

Introducing Oregon's Matrix Model for Educator Summative Evaluations

Oregon's Requirements for Teacher and Administrator Evaluation and Support Systems

Teacher and administrator evaluation and support systems in all Oregon school districts must include the following five elements described in the *Oregon Framework for Teacher and Administrator Evaluation and Support Systems*:



These five required elements defined below establish the parameters for local evaluation and support systems. The Oregon Framework describes the state criteria for each of these elements. Districts must align their systems to these elements but have local flexibility in their design and implementation. Local systems must meet or exceed the state criteria for evaluation and support systems.

1. **Standards of Professional Practice.** The state adopted Model Core Teaching Standards and Educational Leadership/Administrator Standards define what teachers and administrators should know and be able to do to ensure that every student is ready for college, careers, and engaged citizenship in today's world.
2. **Differentiated (4) Performance Levels.** Districts select a rubric to evaluate teacher and administrator performance on the standards of professional practice measured on four performance levels. Each level is defined as follows: Level 1=does not meet standards; Level 2 = progress toward meeting standards; Level 3=meets standards; Level 4=exceeds standards.
3. **Multiple Measures.** Multiple sources of data are used to measure teacher and administrator performance on the Standards of Professional Practice, including evidence from: professional practice, professional responsibilities, and student learning and growth.
4. **Evaluation and Professional Growth Cycle.** Teachers and administrators are evaluated on a regular cycle of continuous improvement which includes self-reflection, goal setting, observations, formative assessment, and summative evaluation. The **Oregon Matrix Model** is used for the summative evaluation. The matrix model combines measures for professional practice (PP) and professional responsibilities (PR) and student learning and growth (SLG). The Y-axis represents the performance level for PP/PR, and the X-axis represents the performance level for SLG. The educator's Professional Growth Plan and overall summative performance level are determined by the intersection of the Y- and X-axes.
5. **Aligned Professional Learning.** Relevant professional learning opportunities to improve professional practice and impact on student learning are aligned to the teacher's or administrator's evaluation and his/her need for professional growth.

The Oregon Matrix for Summative Evaluations for Teachers and Administrators

In the Oregon Matrix, Professional Practice (PP) and Professional Responsibilities (PR) intersects with Student Learning and Growth (SLG) culminating in a Professional Growth Plan and summative performance level. When there is a discrepancy between the PP/PR level and SLG level, further inquiry is triggered to explore and understand the reasons for the discrepancy.

Y-AXIS: Combined Rating on Professional Practice and Professional Responsibilities (PP/PR)	LEVEL 4 (Highest)	COLLEGIAL PLAN With focus on SLG Goals *SLG INQUIRY due to LOW level of fidelity between measures 3	FACILITATIVE or COLLEGIAL PLAN With focus on SLG Goals Determined post inquiry *SLG INQUIRY due to only SOME level of fidelity between measures 3 or 4	FACILITATIVE PLAN Educator leads development of Professional Growth Plan GOOD level of fidelity between measures 4	FACILITATIVE PLAN Educator leads development of Professional Growth Plan HIGHEST level of fidelity between measures 4
	LEVEL 3	COLLEGIAL or CONSULTING PLAN With focus on SLG Goals Determined post inquiry *SLG INQUIRY due to SOME level of fidelity between measures 2 or 3	COLLEGIAL PLAN With focus on SLG Goals GOOD level of fidelity between measures 3	COLLEGIAL PLAN Educator and evaluator collaboratively develop Professional Growth Plan HIGHEST level of fidelity between measures 3	COLLEGIAL PLAN Educator and evaluator collaboratively develop Professional Growth Plan GOOD level of fidelity between measures 3
	LEVEL 2	CONSULTING PLAN With focus on SLG Goals Evaluator consults with the educator and guides development of Professional Growth Plan GOOD level of fidelity between measures 2	CONSULTING PLAN With focus on SLG Goals Evaluator consults with the educator and guides development of Professional Growth Plan HIGHEST level of fidelity between measures 2	CONSULTING PLAN Evaluator consults with the educator and guides development of Professional Growth Plan GOOD level of fidelity between measures 2	COLLEGIAL or CONSULTING PLAN Determined post inquiry *PP/PR INQUIRY due to only SOME level of fidelity between measures 2 or 3
	LEVEL 1 (Lowest)	DIRECTED PLAN With focus on SLG Goals Evaluator determines Professional Growth Plan HIGHEST level of fidelity between measures 1	DIRECTED PLAN With focus on SLG Goals Evaluator determines Professional Growth Plan GOOD level of fidelity between measures 1	CONSULTING or DIRECTED PLAN Determined post inquiry *PP/PR INQUIRY due to only some level of fidelity between measures 1 or 2	CONSULTING PLAN Evaluator consults with the educator and guides development of Professional Growth Plan *PP/PR INQUIRY due to only LOW level of fidelity between measures 2
		LEVEL 1 (Lowest)	LEVEL 2	LEVEL 3	LEVEL 4 (Highest)
X-AXIS: Rating on Student Learning and Growth					

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