Student Learning Objectives (SLO) Process Rubric

ANALYSIS OF STUDENT PERFORMANCE DATA (STAGE 1)			
Distinguished (4)	Proficient (3)	Basic (2)	Unsatisfactory (1)
Multiple forms of student performance data were analyzed via data analysis teams. Performance data was directly connected to an Academic Standard(s) and district curriculum.	Multiple forms of student performance were analyzed. Performance data directly connected to an Academic Standard and Assessment Anchor.	At least one form of student performance data was analyzed. Performance data was loosely connected to an Academic Standard and Assessment Anchor.	The use of student performance data for analysis was unclear or non-existent. Performance data was not linked to an Academic Standard or Assessment Anchor.

IDENTIFICATION OF INSTRUCTIONAL NEED & IDENTIFICATION OF TARGET POPULATION (STAGE 1)			
Distinguished (4)	Proficient (3)	Basic (2)	Unsatisfactory (1)
Identification of instructional need was directly connected to the analysis of multiple forms of student performance data and collaboration with one's peers. A direct connection between student performance data, Academic Standard, an Assessment Anchor and its Eligible Content existed. Background information was researched for the subgroup of students selected (e.g., I.E.P.; ELL, etc.) and a rationale for the subgroup of students was clear.	Identification of instructional need was directly connected to multiple forms of student performance data, an Academic Standard, an Assessment Anchor and its Eligible Content. Background information related to the subgroup was reviewed and the rationale for selecting the subgroup of students was clear.	Identification of instructional need was loosely connected to performance data, an Academic Standard, an Assessment Anchor and its Eligible Content. Background information related to the target population was reviewed; however, the rationale for selecting the target population was unclear.	No/unclear connection between the analysis of student performance data and the identification of instructional need was illustrated. Link to Academic Standard, an Assessment Anchor or its Eligible Content was unclear. No rationale existed for selecting the subgroup of students.

ACHIEVEMENT GOAL (STAGE 1)			
Distinguished (4)	Proficient (3)	Basic (2)	Unsatisfactory (1)
The Achievement Goal was directly connected to the identified instructional need(s), Academic Standard(s), Assessment Anchor and its eligible content for the subgroup of students selected. The Achievement Goal took into consideration needs specific to this subgroup selected (e.g., process monitoring, specifically designed instruction, etc.) The Achievement goal was highly appropriate for the subgroup of students selected.	The Achievement Goal was directly connected to the identified instructional need, Academic Standard, Assessment Anchor and its Eligible Content for a specific subgroup of students. The Achievement Goal was reasonable for the subgroup of students selected.	The Achievement Goal was loosely connected to the identified instructional need, Academic Standard, Assessment Anchor and its Eligible Content for a specific set of students. The Achievement Goal was somewhat reasonable for the subgroup of students selected.	The Achievement Goal was not connected to the identified instructional need, Academic Standard, Assessment Anchor, or its Eligible Content. The achievement goal was unreasonable for the subgroup of students selected.

DEVELOPMENT OF PRE- AND POST-ASSESSMENT AND INSTRUCTIONAL PLAN (STAGE 2)			
Distinguished (4)	Proficient (3)	Basic (2)	Unsatisfactory (1)
Pre- and post-assessment directly aligned to content standard(s) identified for the target population. Pre- and post-assessments were carefully designed for the target population and meaningful data can be generated to inform future instructional decisions using the pre- and post-assessments. The instructional plan consisted of a complete unit that contained a clear beginning and ending date. Instructional outcome was clearly identified and directly connected to the identified instructional need(s), Academic Standard(s), Assessment Anchors(s), and Eligible Content. Instructional plan was based on research-based instructional methodology. A sound rational for the selection of the instructional methodology selected was included. The instructional plan took into consideration needs specific to the subgroup of students selected (e.g., I.E.P.; ELL, etc.). Multiple forms of follow-up student performance data were analyzed to determine the effectiveness of the instructional plan.	Pre- and post-assessment aligned to the instructional standard identified for analysis. The pre- and post-assessments were appropriate for the target population and sufficiently designed to attain measurable data. Instructional plan consisted of a series of lessons that contained a clear beginning and ending date. Instructional outcome was clearly identified and connected to the identified instructional need, Academic Standard, Assessment Anchor and its Eligible Content. Instructional plan was based on the "best practice" or research-based instructional methodology and a sound rationale was provided for instructional methodology Multiple forms of follow-up student performance data were analyzed to determine the effectiveness of the instructional plan.	The pre- and post-assessment were somewhat aligned to the instructional standard identified for analysis. The pre- and post-assessments were somewhat appropriate for the target population and designed to attain measurable data. Instructional plan did not contain a series of lessons or a clear beginning and ending date. Instructional outcome was loosely connected to the identified instructional need, Academic Standard, Assessment Anchor and its Eligible Content. Instructional plan was based on the "best practice" or research-based instructional methodology. A rationale for instructional methodology was included but unclear. At least one form of follow-up student performance data was analyzed to determine the effectiveness of the instructional plan.	The pre- and post-assessment were not aligned to the instructional standard identified for analysis. The pre- and post-assessments were not appropriate for the target population and were not designed to elicit measurable data. Instructional plan did not consist of a series of lessons and did not contain a clear beginning and ending date. Instructional outcome was not connected to the identified instructional need, Academic Standard, Assessment Anchor or its Eligible Content. Instructional plan was unclear and was not based on "best practice" or research-based instructional methodology. No rationale was provided for the instructional methodology selected. No follow-up student performance data was analyzed to determine the effectiveness of the instructional plan.

REFLECTION (STAGE 3)			
Distinguished (4)	Proficient (3)	Basic (2)	Unsatisfactory (1)
The reflection related to the SLO process was in-depth and included a collaborative discussion with one's peers. The reflection identified the academic growth of all members of the target population through the analysis of multiple forms of pre- and post-student performance data. The reflection included a rationale for selecting the target population. The reflection included a rationale for selecting the instructional plan as well as recommendations for how the instructional plan could inform educators who will teach the target population in the future. The reflection included a rationale for the instructional plan. The rationale included an analysis of the instructional plan implanted, including mitigating factors that may have detracted from performance gains for the target population. The SLO reflection includes recommendations for further SLO development to support student achievement standards in the targeted content area.	The reflection related to the SLO process was in-depth. The reflection identified the academic growth of all members of the target population through the analysis of multiple forms of pre- and post-student performance data. The reflection included a rationale for selecting the target population. The reflection included an analysis of the effectiveness of the instructional plan implemented, including mitigating factors that may have detracted from performance gains.	A reflection to the SLO process was provided. The reflection was unclear in identifying the instructional growth of all members of the target population. The rationale for selecting the target population and instruction plan was unclear. The reflection included analysis of the effectiveness of the Instructional Plan but did not include mitigating factors that may have impended academic progress.	The reflection related to the SLO process was minimal or non-existent. The instructional growth of the target population was not included or unclear. The rationale for selecting the target population and the instructional plan was not clear. An analysis related to the effectiveness of the instructional plan was not included or unclear.

DELIVERY AND PRE-ASSESSMENT AND INSTRUCTIONAL PLAN (STAGE 3)			
*Note this section is not scored. The SLO is scored for process, not outcome. Performance outcome of P-12 students should be outlined in the SLO Template and included in the teacher candidate's reflection.			
Distinguished	Proficient	Basic	Unsatisfactory
Pre-assessment was administered to the target population in congruence with each learner's needs (e.g. IEP, ESL, etc.). Baseline data was established that was valid. Instructional delivery was congruent with the instructional plans and professional adjustments were made as leaner needs dictated. Research-based methodology, best practices, and Danielson components were exceptionally professional. The remainder of the class was appropriately accommodated given their instructional needs through a variety of means (e.g., differentiated instruction, co-teaching, technology-based instruction, etc.).	Pre-assessment was administered to the target population following appropriate testing protocol. Pre-assessment scores were calculated to identifying baseline performance for the target population. Instructional delivery was consistent with the instructional plan. Research-based instructional methodologies, best practices, and Danielson components were delivered professionally. The instruction adhered to in considered of unforeseen circumstances (e.g., snow day, etc.).	Pre-assessment was administered to the target population. Testing protocol did not interfere with the attainment of valid baseline data. Instructional delivery was congruent with the instructional plan. Research-based instructional methodologies, best practices, and Danielson components were delivered but corrections were necessary. The instruction somewhat adhered to in considered of unforeseen circumstances (e.g., snow day, etc.).	Pre- and post-assessment was administered to the target population but the protocol interfered with the attainment of valid baseline data. Instructional delivery was not congruent with the instructional plan. Research-based instructional methodologies, best practices, and Danielson components were not delivered acceptably. The timeline established for the instructional plan was not adhered to even in consideration of unforeseen circumstances (e.g., snow days, etc.).

DELIVERY AND POST-ASSESSMENT AND ANALYSIS OF ACADEMIC GROWTH (STAGE 3)			
*Note this section is not scored. The SLO is scored for process, not outcome. Performance outcome of P-12 students should be outlined in the SLO Template and included in the teacher candidate's reflection.			
Distinguished	Proficient	Basic	Unsatisfactory
Post-assessment was professionally administered to the target population following appropriate testing protocol. Post-assessment results were calculated and compared to the pre-assessment results and the academic growth of the target population was clearly identified. The academic growth of the target population determines the scores for this section (as outlined above).	Post-assessment was administered to the target population following appropriate testing protocol. Post-assessment scores were calculated and compared to the pre-assessment results and the academic growth for the target population was clearly identified.	Post-assessment was administered to the target population. Testing protocol did not interfere with the attainment of valid post-assessment data. Post-assessment scores were calculated and compared to the pre-assessment results and the academic growth for the target population was somewhat identified.	Post-assessment was administered to the target population. Testing protocol interfered with attainment of valid data. Post-assessment scores were not compared to pre-assessment scores and no reasonable identification of growth was indicated.