

COMBINING THE STUDENT GROWTH MEASURES: Process, Examples, and Technical Appendices

Overview

Student growth measures will be used in the evaluation of teachers and principals in Ohio. While there are different types of student growth measures, they are intended to be comparable and consistent across educators. This document describes the overall process for combining multiple measures of student growth into a *student growth rating* that comprises 50% of the educator effectiveness rating. For additional information on student growth measures, please visit <http://education.ohio.gov/Topics/Teaching/Educator-Evaluation-System/Ohio-s-Teacher-Evaluation-System/Student-Growth-Measures>.

There are three types of student growth measures: Value-Added, ODE-Approved Vendor Assessments, and Local Education Agency (LEA) Measures. Subsequently, there are three categories of teachers (A, B, and C). Teachers and principals will utilize different measures based on data availability and district decisions.

Process for Calculating Educators' *Student Growth Ratings*

The process for determining a Final Student Growth Rating consists of five steps which will be completed in the electronic Teacher and Principal Evaluation System (eTPES):

1. The district determines a student growth measure default percentage plan (may be adjusted annually); superintendent or designee enters the default percentages.
2. The evaluator assigns each educator to a student growth measure category (A1, A2, B, or C) and verifies the weighted percentages of the student growth measures for each educator.
3. The evaluator enters student growth data into eTPES for the individual teacher and principal.
4. The eTPES combines the multiple measures entered for each type of student growth measure.
5. The system calculates the *student growth rating* for each educator.

The final student growth rating is then combined in eTPES with the final performance rating to determine the educator's Final Summative Rating.

STEP 1: Annual District Student Growth Measures Percentage Plan is Submitted into eTPES

Each district superintendent or superintendent designee must submit an annual district student growth measure plan in eTPES, which includes *default percentages* for each of the three categories of teachers as well as principals. ODE guidance focuses on assigning category weights with:

- Consistency across educators; Percentages should not be determined by individual teachers/principals or determined based on individual past results;
- Minimal variation across teachers and principals when possible; valid rationale for variation from the district default category percentages includes the amount and types of data available.

Figure 1: Template for the Annual Student Growth Measure District Default Percentage Plan

LEA Default Percentages by Category

Teacher Category		Value-Added	Vendor Assessment	LEA Measures		Total = 50%
				SLO/Other*	Shared Attribution	
A (Value-Added)	A1 (exclusive)	_____%		_____%	_____%	50%
	A2 (non-exclusive)	_____%		_____%	_____%	50%
B (Approved Vendor Assessment)			_____%	_____%	_____%	50%
C (LEA Measures)				_____%	_____%	50%

*Category A teachers with Value-Added data may also include ODE-Approved Vendor Assessment data in this LEA Measure. Category A1 teachers must use their teacher-level Value-Added report as the full 50 percent student growth measure beginning July 2014.

Sample District Student Growth Measure Percentage Default Plan. In the following example, for the 2013-2014 school year, the district decides that the split for Category A and B teachers should be 30% / 20%, with the local measures for teachers consisting of SLOs for 10% and a shared attribution measure for 10%. The district decides that Category C teachers will have a 40% / 10% split and thus enters the following into eTPES:

Figure 2: Sample District SGM Plan

Teacher Category		Value-Added	Vendor Assessment	LEA Measures		Total = 50%
				SLO/Other*	Shared Attribution	
A (Value-Added)	A1 (exclusive)	30 %		10 %	10 %	50%
	A2 (non-exclusive)	30 %		10 %	10 %	50%
B (Approved Vendor Assessment)			30 %	10 %	10 %	50%
C (LEA Measures)				40 %	10 %	50%

*Category A1 teachers must use their teacher-level Value-Added report as the full 50% student growth measure beginning July 2014.

STEP 2: Assign Categories and Verify Percentages

Some data are pre-loaded into eTPES. The Ohio Department of Education will upload the most current Value-Added composite ratings including up to the three most recent years of data from the EVAAS reports.

Districts must provide additional data. Annually, upon district and building setup within eTPES, administrators will review and update teacher rosters as necessary. The roster verification must occur prior to the following steps:

- Review and manually enter a *category* for each teacher and principal. Because the Value-Added data is pre-loaded, the system will automatically identify Category A teachers/ principals. All teachers with Value-Added EVAAS reports will be loaded as A2 teachers, and all principals in buildings having a Value-Added progress measure on the Local Report Card (LRC) will be loaded as Category A principals.
- Teachers and principals with no Value-Added data will default to Category C.
- Evaluators may need to reassign teachers and principals with ODE approved vendor data from category C to B.
- Educators with Value-Added data cannot be moved out of the A category. However, teachers can be moved between the A1 and A2 categories.
- Until the principal Value-Added composite reports are available, principals may be moved in and out of any category during initial setup.
- For teachers and principals changing assignments when Value-Added data is involved, specific guidelines regarding Value-Added usage must be followed. Please see the [Business Rules for Student Growth Measures](#) for details regarding teachers and the [OPES webpage](#) for principal details.

Figure 3: Sample Teacher Category Designation

Teacher	Teacher Category
Smith	A1
Day	A2
Reeves	B
Franklin	C

"A" teachers are pre-populated

Once the educator category is entered, each educator is then connected with the default percentages established in the district plan for the assigned category.

Figure 4: Sample Teacher Roster with District Percentages

Teacher	Teacher Category	Value-Added		Vendor Assessment		LEA Measures			
		Score	%	Score	%	SLOs*		Shared Attribution	
						Score	%	Score	%
Smith	A1		30%				10%		10%
Day	A2		30%				10%		10%
Reeves	B				30%		10%		10%
Franklin	C						40%		10%

Adjusting the percentages. If the district decides to allow variation from the default percentages, administrators must make manual adjustments within eTPES.

- Districts should try to be as consistent as possible when establishing percentages.
- Percentages should not be determined by individual teachers or determined based on individual past results.
- Category A2 teacher weights will need to be adjusted due to the wide variety of schedules.

STEP 3: The District Enters the SGM Data into eTPES for Individual Teachers

All of an individual educator’s student growth measure scores for each approved vendor growth report, student learning objective (SLO), and/ or shared attribution must be manually

Q. What about teachers that have Value-Added AND Vendor Assessment reports? This is a common question. Some teachers who fall in the A1 or A2 Value-Added categories may also have Approved Vendor Assessments. In this scenario, districts are not required to use the Approved Vendor Assessment data, but they have the option. This data would be considered an LEA measure if used.

entered into the teacher worksheet OR SGM Import Template in eTPES (examples of each can be seen in Figures 5 and 6). All three types of student growth measures are scored using the numbers 1 - 5.

- The most current [Value-Added](#) teacher-level scores will be preloaded into eTPES for Category A1 and A2 teachers. These are the same composites that are on the individual teacher EVAAS reports received annually in the fall. These composite reports include all Value-Added subjects instructed in the prior three years and may be a one, two, or three year composite of those courses dependent on the teacher's Value-Added course instruction over the three immediately prior years.
- The [Approved Vendor Assessment](#) scores come from the growth reports provided by vendors. It is the responsibility of the district to work with the vendor assessment representative to determine this process. The district will manually enter most of these scores in eTPES for Category B teachers. Only the data from those vendors using URM Value-Added calculations to determine student growth will be preloaded into eTPES.
- For [LEA measures](#), each SLO score comes from the individual teacher [SLO Scoring Template](#) document. The district will manually enter these SLO scores in eTPES.
- The LEA [shared attribution](#) measure comes from the district or building Local Report Card (LRC). For districts using building-based or district-based SLOs, see the *SLO Scoring Template* document. The district will manually enter the shared attribution scores in eTPES.

Q. How is Building and District Value-Added scored on the five-point scale?
Districts choosing to use this data as a shared attribution measure will find the overall progress measure (reading and math composite) or the content area progress score on the District or Building Local Report Card.

5 = (A) 2.0 and up
4 = (B) 1.0 to 1.9
3 = (C) -1.0 to 0.9
2 = (D) -2.0 to -1.1
1 = (F) below -2.0

Figure 5: Blank Teacher Worksheet

A: Value-Added				B: Approved Vendor Assessment		C: LEA Measure			
A1-Exclusive	Rating	A2-Non-exclusive	Rating	Vendor Assessment	Rating	SLO/Other	Rating	Shared Attribution	Rating
MRM Composite		MRM Composite		Vendor 1		SLO 1		Shared Attribution	
				Vendor 2		SLO 2			
				Vendor 3		SLO 3			
				Vendor 4		SLO 4			
				Vendor 5		Other			
Added Overall Rating		A2 Value-Added Overall Rating		Vendor Assessment Overall Rating		SLO/Other Overall Rating		Shared Attribution Overall Rating	
Value-Added Percentage		Value-Added Percentage		Vendor Assessment Percentage		SLO/Other Percentage		Shared Attribution Percentage	
STUDENT GROWTH MEASURES									

*Only the assigned Superintendent/ Principal has access to enter SGM data into the yellow cells.

Figure 6: Sample SGM Import Template

Educator Name	B: Vendor Scores (5 max)					C: SLO / Other Scores (5 max)					C: Shared Attribution (1 score)
Smith											
Day											
Reeves											
Franklin											

STEP 4: The Multiple Measures within Each SGM Type are Combined in eTPES

Important requirements. When the multiple student growth measures are combined in eTPES, it is important to take note of the following requirements:

- *Individual educators may have no more than two types of student growth measures, dependent upon their designated category and district plan.* For example, Category A teachers could have Value-Added data only or may also use LEA measures; Category B teachers may use only approved vendor assessment data or may additionally utilize LEA measures; and Category C teachers will only have LEA measures.
- *All scores within each type of measure must be weighted equally.* For example, if a teacher has four SLOs as her four LEA measures, then all four will be weighted the same when calculations are

performed by the system. Similarly, if four ODE-Approved Vendor Assessments are utilized, then all four must be weighted the same.

- *Shared Attribution is weighted separately.* While shared attribution is considered an LEA measure, it is weighted separately from SLOs, and is not required to be weighted equally. Only one shared attribution measure may be applied to each educator as an optional local measure. Districts can opt to use this as a collaborative team measure applied consistently to all educators within a building or district.
- *Maximum of five measures within each student growth measure category.* For example, there can be no more than five ODE Approved Vendor Assessments for any one educator. The following lists the possible measures within each type:
 - Value-Added: a single MRM composite as reported in EVAAS
 - ODE Approved Vendor Assessment: Up to five ODE Approved Vendor Assessment scores (e.g. five different assessments)
 - LEA Measures: Up to five LEA measures including 2-4 SLOs and/or a single Shared Attribution measure (additionally, Category A Value-Added teachers who are also utilizing ODE Approved Vendor Assessment data would include it here)

Calculating the final rating for each student growth measure type. After all student growth measures scores are entered by the district into eTPES either via the teacher worksheet or the SGM Import spreadsheet, a rating for each type of measure will be calculated in eTPES using the student growth measure lookup tables. (See **Appendix A** for the Student Growth Measure Lookup Tables.)

Figure 7: Blank Teacher Worksheet

Value-Added		B: Approved Vendor Assessment		SLO/Other		Measure	
A1-Exclusive	A2-Non-exclusive	Vendor Assessment	Approved Vendor	SLO/Other	SLO / Other	Shared Attribution	Shared Attribution
MRM Composite	MRM Composite	Vendor 1		SLO 1		Shared Attribution	
		Vendor 2		SLO 2			
		Vendor 3		SLO 3			
		Vendor 4		SLO 4			
		Vendor 5		Other			
A1 Value-Added Overall Rating	A2 Value-Added Overall Rating	Vendor Assessment Overall Rating	Approved Vendor Overall Rating	SLO/Other Overall Rating	SLO / Other Overall Rating	Shared Attribution Overall Rating	Shared Attribution Overall Rating
Value-Added Percentage	Value-Added Percentage	Vendor Assessment Percentage	Approved Vendor Percentage	SLO/Other Percentage	SLO / Other Percentage	Shared Attribution Percentage	Shared Attribution Percentage
STUDENT GROWTH MEASURES							

Five-Level to Three-Level Effectiveness Conversion. The eTPES uses the Student Growth Measure Lookup Tables in **Appendix A** to combine the multiple measures within each type of student growth measure and automatically makes the conversion of five to the three levels required for the summative rating: Below Expected Growth, Met Expected Growth, and Above Expected Growth. This conversion is based on the following table:

Figure 8: Five-Level to Three-Level Conversion Table

5-level rating	3-level rating
Most Effective (5)	Above
Above Average (4)	Expected
Average (3)	
Approaching Average (2)	
Least Effective (1)	Below

STEP 5: The Educator *Student Growth Rating* is Generated

A rating based on the three levels (Above, Expected, Below) has been calculated for each type of measure using the SGM Lookup Tables and is displayed in the gray boxes on the teacher worksheet in eTPES. Any individual teacher can only have two types of measures (and shared attribution). The eTPES then combines these two ratings with the relevant weighted percentages, as specified in the district plan, to generate a *student growth rating* for each teacher. The following formula demonstrates this process:

$$\text{Student Growth Rating} = (\text{Rating}_1 \times \text{Percentage}_1) + (\text{Rating}_2 \times \text{Percentage}_2) = .5 \text{ to } 2.5 \text{ (possible range)}$$

For Example: Value-Added Rating x Value-Added Percentage = .5 to 2.5 (possible range)

Since each type of growth measure is scored on the same one to five point scale, the range of possible student growth rating index scores is .5 (1 x 50%) to 2.5 (5 x 50%).

The index score range is converted to an effectiveness rating by dividing the index score range into three equal categories as shown in Figure 10 below. The final *Student Growth Rating* is then displayed as an effectiveness rating in the pink box of the teacher/ principal worksheet in eTPES.

Figure 9: Student Growth Measure Index

Student Growth Rating Index Score	Student Growth Rating
1.833 and above	Above
greater than 1.167 and less than 1.833	Expected
1.167 and below	Below

See **Appendix B** for specific details on the calculations and scoring range for the student growth measure rating.

See **Appendix D** for examples of combining student growth measures into a final student growth measure rating.

Teacher Verification Screen. After all the individual teacher student growth data is entered into eTPES and the administrator verifies the data by entering his/ her PIN, the eTPES compiles the data into the Teacher Verification Screen as shown below.

Figure 10: Student Growth Measure Teacher Verification Screen

Teacher	Teacher Category	Value-Added		Vendor Assessment		LEA Measures				Final SGM rating
						SLOs*		Shared Attribution		
		Score	%	Score	%	Score	%	Score	%	
Smith	A1	Above	30%			Expected	10%	Expected	10%	Above
Day	A2	Below	30%			Expected	10%	Expected	10%	Below
Reeves	B			Above	30%	Above	10%	Expected	10%	Above
Franklin	C					Expected	40%	Expected	10%	Expected

STEP 6: Determining the Final Summative Rating

The Student Growth Overall Rating is combined with the holistic Final Teacher Performance Rating using the Evaluation Matrix shown here and in **Appendix C**. The Evaluation Matrix is used by the eTPES system to arrive at the annual final summative rating for the teacher or principal.

Figure 11: OTES Evaluation Matrix for determining Final Summative Ratings

		Teacher Performance			
		4	3	2	1
Student Growth	Above	Accomplished	Accomplished	Skilled	Developing
	Expected	Skilled	Skilled	Developing	Developing
	Below	Developing	Developing	Ineffective	Ineffective

Note the (1, 2, 3, 4) numerical ratings at the top of the matrix. The numbers correspond to the teacher performance ratings of:

- 1 Ineffective
- 2 Developing
- 3 Skilled
- 4 Accomplished

For example, Mr. Day in *Example #2 (see Appendix D for full details)* was below expected growth for his student growth measures. If his final performance rating were “skilled,” (shown by a 3 along the top of the matrix), his final summative rating for the year would be “developing.”

Figure 12: OTES Evaluation Matrix Demonstrating Mr. Day’s Final Summative Rating

		Teacher Performance				
		4	3	2	1	
Growth	Above	Accomplished	Accomplished	Skilled	Developing	
	Expected	Skilled	Skilled	Developing	Developing	
	Below	Developing	Developing	Ineffective	Ineffective	

Likewise, Miss Franklin in *Example #4 (see Appendix D for full details)* was rated met expected growth for her student growth measures. If her final performance rating were “skilled,” her final summative rating for the year would be “skilled”.

Figure 13: OTES Evaluation Matrix Demonstrating Miss Franklin’s Final Summative Rating

		Teacher Performance				
		4	3	2	1	
Student Growth	Above	Accomplished	Accomplished	Skilled	Developing	
	Expected	Skilled	Skilled	Developing	Developing	
	Below	Developing	Developing	Ineffective	Ineffective	

Appendix A: SGM Lookup Tables (for combining scores within types of measures)

The following lookup tables are utilized for each of the individual types of measures. The eTPES system automatically conducts this process.

NOTE: Individual score combinations are organized from high to low. So for example, a teacher with four SLO scores of 1,2,1,2, would use the corresponding 2211 combination on the four score table resulting in an SLO rating of Below Expected Growth (1).

1 score

Combinations	Score for eTPES
5	Above (5)
4,3,2	Expected (3)
1	Below (1)

2 scores

Combinations	Score for eTPES
55,54	Above (5)
53,52,51,44,43,42,41,33,32,31,22	Expected (3)
21,11	Below (1)

3 scores

Combinations	Score for eTPES
555,554,553,544	Above (5)
552,551,543,542,541,533,532,531 522,521,511,444,443,442,441,433 432,431,422,421,411,333,332,331 322,321,222	Expected (3)
311,211,221,111	Below (1)

4 scores

Combinations	Score for eTPES
5555,5554,5553,5552, 5544,5543,5444	Above (5)
5551,5542,5541,5533,5532,5531 5522,5521,5511,5443,5442,5441 5433,5432,5431 5422,5421,5411 5333,5332,5331,5322,5321,5311 5222,5221,5211,5111,4444,4443 4442,4441,4433,4432,4431,4422 4421,4411,4333,4332,4331,4322 4321,4311,4222,4221,4211,3333 3332,3331,3322,3321,3311,3222 3221,2222	Expected (3)
4111,3211,3111,2221 2211,2111,1111	Below (1)

5 scores

Combinations	Score for eTPES
55555,55554,55553,55552, 55551,55544,55543,55542, 55533,55444,55443,54444	Above (5)
55541,55532,55531,55522 55521,55511,55442,55441 55433,55432,55432,55422 55421,55411,55333,55332 55331,55322,55321,55311 55222,55221,55211,55111 54443,54442,54441,54433 54432,54431,54422,54421 54411,54333,54332,54331 54322,54321,54311,54222 54221,54211,54111,53333 53332,53331,53322,53321 53311,53222,53221,53211 53111,52222,52221,52211 52111,44444,44443,44442 44441,44433,44432,44431 44422,44421,44411,44333 44332,44331,44322,44321 44222,44221,44211,44111 43333,43332,43331,43322 43321,43311,43222,43221 43211,43111,42222,42221 42211,33333,33332,33331 33322,33321,33311,33222 33221,33211,32222,32221 22222	Expected (3)
51111,42111,41111,33111 32211,32111,31111,22221 22211,22111,21111,11111	Below (1)

Appendix B: Scoring Calculation for Final Student Growth Rating

The eTPES system uses the following formula to determine the Student Growth Rating for each individual educator:

$$y = (x_1 * w_1) + (x_2 * w_2) + (x_3 * w_3) + (x_4 * w_4)$$

Where:

y	=	Student Growth Rating Index Score
x ₁	=	Value-Added Rating
w ₁	=	Value-Added weighted %
x ₂	=	Vendor Assessment Rating
w ₂	=	Vendor Assessment weighted %
x ₃	=	SLO Rating
w ₃	=	SLO weighted %
x ₄	=	Shared Attribution Rating
w ₄	=	Shared Attribution weighted %

This can also be stated as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} & (\text{Value-Added Rating} \times \text{Value-Added weighted \%}) + \\ & (\text{Vendor Assessment Rating} \times \text{Vendor Assessment weighted \%}) + \\ & (\text{SLO Rating} \times \text{SLO weighted \%}) + \\ & (\text{Shared Attribution Rating} \times \text{Shared Attribution weighted \%}) = \\ & \text{Student Growth Rating Index Score} \end{aligned}$$

Note: Any individual teacher would have no more than two types of measures (and shared attribution).

Since each type of measure is scored on the same one to five point scale, the range of possible Student Growth Rating Index Scores is .5 (1 x 50%) to 2.5 (5 x 50%). The index scoring range is divided into three equal categories to determine the final Student Growth Rating:

Student Growth Rating Index Score	Student Growth Rating
1.833 and above	Above
greater than 1.167 and less than 1.833	Expected
1.167 and below	Below

Appendix C: OTES Evaluation Matrix for Determining Final Summative Ratings

The eTPES uses the final Student Growth Rating and the final Teacher Performance Rating to determine the Summative Effectiveness Rating based on the following matrix:

		Teacher Performance			
		4	3	2	1
Student Growth	Above	Accomplished	Accomplished	Skilled	Developing
	Expected	Skilled	Skilled	Developing	Developing
	Below	Developing	Developing	Ineffective	Ineffective

Appendix D: Four Examples

The following examples demonstrate the process for combining the multiple student growth measures into a final *Student Growth Rating* using the four sample teachers above in Figure 4.

Example #1. Ms. Smith is a category A1 teacher exclusively instructing 8th grade English language arts.

STEP 1: *The Annual District Plan is submitted into eTPES.*

This district has weighted Value-Added for A1 teachers at 30%. The remaining 20% was attributed to LEA measures of which 10% is SLOs and 10% is shared attribution. These designated weights can be seen in the blue boxes of Ms. Smith’s eTPES worksheet.

STEP 2: *District verifies and completes the teacher roster in eTPES.*

The eTPES has designated Ms. Smith Category A1 because she has an EVAAS Value-Added report for 8th grade English language arts. As Ms. Smith exclusively instructs this Value-Added course, her administrator drags and drops her name into the A1 column. The district verifies the weighted split of 30% / 20% for Value-Added and Local Measures and ensures the LEA measures display 10% for SLOs and the other 10% for shared attribution.

STEP 3: *District enters the student growth measure scores into eTPES.*

Ms. Smith has an MRM Value-Added report as well as two SLOs for the English courses she instructs, and a building-level Value-Added score for shared attribution. The teacher-level Value-Added data is automatically uploaded into the system. The evaluator enters the two SLO scores and the shared attribution score into the relevant worksheet cells.

STEP 4: *The multiple measures are combined in eTPES.*

The eTPES system automatically loads the MRM composite score for Ms. Smith. She received a score of 5 on her teacher-level Value-Added report as it indicated she was Above Expected Growth. The eTPES uses the “one score” lookup table to determine that a score of 5 equates to a 5, Above Expected Growth which is displayed in the gray box in the Value-Added column.

Figure 1: One Score Student Growth Measure Lookup Table

1 score		
Value-Added Score	Combinations	Score for eTPES
= 5	5	Above (5)
	4,3,2	Expected (3)
	1	Below (1)

*See **Appendix A** for the full series of Student Growth Measure Lookup Tables.

The evaluator then enters Ms. Smith’s two SLO scores (SLO 1: 3, SLO 2: 4). The system aligns these two SLO scores in order from highest to lowest as 4, 3 and then uses the “two score” look-up table to determine the score of 3, Met Expected Growth for this category which is displayed in the gray box of the SLO / Other column.

Figure 2: Two Score Student Growth Measure Lookup Table

2 scores

Combinations		Score for eTPES
55,54		Above (5)
4,43,42,41,33,32,31,22		Expected (3)
21,11		Below (1)

SLO Scores = 4,3 → (points to the '4,43,42,41,33,32,31,22' combination)

← (points from the 'Expected (3)' score to the 'SLO Rating= Expected (3)' box)

SLO Rating= Expected (3)

*See **Appendix A** for the full series of Student Growth Measure Lookup Tables.

Additionally, the evaluator enters a shared attribution score of 3, Met Expected Growth, as the building Local Report Card indicates met expected growth with a letter grade of “C”. The eTPES uses the “one score” lookup table to determine that a score of 3 equates to a 3, Met Expected Growth, which is displayed in the gray box of the shared attribution column. See **Appendix A** for the Student Growth Measure Lookup Tables.

Figure 3: Ms. Smith’s Teacher Worksheet

A: Value-Added				B: Approved Vendor Assessment		C: LEA Measure			
A1-Exclusive	Rating	A2-Non-exclusive	Rating	Vendor Assessment	Rating	SLO/Other	Rating	Shared Attribution	Rating
MRM Composite	5	MRM Composite	_____	Vendor 1	_____	SLO 1	4	Shared Attribution	3
				Vendor 2	_____	SLO 2	3		
				Vendor 3	_____	SLO 3	_____		
				Vendor 4	_____	SLO 4	_____		
				Vendor 5	_____	Other	_____		
A1 Value-Added Overall Rating	5 (Above)	A2 Value-Added Overall Rating	_____	Vendor Assessment Overall Rating	_____	SLO/Other Overall Rating	3 (Expected)	Shared Attribution Overall Rating	3 (Expected)
Value-Added Percentage	30%	Value-Added Percentage	_____	Vendor Assessment Percentage	_____	SLO/Other Percentage	10%	Shared Attribution Percentage	10%
STUDENT GROWTH MEASURES					2.1 (Above)				

*Category A1 teachers must use their teacher-level Value-Added report as the full 50% student growth measure beginning July 2014.

STEP 5: *The system calculates the student growth rating for each educator.*

Once the rating is determined for each type of student growth, eTPES will use a simple index to create the final overall Student Growth Measure Rating using the following formula to calculate Ms. Smith’s Teacher Index Rating:

$$\text{Teacher Index Rating} = (\text{rating}_1 \times \text{percentage}_1) + (\text{rating}_2 \times \text{percentage}_2) + (\text{rating}_3 \times \text{percentage}_3)$$

Once applied, the formula results in a Teacher Index Rating of **2.1** as demonstrated by the formula below:

$$\text{Value-Added Rating (5 x 30\%)} + \text{SLO Rating (3 x 10\%)} + \text{Shared Attribution Rating (3 x 10\%)} = \mathbf{2.1}$$

The Teacher Index Rating is then converted to an effectiveness rating using the SGM Index below.

Figure 4: Student Growth Measure Index

Student Growth Rating Index Score	Student Growth Rating
1.833 and above	Above
greater than 1.167 and less than 1.833	Expected
1.167 and below	Below

Ms. Smith’s index score of 2.1 would equate to an overall SGM Rating of “Above Expected Growth” which is displayed in the pink box of Figure 13 above.

Example #2. Mr. Day is a category A2 teacher and has a MRM Value-Added report, two SLOs, and is using building-level Value-Added as Shared Attribution measure. The MRM Value-Added report is automatically loaded into the eTPES system. The other scores are entered in the relevant worksheet cells by Mr. Day’s administrator.

Figure 5: Mr. Day’s Completed Individual Teacher Worksheet

A: Value-Added				B: Approved Vendor Assessment		C: LEA Measure			
A1-Exclusive	Rating	A2-Non-exclusive	Rating	Vendor Assessment	Rating	SLO/Other	Rating	Shared Attribution	Rating
MRM Composite		MRM Composite	1	Vendor 1		SLO 1	3	Shared Attribution	3
				Vendor 2		SLO 2	1		
				Vendor 3		SLO 3			
				Vendor 4		SLO 4			
				Vendor 5		Other			
Added Overall Rating		A2 Value-Added Overall Rating	1 (Below)	Vendor Assessment Overall Rating		SLO/Other Overall Rating	3 (Expected)	Attribution Overall Rating	3 (Expected)
Value-Added Percentage		Value-Added Percentage	30%	Vendor Assessment Percentage		SLO/Other Percentage	10%	Shared Attribution	10%
STUDENT GROWTH MEASURES					0.9 (Below)				

Once the rating is determined for each type of student growth measure using the Student Growth Measure Lookup Tables in **Appendix A**, eTPES will do a simple index to create the final overall Student Growth Measure Rating using the following formula to calculate Mr. Day’s Teacher Index Rating:

$$\text{Teacher Index Rating} = (\text{rating}_1 \times \text{percentage}_1) + (\text{rating}_2 \times \text{percentage}_2) + (\text{rating}_3 \times \text{percentage}_3)$$

Once applied, the formula results in a Teacher Index Rating of **0.9** as demonstrated below:

$$\text{Value-Added Rating } (1 \times 30\%) + \text{SLO Rating } (3 \times 10\%) + \text{Shared Attribution Rating } (3 \times 10\%) = \mathbf{0.9}$$

The Teacher Index Rating is then converted to an effectiveness rating using the Student Growth Measure Index shown below.

Figure 6: Student Growth Measure Index

Student Growth Rating Index Score	Student Growth Rating
1.833 and above	Above
greater than 1.167 and less than 1.833	Expected
1.167 and below	Below

Mr. Day’s index score of 0.9 would equate to an overall SGM Rating of “Below Expected Growth” which is displayed in the pink box of his teacher worksheet above.

Example #3. Mr. Reeves is a Category B teacher and has reports from three separate vendor assessments, as well as two SLOs and building-level Value-Added for shared attribution. Those scores are entered in the relevant teacher worksheet by his administrator.

Figure 7: Mr. Reeves’ Teacher Worksheet

A: Value-Added				B: Approved Vendor Assessment		C: LEA Measure			
A1-Exclusive	Rating	A2-Non-exclusive	Rating	Vendor Assessment	Rating	SLO/Other	Rating	Shared Attribution	Rating
MRM Composite	_____	MRM Composite	_____	Vendor 1	5	SLO 1	4	Shared Attribution	3
				Vendor 2	4	SLO 2	3		
				Vendor 3	4	SLO 3	_____		
				Vendor 4	_____	SLO 4	_____		
				Vendor 5	_____	Other	_____		
Added Overall Rating		A2 Value-Added Overall Rating		Vendor Assessment Overall Rating	5 (Above)	SLO/Other Overall Rating	3 (Expected)	Attribution Overall Rating	3 (Expected)
Value-Added Percentage		Value-Added Percentage		Vendor Assessment Percentage	30%	SLO/Other Percentage	10%	Shared Attribution	10%
STUDENT GROWTH MEASURES					2.1 (Above)				

Once the rating is determined for each type of student growth measure using the Student Growth Measure Lookup Tables, eTPES will do a simple index to create the final overall rating using the following formula to calculate Mr. Reeves’ Teacher Index Rating:

$$\text{Teacher Index Rating} = (\text{rating}_1 \times \text{percentage}_1) + (\text{rating}_2 \times \text{percentage}_2) + (\text{rating}_3 \times \text{percentage}_3)$$

Once applied, the formula results in a Teacher Index Rating of **2.1** as demonstrated by the formula below:

$$\text{Approved Vendor Rating (5 x 30\%)} + \text{SLO Rating (3 x 10\%)} + \text{Shared Attribution Rating (3 x 10\%)} = \mathbf{2.1}$$

The Teacher Index Rating is then converted to an effectiveness rating using the SGM Index below.

Figure 8: Student Growth Measure Index

Student Growth Rating Index Score	Student Growth Rating
1.833 and above	Above
greater than 1.167 and less than 1.833	Expected
1.167 and below	Below

Mr. Reeves’ index score of 2.1 would equate to an overall SGM Rating of “Above Expected Growth” which is displayed in the pink box of his teacher worksheet.

Example #4. Miss Franklin is a Category C teacher and has three SLOs and a building-level Value-Added score for shared attribution. Those scores are entered in the relevant teacher worksheet.

Figure 9: Miss Franklin’s Teacher Worksheet

A: Value-Added				B: Approved Vendor Assessment		C: LEA Measure			
A1-Exclusive	Rating	A2-Non-exclusive	Rating	Vendor Assessment	Rating	SLO/Other	Rating	Shared Attribution	Rating
MRM Composite	_____	MRM Composite	_____	Vendor 1	_____	SLO 1	3	Shared Attribution	3
				Vendor 2	_____	SLO 2	1		
				Vendor 3	_____	SLO 3	2		
				Vendor 4	_____	SLO 4	_____		
				Vendor 5	_____	Other	_____		
Added Overall Rating		A2 Value-Added Overall Rating		Vendor Assessment Overall Rating		SLO/Other Overall Rating	3 (Expected)	Attribution Overall Rating	3 (Expected)
Value-Added Percentage		Value-Added Percentage		Vendor Assessment Percentage		SLO/Other Percentage	40%	Shared Attribution	10%
STUDENT GROWTH MEASURES					1.5 (Expected)				

Once the rating is determined for each type of student growth measure, eTPES will do a simple index to create the final overall Student Growth Measure Rating using the following formula to calculate Miss Franklin’s Teacher Index Rating:

$$\text{Teacher Index Rating} = (\text{rating}_1 \times \text{percentage}_1) + (\text{rating}_2 \times \text{percentage}_2)$$

Once applied, the formula results in a Teacher Index Rating of **1.5** as demonstrated below:

$$\text{SLO Rating } (3 \times 40\%) + \text{Shared Attribution Rating } (3 \times 10\%) = \mathbf{1.5}$$

The Teacher Index Rating is then converted to an effectiveness rating using the SGM Index.

Figure 10: Student Growth Measure Index

Student Growth Rating Index Score	Student Growth Rating
1.833 and above	Above
greater than 1.167 and less than 1.833	Expected
1.167 and below	Below

Miss Franklin’s index score of 1.5 would equate to an overall SGM Rating of “Met Expected Growth” which is displayed in the pink box above on her teacher worksheet.