Student Learning Objectives (SLO) Process Rubric Formative Assessment Stage #1 #2 #3

Classroom Context		
Name	School	District
Class/Course Title	Grade Level	Total Number of Students
Typical Class Size	Class Frequency	Class Duration

	Distinguished (4)	Proficient (3)	Basic (2)	Unsatisfactory (1)
Analysis of Student Performance Data (Stage 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)	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)	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.

	Pre and Post-Assessment	Pre and Post-Assessment	The Pre and Post-	The Pre and Post-
Development of				
Pre and Post-	directly aligned to	aligned to the instructional standard	Assessment were	Assessment were not
Assessment and	content standard(s)	identified for analysis.	somewhat aligned to the instructional standard	aligned to the instructional standard
Instructional Plan	identified for the target	5	identified for analysis.	identified for analysis.
	population. Pre- and Post-Assessments were	The pre and post- assessments were	5	
(Stage 2)	carefully designed for the	appropriate for the target	The pre and post- assessments were	The pre and post- assessments were not
	target population and	population and	somewhat appropriate for	appropriate for the target
	meaningful data can be	sufficiently designed to	the target population and	population and were not
	generated to inform	attain measurable data.	designed to attain	designed to elicit
	future instructional	Instructional plan	measurable data.	measurable data.
	decisions using the pre	consisted of a series of	Instructional plan did not	Instructional plan did not
	and post-assessments.	lessons that contained a	contain a series of	consist of a series of
	The instructional plan	clear beginning and	lessons or a clear	lessons and did not
	consisted of a complete	ending date. Instructional	beginning and ending	contain a clear beginning
	unit that contained a clear	outcome was clearly	date. Instructional	and ending date.
	beginning and ending	identified and connected	outcome was loosely	Instructional outcome
	date. Instructional	to the identified	connected to the	was not connected to the
	outcome was clearly	instructional need.	identified instructional	identified instructional
	identified and directly	Academic Standard.	need. Academic	need. Academic
	connected to the	Assessment Anchor and	Standard, Assessment	Standard, Assessment
	identified instructional	its eligible content.	Anchor and its Eligible	Anchor or its Eligible
	need(s), Academic	Instructional plan was	Content. Instructional	Content. Instructional
	Standard(s), Assessment	based on the "best	plan was not based on the	plan was unclear and was
	Anchors(s), and Eligible	practice" or research-	"best practice" or	not based on "best
	Content. Instructional	based instructional	research-based	practice" or research-
	plan was based on	methodology and a sound	instructional	based instructional
	research-based	rationale was provided	methodology. A rationale	methodology. No
	instructional	for instructional	for instructional	rationale was provided
	methodology. A sound	methodology Multiple	methodology was	for the instructional
	rational for the selection	forms of follow-up	included but unclear. At	methodology selected.
	of the instructional	student performance data	least one form of follow-	No follow-up student
	methodology selected	were analyzed to	up student performance	performance data was
	was included. The	determine the	data was analyzed to	analyzed to determine the
	instructional plan took	effectiveness of the	determine the	effectiveness of the
	into consideration needs	instructional plan.	effectiveness of the	instructional plan.
	specific to the subgroup		instructional plan.	
	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.			

Reflection (Stage 3)	The reflection related to	The reflection related to	A reflection to the SLO	The reflection related to
	the SLO Process was in-	the SLO Process was in-	process was provided.	the SLO process was
Please refer to the	depth and included a	depth. The Reflection	The reflection was	minimal or non-existent.
	collaborative discussion	identified the academic	unclear in identifying the	The instructional growth
DELIVERY OF	with one's peers. The	growth of all members of	instructional growth of	of the target population
PRE AND POST	reflection identified the	the target population	all members of the target	was not included or
ASSESSMENT	academic growth of all	through the analysis of	population. The rationale	unclear. The rationale for
section below	members of the target	multiple forms of pre and	for selecting the target	selecting the target
section below	population through the	post student performance	population and	population and the
	analysis of multiple	data. The reflection	instruction plan was	instructional plan was not
	forms of pre and post	included a rationale for	unclear. The reflection	clear. An analysis related
	student performance	selecting the target	included analysis of the	to the effectiveness of the
	data. The reflection	population. The	effectiveness of the	instructional plan was not
	included a rationale for	reflection included an	Instructional Plan but did	included or unclear.
	selecting the target	analysis of the	not include mitigating	
	population. The	effectiveness of the	factors that may have	
	reflection included a	instructional plan	impended academic	
	rationale for selecting the	implemented, including	progress.	
	instructional plan as well	mitigating factors that		
	as recommendations for	may have detracted from		
	how the instructional	performance gains.		
	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.			
	0		1	1

DELIVERY OF PRE AND POST ASSESSMENT- THIS SECTION IS NOT SCORED. IT IS ONLY USED AS A GUIDE FOR ASSESSORS OR CANDIDATES IN THE DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION OF THE SLO.

Distinguished (4)	Proficient (3)	Basic (2)	Unsatisfactory (1)
Pre-Assessment was	Pre-Assessment was	Pre-Assessment was	Pre and Post- Assessment was
administered to the target	administered to the target	administered to the target	administered to the target
population in congruence	population following	population. Testing	population but the protocol
with each learner's needs	appropriate testing	protocol did not interfere	interfered with the attainment o
(e.g. IEP, ESL, etc.).	protocol. Pre-Assessment	with the attainment of	valid baseline data. Instructiona
Baseline data was	scores were calculated to	valid baseline data.	delivery was not congruent wit
established that was	identifying baseline	Instructional delivery was	the instructional plan. Research
valid. Instructional	performance for the	congruent with the	based instructional
delivery was congruent	target population.	instructional plan.	methodologies, best practices,
with the instructional	Instructional delivery was	Research-based	and Danielson components wer
plans and professional	consistent with the	instructional	not delivered acceptably. The
adjustments were made	instructional plan.	methodologies, best	timeline established for the
as leaner needs dictated.	Research-based	practices, and Danielson	instructional plan was not
Research-based	instructional	components were delivered	adhered to even in consideratio
methodology, best	methodologies, best	but corrections were	of unforeseen circumstances
practices, and Danielson	practices, and Danielson	necessary. The instruction	(e.g. snow days, etc.).
components were	components were	somewhat adhered to in	(e.g. 510w days, etc.).
exceptionally	delivered professionally.	considered of unforeseen	
professionally. The	The instruction adhered	circumstances (e.g. snow	
remainder of the class	to in considered of	day, etc.).	
	unforeseen circumstances	day, etc.).	
was appropriately			
accommodated given	(e.g. snow day, etc.).		
their instructional needs			
through a variety of			
means (differentiated			
instruction, co-teaching,			
technology-based			
instruction, etc.).	_		
Post-assessment was	Post-assessment was	Post-assessment was	Post-assessment was
professionally			
	administered to the target	administered to the target	administered to the target
administered to the target	population following	administered to the target population. Testing	population. Testing protocol
population following	population following appropriate testing	administered to the target population. Testing protocol did not interfere	population. Testing protocol interfered with attainment of
	population following	administered to the target population. Testing	population. Testing protocol
population following appropriate testing	population following appropriate testing	administered to the target population. Testing protocol did not interfere	population. Testing protocol interfered with attainment of
population following appropriate testing protocol. Post-assessment	population following appropriate testing protocol. Post-assessment	administered to the target population. Testing protocol did not interfere with the attainment of	population. Testing protocol interfered with attainment of valid data. Post-assessment
population following appropriate testing protocol. Post-assessment results were calculated	population following appropriate testing protocol. Post-assessment scores were calculated	administered to the target population. Testing protocol did not interfere with the attainment of valid post-assessment data.	population. Testing protocol interfered with attainment of valid data. Post-assessment scores were not compared to
population following appropriate testing protocol. Post-assessment results were calculated and compared to the pre-	population following appropriate testing protocol. Post-assessment scores were calculated and compared to the pre-	administered to the target population. Testing protocol did not interfere with the attainment of valid post-assessment data. Post-assessment scores	population. Testing protocol interfered with attainment of valid data. Post-assessment scores were not compared to pre-assessment scores and no
population following	population following appropriate testing protocol. Post-assessment scores were calculated and compared to the pre- assessment results and	administered to the target population. Testing protocol did not interfere with the attainment of valid post-assessment data. Post-assessment scores were calculated and	population. Testing protocol interfered with attainment of valid data. Post-assessment scores were not compared to pre-assessment scores and no reasonable identification of
population following appropriate testing protocol. Post-assessment results were calculated and compared to the pre- assessment results and	population following appropriate testing protocol. Post-assessment scores were calculated and compared to the pre- assessment results and the academic growth for	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-	population. Testing protocol interfered with attainment of valid data. Post-assessment scores were not compared to pre-assessment scores and no reasonable identification of
population following appropriate testing protocol. Post-assessment results were calculated and compared to the pre- assessment results and the academic growth of	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	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	population. Testing protocol interfered with attainment of valid data. Post-assessment scores were not compared to pre-assessment scores and no reasonable identification of
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	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	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	population. Testing protocol interfered with attainment of valid data. Post-assessment scores were not compared to pre-assessment scores and no reasonable identification of
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	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	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	population. Testing protocol interfered with attainment of valid data. Post-assessment scores were not compared to pre-assessment scores and no reasonable identification of
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	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	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	population. Testing protocol interfered with attainment of valid data. Post-assessment scores were not compared to pre-assessment scores and no reasonable identification of
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	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	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	population. Testing protocol interfered with attainment of valid data. Post-assessment scores were not compared to pre-assessment scores and no reasonable identification of
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	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	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	population. Testing protocol interfered with attainment of valid data. Post-assessment scores were not compared to pre-assessment scores and no reasonable identification of
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	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	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	population. Testing protocol interfered with attainment of valid data. Post-assessment scores were not compared to pre-assessment scores and no reasonable identification of

*Note this section is not scored. The SLO for the PA Teacher Candidate Effectiveness Model is scored for process, not outcome. Performance Outcome should be noted and included in the teacher candidate's Reflection (below).