

## SGO Scoring Checkpoints and Considerations

As noted in the “[Finishing Strong](#)” document, districts should plan ahead in order to complete the evaluation process effectively, including in the area of SGOs. The guidelines below provide more detail on aspects associated with scoring SGOs. As noted in several areas below, principals can and increase the collaborative nature of the SGO process by asking teachers to provide adequate and organized documentation and a provisional score based on this evidence before the annual conference.<sup>1</sup> A simplified list of checkpoints can be found in the [SGO Scoring Checklist](#).

Checkpoint	<input type="checkbox"/> Was the SGO assessment administered in a fair and accurate manner consistent with locally-approved policies?
<b>Example</b>	SGO tests in the district’s high school occur during the time window allotted to third benchmark tests. For a given subject area or grade, common assessments are administered by teams of teachers using a standardized protocol. Where possible, teachers other than the teacher of record for the class administer the assessments.
<b>District Policy Check<sup>2</sup></b>	Districts should consider creating a policy to determine the “when and how” of SGO test administration. This policy should include guidelines for less traditional assessments such as portfolios where information is collected throughout the year.
<b>Resources</b>	<a href="#">Administering and Scoring Assessments</a>

Checkpoint	<input type="checkbox"/> Was the student data for the teacher’s SGO determined through a fair and accurate scoring process consistent with locally-approved guidelines?
<b>Example</b>	Whenever possible, assessments are scored by colleagues or supervisors, but not the teacher of record. Teams of teachers grade each other’s common assessments and prior to scoring, calibrate themselves according to the common scoring guide. In all cases, including those of team-based scoring, the principal/supervisor conducts an audit of each scorer’s work to ensure consistency and accuracy.
<b>District Policy Check</b>	Districts should consider moving towards a system of common assessments and scoring procedures that produce more consistent measures of student learning within the same subjects and grades.
<b>Resources</b>	<a href="#">Administering and Scoring Assessments</a> <a href="#">AchieveNJ 2013-14: Lessons From Educators</a> (p. 3-4)

<sup>1</sup> AchieveNJ regulations state that the teacher’s supervisor and/or a member of the School Improvement Panel (ScIP) shall calculate each teacher’s SGO score. For the purposes of this document, the term principal will be used in place of supervisor - in many but not all districts, it is the principal, who also sits on the ScIP who evaluates the teacher.

<sup>2</sup> District Policy Checks can be discussed by the District Evaluation Advisory Committee (DEAC). Rules can be developed by the DEAC and leadership team, and communicated to district schools through ScIPs.

Checkpoint	<input type="checkbox"/> Does the teacher provide clear student-level evidence for student performance (both baseline data and assessment data) over the SGO period?
Example	The teacher provides evidence of prior learning and assessment scores in a simple table summarizing student learning. The teacher attaches more detailed paperwork/files to support the summary table as needed.
District Guidance Check	Has the district set and communicated clear guidelines to teachers regarding the collection and submission of SGO data for evaluations?
Resources	<a href="#">5<sup>th</sup> grade ELL SGO Exemplar</a>

Checkpoint	<input type="checkbox"/> Has the teacher provided an accurate SGO rating for each SGO using the data they have submitted?
Example	The teacher indicates in the space provided on a copy of their SGO form a score between 1 and 4 that accurately reflects the number of students achieving the stated target. This, along with supporting documentation, is shared with the principal before the annual conference.
District Guidance Check	Is the district using SGO forms that include a scoring plan with a logical 1-4 scale? Have teachers received guidance for completion of forms and calculation of a score?
Resources	<a href="#">SGO Guidebook</a> , Review Results and Score, pg 21-23 <a href="#">Optional SGO forms</a>

Checkpoint	<input type="checkbox"/> Is it necessary to adjust the scoring of the SGO based on significant student attendance issues or changes in class roster?
Example	<p><b>Scenario 1</b>  Based on the scoring plan, and including all 53 students on the middle school math teacher's roster, the teacher scores 3 points. Two students who took the SGO assessment joined the class in January, five students missed more than 15 days of school spread over a 6 month period. When all students, including these seven, are figured into the final SGO score, the teacher still scores 3 points. The principal assigns this score to the teacher.</p> <p><b>Scenario 2</b>  Based on the DRA assessment, only seventy five percent of the 4<sup>th</sup>-grade teacher's 20 students met their target of 1½ years of reading growth. This equates to a teacher score of 2 points on the SGO scoring plan. However, due to a recurrent health condition, one of the teacher's students missed more than 17 days of school over the SGO instructional period. After reviewing the student's records, the principal determines that the student's attendance significantly affected the child's performance on the SGO assessment. The principal recalculates the SGO score omitting this student and finds that the teacher's score rises to 3 points. The principal agrees to remove this student from the SGO calculation and assigns the teacher a score of 3 points.</p>
District Policy Check	The district should consider setting a policy that provides parameters for adjusting SGO scores in cases of chronic student absence and changing enrollment. Principals should use these parameters as a guide when dealing with scoring questions on a case-by-case basis.

Checkpoint	<input type="checkbox"/> In the case of 2 SGOs, is the final SGO rating determined by a pre-determined simple or weighted average?
Example	<b>Weighted Average Used</b> SGO 1 includes a teacher's 74 11 <sup>th</sup> -grade English students. SGO 2 includes the teacher's 13 AP Literature students. The principal and teacher agreed in October that SGO1 should account for two-thirds of the teacher's final score in recognition of the larger number of students included in the SGO.
Implementation Check	Are the SGO weighting rules are consistent with the district policy that was developed and communicated with the teacher at the beginning of the SGO process?
Resources	<a href="#">SGO Guidebook</a> , Review Results and Score, pg 21-23 <a href="#">Optional SGO forms</a>

Checkpoint	<input type="checkbox"/> Has the teacher reflected on lessons learned through this year's SGOs and developed an action plan for SGOs for next year?
Example	At the annual conference, the teacher reflects on how the pre-assessment she used this year to determine target scores provided little useful information about the starting points of her students. She explains that she and other members of her PLC are developing a series of measures to determine starting points that include grades to date, scores on a first unit test, and a measure of student engagement in class during the first six weeks of school.
District Guidance Check	Districts should consider building in time to the annual conference procedure in each school to discuss SGO performance and plans for the following year.
Resources	Optional Annual Summary Conference Forms <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Teachers not receiving mSGPs (<a href="#">Word</a>   <a href="#">PDF</a>)</li> <li>• Teachers receiving mSGPs (<a href="#">Word</a>   <a href="#">PDF</a>)</li> </ul> <a href="#">Example of Using Multiple Measures to Set Targets</a>

Checkpoint	<input type="checkbox"/> If SGO data is not available at the time of the annual conference, has time been set aside to discuss SGO performance and a summative rating with the teacher?
Example	A teacher is using AP biology test scores for one of his SGOs. The principal conducts the teacher's annual conference using data from his other SGO, which was based upon a common assessment used by the science department's Biology 1 teachers. At the beginning of the next school year during the first SGO conference or post-observation conference with the teacher, the principal and teacher review the prior year's SGO score based on AP scores. Now that all performance data is available for the teacher, the principal provides the teacher's summative rating for the prior year at this time.
District Policy Check	Districts should consider how to communicate to staff about how and when they will receive a summative rating if SGO data (and median Student Growth Percentile (mSGP) data is not available until the following school year.
Resources	<a href="#">Teacher Evaluation Scoring Guide</a>