluators, these observers may assess teacher performance against the components in the appropriate rubric and provide the teacher with feedback accordingly. However, the ratings and comments of these additional observers will not be used for the purposes of evaluation, only to support teachers’ ongoing development. Observers may be administrators or other supervisory level staff; they may also be teacher leaders or peers.

**Compass Teacher Rubric**

The LDOE has adopted an abridged version of Charlotte Danielson’s Framework for Effective Teaching as the Compass teacher support and evaluation tool. The Danielson model is research-based and well-respected nationally. It has been implemented in more than 15 other states and hundreds of districts. In an effort to narrow teachers’ and evaluators’ focus on high-impact actions, the LDOE selected five of the 22 components included in Danielson’s framework most likely to lead to student success with the Common Core. Evaluators and observers in LEAs using the Compass Teacher Rubric will be able to script, enter comments, and provide ratings for each observation into the HCIS and then share them with teachers and keep ongoing records of observations electronically.

Figure 6: Components Selected from Danielson Framework for Effective Teaching

---

**Compass Teacher Rubric Components**

- **Setting Instructional Outcomes (1c):** Establishing clear, rigorous objectives that describe what students will learn.
- **Managing Classroom Procedures (2c):** Establishing a smoothly functioning classroom through the management of instruction and transitions to allow for maximum learning for all students.
- **Using Questioning and Discussion (3b):** Strategically using a varied set of questions to engage all students in discussion around rigorous content.
- **Engaging Students in Learning (3c):** Asking all students to do work that is rigorous and intellectually challenging.
- **Using Assessment in Instruction (3d):** Using clear assessment criteria to drive instructional choices throughout the lesson and at the end.

Please see the [Compass Teacher Rubric: Complete Framework](#) for the complete Compass Teacher Rubric. There are links to additional documents in the [Resources for Educators](#) section of this guidebook.
Teachers will be evaluated on these five components at each observation. To provide teachers and administrators with clear guidance, the Compass Teacher Rubric explains in concrete terms, with accompanying examples, the actions a teacher should take to improve his or her practice. These five components will help teachers design and deliver a rigorous course of instruction.

While the LDOE recommends this rubric, the Department also recognizes that several LEAs have invested time and resources to implement evaluation tools and/or rubrics that are equally as rigorous and effective. If your LEA has received approval from the LDOE to use an alternate tool or rubric, that will be the tool used to generate a Professional Practice score for each teacher.

**Scoring: Professional Practice**

Teachers earn a score of 1, 2, 3, or 4 on each of the five components of the Compass Teacher Rubric during each observation. LEAs using an alternative observation tool may use rubrics that are not on a four-point scale but must ensure that scores can ultimately be converted to a four-point scale so that scoring will be consistent across LEAs.

A teacher’s score for each observation will be the average of his or her scores on each component of the observation rubric. A teacher’s overall Professional Practice score will be the average of the teacher’s scores from each observation. (Note: Some teachers may have more than two observations, depending on the requirements of their LEAs.) The final score for Professional Practice will be on a 1.00 to 4.00 scale. For LEAs using the HCIS, this scoring calculation will be done automatically in the system.

The Professional Practice scores for our four Compass teachers are the average of their ratings on the observations required by their districts.

Our first example teacher, Ms. Mason, consistently received scores of either Ineffective or Effective: Emerging on the two observations conducted by her principal. She did show improvement in several components, which led to a slight increase on the overall score for her second observation – from 1.4 to 2.0. Each of these scores was the average of the scores on the five components. In order to determine her final professional practice score, her principal averaged these two scores, resulting in a score of 1.70.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMPONENT</th>
<th>OBSERVATION 1 SCORE</th>
<th>OBSERVATION 2 SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1c</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2c</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3c</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3d</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVERAGE</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FINAL SCORE</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mr. Albert showed significant improvement over the course of the year. In previous years, he effectively managed the classroom environment and was able to keep his students highly engaged in their artistic endeavors. However, he had paid little attention to the outcomes of each individual lesson, rarely used questions to improve student practice, and did not provide sufficient formative feedback to his students on their work. In truth, he had rarely been observed and had been given relatively little support related to his instructional practice. Given the changes implemented at his school as part of Compass, he was given the
feedback and development opportunities he needed in these key areas – and his observation score increased accordingly, from a 2.2 to a 3.0.

**MR. ALBERT – VISUAL ARTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMPONENT</th>
<th>OBSERVATION 1 SCORE</th>
<th>OBSERVATION 2 SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1c</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2c</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3c</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3d</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AVERAGE</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.2</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FINAL SCORE</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.60</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Local evaluation implementation in Ms. Zenobia’s district required a third informal observation in addition to the two (one informal and one formal) observations required statewide. At the beginning of the year, Ms. Zenobia and her evaluator agreed that one of the goals on her Professional Growth Plan should relate to Engaging Students in Learning. With this focus, Ms. Zenobia attended professional development sessions and was able to observe teachers in her school who were Highly Effective in this area. Her scores on Component 3c improved, as did her scores in other areas. Her average score on the third observation (3.6) was in the Highly Effective range, and her principal believes that she is on a trajectory to become an instructional leader in the school. Her final Professional Practice score (3.27) was the average of the three observation scores (3.0, 3.2, and 3.6).

**MS. ZENOBIA – ALGEBRA II**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMPONENT</th>
<th>OBSERVATION 1 SCORE</th>
<th>OBSERVATION 2 SCORE</th>
<th>OBSERVATION 3 SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1c</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2c</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3c</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3d</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AVERAGE</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.2</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.6</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FINAL SCORE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>3.27</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In his first year of teaching, Mr. Davis struggled early on in the areas of classroom management and assessment. With the support of his mentor teacher, he showed improvement over the course of the four observations that his district requires for new teachers. In addition to these four observations conducted by an evaluator, Mr. Davis was observed multiple times by his mentor, allowing him to focus on strategies and practices that improved his instruction and resulted in growth for many of his students. His observation scores increased from a 1.8 to a 2.8. His scores were averaged to a final Professional Practice score of 2.25, and his evaluator and mentor agree that he shows potential to develop into an effective teacher in his second year.
Ms. Boudreaux has had the benefit of working with a mentor special educator at her school for the past two years. In her third year of teaching, she has mastered the planning and management skills needed to set her students up for success, but she is still working on utilizing assessment and data to drive her instruction while providing her students with the accommodations they need. In the pre-observation conference prior to her formal observation (the first of her two observations), Ms. Boudreaux explained her students’ needs to her principal and demonstrated how some of them used assistive technology to communicate. In this first observation, Ms. Boudreaux’s principal was impressed with her clear, rigorous objectives for each student and her ability to manage her class, given the diverse individual needs of her students. Her principal also observed that she was focused on challenging her students through probing questions and formative assessment but with mixed success. As a result, her overall rating for this observation was a 3.0. In subsequent faculty cluster meetings, Ms. Boudreaux worked with her mentor teacher more intensively on assessment design and data analysis, developing creative methods for gathering meaningful data on her students without overwhelming them with formal assessments. By Ms. Boudreaux’s second observation, she had begun to more seamlessly integrate formative assessments into her lessons, and she had established trackers for each student to monitor their progress with the goals outlined in her SLTs. In this observation, her score increased to a 3.6, giving Ms. Boudreaux an overall professional practice score of 3.30.

Frequently Asked Questions: Professional Practice

Q: Which comes first: the formal observation or the informal observation?

A: Compass does not require any particular order of observations. LEAs have the decision-making authority to determine the order, if any, of observations.
Q: I currently receive/conduct more than two observations per year. Does this mean there will only be two observations per year from now on?

A: Compass requires a minimum of two observations per year. Your LEA will determine the number of observations above the required two, if any, that will be conducted each year and counted as part of the Professional Practice score. Additional observations can be any combination of formal and informal observations.

Q: Is there a separate Compass rubric for librarians?

A: No, the LDOE has not provided a separate rubric for observations of librarians. LEAs may choose to use the Compass teacher rubric or another tool they feel best measures the effectiveness of their librarians. The tool must be able to yield or convert to a four-point rating to be combined with the librarian’s student growth score.

Q: Is there a separate Compass rubric for school counselors?

A: Yes, the LDOE will make available a rubric for counselors adapted from the Louisiana Professional School Counselors Model. LEAs may choose to use this model or propose an alternative tool they feel best measures the effectiveness of their school counselors. The tool must be able to yield or convert to a four-point rating to be combined with the counselor’s student growth score.

STUDENT GROWTH

The second component of the Compass system is the measure of student growth. Student learning is the most important measure of the success of a teacher, school, or district. Maximizing student learning starts with setting meaningful achievement goals for students – goals that are attainable but require a continued commitment to excellence – and initiating a more targeted use of data with students, teachers, and school leaders.

All teachers who provide direct instruction or instructional support to a specified group of students to whom they are formally assigned will receive a Student Growth score. There are two ways to calculate a Student Growth score: student learning targets (SLTs) and the value-added model (VAM). While all teachers will follow the SLT framework of setting strong goals for students and assessing their progress towards those goals, only teachers without VAM data will receive their official Student Growth scores from the SLT process.

Which Student Growth Score Will a Teacher Receive?

In order to receive value-added data, teachers must teach a course in which there is a state standardized assessment and where there is a state standardized assessment in the previous course as well. The measure of student growth will be the VAM for teachers, where available, or SLTs where value-added data is not available. Figure 7 describes the process for determining who will be evaluated under the Compass system and can be used to determine which method will be used for a teacher’s student growth score. The table following the flowchart (Figure 8) lists the courses for 2012-13 where value-added data are and are not available.
Figure 7: Compass Evaluation Flowchart

**Do you teach one or more of the following courses?**
- 3rd grade ELA and/or Math
- 4th-8th grade ELA/Reading, Math, Science, and/or Social Studies
- Algebra 1
- Geometry

**YES**

**Do you meet the value-added criteria?**
- Teach at least 10 students who are enrolled in your class for the majority of the academic term.
- Students have at least one year of prior achievement data

**YES**

- Your impact on student growth will be measured by the Value-Added Model.

**NO**

**Do you provide direct instruction or instructional support to a specified group of students to whom you are formally assigned?**

**YES**

- Your impact on student growth will be measured by Student Learning Targets.

**NO**

- You will not receive a student growth

Figure 8: Value-Added Data Availability

**2012-13 COURSES IN WHICH VALUE-ADDED DATA ARE AVAILABLE**

- 3rd Grade English Language Arts and Mathematics
- 4th-8th Grade English Language Arts, Mathematics, Science and Social Studies
- 6th-9th Grade Algebra I and Geometry
- Special Education assignments in which the special educator instructs 10 or more eligible students* in the grade levels and content areas above.

**2012-13 AREAS IN WHICH VALUE-ADDED DATA ARE NOT AVAILABLE**

- Pre-Kindergarten
- Kindergarten, 1st Grade, 2nd Grade
- Grade 3 (subjects other than English Language Arts and Mathematics)
- Health and Physical Education
- Creative Arts (e.g., Visual Art, Music)
- High School Core Courses (other than 9th grade Algebra I and Geometry)
- World Languages
- Secondary Electives (e.g., Journalism)
- Career and Technical Education Courses
- Technology Courses
- Special Education Assignments in which the educator does not instruct 10 or more eligible students* in VAM grades/content areas
- Academic Interventionists
- Librarians
- Professional School Counselors

*Students are eligible to contribute to VAM scores if they are enrolled for the majority of the year, take the standard state assessment for their grade/content area, and are confirmed to be on the roster of the teacher(s) receiving the VAM score.

Teachers with value-added data available will still set student learning targets even though their official Student Growth score will be determined by the VAM. All teachers should set student learning targets as an
effective professional practice meant to advance students’ growth. In addition, the targets will provide a backup measure in case there are extenuating circumstances that prevent the calculation of a value-added score for a teacher who would have otherwise received one (e.g., assessment irregularities occur or a student population becomes smaller than ten students).

STUDENT LEARNING TARGETS (SLTS)

The Value of Setting Goals for Students

The SLT component of the Compass process is directly related to the Core Element of goal-setting. Setting meaningful goals for students is a critical instructional practice, as goals provide the motivation, focus, and accountability necessary to advance student achievement. The process of goal-setting also helps to promote teachers’ engagement with their content and consideration of their students’ needs.

Setting clear, measurable goals for students and holding teachers accountable to them is nothing new in education and is a sound practice that strong educators across the state already embrace. Therefore, the purpose of this section is not to strictly prescribe or reinvent goal-setting, but instead to:

• Provide a common framework and process for all educators to follow as they set goals for students and
• Explain how these goals will factor into teachers’ evaluations.

An Introduction to Student Learning Targets

The LDOE has created a goal-setting framework for teachers centered on SLTs. An SLT is a measureable goal for student achievement over a given period of time. SLTs may measure students’ growth in or mastery of particular content.

Each teacher will set a minimum of two SLTs per year, with the aim of providing a comprehensive and meaningful assessment of his or her impact on student learning that year. SLTs may be written to address an entire class or multiple classes of students; they may be written to address small groups or even individual students, depending upon teachers’ assignments and the needs of the students they serve.

While SLTs may look different across classrooms, schools, and LEAs, strong SLTs have a few key characteristics in common:

1. They prioritize content that is aligned to Common Core State Standards (CCSS) or other national, state, or local standards;
2. They articulate rigorous, but reasonable, expectations for student growth; and
3. They identify a high-quality assessment to measure student progress.
While SLTs must reflect a thorough investigation of content, a thoughtful consideration of students’ needs and a strong understanding of assessment in order to embody these three characteristics, they can be summarized with simple statements, describing what students will know and be able to do at the end of a course.

Figure 10: Excerpts from Compass Teachers’ SLTs

**Ms. Mason - 1st Grade Mathematics**
- At least 86% (18/22) of my students will grow 12 months or more on the Iowa Test of Basic Skills Math test from the fall to the spring assessment.

**Mr. Albert - Visual Arts**
- 65 out of 84 art students will demonstrate proficiency on four out of five principles of drawing, (lines, spaces and shapes, relationship, lighting and shading, and composition) in their final observational drawings, as measured by a district-created rubric. (Proficiency is defined by a score of at least 3 out of 4 on the rubric.)

**Ms. Zenobia - Algebra II**
- 70% of these Algebra II students will score 67% or better on the Algebra 2 – ACT Concepts (EAGLE) post-test.

**Mr. Davis - 6th Grade ELA**
- By the end of the year, 75% of my students will increase the average percent of questions they answer correctly on each of the ELA content standards assessed on the iLEAP by five percentage points.

**Ms. Boudreaux - Special Education**
- Four of the six students in the class will demonstrate growth in literacy skills (Early Emerging, Transitional Emerging, Early Conventional) as evidenced on a pre- and -post assessment via the Staugler Literacy Rubric.
At the beginning of the school year, teachers will draft at least two SLTs. Teachers are encouraged to collaborate with colleagues as they consider what would make ambitious, achievable goals for their students. Districts may provide additional guidance to teachers regarding assessments they should use in setting targets and/or the extent to which their targets should align with those of their colleagues in similar assignments. Teachers may also collaborate directly with evaluators and revise SLTs based on their feedback. In any case, teachers should gather baseline data on their students prior to finalizing their SLTs for the year, to ensure the targets they set are rigorous and reasonable for the particular group of students they will teach that year. Ultimately, in the early part of the school year, teachers and their evaluators will agree on at least two SLTs to serve as each teacher’s student growth measures for the year. Evaluators will assess SLTs to ensure they demonstrate each of the three characteristics of strong targets and will sign off on each SLT once they’ve determined it has met these standards.

Once SLTs are set, teachers and evaluators monitor and assess student progress towards those targets. If the student population a teacher serves shifts significantly during the course of the year or if a teacher’s assignment changes, SLTs may be updated mid-year, provided teacher and evaluator agree on the revised target, and the evaluator signs off on it. At the end of the year, teachers will present the evidence of their students’ progress to their evaluators. Evaluators will in turn assign a rating to each SLT, based on a scoring plan established with teachers in the setting of targets.

Figure 11: Student Learning Target Process*

*There may be scenarios where the timeline for this process varies if a teacher is assigned to a half-year course or is assigned to a class after the start of the school year.

Writing Strong Student Learning Targets

While SLTs will vary from teacher to teacher and course to course, all teachers can follow four basic steps to write strong SLTs.

Step 1: Define the Content

First, teachers should define the content that is most important for students to learn during their time with them. In making this determination, teachers should prioritize content aligned to the Common Core State Standards, wherever possible. They may also look to other national, state, or local standards in identifying the content that students should learn by the end of the course.
Step 2: Select the Assessment & Collect Baseline Data

Second, teachers should identify the most appropriate assessment to measure students’ progress in mastering the identified content. Teachers are encouraged to consult the LDOE Common Assessment List and select an assessment from this list for their grade and content area, if it is available to them. Teachers should also consult with their evaluators to determine whether or not the LEA has provided additional guidance regarding the assessments to be used in particular courses. If neither the LDOE nor the LEA has recommended an assessment for a particular course, then teachers and evaluators should agree on the most appropriate assessment, given the content being taught and the needs of the students being assessed. Like the SLT itself, identified assessments should be aligned to the relevant content standards and key concepts for the course, be rigorous and challenging for students, and provide clear, objective measures of success. The selection of such high-quality assessments presents another opportunity for teachers of similar assignments to collaborate at the school- or district-level to design common assessments.

Figure 12: Considerations in Selecting High-Quality Assessments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ALIGNMENT TO CONTENT STANDARDS &amp; KEY CONCEPTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Test items/tasks cover key subject/grade-level content standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Where applicable, test items/tasks cover knowledge and skills that will be of value beyond the year – either in the next level of the subject, in other academic disciplines, or in career/life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Where applicable, there are low- and high-end stretch items that cover pre-requisite objectives from prior years and objectives from the next year/course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• More complex and more important test items/tasks have more weight in the scoring process</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RIGOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Overall, the test items, tasks, rubrics are appropriately challenging for the grade-level/course and for the particular students being assessed (Assessments should be selected with students’ special needs in mind)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Many test items/tasks require critical thinking and problem solving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Multiple-choice questions are appropriately rigorous or complex (e.g. multistep)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Key content standards/concepts are assessed at greater depths of understanding and/or complexity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLEAR, OBJECTIVE MEASURE OF SUCCESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Test items/tasks are written clearly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Test items/tasks provide students multiple opportunities to demonstrate mastery/growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Tasks and open-ended questions have rubrics that articulate what students are expected to know/do and differentiate between levels of knowledge/mastery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Test administration is standardized across different classes/sections of students</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Once teachers know what they will be assessing students on and how, they should gather baseline data about where students are starting. This will help the teacher set optimal targets and effectively plan instruction. Baseline data may be gathered in a number of ways. They may come from a pre-test aligned to the final assessment, from a diagnostic exam designed to assess students’ readiness for new content, or from an analysis of data from the end of the previous course or year, if available. Teachers should determine with their evaluators the most appropriate method of gathering baseline data.

Step 3: Identify the Student Group

Before articulating a specific target, teachers should identify the students to whom the target will apply. SLTs may be set for entire classes of students or multiple sections of the same course, or they may be set for smaller groups of students, such as the lowest performing students a teacher serves. Teachers and evaluators
have the flexibility to determine which types of targets are the most meaningful measures of teachers’ work in a given year. It is recommended that teachers try to address the majority of their students across their two or more SLTs. If they teach multiple subjects, teachers should prioritize the academic content areas that are most aligned to the Common Core as they finalize their SLTs.

**Step 4: Set the Expectation for Growth & Aligned Scoring Plan**

Finally, teachers will set the expectation for student growth at each attainment level. This expectation should represent a goal that is ambitious – maybe a bit of a stretch for students – but still attainable.

Once the target itself has been set, teachers and evaluators should agree upon a scoring plan for the SLT, so the assignment of a rating at the end of the year is a transparent and well-defined process. Each SLT will be scored on a four-point scale, as shown below. To set the achievement ranges for each scoring level, teachers and evaluators should begin with the Full Attainment level (3), and establish range of student outcomes that begins with the target itself and extends approximately 10 to 15 percent above the targets. Next they should determine the range for the Exceptional Attainment level (4) as anything above the Full Attainment range. The Partial Attainment range should be about equal to that of the “Full Attainment” range, beginning approximately 10 to 15 percent below the target and extending to just below the target. The “Insufficient Attainment” range should be defined as any result below the “Partial Attainment” range. Examples of achievement ranges for the four Compass Teachers are included in Figure 13.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSUFFICIENT ATTAINMENT OF TARGET (1)</th>
<th>PARTIAL ATTAINMENT OF TARGET (2)</th>
<th>FULL ATTAINMENT OF TARGET (3)</th>
<th>EXCEPTIONAL ATTAINMENT OF TARGET (4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The teacher has demonstrated an insufficient impact on student learning by falling far short of the target, (by more than 10-15%).</td>
<td>The teacher has demonstrated some impact on student learning, but did not meet the target. (This may be a range 10-15% below the target.)</td>
<td>The teacher has demonstrated a considerable impact on student learning by meeting the target or exceeding it by a small amount (10-15%).</td>
<td>The teacher has demonstrated an outstanding impact on student learning by surpassing the target by a meaningful margin (more than 10-15%).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 13: SLT Rating Categories and Example Teachers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MS. MASON – 1ST GRADE MATHEMATICS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-59% (0-13) of my students grow at least 12 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-85% (13-17) of my students grow at least 12 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86-94% (18-20) of my students grow at least 12 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95-100% (21-22) of my students grow at least 12 months</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MR. ALBERT – VISUAL ARTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>54 students or fewer demonstrate proficiency on four out of five principles of drawing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64 students demonstrate proficiency on four out of five principles of drawing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-76 students demonstrate proficiency on four out of five principles of drawing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77-84 students demonstrate proficiency on four out of five principles of drawing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MS. ZENOBIA – ALGEBRA II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>53% or less of the students (at most 29) will score at least 67% on the Algebra 2 – ACT Concepts (EAGLE) post-test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54-69% of the students (30-38) will score at least 67% on the Algebra 2 – ACT Concepts (EAGLE) post-test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-84% of the students (39-47) will score at least 67% on the Algebra 2 – ACT Concepts (EAGLE) post-test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85% or more of the students (at least 48) will score at least 67% on the Algebra 2 – ACT Concepts (EAGLE) post-test</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MR. DAVIS – 6TH GRADE ELA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percentage Range</th>
<th>Increase by 5 Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 69% of students</td>
<td>increase their percent</td>
<td>by 5 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>increase their percent correct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69-74% of students</td>
<td>increase their percent</td>
<td>by 5 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>increase their percent correct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75-80% of students</td>
<td>increase their percent</td>
<td>by 5 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>increase their percent correct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 80% of students</td>
<td>increase their percent</td>
<td>by 5 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>increase their percent correct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MS. BOUDREAUX – SPECIAL EDUCATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fewer than 3 students meet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>their target</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 out of 6 students meet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>their target</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 out of 6 students meet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>their target</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 or 6 students meet their</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>target OR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 students meet their target,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and at least 2 exceed the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>target by at least 1 point</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scoring: Student Learning Targets

All teachers should set targets for students’ growth at the beginning of the year as a best practice. For many teachers, an assessment of students’ attainment of these targets will contribute 50 percent of their annual evaluation as part of the Compass system. For other teachers, data from Louisiana’s value-added model, rather than students’ attainment of targets, will contribute 50 percent of their Compass evaluation rating.

At the conclusion of the instructional interval specified in each SLT (typically the end of school year), evaluators will review student performance data to determine each SLT score. The score will be based on the scoring plan that was included in the SLT when it was written. The average of the teachers’ multiple SLTs will serve as their student growth score for the year.

Three of the example teachers will be using SLTs to determine their Student Growth score. While Mr. Davis set SLTs for his students at the beginning of the year, he receives VAM results and his student growth score will be based on those results.

Ms. Mason set three SLTs for her first grade class, including the SLT in Math described above (see Figures 10 and 13). At the end of the year, 16 out of Ms. Mason’s 22 students grew 12 months or more on the Iowa Test. Three grew at least 10 months, and two grew less than 10 months. In this SLT, Ms. Mason set a goal of 18 students achieving 12 months growth or more. She and her evaluator agreed that if 13 to 17 students met the goal, that would be categorized as Partial Attainment of the target and receive a score of 2. Since 16 students met the target, Ms. Mason received a score of 2 on this target. While the progress of her students met the Partial Attainment target on this SLT, their performance fell in the Insufficient Attainment range on an SLT she set for literacy and her SLT that targeted the lowest performing students in mathematics. Her final Student Growth score of 1.33 was the average of these three SLT scores (2, 1, and 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MS. MASON – 1ST GRADE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SLT 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLT 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLT 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mr. Albert set two SLTs for his Visual Arts students. One of the SLTs focused on all of the students in his courses. At the end of the year, 70 of Mr. Albert’s 84 students were able to demonstrate proficiency on four out of the five principles of drawing. In this SLT, Mr. Albert set a goal of 65 students demonstrating proficiency on four out of five principles of drawing, as measured by a district-created rubric. He and his evaluator agreed that if 65 to 76 students met this goal, that would be categorized as ‘Full Attainment’ and receive a score of 3. Since 70 of Mr. Albert’s students met this goal, he received a score of 3 on this target.
Mr. Albert set a second SLT that focused on the students in his course who initially scored the lowest on his rubric. For this group, Mr. Albert’s student growth fell at the Partial Attainment (2) level. His final Student Growth score was a 2.50.

Ms. Zenobia set two SLTs for her Algebra II students, including the one described above. At the end of the year, 89 percent of Ms. Zenobia’s students scored 67 percent or better on the Algebra II post-test. In this SLT, Ms. Zenobia set a goal of 70 percent of students scoring 67 percent or better on the Algebra II post-test, focused on concepts tested by the ACT. She and her evaluator agreed that if 85 percent of her students or more scored 67 percent or better on the post-test, that would be categorized as ‘Exceptional Attainment’ and would receive a score of 4. Since 89 percent of her students score 67 percent or higher, Ms. Zenobia received a score of 4 on this target. She also received a score of 4 on her other SLT, so her final Student Growth score was a 4.00.

Ms. Boudreaux set two SLTs for her students, including the one described above. At the end of the year, three out of Ms. Boudreaux’s six students met their individual goals for growth in fundamental literacy skills, as measured by the Staugler Literacy Rubric. Two students fell short of their goals, and another student exceeded her goal by two points. Ms. Boudreaux and her evaluator agreed that if at least four of her students met their targets, that would be considered ‘Full Attainment’ of the target, and she would receive a rating of a 3. Since four of her students met their targets (with one of the four significantly exceeding her target) and two of her students fell short of their targets, Ms. Boudreaux received a score of a 3 on this SLT. Ms. Boudreaux set a second SLT focused on one student in her class who is non-verbal and has the greatest challenges communicating. Her score was a 2 on that SLT. Her final Student Growth score was a 2.50.

**Educator Roles & Responsibilities in the SLT Process**

The process of crafting an SLT described above is intended to have the flexibility to incorporate the vast diversity of classrooms in the state and the guidance to support an iterative, collaborative process between
teacher and evaluator. It is not intended to require a principal to conduct several individual meetings with every teacher in his or her building. In order to increase the quality of SLTs and the efficiency of the process, LEAs are encouraged to, where possible; consider recommending particular assessments or growth measures for groups of teachers in the same grade or content area. Additionally, school and district leaders may convene groups of teachers to create SLTs collaboratively, rather than each working in isolation with their evaluator. Principals should leverage Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) and cluster or teaming meetings already in their schedules to support teachers in this work. Finally, principals need not be the only evaluators of SLTs on a campus. Other school leadership team members (e.g., assistant principals, deans, etc.) may be designated and certified as evaluators and aid in the process of setting SLTs.

A summary of key responsibilities for educators in the roles of teacher, evaluator, and LEA leader is provided below.

Figure 14: SLT Process Roles and Responsibilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher Role</th>
<th>Evaluator Role</th>
<th>LEA Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Consult with evaluator to determine local guidance</td>
<td>• Inform teachers of local guidance relative to SLTs and assessments</td>
<td>• Provide guidance to educators relative to:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Collaborate with colleagues to define ambitious, achievable SLTs</td>
<td>• Review SLTs and provide feedback, as needed, to ensure SLTs have three key characteristics*</td>
<td>• Recommended Assessments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Write at least two SLTs per year*</td>
<td>• Agree upon targets and scoring plan with teacher*</td>
<td>• Standardized SLTs for teachers with certain assignments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Agree upon targets and scoring plan with evaluator*</td>
<td>• Approve updated SLTs, if teacher assignments or their student population shifts significantly, and the SLTs have three key characteristics*</td>
<td>• Opportunities and/or structures for educator collaboration on SLTs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Monitor student progress</td>
<td>• Assess evidence of student progress</td>
<td>• Local timelines/deadlines for SLT process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Update SLTs, if needed*</td>
<td>• Rate each SLT according to its scoring plan*</td>
<td>• Parameters for revising SLTs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Collect and present evidence of student progress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Items marked with an asterisk (*) represent actions supported by the HCIS.

Additional Resources

A variety of LDOE-provided resources are available to help teachers and evaluators make SLTs a powerful tool to ensure students are meeting rigorous goals. Please see the Resources for Educators section to access them. The LDOE website will be continuously updated over the coming months to provide additional resources relating to SLTs.

Frequently Asked Questions: SLTs

Q: What do I do if there are no common assessments for my course?
A: Teachers of courses for which no common assessments have been identified by the LDOE or LEA should select or develop the most appropriate assessment for measuring students’ progress against their target, given students’ needs. In some cases, this may be an assessment created collaboratively with other teachers in similar assignments in the same school or district. For courses in which the final student assessment involves a performance task of some kind, (i.e., performing a piece of music, demonstrating proper form in tennis, delivering a monologue), the assessment may be a teacher-created rubric.

Q: How do I set SLTs as a teacher of students with special needs?

A: Teachers of students with special needs follow the same general steps to set SLTs, while taking into consideration the unique needs of their students when selecting priority content, determining rigor, and identifying an assessment. Teachers of students with special needs are encouraged to provide any relevant student background information that would help evaluators understand the rigor of the target set. Examples of SLTs addressing students with special needs are available on the LDOE website.

Q: How do teachers in alternative schools set SLTs?

A: Teachers in alternative settings often have transient student populations, which prevents them from being able to set a meaningful goal for a single group of students for the entire year. Teachers in such settings should work with their evaluators to determine appropriate targets, given the configuration of their classes and degree of turnover with their student population. These targets may set an expectation for growth with a particular group of students over a short period of time or articulate a general expectation for the progress the teacher expects to make with any individual student entering his/her class.

Q: What are my key responsibilities as an evaluator when it comes to SLTs?

A: Evaluators serve as thought partners to teachers as they work to set rigorous SLTs; they uphold a common standard for rigorous, meaningful goals; and they serve as objective evaluators of student progress in assigning ratings at the end of the year. While evaluators are ultimately responsible for assigning teachers’ SLT scores, they are encouraged to provide feedback to teachers and support them in the process of developing and monitoring the progress of their SLTs.

VALUE-ADDED MODEL (VAM)

While all teachers will set SLTs as part of establishing a vision for student achievement and measuring student success each year, some teachers will also have value-added data available to provide a measure of student growth. Their Student Growth scores will be based on the value-added data, not SLT attainment. To measure teachers’ impact on students’ growth, Louisiana’s VAM considers student-specific information to determine the typical growth for individual students. At the end of the year, the actual achievement for each student is compared to the “typical” growth to determine if a student has made more, less, or the typical amount of progress. The results for all students on a teacher’s roster are then combined for that teacher.

The value-added model considers the following factors when estimating a student’s typical score:

- Available prior achievement data (up to three years)
- Gifted status
- 504 status
- Attendance
- Disability status
- Free and reduced meal eligibility
- Limited English proficiency
- Prior discipline history
- Classroom composition variables
After accounting for the factors above, the student’s typical score is then subtracted from the actual score.

- A difference of zero indicates that the student performed exactly as would be typical.
- A positive difference indicates that the student made more growth than typical.
- A negative difference indicates that the student made less growth than typical (even though they may have shown growth).

This difference is attributed to the teacher as a measure of the value that teacher added to the student’s academic growth. As an example, the graph below shows the performance of two students over the previous two years, their typical score for the current year, and their actual score for the current year on a standardized assessment. Student A has consistently scored higher than Student B, but Student A had a lower amount of growth and Student B had a greater amount of growth. Student A would contribute negatively to a teacher’s value-added score and Student B would contribute positively.

Figure 15: Comparing Student Performance Over Three Years

To create a value-added score, the differences for all students in a teacher’s class are averaged, controlling for outlying differences. A final percentile, calculated using a weighted average, is obtained for each teacher. This final percentile allows for comparison of teacher performance across different content areas. The distribution graph below shows what the percentile scale looks like for value-added scores (labeled “Teacher Effect”). The teachers with the highest value-added scores (in blue) are in the 90-99th percentile of all teachers. The teachers with the lowest value-added scores (in red) are in the 1-10th percentiles.
Scoring: Value-added Model

Once a teacher’s value-added percentile score has been calculated, that score is converted to the 1.00 to 4.00 Compass scale and becomes the student growth measure that constitutes 50 percent of the final Compass rating.

In order for a student's assessment results to contribute to the value-added assessment of a particular teacher, the student must:

- Have been enrolled in that school from October 1 until two weeks before testing;
- Have a prior year of standardized test data;
- Take the regular state assessments (LEAP and iLEAP); and
- Be verified by the teacher on his/her roster.
Mr. Davis is the only one of our example teachers who received a value-added score for his students. Based on his students’ results, he received a value-added score of +2, placing him in the 56th percentile, and resulting in a Compass student growth score of 2.65.

Figure 18: Student Growth Score for Mr. Davis

All teachers must verify the accuracy of their student rosters and class schedules through the roster verification process on the Curriculum Verification and Results Reporting Portal (CVR) before these data are used in the value-added assessment. Teachers will have the opportunity to know exactly which students may be contributing to their results and correct data errors. Teachers are only allowed to view their own individual results and rosters. Principals are able to view the information for all teachers in their school, and superintendents may view the information for all teachers in their district. Act 54 protects the confidentiality of these results outside of the approved personnel described.

Value-added scores will be available by June 1 of each year starting in 2012-13. Scores will be released only to teachers, their supervisors, and designated individuals at the district and state levels with permission to view VAM score data. The value-added score reports can be found at https://leads13.doe.louisiana.gov/cvr. First time users must register and create their own login codes and passwords. The value-added reports are located under the “Teacher Results Report” tab. For registration assistance or more information on the value-added score reports, educators should consult the CVR webpage, or contact the LDOECVR help desk at LDOECVR@la.gov.

Frequently Asked Questions: Value-Added Model

Q: There were extraordinary circumstances in my class/school/district this year (e.g. we endured a hurricane and school was closed for two weeks right before testing). Whom do I contact to discuss how my evaluation results will be counted?

A: If your school was closed for a natural disaster, like a hurricane, your value-added scores may be invalidated at the discretion of the state. If there are other extenuating circumstances which you wish to appeal, you must contact your district who must appeal to the State Superintendent on teachers’ behalf in order to invalidate value-added data.

Q: How do I plan for the next academic year if I don’t get my value-added data back until June 1?

A: Although value-added data isn’t available until after the school year has ended, teachers will still be able to have conversations with their evaluators regarding professional practice and the progress towards meeting the non-binding student growth goals.

Q: I teach a small course with only four students. Will I be able to use VAM for my Student Growth score?

A: No. You must have at least 10 students in a course, in addition to meeting other requirements, to use VAM for your Student Growth score.

FINAL SCORES AND EFFECTIVENESS RATINGS

The Professional Practice and Student Growth components are averaged to obtain the final Compass score and effectiveness rating for a teacher. The final Compass score will range from 1.00 to 4.00, and there are
four effectiveness ratings for teachers: Highly Effective, Effective: Proficient, Effective: Emerging and Ineffective.

Calculating Final Scores

Each Compass component is worth 50 percent of the final score for a teacher. To calculate the final score, add the final scores from the Professional Practice and Student Growth (either VAM or SLTs) components and divide by two. (This calculation is done automatically within the HCIS.)

Figure 19: Calculating the Final Score

\[
\frac{\text{Professional Practice} + \text{Student Growth}}{2} = \text{Final Score}
\]

Figure 20: Component and Final Scores for Example Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEACHER</th>
<th>PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE</th>
<th>STUDENT GROWTH</th>
<th>FINAL SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MS. MASON</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR. ALBERT</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS. ZENOBIA</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR. DAVIS</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>2.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS. BOUDREAU</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teacher Effectiveness Rating

The final scores within each component will then be used to determine a teacher’s effectiveness rating for the year. See Figure 21 for the rules that pertain to each effectiveness rating.

Figure 21: Rules for Effectiveness Ratings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEACHER EFFECTIVENESS RATING</th>
<th>RULE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ineffective</td>
<td>Overall Compass score of 1.00 to 1.49 or Received a score less than 1.50 on either the Professional Practice or Student Growth components</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective: Emerging</td>
<td>Overall Compass score of 1.50 to 2.49 and Did not receive a score less than 1.50 on either the Professional Practice or Student Growth components</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective: Proficient</td>
<td>Overall Compass score of 2.50 to 3.49 and Did not receive a score less than 1.50 on either the Professional Practice or Student Growth components</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highly Effective</td>
<td>Overall Compass score of 3.50 to 4.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Continuos Improvement

In addition to providing teachers with end-of-year ratings of their performance, the Compass evaluation system shows teachers where they are effective in addition to where they can improve their professional skills. It will also show LEAs where they need to specifically support teachers in their professional growth so that they can plan and provide appropriate professional development opportunities.

Professional Development

LEAs are to provide individualized professional development opportunities to teachers, based on the results of the evaluation process.

Using the HCIS, a free, web-based performance management system provided by the LDOE, will also make planning for professional development more efficient and effective. School and LEA leaders will be able to quickly pull reports on student and teacher performance trends across their school or LEA and determine where to target professional development.

Professional Growth Plans

Professional growth and development have long been a focus of educators. The Compass system doesn't change the process of creating professional growth plans, which help teachers identify their professional development goals, though those plans should now be informed by the teacher and student data available to educators and evaluators through Compass. At the beginning of each academic year, teachers will develop a professional growth plan designed to enhance their skills and performance. The professional growth plan should take into account the teacher's performance from the previous year, areas where there is need for improvement, and how the teacher will achieve goals for student growth and become a more effective teacher, regardless of where they are in their career. More specifically, the plan should include goal(s), objective(s), action plans, timelines, opportunities for reflection, and evaluation criteria.

Evaluators should consult a teacher's professional growth plan throughout the year and as part of informal and formal observations to see if the teacher is on track with their action plan or if adjustments need to be made mid-year. Professional Growth Plans can be documented and edited in the HCIS.

Self-Assessment

Self-Assessment is not a required component of Compass, however, it is a practice that can greatly enhance the professional development process for teachers and one which will be supported by the HCIS.
function allows teachers to rate themselves on the components of the Compass Teacher Rubric and provide comments to explain their ratings. These reflections can help to drive more meaningful conversations between teacher and evaluator, and enhance plans for professional growth.

### Intensive Assistance Plans

Teachers who receive an **Ineffective** final rating or are performing at a level that is deemed **Ineffective** will develop an intensive assistance plan with their evaluator within 30 days of receiving the rating. Please keep in mind that a teacher who receives an **Ineffective** rating on any component of Compass will receive an **Ineffective** final rating even if the teacher’s final Compass score is 1.50 or greater.

The purpose of the intensive assistance plan is to provide clear and detailed steps for a teacher to improve performance, and to identify assistance and resources for the teacher to utilize. The plan should be taken seriously as failure to adhere to it also requires that the school district begin termination proceedings within six months after a formal re-evaluation of performance is completed.

While successful completion of an intensive assistance plan will not guarantee a higher final rating once re-evaluation is complete, the plan should provide meaningful steps and actions for a teacher to take to work toward a higher rating.

### Figure 23: Requirements for the Intensive Assistance Plan

- An explanation of what the teacher needs to do to strengthen performance including a statement of the objective(s) to be accomplished and the expected level(s) of performance according to the Professional Practice and Student Growth components.
- A description of the assistance, support and/or resources to be provided or obtained by the school district and/or the school administrator.
- The start and end dates for the plan.
- The length of the plan shall be no longer than one calendar year.
- The evaluator’s and teacher’s signatures and date lines.
- The timeline for achieving the objective(s) and the procedures for monitoring the teacher’s progress.
- An explanation of how multiple opportunities for support and feedback on performance will be provided to the teacher.

### Data-Driven Decision Making

In order to support data-driven decision making on the part of teachers, school administrators, and LEA leaders, the LDOE is providing the HCIS, a free, web-based performance management platform to all LEAs. LEAs that adopt the Compass Teacher Rubric will be able to complete all components of Compass in the HCIS. This means that professional growth plans, observations, student learning targets, and final evaluation scores can all be entered into and completed in HCIS. LEAs that do not use rubrics provided by the state will need to import data for the Professional Practice and/or Student Growth scores. Final evaluation scores for all educators must be entered into HCIS each year by the July 15 deadline.

This integrated data system for Compass will make data management more efficient and transparent for teachers and evaluators while still providing local autonomy for LEAs to determine their own timelines and processes for successful implementation.

Here are just a few ways that use of the HCIS could enhance data-driven decision making in schools and LEAs:

1) Use the teacher evaluation results to more accurately identify what types of professional development are needed.
2) Examine detailed reports and data on teacher performance to determine if evaluator ratings are consistent with student performance.

3) Assess the consistency of evaluator approvals of SLTs across a grade level, content-area, school, or LEA.

Impact on Employment Status

The Compass evaluation system takes Ineffective performance seriously in that two final Ineffective ratings in a row will require LEAs to initiate dismissal proceedings for a teacher within six months of the second Ineffective rating. Because of these real implications for careers, teachers who have a final effectiveness rating of Ineffective or demonstrate Ineffective performance as determined by their evaluators before a final rating is available will need to develop an intensive assistance plan with their evaluators. Please see the Intensive assistance plans section for more details.

How to Handle Disagreements with Final Ratings

Teachers must receive a copy of their evaluation results within 15 days after the final rating is determined and are entitled to any evaluation-related documentation. Teachers may provide a written response to the evaluation which will become a permanent part of their personnel file as well as request a meeting with their evaluator after the final evaluation and before the end of the academic year. If a conflict with their evaluator is not resolved, teachers may grieve to the superintendent. Any evaluation results and related documentation are confidential and not part of the public record.
GLOSSARY OF KEY TERMS

Charlotte Danielson’s Framework for Effective Teaching: The broader teacher rubric from which the five components for the Compass Teacher Rubric were adopted.

Compass Teacher Rubric: The five components from Charlotte Danielson’s Framework for Effective Teaching, defined by effectiveness rating, which will be used to evaluate the professional practice of teachers.

Curriculum Verification and Results Reporting Portal (CVR): Online portal to edit teacher rosters, view verified and submitted data, and view value-added score reports. Access to data is dependent upon your assigned user group.

Effective: Proficient teacher: An Effective: Proficient teacher consistently meets expectations.

Effective: Emerging teacher: An Effective: Emerging teacher only partially meets expectations but may show potential for improvement.

Formal observation: One of two observations that counts toward the Professional Practice score. Must be announced and last the entirety of the lesson being taught by the teacher. Must be preceded with a pre-observation conference and concluded with a post-observation conference. A teacher should receive feedback, including areas for commendation and improvement.

Highly Effective teacher: A Highly Effective teacher consistently and considerably surpasses expectations.

Human Capital Information System (HCIS): Online portal for reporting and tracking all components of the Compass system. LEAs that utilize State-model Compass rubrics can use it for all components. LEAs that do not use State-model Compass rubrics can import data into the system and use it to track student learning target information.

Ineffective teacher: An Ineffective teacher consistently performs below expectations. Ineffective teachers must complete an Intensive Assistance Plan and demonstrate improvement within a year or be subject to separation from the LEA.

Informal observation: One of two observations that counts toward the Professional Practice score. Does not need to be announced or have pre- or post-observation conferences. A teacher should receive feedback, including areas for commendation and improvement.

Intensive assistance plan: A plan that is created after a teacher demonstrates Ineffective performance as determined by their evaluator or Compass scores. The plan provides a plan of action to assist the teacher in improving performance and identifies resources for the teacher to utilize.

Professional growth plan: A plan that all teachers set every fall as a way to guide professional improvement through goal-setting and strengthening areas of weakness.

Student learning target: One of two required goals to be set by teachers without value-added data. The student learning targets set goals for student academic growth and are used to determine the Student Growth component score.

Typical score: The score a student would be expected to make on a standardized assessment, based on individual factors, which is in keeping with average academic performance.

Value-added model: Incorporates students’ information with their test scores to determine the average student growth for children with similar histories. The actual achievement for each student is compared to the average achievement of similar students to determine if a student has made more, less, or a “typical” amount of progress, and the results for all students in a teacher’s assignment are then combined for that teacher.
RESOURCES FOR EDUCATORS

To share feedback, questions, or concerns with the LDOE about any part of Compass, please email compass@la.gov.

Professional Practice
Observation Forms: http://www.louisianaschools.net/compass/compass_quick_links.html
Professional Growth Plan: http://www.louisianaschools.net/compass/compass_quick_links.html

Value-Added Model (VAM)
Curriculum Verification and Results Reporting Portal (CVR): https://leads13.doe.louisiana.gov/cvr/
VAM Webpage: http://www.louisianaschools.net/compass/sgm_testedgrades.html

Student Learning Targets (SLTs)
Student Learning Target Samples: http://www.louisianaschools.net/compass/student_learning_goals.html

General Information
Act 54: http://www.legis.state.la.us/billdata/streamdocument.asp?did=711248
Compass Resources: http://www.louisianaschools.net/compass