

Guidance: Measures of Student Learning in Principal Evaluation (Version 1.0)

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 learning for use in Principal evaluations. 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 practice.

In an effort to improve the quality of education provided to all students in the state, Colorado has: adopted new academic standards 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 standards for educators who will be evaluated annually. 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.

The focus of this guidance is on the measures of student learning requirements outlined in the Senate Bill 10-191 (S.B. 10-191). S.B. 10-191 requires that 50 percent of a principal's evaluation in Colorado be based on multiple measures of student learning. Please see [Appendix A](#) at the end of this document for the details of the measures of student learning requirements in principal evaluation

Below are recommended steps for identifying and determining measures of student learning to be included in a district's evaluation system for principals. Taken together, these steps detail a sample process that may be used by districts to determine measures of student learning in order to generate a performance rating for principal Quality Standard seven. An example illustrating the steps below is included at the end of this document.

Step 1: Determine school and district performance priorities.

- Principal goals are likely to vary from school to school and within districts based on the school performance and Unified Improvement Plan areas of focus.
- Take into account how the principal is supporting educators to meet their students', school and district goals.

Step 2: Evaluators and principals collaborate to select and preliminarily weight appropriate measures of student learning that are aligned to areas of focus for the school and district.

- Collaboration is vital when selecting multiple measures to ensure the evaluation is meaningful to the principal.

Step 3: Once measures have been selected, set criteria for each rating category

- Use baseline information to create a context
- Set rigorous but attainable criteria for the expected rating
- Get approval from evaluator

Step 4: Score the results on the selected measures of student learning.

- Use the student learning objective process, or the specific result from the measure to evaluate the measures of student learning to determine the degree to which a goal is met or not met.

Step 5: Combine weighted scores into a “measures of student learning” rating that will comprise 50 percent of the principal’s evaluation rating (See [combining into a final rating guidance](#) and the excel tool below)

CDE has created an excel template to support districts with steps 2 through 5. [[Excel Tools for Principals](#)]

This approach to attributing measures of student learning to principals is aligned to the Student Learning Objective approach for measures of student learning for teachers. The main reason for this alignment is to encourage principals to set goals for the students in their schools, and measure the attainment of those goals. Below is a brief description of Student Learning Objectives.

A student learning objective process enables principals to establish goals for their school and/or groups of students within their school, monitor students’ progress toward these goals and evaluate the degree to which students achieve the stated goals using relevant, meaningful measures (see CTAC, 2011; Goe & Holdheide, 2011; Marion & Buckley, 2011; Goe, 2012). The active involvement of principals in supporting the attainment of goals associated with the selected measures of student learning is the defining feature of the student learning objective process. The design of this process reflects best practices such as setting clear targets, differentiating educational programming for students, monitoring students’ progress toward these targets, using student data to adjust educational programming and evaluating the extent to which students have met the targets. In other words, the student learning objective process is an educational program improvement process driven by principals and aligned with school and district priorities. The essential steps of a student learning objective process are outlined below:

- Determine principal contribution to specific measures of student learning
- Collect baseline information to inform target and scale setting
- Assess quality, attainment level and rigor of student targets and scales
- Monitor student progress over time (formative practice)
- Determine attainment of student learning targets and scales
- Reflect and refine the student learning objective process

Because a student learning objective process asks principals to set targets based on what they know about their students, and to reflect continuously on best practices in order to facilitate student progress, it connects authentically with educator evaluation systems. CDE is currently developing a student learning objective process to support districts that choose to include student learning objectives as measures of student learning.

For additional resources and support in establishing your principal evaluation system, please visit the [Measures of Student Learning Guidance: Version 2.0](#) for teachers. 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.

Example: Determining a Rating for the Measures of Student Learning included in a Principal's Evaluation

Sample Step 1:

The district/BOCES works with principals to identify school and district performance priorities. Once the priorities are determined, the principal, working with their evaluator, may identify multiple measures of student learning for inclusion in their body of evidence.

For this example we will use an elementary principal. The district has a priority on math and reading. This school, however, has identified writing as a priority in their UIP because they are not getting the results that they desire and are substantially below the district and the state.

In this example, three measures of student learning are selected to demonstrate a principal's body of evidence.

1. A Student Learning Objective based on the percent of points earned on the school's SPF.
2. A Student Learning Objective based on the school's writing MGP.
3. A Student Learning Objective based on the district's writing assessment (because the principal has worked with all the ELA teachers in the school on writing techniques, accommodations, and strategies and all the teachers classroom teachers are working on this collectively as an improvement strategy.)

Sample Step 2 using the CDE Excel file for principals:

Selecting and Weighting Measures of Student Learning

Here the principal has preliminarily weighted each of the measures of student learning based on their relevance and alignment to school outcomes.

This principal has identified three measures of student learning that will be included in his/her evaluation.

Here the principal has clearly indicated why the measure was weighted in this manner.

Please Refer State Board Rules

Name of Assessment Measure	Weight	Justification for weight	Attribution Collective / Individual
1 SPF Points Earned	25.00	The SPF is my school's accountability, I take responsibility for how my school performs.	Individual
2 SPF Sub Indicator W	10.00	Writing is a focus of my school's UIP and I'd like to see the MGP for my school increase to acceptable levels.	Collective
3 SLO for Writing	15.00	This is the district's writing assessment (k-5). It is our progress monitoring assessment for our UIP too.	Collective
4			Please Select
5			Please Select
6			Please Select
7			Please Select
Total Weight	50.00		

Sample Steps 3 and 4 using the CDE Excel file for principals:

SLO 1

Student Learning Outcome Measure 1					Attribution
Name of Measure	SPF Points Earned				Percentage of Evaluation
Assessment Type used in the measure (please select -->)	Other				
Content Area for this measure (please select -->)	Other				
Description of Measure	Change in percentage of total points earned				
Rating	☐ Much Less Than Expected	☐ Less Than Expected	☒ Expected	☐ Above Expected	
Criteria for each rating category	minus 16 percent or more.	minus 5 to 15 percent of points earned.	plus or minus 5 points on the percent of points earned.	90% of points earned	
Evidence & Comments on Student Learning Outcome Measure 1	My school earned 84.9% of the possible points last year... we earned 87% this year which translates to expected				

Step 3: At the beginning of the year, identify the criteria for each rating category based on available baseline information. The criteria for each measure are recorded in this row. They are to be rigorous yet attainable...require approval from evaluator.

SLO 2

Student Learning Outcome Measure 2					Attribution	Collective
Name of Measure	State growth (e.g., TCAP Colorado Growth Model)				Percentage of Evaluation	10.0%
Assessment Type used in the measure (please select -->)	Writing					
Content Area for this measure (please select -->)	Writing					
Description of Measure	The school wide writing MGP.					
Rating	☐ Much Less Than Expected	☒ Less Than Expected	☐ Expected	☐ Above Expected		
Criteria for each rating category	Median Growth Percentile 1st to 34th	Median Growth Percentile 35th to 59th	Median Growth Percentile 60th to 74th	Median Growth Percentile 75th to 99th		
Evidence & Comments on Student Learning Outcome Measure 2	The school wide writing MGP was 46. This falls in the less than expected range.					

Step 4: Ratings are assigned in this row based on the evidence.

When results from the Colorado Growth Model are used, the scales pre-populate with criteria that has been determined by the Department.

SLO 3

Student Learning Outcome Measure 3					Attribution
Name of Measure	SPF Sub Indicator Writing				Percentage of Evaluation
Type of assessment used in the measure (please select -->)	District summative (e.g., District Writing Assessment)				
Content Area for this measure (please select -->)	Writing				
Description of Measure	District Common Writing Assessment (rubric 1 to 5; 3 is proficient)				
Rating	☐ Much Less Than Expected	☒ Less Than Expected	☐ Expected	☐ Above Expected	
Criteria for each rating category	Fewer than 64% of the students in my school score a 3 or higher	Between 65 and 74% of students in my school score a 3 or higher	Between 75 and 84% of the students in my school score a 3 or higher	50% of the students in my school score a 4 or higher and at least 80% at least 3.	
Evidence & Comments on Student Learning Outcome Measure 3	Last year 60% of the student in my school scored a 3 or higher on our district writing assessment at the end of the year. This year 72% of students scored a 3 or higher. We were just short of our goal, but very close! We will keep continue to focus on writing and try to meet our goals next year.				

Here is an example of what the evidence and comments might look like for a principal.

Sample Step 5 using CDE Excel file for principals:

[illegible]

Appendix A: State Board Requirements for Principal Measures of Student Learning

Requirement 1: Measure to be included

School Districts and BOCES shall ensure that data included in the school performance framework, required pursuant to section 22-11-204, C.R.S., is used to evaluate principal performance. School Districts and BOCES may choose to weight specific components of the school performance framework differently than they are weighted in the school performance framework, depending on the principal's responsibilities and the performance needs of the school, so long as student longitudinal growth carries the greatest weight.

Requirement 2: Measure to be included

School Districts and BOCES shall incorporate at least one other Measure of Student Academic Growth and must ensure that the Measures of Student Academic Growth selected for principal evaluations are consistent with the Measures of Student Academic Growth used for the evaluation of teachers in each principal's school.

Requirement 3: Measures shall reflect subjects beyond state assessed

Measures of Student Academic Growth shall reflect the growth of students in all subject areas and grades, not only those in subjects and grades that are tested using Statewide Summative Assessments, and shall reflect the broader responsibility a principal has for ensuring the overall outcomes of students in the building.

Requirement 4: Early Childhood - Grade 3.

For the evaluations of principals responsible for students in early childhood education through grade 3, measures shall be consistent with outcomes used as the basis for evaluations for teachers teaching these grade levels, which may include, but are not limited to, assessments of early literacy and/or mathematics shared among members of the school community that may be used to measure student longitudinal growth.

Requirement 5: Grades 4 - 8.

For the evaluation of principals responsible for students in grades 4-8, a portion of the principal's evaluation for Quality Standard VII shall be based on the results of the Colorado longitudinal growth model, calculated pursuant to section 22-11-203, C.R.S., for subjects tested by Statewide Summative Assessments. The weight of this measure may be increased to reflect the increased proportion of subjects covered by Statewide Summative Assessments over time. A portion of the principal's evaluation for Quality Standard VII also shall be based on other appropriate Measures of Student Academic Growth for students in grades 4-8, which may include, but are not limited to, Measures of Student Academic Growth shared among the evaluated personnel in the school.

Requirement 6: Grades 9 - 12.

For the evaluation of principals responsible for students in grades 9-12, a portion of the principal's evaluation for Quality Standard VII shall be based on the results of the Colorado longitudinal growth model, calculated pursuant to section 22-11-203, C.R.S., for subjects tested by state summative assessments. To account for the portion of teachers without direct or indirect results from the Colorado longitudinal growth model, a portion of a principal's growth determination may be based upon appropriate Measures of Student Academic Growth for personnel teaching in subjects and grades not tested by Statewide Summative Assessments, which may include, but are not limited to, Measures of Student Academic Growth shared among evaluated personnel in the school.

Requirement 7: Multiple Grade Spans

For the evaluation of principals responsible for students in multiple grade spans, School Districts and BOCES shall select a combination of Measures of Student Academic Growth reflecting the grade levels of all students in the school.

Requirement 8: Weighting by Technical Quality and Rigor

When compiling Measures of Student Academic Growth to evaluate performance against Principal Quality Standard VII, School Districts and BOCES shall give the most weight to those measures that demonstrate the highest technical quality and rigor.