Overview

Professional practices and measures of student learning are equally represented in determining an educator's final effectiveness rating in the Colorado State Model Evaluation System Each of the two components represents 50 percent of a teacher's final evaluation rating.

How Scoring Works

The State Model Evaluation System determines final effectiveness ratings by adding professional practice scores with measures of student learning scores. The process of combining measures starts by adding together the scores for each standard on the rubric, generating the professional practices score. Then, the score for measures of student learning is determined using multiple measures of student achievement and/or growth.   Those final scores are added together to create a single effectiveness, or index, score, which then falls into the cut points of one of the following categories: ineffective, partially effective, effective, and highly effective.

How Scoring Works

The way in which scores and ratings are calculated has shifted slightly following feedback from teachers, school leaders, and district personnel who felt the former scoring system failed to align with their professional values and impeded coaching conversations. The following sections detail the scoring process.

Note that no changes are being proposed to the progressive scoring at the professional practice level, meaning that an educator must still get all of the professional practices found in Level 1 (formerly known as Basic) and all of the professional practices found in Level 2 (formerly known as Partially Proficient) in order to receive a rating of Level 2 Practices in a specific element.

Professional Practices Scoring

Feedback from focus groups and district leaders indicated a preference for requiring a preponderance of evidence in order to earn a rating at the standard level and for establishing rigorous expectations for achieving the highest rating. The following table details the changes made in relation to this feedback.

	Former Scoring System	Revised Scoring System	Justification
Scoring at the Standard Level	Half of the elements for any given standard must be scored at the higher of two ratings in order to earn the higher rating.	There must be a "preponderance of evidence" in order for an educator to receive the higher of two ratings within a standard. If there are 6 elements in a standard, then the educator must receive 4 out 6 elements at the higher rating in order to earn the higher rating.	In the former system, scores did not necessarily provide an accurate representation of an educator's ability because educators only needed 50 percent (not a majority) of elements rated at the higher rating to earn the higher rating for the standard. Thus, the revised system requires a majority of elements be at the higher rating to earn the higher rating for the standard.
Overall Professional Practices Score	The cut points were set based on the educator earning at least the minimum score for a rating in order to earn the rating.	The cut points were set based on the educator earning the midpoint or higher of the two consecutive ratings in each standard.*	The former scoring system did not accurately define proficient (according to stakeholder values) because an educator could score partially proficient on a majority of standards and still receive a score high enough to gain a proficient rating. The revised scoring system responds to this by making requirements to earn a proficient score more rigorous to better reflect stakeholders' idea of proficient.

The rating ranges were established based on the standards being weighted equally. LEAs may choose their own custom weights in order to emphasize specific standards based on local values and context.

Changes in Rating Scale for Professional Practice

The following tables demonstrate how the aforementioned changes have altered the cut scores for professional practice between the former and revised scales.

Former Scale:

Former Professional Practices Rating	Rubric Scale 0-20 (Rounded to the nearest hundredth)	Scale Converted to 0-540 (Rounded to the nearest whole number)
Basic	0 - 2	0 - 54
Partially Proficient	2.01 - 7	55 - 189
Proficient	7.01 - 12	190 - 324
Accomplished	12.01 - 17	325 - 459
Exemplary	17.01 - 20	460 - 540

Revised Scale:

Revised Professional Practices Rating	Rubric Scale 0-20 (Rounded to the nearest hundredth)	Scale Converted to 0-540 (Rounded to the nearest whole number)
Basic	0 – 3.74	0 - 101
Partially Proficient	3 .75 – 8.74	102 - 236
Proficient	8.75 – 13.74	237 - 371
Accomplished	13.75 – 18.74	372 - 506
Exemplary	18.75 – 20.00	507 - 540

Measures of Student Learning Scoring

No changes have been made to the MSL scoring system. The table below details the measures of student learning ratings for both the former and revised scoring systems.

Measures of Student Learning Rating	0-3 Point Range per Rating (Rounded to the nearest hundredth)	Scale Converted to 0-540 (Rounded to the nearest whole number)
Much Less Than Expected	0 - .49	0 - 134
Less Than Expected	.50 - 1.49	135 – 269
Expected	1.50 - 2.49	270 – 404
More Than Expected	2.50 - 3.00	405 – 540

Final Effectiveness Score and Rating

The changes to the cut points for the Professional Practice score affected the cut points for the combined Final Effectiveness Rating. A change was also made in determining the minimum cut point for Highly Effective. Previously, the minimum cut point for Highly Effective was determined by adding the minimum score for Accomplished to the minimum score for More than Expected. It is now determined by adding the midpoint score for Accomplished to the minimum score for More than Expected.

The following table shows the changes in cut scores for the final effectiveness score and rating.

	Former Scoring	Revised Scoring
Ineffective	0 – 188	0 - 235
Partially Effective	189 – 458	236 - 505
Effective	459 – 728	506 - 843
Highly Effective	729 – 1080	844 - 1080

The figures below provide a visual comparison of the former and revised systems for determining a Highly Effective rating.

Former System

Professional Practices		Measures of Student Learning
Basic	**Ineffective** (zero to the max score for basic plus max score for much less than expected)	Much Less than Expected
Partially Proficient	**Partially Effective** (up to the max score for partially proficient plus the max score for less than expected)	Less than Expected
Proficient	**Effective** (up to max score for proficient plus max score for expected)	Expected
Accomplished	**Highly Effective** (scores above the midpoint score for accomplished plus the minimum score for more than expected)	More than Expected
Exemplary		

Justification

In the former system, the Highly Effective category had the largest possible range of scores. Additionally, school and district leaders found that it was more difficult to have effective feedback conversations around growth with teachers rated Highly Effective. Thus, the revised system sets a higher expectation for earning a Highly Effective rating in order to make the rating more accurate and to facilitate educator growth.

Revised System

Professional Practices		Measures of Student Learning
Basic	**Ineffective** (zero to the max score for basic plus max score for much less than expected)	Much Less than Expected
Partially Proficient	**Partially Effective** (up to the max score for partially proficient plus the max score for less than expected)	Less than Expected
Proficient	**Effective** (up to midpoint score for accomplished plus max score for expected)	Expected
Accomplished	**Highly Effective** (scores above the midpoint score for accomplished plus the minimum score for more than expected)	More than Expected
Exemplary		