The purpose of this document is to highlight possible approaches for districts and BOCES to consider when constructing their approach to selecting measures of student outcomes for use in specialized service professional evaluations. The Colorado Department of Education (CDE) will be collecting on-going feedback to improve this guidance. Please use the Provide Feedback links to submit feedback to CDE. This guidance will be revised annually with refined versions released each summer in order to reflect new learning and emerging best practices.

In an effort to improve the quality of education provided to all students in the state, Colorado has: implemented the Colorado Academic Standards (CAS) that represent what students should know and be able to do at each level of their schooling; implemented school and district accountability strategies that are tied to unified improvement planning; and, adopted Educator Quality Standards that describe effective educators in Colorado. Each of these efforts has the shared purpose of improving student learning and raising student achievement levels. It is important to recognize the interdependence of each of these strategies so that they can be implemented as parts of a cohesive and aligned system. It is also important to ensure that these strategies address how all stakeholders in the system, including specialized service professionals (SSP), can contribute to the desired outcomes for Colorado students.

Senate Bill 10-191

The focus of this guidance is on the measures of student outcomes component of SSP evaluations outlined in Senate Bill 10-191. Senate Bill 10-191 requires fifty percent of a specialized service professional’s evaluation be based on service delivery impact on student outcomes determined by using multiple measures. The phrase “measures of student outcomes” or “MSO” is employed throughout this document to ensure districts understand that evaluating student outcomes for SSP evaluations is not confined to results from academic measures. The term “student outcomes” is purposefully inclusive of multiple types of measures that may be used in specialized service professionals’ evaluations to reflect their support of student-centered goals.

Nine categories of specialized service professionals (referred to as other licensed personnel in law) have been identified and include: audiologists, occupational therapists, physical therapists, school counselors, school nurses, school orientation and mobility specialists, school psychologists, school social workers and speech language pathologists. As previously noted, measures of student outcomes for these SSPs are not limited to academic measures but may include measures focused on increasing access to learning since these educators may concentrate on non-academic factors that affect overall student well-being. The overall intent of S.B. 10-191 is to ensure specialized service professionals’ evaluations provide meaningful and actionable feedback and allow for continuous improvement of practice.

The Colorado State Model Evaluation system for specialized service professionals includes Quality Standards I-VI. Standards I-V cover aspects of professional practice which reflect the knowledge and skills of each SSP. Quality Standard VI pertains to measures of student outcomes consistent with their respective positions. Per S.B. 10-191, Quality Standards I-V shall reflect fifty percent of SSP evaluations while the other fifty percent is represented by Quality Standard VI. All districts/BOCES shall base the evaluations of their SSPs on either the full set of Quality Standards, or shall adopt their own locally developed standards that meet or exceed those identified in the Colorado State Model.
Colorado requirements for specialized service professional evaluations

There are several requirements outlined in the State Board of Education rules 4.04 (A) to be considered as districts design systems to incorporate results from multiple measures of student outcomes into SSP evaluations. The three basic requirements are:

1. At least fifty percent of the evaluation shall be based on at least two measures of student outcomes, these measures shall be aligned with the role and duties of the individual SSP being evaluated.

2. Data used in evaluating SSPs shall be collected from sites, or a representative sample of the sites, where the SSP provides services.

3. In making decisions about how to use data collected about SSP performance, districts/BOCES shall consider whether the data collected are better suited for use in high-stakes evaluation or for the purpose of providing feedback and professional development opportunities for the individual professional, or for both purposes provided they are appropriately weighted. In making this decision, districts/BOCES shall consider the technical quality and rigor of the methods used to collect the data, and the technical quality of the data itself.

Note: Unlike teacher evaluations, there is NO requirement for collective or individual attribution in specialized service professional evaluations. Also, there is no requirement for state data to be used in specialized service professional evaluations, though they may be used if available.

Per H.B. 15-1323:

1. Assessment results (whether local or state) may be used in the current year’s evaluations as long as results are available two weeks prior to the end of the school year. If results are not available within that timeframe they can be used in subsequent school years.

Click here to read more about the impact of H.B. 15-1323 on Educator Evaluations.
Measuring Student Outcomes for use in SSP Evaluations, a Step by Step Process

The sections in this document consist of recommended steps for identifying and determining the measures of student outcomes that may be included in a district’s SSP evaluation system. Taken together, these steps detail a sample process that may be used by districts/BOCES to determine measures of student outcomes in order to generate a performance rating for SSP Quality Standard VI.

The steps are as follows:

**Step 1:** Determine the role and responsibilities of each SSP in order to select relevant measures of student outcomes.
- SSP responsibilities may vary greatly from role to role, and within and between district/BOCES.
- Take into account how the SSP is supporting and providing services to students, schools, and districts/BOCES.

**Step 2:** Select measures and assign weights to measures of student outcomes aligned with the SSPs role and responsibilities.
- Collaboration between SSPs and their evaluators is vital when selecting multiple measures of student outcomes to ensure the evaluation is meaningful to the SSP.
- Measures should reflect varying assignments, job duties, and responsibilities of each SSP.
- Measures should reflect the outcomes the professional wants to see in students, schools, or districts/BOCES based on the services they provide.
- A list of [sample measures of student outcomes](#) has been created for each of the nine categories of SSPs to provide additional support in identifying relevant measures of student outcomes.

**Step 3:** Determine success criteria for results from included measures of student outcomes.
- Use baseline information to determine appropriate success criteria.
- Set rigorous but attainable targets and scales for each rating category.
- Seek approval from evaluator.

**Step 4:** Assign ratings based on identified success criteria using results on the selected measures of student outcomes (this may occur at the end of the year, evaluation cycle or learning cycle).

**Step 5:** Combine weighted ratings from each measure into an overall measures of student outcomes (MSO) rating.

For additional resources and support in establishing your SSP evaluations system, please visit the main site for specialized service professionals. This guidance document can help provide additional points of consideration or system building. Please contact the CDE Educator Effectiveness team if you have any questions or to request support.
Step 1: Determine the role and responsibility of each SSP in order to select relevant measures of student outcomes.

The Colorado State Model Evaluation system for specialized service professionals includes Quality Standards I-VI which outline the knowledge and skills required of an effective SSP and will be used to evaluate SSPs in the state of Colorado. Districts/BOCES shall base their evaluations of their SSPs on either the full set of Quality Standards, or shall adopt their own locally developed standards that meet or exceed those identified in the Colorado State Model.

Identifying roles and responsibilities

The district/BOCES should first identify which of the nine groups of SSPs are employed in their district/BOCES. Once the groups of SSPs in the district/BOCES are determined, the evaluators then work with the SSPs to determine their role and responsibilities in the school, district, or BOCES, as well as what types of measures of student outcomes relate to their role and responsibilities.

The roles and responsibilities of SSPs may vary greatly within and across groups. Some SSPs work with small groups of students in therapeutic situations to achieve very specific individualized goals. Some SSPs may have roles where they support adults in the school/district/BOCES in order to support individual student needs. The purpose of this guidance document is to encourage districts/BOCES to choose measures of student outcomes that are relevant to the role and responsibilities of each individual SSP.

Example: Identifying the SSP’s role and responsibilities

Throughout this document, an example of a speech language pathologist (SLP) will be utilized to demonstrate the recommended steps for identifying and determining the measures of student outcomes to be included in district/BOCES evaluation systems for SSPs. For this example, the SLP regularly provides one-on-one services to an assigned caseload of students. The services this SLP provides are intended to support students in accessing the district’s Reading, Writing and Communicating curriculum and mastering the standards as evidenced by their performance on the English language arts (ELA) assessments given in their classrooms. This SLP also works with all the ELA teachers in the school on writing techniques, accommodations, and strategies.

Based on the role and responsibilities of this SSP, it may make sense to have three measures of student outcomes included in this SSP’s body of evidence. The following MSOs are examples that align to this speech language pathologist’s role and responsibilities:

1. A measure of student outcomes specific to the types of outcomes the caseload of students is able to demonstrate as a result of the SLP’s services. This could possibly be a percentage of caseload meeting individualized goals.
2. A measure of student outcomes based on the caseload’s performance on a vendor-based reading assessment. This could possibly be the percentage of caseload meeting proficiency on the assessment.
3. A measure of student outcomes based on all students’ performance on the school’s writing assessment because the SLP works with all of the ELA teachers on writing techniques, strategies, and accommodations.
Tools/resources to assist with Step 1:

- **MSO samples for each SSP category**
- **The District Questions to Consider** document is a series of questions for districts to support their work in determining measures of student learning.
- The **MSL Guiding Questions** document (developed by the Colorado Education Initiative [CEI]) presents questions for districts to consider while developing and improving their systems.
Step 2: Select measures and assign weights to measures of student outcomes aligned with SSP roles and responsibilities.

After determining the roles and responsibilities of the specialized service professionals, SSPs should collaborate with their evaluators in order to determine what measures of student outcomes will be utilized for evaluations. In Step 2, SSPs and their evaluators will select measures and assign weights to the measures for use in SSP evaluations.

When selecting measures for SSP evaluations, districts/BOCES should be mindful of the implications associated with H.B. 15-1323 discussed previously in this document.

Assigning weights to measures

By assigning weights to each measure in an SSP’s evaluation, districts/BOCES are signaling which measures in the system are deemed to have more value than others, are better aligned with the role and responsibilities of the SSP, or are more appropriate for measuring SSP impact.

As districts consider how to weight measures of student outcomes, it may be beneficial to review the requirements for SSP evaluations outlined in S.B. 10-191. A few questions to consider are:

- What measures are most consistent with and reflect varying job duties?
- What measures can be collected from the site, or representative sample of the site, where the SSP provides services?
- What measures yield results deemed to be of higher technical quality?

Example: Selecting measures and assigning weights to identified MSOs

In step 1 we utilized an example of a speech language pathologist to describe each step in the process. Based on the roles and responsibilities of the SSP, three relevant measures of student outcomes have been identified:

1. Caseload Goal: Identified as a percentage of students on the SSP’s caseload meeting individual goals.
2. Vendor-based Reading Assessment: Identified as a percentage of students on the SSP’s caseload who are proficient on the assessment.
3. Common School Writing Assessment: A measure based on the performance of all students in the school on the school’s writing rubric.

Table 1 illustrates the three measures of student outcomes that have been selected to demonstrate the SSP’s body of evidence. In addition, the SSP has collaborated with the evaluator to preliminarily weight each MSO. In this example, the description of each measure clearly identifies the measure as well as provides a rationale for why the measure was weighted in the identified manner.
Table 1: MSO weighting examples as shown in the Colorado Performance Management System

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures of Student Learning/Outcomes</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caseload Goal</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>This measure is specifically related to what the SLP does on a daily basis through the provision of services to help students meet their goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vendor-based Reading Assessment</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>Students supported by the SLP take this assessment. Work done with students in one-on-one and small group instruction supports this measure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common School Writing Assessment</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>The SLP team teaches ELA teachers and provides support on writing techniques, strategies, and the implementation of accommodations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note that the individual MSOs add up to a total weight of 100% of the MSO side of the specialized service professionals evaluation, but only 50% of an SSP’s entire evaluation once combined with the professional practice side.

As Table 1 illustrates, the district/BOCES has decided to weight the speech language pathologist’s caseload goal with a higher weight (60%) than the vendor-based reading assessment and common school writing assessment (20% each). In this table, the SSP has clearly described each measure of student outcomes which provides the rationale for why the measures were weighted in the identified manner. The combination of scores from the weighted measures is discussed in Step 5.

**Tools/resources to assist with Step 2:**

- [MSO samples for each SSP category](#)
- [The District Questions to Consider](#) document is a series of questions for districts to support their work in determining measures of student learning.
- The [MSL Guiding Questions](#) document (developed by the Colorado Education Initiative [CEI]) presents questions for districts to consider while developing and improving their systems.
Step 3: Determine success criteria for results from included measures of student outcomes.

In the previous steps, SSPs would have identified goals based on their specific roles and responsibilities and collaborated with their evaluators to select and weight appropriate measures of student outcomes. In this step, SSPs will work with their evaluators to determine the success criteria for each measure within the established performance categories. The State Model Evaluation System has identified a rating scale which includes four performance categories: much less than expected, less than expected, expected, and more than expected.

When establishing success criteria for each measure of student outcome, evaluators should work with their SSPs using available baseline information to set success criteria for each rating category. The success criteria for each measure should be rigorous yet attainable and should be approved by an evaluator.

Example: Determining success criteria

Caseload goals
In our example of the speech language pathologist, caseload goals were identified as one MSO and success criteria were identified for each rating category at the beginning of the year. These success criteria were based on baseline information which showed that at the end of last year, 75% of the SLP’s caseload reached their goals. For this year, the SLP has decided to create a scale to reflect a 5% increase over last year’s result in order to make the “expected” rating. In addition, the SLP will work to make more rigorous individual goals for individual students. Table 2 identifies the success criteria and score associated with each rating category.

Table 2: Success criteria for percent of students on caseload meeting individual goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Category</th>
<th>Much less than expected</th>
<th>Less than expected</th>
<th>Expected</th>
<th>More than expected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score = 0</td>
<td>Score = 1</td>
<td>Score = 2</td>
<td>Score = 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Example Success Criteria</td>
<td>Below 70% of my caseload will attain their individual goals by the end of the year</td>
<td>70-79.9% of my caseload will attain their individual goals by the end of the year</td>
<td>At least 80% of my caseload will attain their individual goals by the end of the year</td>
<td>80% of my caseload will attain their individual goals and 50% will exceed their goals by the end of the year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 illustrates the success criteria for this MSO in each of the identified rating categories (much less than expected, less than expected, expected, and more than expected). In addition, Table 2 identifies the score associated with each rating category (0, 1, 2, and 3). Once a rating has been determined at the end of the evaluation cycle for all MSOs, a weighted score will be converted to an overall MSO rating (this process is outlined in Step 5).

Vendor-based reading assessment
In selecting multiple measures for use in specialized service professional evaluations, districts/BOCES should work with their SSPs to determine success criteria for student learning. In this example, the evaluator and SSP have decided to use results from the district’s vendor-based reading assessment as a measure for this speech language pathologist’s evaluation. All students on the SLP’s caseload take this assessment and success criteria are defined by the percentage of students meeting proficiency on the assessment.
Table 3 presents the success criteria and score for each performance category rating associated with this measure. The success criteria were determined by using baseline information which indicated that last year 52% of students on the SLP’s caseload were proficient or higher on this assessment. This year, the SLP has implemented some new reading strategies (learned through professional development opportunities) which have shown to be highly effective. Therefore, the SLP has set a very rigorous goal of improving student proficiency on this assessment to at least 70% in order to attain an “expected” rating on this measure.

**Table 3: Success criteria for the vendor-based reading assessment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Category</th>
<th>Much less than expected</th>
<th>Less than expected</th>
<th>Expected</th>
<th>More than expected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Score = 0</td>
<td>Score = 1</td>
<td>Score = 2</td>
<td>Score = 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Example Success Criteria</strong></td>
<td>Below 60% of my caseload will be proficient or higher on the assessment</td>
<td>60-69.9% of my caseload will be proficient or higher on the assessment</td>
<td>70-79.9% of my caseload will be proficient or higher on the assessment</td>
<td>80% of my caseload will be proficient or higher on the assessment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Common school writing assessment

When determining success criteria for selected measures, targets should be established based on local context within a district or school. In this school, the SLP team teaches with all of the English language arts teachers and provides support on writing techniques, strategies, and the implementation of accommodations for all students (not just those on the SLP’s caseload). Based on the identified responsibilities, it is appropriate for the SLP to use the common school writing assessment as a measure of student outcomes which reflects the learning of all students in the school.

The success criteria for this measure were defined by looking at student performance in the prior year. Last year on the common school writing assessment, the average rubric score was 5.4. This year the SLP, in collaboration with the evaluator, set the success criteria so that a similar performance by students this year will yield an “expected” outcome on this measure. Table 4 illustrates the identified success criteria for this measure.

**Table 4: Success criteria for the common school writing assessment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Category</th>
<th>Much less than expected</th>
<th>Less than expected</th>
<th>Expected</th>
<th>More than expected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Score = 0</td>
<td>Score = 1</td>
<td>Score = 2</td>
<td>Score = 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Example Success Criteria</strong></td>
<td>Common school writing assessment average rubric score is 3 or below</td>
<td>Common school writing assessment average rubric score is above 3 and less than or equal to 5</td>
<td>Common school writing assessment average rubric score is above 5 and less than or equal to 7</td>
<td>Common school writing assessment average rubric score is above 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Tools/resources for completing Step 3:**
- The [Setting Student Learning Targets and Scales](#) activity walks participants through the steps in determining a target and scale based on given sets of data.
Step 4: Assign ratings based on identified success criteria using results on the selected measures of student outcomes.

In the previous steps, specialized service professionals have collaborated with their evaluators to identify measures of student outcomes that align with their identified roles and responsibilities, selected and weighted appropriate measures of student outcomes, and identified success criteria for each MSO. In this step, results from the selected measures of student outcomes are used to rate SSPs (at the end of the year, evaluation cycle or learning cycle) in one of the performance categories: much less than expected, less than expected, expected, and more than expected. These ratings will then be converted into a score ranging from 0 to 3 which will be used to calculate the overall MSO score. Educators are encouraged to set the bar high, with “expected” meeting criterion that is similar to “proficient” for students on state assessments.

Example: Assign ratings to results for identified MSOs

Continuing with the example of the SLP used throughout this document, success criteria for each MSO (caseload goals, vendor-based assessments, and the common school writing assessment) have been set and ratings were assigned based on the results of each measure at the end of the evaluation cycle. Tables 5-7 show the success criteria and ratings for each MSO accompanied by a short explanation of how ratings and scores were determined.

Table 5: Rating for the caseload goals (MSO #1) as shown in the Colorado Performance Management System

82% of the SLP’s caseload reached their individual goal. Therefore, the SLP received a rating of “expected” on MSO #1 (score = 2).

Table 6: Rating for the vendor-based assessment (MSO #2) as shown in the Colorado Performance Management System

68% of the SLP’s caseload were proficient on the vendor-based assessment. Therefore, the SLP received a rating of “less than expected” on MSO #2 (score = 1).
### Table 7: Rating for the common school writing assessment (MSO #3) as shown in the Colorado Performance Management System

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Much Less Than Expected</td>
<td>Common school writing assessment average rubric score is 3 or below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Than Expected</td>
<td>Common school writing assessment average rubric score is above 3 and less than or equal to 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>Common school writing assessment average rubric score is above 5 and less than or equal to 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More Than Expected</td>
<td>Common school writing assessment average rubric score is above 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The common school writing assessment average rubric score for all students in the school was a 4.3. Therefore, the SLP received a rating of “less than expected” on MSO #3 (score = 1).
Step 5: Combine weighted ratings from each measure into an overall measures of student outcome (MSO) rating.

By assigning weights to each of the multiple measures in specialized service professional evaluations, districts are signaling which results or measures in the system are deemed to have more value than others and are more appropriate for measuring SSP impact. Districts may preliminarily weight each measure at the beginning of the school year and reevaluate the weights later; however, the weights must be finalized before a measure of student outcomes rating can be determined. Districts are encouraged to continuously evaluate the impact of weighting decisions and make revisions as needed in the upcoming evaluation cycles.

Example: Combine individual measure ratings into an overall MSO rating

As shown in the previous examples, the speech language pathologist has been rated on each of the three identified MSOs, based on the identified success criteria. The evaluator will then use those ratings to determine an overall MSO rating. Table 8 provides an illustration of how the ratings from selected measures sum for a single overall MSO rating. Each of the columns is described below:

- **Name**: Measure name (general)
- **Weight**: Weight of the measure
- **Description**: Measure description including more specific information
- **Rating**: Rating (much less than expected, less than expected, expected, and more than expected)

In this example, selected measures of student outcomes have been combined into an overall rating. You can see that even though the SSP has a “less than expected” score on two measures, the overall rating is still “expected” because the educator earned an “expected” rating on the measure with the highest weight.

Table 8: MSO weighting and combining ratings example as shown in the Colorado Performance Management System

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures of Student Learning/Outcomes</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Attribution</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Caseload Goal</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>This measure is specifically related to what the SLP does on a daily basis through the provision of services to help students meet their goals.</td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>![Expected Image]</td>
<td>![View Image]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vendor-based Reading Assessment</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Students supported by the SLP take this assessment. Work done with students in one-on-one and small group instruction support this measure.</td>
<td>Less Than Expected</td>
<td>![Less Than Expected Image]</td>
<td>![View Image]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Common School Writing Assessment</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>The SLP team teaches with ELA teachers and provides support on writing techniques, strategies, and the implementation of accommodations.</td>
<td>Less Than Expected</td>
<td>![Less Than Expected Image]</td>
<td>![View Image]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Weight</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>![Expected Image]</td>
<td>![View Image]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A description of the measures and weights illustrated in Table 8 was described in Step 3. Sample success criteria and ratings for measures were given in Steps 3 and 4. After determining which performance category the SSP earned on each measure, the final step is to combine the weighted ratings in order to determine an overall MSO score, which is used to determine an overall MSO rating shown in the bottom right of the table (the specific math for combining the ratings into an overall MSO score and the conversion of that score into an overall MSO rating is illustrated in Table 9).
For more detailed information on how to calculate an overall MSO score and combine the overall MSO score with the overall professional practice score, please see Determining Final Effectiveness Ratings Using the Colorado State Model Evaluation.

Table 9: Combining MSO ratings into a weighted score and converting to an overall MSO rating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Score (0-3)</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Weighted Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caseload Goal</td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>(2 * .60) = 1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vendor-based Reading Assessment</td>
<td>Less than expected</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>(1 * .20) = .2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common School Writing Assessment</td>
<td>Less than expected</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>(1 * .20) = .2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Score</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1.2 + .2 + .2) = <strong>1.60</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tools/Resources for completing Step 5:
- **Measures of Student Learning/Outcomes Tool**: This Microsoft Excel tool is one sample approach designed to help Colorado educators input the measures that will be used in their evaluations, see the impact of the weighting decisions for each measure, input the desired learning targets that are expected as a result of their instruction, and synthesize the evidence from multiple measures into one score that will be used in educator evaluation. It includes the requirements included in S.B. 10-191, the rationale for decisions made, and creates sample graphics for various groups of teachers.
- **Determining Final Effectiveness Ratings Using the Colorado State Model Evaluation**: Technical document for combining MSL/MSO scores with professional practice scores.
The purpose of this document is to illuminate a step-by-step process for districts/BOCES to consider as they determine their approaches and design considerations for evaluating measures of student outcomes for use in specialized service professional evaluations. As districts develop their approach, they will want to keep the following principles in mind:

- The process begins with districts/BOCES, in collaboration with SSPs, identifying the role and responsibilities of the various SSPs. Knowing what the role and responsibilities are serves as the foundation for selecting the set of appropriate measures of student outcomes to use in SSP evaluations. This approach is consistent with the intended vision that each of the measures of student outcomes included in an SSP evaluation system provides meaningful and useful information for the SSPs.
- The guiding principles and values for selecting measures of student outcomes and the method for combining measures should be transparent and clear to all stakeholders.
- Specialized service professional evaluation systems employed by districts/BOCES are continuously monitored and improved based on data analyses and feedback from SSPs.

Resources for districts to review related to the design and improvement of their educator evaluation system:

1. Colorado State Board of Education Rules for Written Evaluation Systems
2. MSO Samples for each SSP Category
3. The District Questions to Consider document is a series of questions for districts to support their work in determining measures of student learning.
4. Determining Final Effectiveness Ratings Using the Colorado State Model Evaluation is a technical document for combining MSL/MSO scores with professional practice scores.
5. The Measures of Student Learning Tool is an Excel tool designed to help Colorado educators input the measures that will be used in their evaluations, see the impact of the weighting decisions for each measure, input the desired learning targets that are expected as a result of their instruction, and synthesize the evidence from multiple measures into one score that will be used in educator evaluation.
6. The CEI MSL Guiding Questions document, which presents questions for districts to consider while developing and improving their systems.
7. The Setting Student Learning Targets and Scales activity walks participants through the steps in determining a target and scale based on given sets of data.
9. Use of the SPF/DPF in Educator Evaluations (when SPF/DPF are available)
11. The Educator Effectiveness Tools and Materials Guide provides an overview and brief description of additional resources available for use.