

Student Growth – FAQ’s

1. What is the definition of student growth?

[RCW 28A.405.100](#) defines student growth as the “change in student achievement between two points in time.”

2. What measures can be used to determine student growth?¹⁰

[WAC 392-191A-080](#) states: “More than one measure of student growth data must be used in scoring the student growth rubrics.”

Measures include:

- classroom-based tools
- school-based tools
- district-based tools
- state-based tools

3. OSPI began publishing Student Growth Percentiles (SGPs) in Spring 2013. How will this information impact the teacher or principal evaluation system and what guidance can you give districts about SGPs?

Please read the [TPEP Statement on Student Growth Percentiles](#) and [OSPI’s Student Growth Percentiles FAQ](#).

4. What are the three components of student growth and how they are different for each criterion?

For *teachers*, there are five components of student growth embedded across criteria three, six, and eight. They are the same state components for each of the approved instructional frameworks. The components are:

SG 3.1 – Establish Student Growth Goals

Refers to individual or subgroups of students (achievement/opportunity gap)

SG 3.2 – Achievement of Student Growth Goals

Refers to individual or subgroups of students (achievement/opportunity gap)

SG 6.1 – Establish Student Growth Goals using Multiple Student Data Elements

Refers to the whole class based on appropriate standards and aligned to school and district goals

SG 6.2 – Achievement of Student Growth Goals

Refers to the whole class based on appropriate standards and aligned to school and district goals

SG 81. – Establish Team Student Growth Goals

Refers to the teacher as part of a grade-level, content area, or other school or district team

For *school leaders*, there are three components of student growth embedded in criteria three, five, and eight. They are also identical across both of the approved leadership frameworks. The components are:

- **SG 3** – Provides evidence of student growth that results from the school improvement planning process.
- **SG 5** – Provides evidence of student growth of selected teachers.
- **SG 8** – Provides evidence of growth in student learning.

5. Why is there 8.1 and not 8.2 for teachers?¹¹

SG 8.1 asks a group of teachers to focus together on a set of students for whom they have common responsibility, analyze the learning needs of those students, set a common goal or goals, develop and implement high-quality measures and collectively monitor progress during the year. Teachers can be held individually responsible for active collaboration and for making changes to his/her instruction (SG 8.1) but cannot be held individually responsible for the student growth of others.

6. How should student growth be evaluated?¹²

The principal and the teacher should sit down to discuss available evidence that demonstrates progress towards goals. The discussion should be based on the goal(s) set by the teacher and approved by the principal as well as on student work and/or performance that demonstrates progress towards that goal. Some districts have defined “growth for most students” and “high evidence of growth” but the context of each classroom is critical to every decision.

7. Do student growth goals for teachers need to align with principal goals or the school improvement plan?¹³

Most importantly, goals must be meaningful and relevant to the teacher. The 6.1 student growth rubric for Distinguished in 6.1 states “These whole classroom goals align to school goal(s).” The principal student growth rubric asks principals to “provide evidence of student growth that result from the school improvement planning process (SG3) and provide evidence of growth in student learning.” While it makes perfect sense that all boats are pulling in the same direction, it is not required that the teacher goals match the principal or school goals unless the bargaining agreement specifies that as a local requirement.

8. When might it make sense to change a student growth goal?¹⁴

The following scenarios are examples of situations where it makes sense to change a goal:

- if several ELL students move into the class during the identified instructional period,

- if a large number of families leave the school and affect the size of the identified student group
- if the students in question all meet the goal several weeks ahead of schedule.

Any change in goal should occur as the result of a conversation between the teacher and the evaluator.

9. May teachers include summative student learning data (HSPE, MSP) as general trend evidence?¹⁵

Yes, if they can show direct responsibility for scores.

10. How does the federal waiver change Washington’s approach to student growth?¹⁶

The Legislature did not pass a bill, so there is no change to TPEP. Washington’s student growth process and rubrics remain the same.

11. Is there a form to guide a student growth inquiry?¹⁷

WAC 392-191A-090 outlines the requirements for the inquiry triggered by a low student growth score on a teacher’s Comprehensive evaluation. WAC 392-191A-180 outlines similar requirements for principals. If there are areas of concern related to the framework, it would make sense for the PD connected to the student growth inquiry to be tied to C3, C6 and C8 for teachers and C3, C5 and C8 for principals. If the framework evidence reveals no issues, but a low student growth score exists, the professional development plan should be related to one or more topics mentioned in that section of the WAC.

12. What evidence is needed for Criterion 8?¹⁸

Criterion 8 is about the collaborative work of professionals. Evidence can be found in staff meetings, department meetings, PLCs, and other points of collaboration. The principal can observe any of those events, or the teacher could provide evidence from events where the principal is not present.

13. What happens if there is not sufficient evidence to score a component?¹⁹

The framework authors’ advice is to score the preponderance of the evidence. If there is evidence, score what is available. To supplement, a short observation to focus on specific elements could be scheduled and/or the teacher could provide evidence from outside the observation.

14. How do I calculate a summative score?²⁰

A comprehensive evaluation has two scoring steps:

1. Districts create procedures and practices to establish criterion scores and they are summed equally to create a summative score. Framework rubric scores and student growth rubric scores are included in the calculation. The state's scoring matrix assigns a corresponding label (Unsatisfactory to Distinguished or 1-4).
2. Calculate the Student Growth Impact Rating, which is the sum of the five student growth rubrics from criteria 3, 6, and 8 for teachers or criteria 3, 5 and 8 for principals. The Distinguished label would be reduced to Proficient if a low Student Growth Impact Rating exists, and a Student Growth Inquiry would be triggered.

Note: eVAL calculates these simultaneously; others will need to do two calculations.

A focused evaluation has one scoring step. The Final Summative Score is the same as the final score for the criterion that was selected for focus. Criterion scores result from a locally-determined process that includes both framework rubric scores and applicable student growth rubric scores. The Focused evaluation does not have a separate student growth impact rating.

15. What gets submitted to OSPI after scoring is complete?²¹

Each district sends in information each fall, with total number of teachers in each summative category. Individual results remain at the district. Each district defines local practices about how and where data should be stored. For districts that use eVAL, all data is retained electronically and can only be accessed by the local district.

16. What happens if there is not sufficient evidence to score when summative reports are due?²²

Attention to management and frequent dialogue through the year should help avoid gaps in the evidence. If gaps are discovered in April, there is still time to use strategies described above. It is a state requirement that each criterion be scored for a Comprehensive evaluation. Skipping criterion scoring is not an option. If the principal has conducted several observations and does not see any evidence for a particular observable component, the absence of that evidence might be evidence in itself. But it is incumbent on both the principal and the teacher to assure that plentiful opportunities have existed before drawing any conclusion about a lack of evidence.

17. If principals have not been scoring observations during the year, is it permissible to holistically rate the evidence at the end of the year?²³

One critical key to the revised system is holistic scoring – looking at all evidence, over time. It is important to NOT make judgments based on one visit or one conversation or one piece of evidence. There is no state expectation that each observation or artifact be scored. It is the collection of evidence that provides information for scoring, not any one item or event.

In a standards-based system, if a student or a teacher or a principal could not do something in the fall, but demonstrates that skill in winter and spring, the fall “score” is not relevant.

Looking at the preponderance of evidence reveals its scope and depth, as well as growth over time.

This is a local decision, however, and some districts have rules about averaging in order to obtain a criterion score. Others have contract language about providing a teacher, or a group of teachers such as those who are new, with a summative score mid-year. This is not a state expectation, for the reasons stated above, but is a local decision.