

Educator Effectiveness Updates



Oregon Department of Education

Summing it All Up: The Oregon Matrix



The Oregon Matrix

- Share your expertise
- Equity of voice
- Active listening
- Respect the current speaker – no side conversations
- Safety to share different opinions and perspectives
- Respectful use of technology

Group Norms

ESEA Waiver Update

October 19, 2014

- Approval received for SY2014-15 from USDOE on October 9, 2014
- The Oregon Matrix is required for teacher & administrator summative evaluations in 2014-15
- Do not have to use state assessments for student learning and growth (SLG) in 2014-15
 - Must set 2 SLG goals using Category 2 assessments

Oregon Matrix is the summative component of the district's evaluation cycle



OREGON FRAMEWORK 5 Required Elements:

1. Standards of Professional Practice
2. 4-Level Rubric
3. Multiple Measures:
 - Professional Practice
 - Professional Responsibilities
 - Student Learning & Growth
4. Professional Growth Cycle
5. Aligned Professional Learning

Framework Required Elements

▶ Educator Evaluation

Measures are ways/tools to gather evidence in our evaluation and professional growth systems

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Standards of Professional Practice	Differentiated Performance Levels <i>(4 levels)</i>	Multiple Measures	Evaluation and Professional Growth Cycle	Aligned Professional Learning

STANDARDS OF PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE

Teachers

Model Core Teaching Standards (INTASC)

- Four Domains/10 Standards:
 1. The Learner and Learning
 2. Content
 3. Instructional Practice
 4. Professional Responsibility

Administrators

Educational Leadership/ Administrator Standards (ISLLC)

- Six Domains:
 1. Visionary Leadership
 2. Instructional Improvement
 3. Effective Management
 4. Inclusive Practice
 5. Ethical Leadership
 6. Socio-Political Context

⇒ **Impact on Student Learning and Growth**

Multiple Measures

Oregon teacher & administrator evaluations must include measures from three categories of evidence:

(A) Professional Practice

Aligned to the standards of professional practice

(C) Student Learning and Growth

(B) Professional Responsibilities



The Oregon Matrix

Oregon Matrix

Key Features

- Is the summative “wrap-up” at the end of the evaluation cycle
- Focus remains on professional growth
- For reporting purposes only

Y-Axis: PP / PR	LEVEL 4	Collegial <i>*SLG Inquiry</i> 3	Facilitative or Collegial <i>* SLG Inquiry</i> 3 or 4	Facilitative 4	Facilitative 4
	LEVEL 3	Collegial or Consulting <i>*SLG Inquiry</i> 2 or 3	Collegial 3	Collegial 3	Collegial 3
	LEVEL 2	Consulting 2	Consulting 2	Consulting 2	Collegial or Consulting <i>* PP/PR Inquiry</i> 2 or 3
	LEVEL 1	Directed 1	Directed 1	Consulting or Directed <i>* PP/PR Inquiry</i> 1 or 2	Consulting <i>* PP/PR Inquiry</i> 2
<i>*Inquiry Process</i>	LEVEL 1	LEVEL 2	LEVEL 3	LEVEL 4	
X-Axis: SLG					

Professional Growth Plans

Blue, Green, Yellow & Red boxes

- Just a fancy term for the professional growth goal(s) all educators already set as a part of the evaluation system
- The plans determine who leads in the setting of the professional goals
- Professional Growth Plans, simplified...
 - Facilitative = Educator led
 - Collegial = “50-50”, Educator/Evaluator
 - Consulting = “55-45”, Evaluator/Educator
 - Directed = Evaluator led

Inquiry Process

Gray boxes

- In place where the two axes do not tell the same story
- Must gather more evidence prior to a determination of plan and/or summative performance level
- Inquiry happens collaboratively
- Educator can also provide additional evidence

Y-Axis

Key Features

- Add up all component scores for total points possible;
- Divide by number of components (based on rubric);
- Get a rating between 1 and 4;
- Use the following thresholds to determine PP/PR level:
 - $3.6 - 4.0 = 4$
 - $2.81 - 3.59 = 3$
 - $1.99 - 2.8 = 2$ *
 - $< 1.99 = 1$

***PP/PR Scoring Rule:** If the educator scores two 1's in any PP/PR component and his/her average score falls between 1.99-2.499, the educator's performance level cannot be rated above a 1.

The Y-axis: Rating on Professional Practice & Professional Responsibilities (PP/PR)

Example: Danielson has a total of 22 components

I. Planning and Preparation		II. Classroom Environment		III. Instruction		IV. Professional Responsibilities	
1.	1a. Knowledge of Content and Pedagogy	7.	2a. Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport	12.	3a. Communicating with Students	17.	4a. Reflecting on Teaching
2.	1b. Demonstrating Knowledge of Students	8.	2b. Establish a Culture for Learning	13.	3b. Questioning and Discussion Techniques	18.	4b. Maintaining Accurate Records
3.	1c. Setting Instructional Outcomes	9.	2c. Managing Classroom Procedures	14.	3c. Engaging Students in Learning	19.	4c. Communicating with Families
4.	1d. Demonstrating Knowledge of Resources	10.	2d. Managing Student Behavior	15.	3d. Using Assessment in Instruction	20.	4d. Participating in a Professional Community
5.	1e. Designing Coherent Instruction	11.	2e. Organizing Physical Space	16.	3e. Demonstrating Flexibility and Responsiveness	21.	4e. Growing and Developing Professionally
6.	1f. Designing Student Assessments					22.	4f. Showing Professionalism

Where are you on the Y-axis if....?

Example: 29 Component-level Indicators

➤ 24 indicators = 3; & 5 = 2

BOX it

➤ All 29 indicators = 3

STAR it

➤ 11 indicators = 3; & 18 = 4
it

CIRCLE

➤ 12 indicators = 3; & 12 indicators = 2; &
5 indicators = 1

HEART it

Y-Axis: PP / PR

LEVEL 4	Collegial <i>*SLG Inquiry</i> 3	Facilitative or Collegial <i>* SLG Inquiry</i> 3 or 4	Facilitative 4	Facilitative 4
LEVEL 3	Collegial or Consulting <i>*SLG Inquiry</i> 2 or 3	Collegial 3	Collegial 3	Collegial 3
LEVEL 2	Consulting 2	Consulting 2	Consulting 2	Collegial or Consulting <i>* PP/PR Inquiry</i> 2 or 3
LEVEL 1	Directed 1	Directed 1	Consulting or Directed <i>* PP/PR Inquiry</i> 1 or 2	Consulting <i>* PP/PR Inquiry</i> 2
<i>*Inquiry Process</i>	LEVEL 1	LEVEL 2	LEVEL 3	LEVEL 4

X-Axis: SLG

X-Axis

Key Features

- Checklist for goal approval in collaborative setting process
- Choose 2 of 4 goals
 - 1 goal must be Cat. 1 goal if ELA/Math grades 3-8 & 11
 - Smarter Balance goals moratorium 2014-15
- Score using state rubric
- Thresholds for x-axis:
 - 4 = both goals 4s
 - 3 = both goals 3s; one goal 3 & one 4; one goal 2 & one 4
 - 2 = both goals 2s; one goal 2 & one 3; one goal 1 and one 3; one goal 4 and one 1
 - 1 = both goals 1s; one goal 1 and one 2

Where are you on the X-axis if....?

➤ Both goals = 2

BOX it

➤ One goal = 2; & one goal = 4

STAR it

➤ One goal = 2; & one goal = 3

CIRCLE it

➤ One goal = 3; & one goal = 4

HEART it

Resulting in....

- Everyone has a Professional Growth Plan (Professional Goals)
- Differentiated based on performance
- Inquiry process where Y-axis and X-axis do not say the same thing
- Final summative performance level ***for reporting purposes only***

Y-Axis: PP / PR	LEVEL 4	Collegial <i>*SLG Inquiry</i> 3	Facilitative or Collegial <i>* SLG Inquiry</i> 3 or 4	Facilitative	Facilitative 4
	LEVEL 3	Collegial or Consulting <i>*SLG Inquiry</i> 2 or 3	Collegial 3	Collegial 3	Collegial 3
	LEVEL 2	Consulting 2	Consulting 2	Consulting 2	Collegial or Consulting <i>* PP/PR Inquiry</i> 2 or 3
	LEVEL 1	Directed 1	Directed 1	Consulting or Directed <i>* PP/PR Inquiry</i> 1 or 2	Consulting <i>* PP/PR Inquiry</i> 2
<i>*Inquiry Process</i>	LEVEL 1	LEVEL 2	LEVEL 3	LEVEL 4	
		X-Axis: SLG			

Local Collaborative Teams Can Customize...

- The performance level labels
- The Professional Growth Plan's (PGP) names
- Additional details on what each PGP looks like
- What "SLG focus" PGP looks like
- Additional inquiry process ideas
- Other systemic differentiated supports, such as:
 - Observations
 - Frequency of check-ins/meetings with evaluators
 - Self-reflection practices

Regional Peer Review Panels (PRP)

Peer Review Panel: Background

- As a requirement of the ESEA waiver, ODE must establish a process to ensure that all districts implement a comprehensive, high-quality evaluation and support system consistent with state guidelines.
- What purpose do the Peer Review Panels serve?
 - Feedback on each school district's evaluation system
 - Identify supports tailored to each school district's needs
 - Identify best practices

Professional Growth & Continuous Improvement

Peer Review Panel

Support

Accountability

Feedback
to
Districts

Identify Needs
Technical
Assistance
Professional
Learning

Continuous
Improvement of
System
Inform State Policy

Peer Review Panel: Process

- The Peer Review process is intentionally designed to be a collaborative conversation between colleagues within a region
- Through process of districts examining each others' systems, regional colleagues can strengthen their processes by sharing best practices

Peer Review Panel: Process

- Districts complete self-appraisal and two-page summary outlining strengths and gaps
- Submit to ESD Coordinator 2 weeks prior to PRP
- District representatives (2-3) meet with PRP for one-hour conversation
 - District and PRP discuss strengths and gaps & determine next steps
- PRP lead provides summary to ODE
- District upload PRP summary/next steps in Indistar

Peer Review Panel: Process

- Support to Districts
 - ODE will identify district needs and design professional learning and technical assistance
 - ODE will disseminate promising practices
- Accountability
 - Requirement of Waiver and OAR 581-018-0315
 - ODE will monitor the PRP process in each region
 - ODE will follow up with districts in need of support to ensure gaps are addressed

Peer Review Panel: Criteria

Criteria for Panel Member Selection:

- Demonstrated understanding of the new evaluation system through participation on the districts' evaluation design team
- Demonstrated understanding of Student Learning and Growth (SLG) goals having written or approved SLG goals
- Completed Inter-rater Reliability training (administrators)
- Knowledgeable about CCSS instruction and alignment with evaluation systems

*Districts submit 2-3 names of individuals who meet the criteria; not required but encouraged as professional growth opportunity

Peer Review Panel: Self-Appraisal Tool

- The criteria and indicators in the Self-Appraisal Tool describe a high-quality, comprehensive evaluation and support system fully implemented. District teams will use the indicators and guiding questions in the tool to critically review and determine the current level of implementation and quality of their evaluation system

INDICATOR	☐ Insufficient	☐ Progressing	☐ Sufficient	Evidence
<p>T2.4 The district has a process in place to determine an educator's summative evaluation rating based on the Oregon Matrix Model for Educator Summative Evaluations which includes: professional practice and professional responsibilities ; and student learning and growth as a significant factor.</p>	<p>There is little or no evidence that the combination of evaluation from these three areas is used to determine the administrator's summative rating aligned to the Oregon Matrix.</p>	<p>The district is developing their summative model which combines evaluations from these three areas to determine the administrator's summative rating aligned to the Oregon Matrix requirements.</p>	<p>The combination of evaluation from these three areas is used to determine the administrator teacher's summative rating aligned to the Oregon Matrix requirements.</p>	

Guiding Questions 2.4:

- **What is the district's plan to incorporate the Oregon Matrix summative model into their evaluation system?**

Support Materials

- ODE Educator Effectiveness webpage
<http://www.ode.state.or.us/search/page/?id=3478>
- *Main page*
- *Toolkit*
- *PRP Materials*

- Where does goal setting originate?
- What is the role of SLG goals in overall evaluation?
- Who has to set SLG goals?
- Who are SLG goals set for?
- What kinds of Assessments can be used?
- What is the scope of SLG goals?
- What is the difference between Achievement and Growth?

Clarifications

- Rationale added to the template
- Category 3 removed
- State checklist and scoring rubric

Revisions to SLG Goal Guidance

- Targeted goals rather than school wide
- All goals must be focused on academic growth

**Revisions Specific to
Administrators**

- **Mentoring Definition**

- (7) "Mentorship program" means a program provided by a mentor to a beginning teacher or administrator that includes, but is not limited to, direct classroom observation and consultation; assistance in instructional planning and preparation; support in implementation and delivery of classroom instruction; development of school leadership skills and other assistance intended to assist the beginning teacher or administrator to become a confident and competent professional educator who makes a positive impact on student learning.

Oregon Mentoring Program

- Oregon Mentoring Program Standards were adopted by the State Board of Education in August of 2014.
 - 581-018-0133 Mentoring Program Standards

Mentoring Program Standards

Contact Information

- Theresa Richards, Director of Educator Effectiveness
E: theresa.richards@state.or.us
- Tanya Frisendahl, Education Specialist
E: tanya.frisendahl@state.or.us
- Sarah Martin, Education Specialist
E: sarah.martin@state.or.us
- Sarah Phillips, Education Specialist
E: sarah.phillips@state.or.us
- Brian Putnam, Education Specialist
E: brian.putnam@state.or.us