SLO Survey 2016

Select Building

Boulevard	6
Canterbury	8
Fairfax	6
Gearity	8
Noble	6
Oxford	8
Roxboro Elementary	7
Monticello	13
Roxboro Middle	14
High School	34
Options	2

How would you rate the quality of the assessment that was used for the SLO?

1 Poor	28
2	17
3	33
4	25
5 Excellent	10

How would you rate the ease and efficiency of implementing, scoring and recording of the SLO?

1 Poor	36
2	23
3	26
4	13
5 Excellent	14

How would you rate your experience with setting the growth targets for the SLO?

1 Poor	34
2	19
3	36
4	15
5 Excellent	10

SLO Survey 2016

Comment on the quality of the assessment.

It was one mandated by the college for which sponsors the course.

If I only used the assessment given for baseline data I would not have any specific data. The test did not record the answers for one of the questions. More than 50% of the test was writing with one question alone being worth 45% of the test. I understand writing is important, but this test should have been more centered on comprehension. MAP was a much better test because it would tell us what students strengths were.

While we had input on the assessment it was very last minute (a month into school starting).   Additionally, the SLO test covers many standards - perhaps too many for SLO purposes.   Our data is not accurate as this test was not given until a month or more into school. Some of us had already taught skills covered in 4-6 questions which is a big deal on a test that is only 30 questions long. I find this very disappointing and disrespectful to teachers who work so hard for our students. I have a difficult time valuing the process as it was not well-developed or done ahead of time.

The assessment was not a textbook produced assessment but one that we had to devise. Although the textbook company had benchmark exams, we did not have access to these. Tests were teacher created which implies subjective rather than an objective perspectives.

it tests on all topics on state test that we get to before giving slo test in the spring

many questions not aligned with course. Thus how will students do better if they are not studying the topics included in the test.

It might have been helpful to have the SLO completed by teachers in the spring. There were many teachers that piloted the new programs and would have been able to give useful feedback. The questions were only multiple choice which can be difficult to set growth targets.

This assessment was all word problems. It was given to us to give in the 4th week of school after we had already spent time instructing math, so it did not show the validity of what students truly didn't know. It also had questions on it that are taught at the end of the school year and are not relevant to the Feb end of SLO date. So this is not a true depiction of what my students did not know prior to 5th grade Mathematics instruction. I think that this change should have been discussed prior to the start of the school year so that it was a fair assessment and also so that it showed true growth. My students will now know the answers to at least 4 or five of these questions which is not fair for me as an instructor to not be given credit for the student learning that I have conducted. I believe that all 5th grade teachers have given MAP thinking it was their SLO data point for the year, it is kinda stressful to think we have to start again.

The length of the SLO was too long for both reading and mathematics. The mathematics SLO assesment could have been 20 questions or less. the reading SLO could have been 1 essay, 1 short response and 10 questions.

SLO Survey 2016

We were supposed to use the new textbook online assessment developer to create the assessment. I suppose the quality could have been better, but creation of the assessment was very difficult for various technical reasons. NWEA Map is used.

The answer key isn't aligned to the SLO from last year, let alone this year. No time was taken to make the changes to the answer key from last year, yet we have to spend the time assessing, scoring, and entering the data. In addition, we have to create our class spreadsheet with growth targets, make changes if necessary, and submit the google doc.

Grades 3-5 ELA were instructed to use the Unit 2 summative assessment from the brand new ReadyGen series (of which training has been inadequate, at best). It is not normed in any way. No grade level has completed Unit 1 so we have no idea what to expect as adequate growth for the assessment after sufficient instruction.

There were issues with administering the assessment as students were not able to go back and correct questions or answer a question they skipped (they were locked out of editing responses once they clicked "next" to go on).

The results were reported, through the ReadyGen portal, as percentages and I had no breakdown of the data available so I could see trends. In fact, the website said their was no data available even though I was online to score the extended responses, and students responses were there for me to view.

We were asked our opinion on the assessment prior to its adoption through a GoogleDoc from Karen Heinsbergen. That document overwhelmingly was against the use of this assessment and questions were raised as to why we weren't using the TRC or MAP like in the past. There were no answers to our questions and it seems as though our input was completely ignored.

Its old and Based on an old text book- not current with new standards and air test

Quality is okay due to it being a teacher created assessment.

Used MAP Test

They are fine. They will show growth of the kids.

As an Intervention Specialist I was permitted to use the MAP fall to winter targets. I feel that MAP is an excellent growth measure. I hope we will keep using MAP for special ed. students. I think we should also consider using it for all students.

I don't feel this is the right assessment for the students. For the math part I'm to give part one on one to each student. This makes it impossible to teach.

For the ELA one we used the Super Kids benchmark taken on the ipad. Because the answer choices are limited most students get a higher grade because they happened to guess the correct answer, when other tests and class work displays they don't know the answers.

SLO Survey 2016

Math was fine. ELA was overwhelming for students and doesn't capture the whole picture.

This is an assessment that we have used with our students over the years and it has been effective.

The information that is presented on this assessment is not indicative of what the students learn in this class. There are some in depth questions that pertain more to pharmacy and STNA training, than to a Sports Medicine & Exercise Science Program. The state is working to make the WebXams better for SMES, but as of right now, there are inappropriate questions.

I also do not feel that a straight selected response assessment is indicative of student knowledge and allows guessing when responding to questions. It does not indicate the depth of information that the students know.

The ELA assessment was not high quality and was a Superkids assessment. Last year we used the TRC.

The math slo was fine, but we should have been told what it was sooner. The reading slo was a unit test, and I'm not sure why we gave that rather than an of the year test.

This is a new class that is part of a program that we paid to teach. I used the test that the company gave us.

Ready Gen Unit 2 assessment was used to determine the third grade SLO. The test is worth a total of 45 points, however, only 21 of the 45 points are comprehension and vocabulary. The remaining 24 points are earned through writing. I understand the relationship of reading and writing, however, since this is a reading SLO, I'm not sure why writing is included on the test.

The math assessment is too long! It takes time for students to complete and an enormous amount of time for teachers to grade and enter in IlluminatED. The answers are worth different amounts of points and letters of multiple choice questions don't always coordinate with the letters for the answers in IlluminatED. Filling in the bubble sheets is too difficult for third graders so teachers have to enter each individual point for every answer for every students.

The reading SLO was 20/45 points based on a writing prompt.

Math was much better than ELA entirely to many points based on a writing essay.

The reading is ridiculous that the majority of the score is from an essay.

The Ready Gen is more of a writing assessment than reading

SlO for ELA included multiple items in which students had a choice between 2 items. So many students scored high because of guessing correctly. Not an accurate measure of what they know.   Math SLO is fine.

It was only 30 questions. I don't know that that is the best sample size.

MAP

Pearson Mid-Year.....pre and post are exactly the same.

SLO Survey 2016

The math SLO assessment was fine. The reading SLO assessment was too long and the majority of the points were derived from one writing piece. It was not a true indicator of the student's overall reading ability.

My assessment was created by the state and is a webxam. I have no control over it, which means I do not know the quality of the assessment.

the material that was on the slow was random and not meaningful

WE designed it. The only mistake I made was reusing the true false questions with an imbalance of true false which rewards guessing on pretest thus masking potential growth. I'll fix it if there's a next time.

I like that the assessment was only 22 questions, as the kids are tested out. At the same time it was difficult to set goals. I typically use 70 as Proficient but this test made it 77%.

It was an assessment by the publisher of the new series.

Not a true measure of our content, If a student scores 220 and above on the pre-assessment the content they need to grow is not 8th grade content it is High school.

the math was ok.... 3

the reading was poor...1   Superkids benchmark. we were given time to look it over and then add our feedback before it was to administered. I felt that the majority of the questions/comments were not answered. None of the test was changed. There is a reading passage for the students to read. I had many students who could not read the passage. By the end of the year some of those students will have improved tremendously in their reading but will still not be able to read that passage. They will not show growth according to Superkids and will be unable to meet their growth target. The TRC based the student on what reading level they were currently at and what level they were on at the end of the year thus showing growth. We were told we could not use TRC for the SLO. On the other end ... my higher students who could read the passage that did well will leave them no room to show growth according to this test as well.

I have no idea because I am not allowed to see it! The state determines the pre test and post test in CTE and we have no idea what we are even evaluating, really. Only vague and sometimes completely irrelevant, unrealistic, unnecessary and unattainable "standards"

Depending on the individual teacher grading the assessment, grades can vary greatly. The responses were too subjective.

Assessment material on SLO,is material that is not covered in the series.

Using a benchmark test should not be a consideration for a SLO. In addition it was much too long and required too much time to administer.

How can you assess something that has never been taught at any other grade level. What should be assessed is the basic skills required to pass the units of study that the SLO is covering.

SLO Survey 2016

Our department had to create our own assessments based on Ohio standards for world languages. I felt the one I used was very good, but I have since made improvements to it I plan to use for next year.

We used the school approved Math curriculum big ideas that aligns with the state standards.

I think our assessment was well written but then we were forced to add additions questions to make it more like an end of course exam. It ended up being more like an additional final exam.

Not enough questions, not all grade level standards

Program not user friendly, unable to print any portion of the test, unable to share tests with colleagues , and tedious process to grade due to the test being administered through textbook site. The test material is very rigorous.

Using a 20 point essay for ELA is too subjective, too much work, and the kids did it in a 3 inch box on the computer.

Math was ok.

Question numbers were left in the test without questions to accompany them. The answer key was wrong. The test was administered way after teaching 5 weeks of math. It will not be an accurate measure of student growth.

This is a quality assessment.

Assessment wasn't given to us until after a full chapter of instruction!

Biology team developed the SLO assessment collaboratively.

Our department made the assessment. The questions are all aligned to standards and varied DOK levels.

It represent most of what is covered in the curriculum

Common Assessment was directed to be used. My students did so poorly on it (and many were never completed) I chose to utilize MAP, instead -- to determine growth goal.

There should have been a meeting to select the best assessment. E-mail is not an effective method for deciding important information.

There should have been a meeting to decide the best assessment to use. Email is not an effective way to make these decisions.

@ out of 5 sections on the ELA slo only had 2 choices for an answer, so the kids had a 50%chance to guess correctly.

The math SLO needs to be cleaned up and only contain the questions we are giving in numerical order, not skipping around the test and answer sheet for the omitted ones.

Grade level appropriate

The SLO wasn't a good measure of what knowledge students were able to demonstrate.

SLO Survey 2016

Out of the possible 54 points 15 questions require the student to circle one of two options (therefore they have a 50/50 chance of getting the answer correct). 26/54 points on this assessment require students to circle one of three possible options. I had some students, who on a previous kindergarten entrance assessment were not able to identify any upper case or lower case letters, score well on this assessment due to the fact that they had a decent chance of guessing correctly. When this assessment is readministered in March, it is possible the students will not do as well as they did initially due to confusing short vowel sounds. In other words, they will have the skills (letter/sound knowledge) but may confuse certain sounds. It may not be a reflection of the progress made as it is an all or nothing assessment (especially on the 50/50 questions). They may guess well again. They also may have mastered the skills taught thus far in Superkids and pass the assessment without guessing. As a teacher who knows her students, I will be able to discern where on this spectrum they fall, however, to an outsider the assessment can be deceiving (making a student appear to know more or less than they actually know and can demonstrate in reading groups). I prefer the DSA (Developmental Spelling Assessment) which was used last year.

Using the Pearson mid-year assessment was an afterthought. I am unsure why the SLO assessment was not ready at the commencement of the school year, but the mid year exam then was paired down to 20 questions. Really? How are you measuring student mastery of skills on only 20 questions?
The quality of the math SLO was better than the reading one.

The assessment in only inclusive of those lessons we have taught until March. And it only illustrates one question per standard being tested. It is not a true picture of what students really know.
Self-created assessment for world languages.
I was confused about why there was writing on the "Reading" SLO.

The Math assessment was acceptable, but the ELA assessment did not provide valuable information to inform instruction.

It was customized on Pearson and did not address the standards required for success for these students at the end of the year. Very limited info
One of the questions had a typo. The assessment does not align to the Benchmark assessments the district makes us use.

SLO Survey 2016

Comment on the implementing and scoring.

It's extra work. I already knew the students could not do well not he essay.

We had to hand score and enter into Illuminate,. We can not save when working on the SLO. You have to do a practice one first on paper. When you submit math you get an instant response it was received but when you do ELA you do not, so people think they have to retype the whole things.. Co workers typed them in 4 times. I stopped after 2

Since the test was not multiple choice we could not scan it into Illuminate Ed. We were asked to score by hand then to fill out individual score sheets for each student bubbling in whether they earned 1 point or 2 for each question (blank if they missed the points).   This was very time consuming particularly since we were so far into the school year and already trying to fulfill other obligations.

The Google Form made it easier to complete the required fields.

We did not receive adequate information on SLOs until material was already being taught, and that information was conflicting.

It is very cumbersome and time consuming to put scores on two different charts

Some of the questions asked were redundant. However the process this time was simpler.

The SLO was simple for the students to take and the Pearson program scored the test. The SLO google form was also very easy to follow. The only issue on the ELA SLO was that the rationale section was completed for us and we could not rationalize why growth targets were set a certain way.

It took me a total of 6 hours and 20 minutes to assess my students, score their papers, fill in their bubble sheets, scan their bubble sheets, evaluate their results, and complete the SLO data graph. That is ridiculous. I am only allotted 200 minutes a week for planning and so the rest of the time I had to complete this outside of school hours.

I prefer paper and pencil, which is what we eventually agreed on.

Implementing is very easy. However, scoring is very tedious and time consuming.

SLO Survey 2016

The online assessment program first wouldn't allow me to even open my students' assessments. After a couple weeks of correspondence back and forth between the textbook publisher, I was finally able to open the assessments. After grading them, however, I could not see the scores for all of my students. The publisher assured me that the problem would be fixed, but it hasn't been.

There was some confusion on what exactly needed to be turned in for student data. Still not sure if I need to complete the excel sheet where all student data and growth measures are recorded.

See above. Myself and 6 other colleagues also spent 3 hours deciding on how to make meaningful growth targets using an assessment that had 50/50 chances that students got correct even though they didn't know how to correctly respond. Setting targets using a baseline that is baseless is ridiculous.

The ReadyGen site is not intuitive for finding where to go so extended responses can be scored. I had to do a lot of random clicking to find where I should have been.

Grading such a huge test with so many kids was tough

I use Austin Formula data sheet and calculate scores on my own based on my growth target. (not the Austin calculation)

All student data required for SLOs/TBTs etc should be all easily ready in one data base. Not some info on infinite campus, some Illuminate Ed, some elsewhere .....frustrating to say the least.

It was a challenge to grade as the specifics were not originally given out until we had to ask for a scoring chart.

Scoring the math took at least 3 hours. The reading was shorter because most of it was scored online.

Valuable time is wasted on continuously testing

It's not easy and is not efficient for the reading and math SLO.

The ReadyGen Baseline Assessment was extremely difficult to use. A few students were missing from my roster, I had students on my roster who weren't in my class, and we were unable to see a breakdown of each student's scores for individual questions. This made it nearly impossible to identify areas of student growth.

SLO Survey 2016

The multiple choice questions were scored on-line. However, teachers had to grade questions 4 constructed responses and the extended response essay. We also had major problems getting students logged-on due to word password issues.

There were question deleted from the original SLO and there were no adjustments made in Illuminate Ed. More time was taken when inputting the scores because you had to make sure that you did not put a score in for that deleted question.

The math is far too long!

I really liked giving and scoring the reading assessment online.
Recording templates are always changing

We are paying for MAP and taking them. Why not use them. They also give a projected growth which helps with the setting growth target.

Very tedious and time consuming. Some tests were to be given on ipad. Students were just pressing any kind of button-like a game- so also not an accurate representation. I also had students that had to take it paper and pencil- I had to do this individually with each student- because of a glitch in the ipad programming that has yet to be resolved after 4 calls to the superkids IT department.
GradeCam is difficult to work with

There were some issues with technology, this is the 1st year many teachers are using Pearson and only had a few hours of training over the summer. This was not a sufficient amount of time to implement an online test.

It was difficult because I put the preassessment into illuminateED and when tagging the standards to each question it was confusing because the numbering from ODE was different than the numering of each standard in IlluminateED.

Both SLOs were very time consuming in in all areas. They took away a lot of instructional time. The MAP tests would have been much faster and more efficient.

My assessment was created by the state and is a webxam.

SLO Survey 2016

The answer document should have been a scantron sheet that could be placed into a scantron reader for easy grading. Or the test should have been taken on a computer-all multiple choice.
SElf designed so can't complain

Grading 46 written responses online was lengthy. I was not able to see #2 on any of my students' assessments. I emailed two times and it never was corrected.
Logging in was a problem as the passwords and log ins kept being changed and I had to keep calling to let them know to stop changing the passwords.

Because Superkids benchmark for second grade was new... it was not available/ready to be given until after we have already been teaching for a full month. This also skews the data. This should have been done last year and ready to go the first week of school.

Individual teachers should not be scoring the assessment. There is too much room for bias grading. A test such as MAP that is scored and based on each individual child should be used.
SLO took almost four days to implement.

Too long, too much time spent administering and scoring.
Since it was teacher-made and not computer administered, it was quite time consuming.

Because they wanted online testing, it was slighting difficult because we were unable to delete the questions we did not want to use, so we had to have the students go through and only answer some of the questions.
We were not able to customize the test electronically
Illuminate Ed is very easy to use.
One question in ELA did not even show up in the answers to the kids got a zero on it. Again, the 20 point essay with a rubric is way too much for a SLO.
It took 2 hours after school to grade and enter the scores into the computer.
The test was easy to implement and score.

Assessment wasn't given to us until after a full chapter of instruction! Students then had to write in answers, we had to hand grade them, and then bubble each students score for every question answered so that it could be uploaded into Infinite Campus
We used Illuminate Ed.
The post test should be incorporated with the class score to encourage effort to reliable scores.

SLO Survey 2016

Once I chose MAP -- it was fine. However, had I decided to remain with the common assessment, each assessment was hand scored, item by item.

We were provided with a scoring system that made no sense. The scoring system should have been created collaboratively.

We were provided a scoring system that made no sense. The scoring system should have been formed collaboratively between both middle schools.

time consuming to give to kindergartners, do not understand how to take a test yet and both are too long for them

It took me 4 hrs to score and bubble in the scantron and scan into illuminatED

Some of the machine scored items for the ELA assessment did not function properly.

Scoring the SLO wasn't considered and was never really decided upon in full. It was easy to implement (on iPad).

There has been no time to score. Hildesheim were tired of being tested and doing tests that seemed to have no purpose!

The assessment contained items stating, "This item has been omitted." This made implementing it difficult for my young students to follow along with on the SmartBoard, and entering data unnecessarily tedious into IlluminateEd.

Kindergarteners want to please, especially in the first few weeks of school. I administered the assessment in small groups in hopes of easing any anxiety students might feel. This year I had several students in tears despite my best efforts to assuage their fears and explain they are not supposed to know any of this now. I wonder if there is a developmentally appropriate way to measure teachers. It is painful to watch them struggle. The impending SLO does not in any way make me work harder as a teacher. I want my students to READ at the end of the school year. This motivates me.

The scoring was easy but as eluded to above the score itself was not always reflective of what student knowledge. Many scored higher than their skills due to the nature of the assessment.

SLO Survey 2016

The SLO test should be scored through Illuminate. We were forced to administer through the Pearson site which only added to the teacher work load. Then to go through and look at and organize scores for each sub group when Illuminate would have done that, was time consuming. Having Illuminate and then NOT using it to desegregate the data is just ridiculous.

Scoring rubrics for math were not accurate and did not match the test and reading took a long time to get targets set.
Time Consuming

Implementing and scoring the assessment was fine, but recording it apart from Infinite Campus (especially with regard to demographic information) was more of a burden and busywork than anything else.

The Reading SLO took me a very long time to grade and score.

The level of communication was lacking. Because the administration could not agree on which assessment should be given, we were required to give three before the third one was accepted as "ok."

Five days were used to give the assessments!
Computer did it

very long and time consuming to administer. Many students had difficulty finishing. Time consuming to score.

SLO Survey 2016

Comments on setting growth targets.

I knew students did not know the content of the SLO.

I used Austin Formula only because the test was so bad I had no idea what would be reasonable.

There was confusion as to what the growth target should be.   We were under the impression that growth targets should be achievable and agreed upon but then we were told at one point that the growth target should be "70% of students will score a 70% or higher on the SLO" which is not achievable nor agreed upon.

There was little insight into calculating growth targets.

While I am confident that many students will reach and surpass a 50% growth target, I have many students that come to me well below reading level and having not taken or passed biology. With said students, I am striving for and excited to see a 30% growth..

I enjoy working with my team.

They are meaningless for the most part.

It is very difficult to set a growth target on a 20 question multiple choice test. I know that teacher input greatly reduced the amount-of questions, but we had so little time to make smart decisions about the SLO. the growth target was strictly a guess and based on what my team thought was a reasonable target for March. There is obviously no way for us to know what possible growth our students could make.

There is ABSOLUTELY NO CONSISTENTLY in how to set growth targets. The district says to use the Austin formula, which is OUTRAGEOUS and not a true growth measure for our students. The Union says pick whatever, so I chose what I thought to be fair. However, that does not mean that other schools will choose the same growth measurement. It is unfair to students that there is absolutely no accountability and no consistency with this.

Very hard to determine approprate growth targets.

I was forced to use the MAP test because of all the problems using the online textbook assessment system. It is very easy to set the SLO target using MAP.

This is done by NWEA map assessment, however there has been no exact answer on whether winter or spring growth measures will be used.

See above.

How do you set growth targets for an assessment that is not normed, is brand new (even to the publisher), and you have no trend data to give you an idea of what acceptable growth would look like?

Proficiency is not the same as growth.

SLO Survey 2016

I think my percents for growth targets were Ok . I dont get why we have to set growth targets when the students come in not knowing anything about the particular subject matter they are going to learn about anyways.

I will have students less than a total of 18 weeks since class meets approximately every other day by "even" or "odd" dates.
Some pull outs happen during UA classes as well.

I was under the impression that they wanted a blanket growth target and didn't take into consideration of students on IEP's (their individual reading levels)
I was able to use the MAP growth targets.
This is easy with that austin formula
MAP did it for me
It's based on a formula... doesn't look st whole picture.

This takes a long time, and the feedback we receive about our growth targets often feels misplaced and inappropriate as we know our students better than most of the people giving us feedback.

I think it is difficult to accurately guess the growth of a student based on a multiple choice assessment, but the worksheet is helpful in setting my targets.

The PE department was notified several years ago that we are mandated to use the Austin formula. However, art, music, and foreign language are not required to use it. Since I am a professional, I have made the Austin formula work over the last couple of years. Now I continue to use it because I know that the district will accept it since they mandated it previously.

On ELA some questions were worth .5 and some students have to make a tremendous jump. With the point system they need to grow so many points yet the values were low. Therefore, they would need to get most questions right to make that jump.

The directions for completing the data collection was confusing. Many of my colleagues thought they were supposed to submit them when our principal wanted a written copy so that he could preview it.

I have never had to do a SLO before and I copied what someone else did

As it stands now, students in third grade at one elementary school in CHUH can have different growth targets even though they have the same pretest score. There has been no guidance given as to how to set the growth target other than to use the Austin Formula, but that was not a directive so teachers were left to use whatever method was preferred. It was confusing and very time consuming.

As stated before, growth targets were impossible because we could not see a breakdown of student scores.

All 37 students scored in "below proficient" range and there was no guide or rational for establishing a reasonable growth target.

15

SLO Survey 2016

I used the excel template that Ari sent out a few years back. It made setting the growth targets easy.

If other buildings were allowed to set their own growth targets, it is not fair that we had to use the REACH targets.

see above

With a new SLO for our grade level, teachers had to get together multiple times on our own time to try to figure out reasonable growth targets for ELA.

They are nothing more than educated guesses.

Growth targets were set by district personnel and teachers did not have a say in weather the targets were either rigorous and attainable. Given the growth targets, they are rigorous, but not attainable.

It is crazy that some people are allowed to use the standard deviation model given to us a few years back from the Building Leadership Team and others are not. This an issue where some teachers are being held to different expectations based on the whims of their administrator.

Administrators want growth but have no actual model or reasoning behind what they want. They want the teacher to guess, but then if the teacher guesses wrong the teacher gets punished. Administration has been rejecting growth targets because they say they are low, but have no evidence to back it up. THIS WHOLE PROCESS IS UNFAIR.

I can not predict how these students who I have known for a few weeks will develop. I can not predict what life events will occur, if they are eating well, sleeping well or will contract some sort of disease. I can only teach to the best of my ability and hope for the best.

I actually raised my previous growth targets based on last years data.

It was very difficult to set realistic growth targets for students who only scored 4 to 8 on the pre-assessment. The Austin method set the score to high, the Statistical method set it too low|

There was no clear communication for what the growth targets needed to be.

MAP sets growth targrts

just awful. We were told to use the Austin method. plug in the percentage and whatever growth target that spit out is what we had to use. We were not able to use our professional judgement to change that growth target in any way.

Again, too subjective. This should be clear cut.

Growth targets were difficult to set.   I have never given this assessment before and the children are not really being taught in this program, some of the material that is on the post assessment.

SLO Survey 2016

This should have been done as a district grade level team long before it was attempted. We spent 3 hours of our own time trying to make sense of a senseless document but finally came up with something we could live with.

I feel that it is unrealistic and set up for failure.

I set growth targets based on the recommendations of Ohio learning standards and modified them based on my knowledge of individual classes and students. I was still very time consuming.

I struggled. We were provided with two different calculations and I struggled to determine was was reasonable growth. When a student scores a 0, is it reasonable to think that they would score an 80% by the end of the year

It was not difficult to create the growth target but it is more like guess work then anything else.

Unclear, subjective, not accurate

Reading seemed to be done but math wasn't. Confusing.

Growth targets would be fair if the test was given before any new instruction.

Growth targets would be great if the test was given the first week of school.

told target needs to be 70% for each kid. going from 0% to 70% is unrealistic growth.

There were no uniform guidelines for how to adjust growth targets. There should be consistent standards. The current system is arbitrary.

There were no uniform guidelines as to adjust growth targets. Everyone should be using the same standards.

math-austin formual, ELA-we created a table as a team--took lots of time because of the guessing aspect of 2 parts of the test

This experience was AWFUL! I am not a trained statistician and have no idea how to project growth! The district should have provided us with a "growth target formula". This too took me hours to track down and use a formula to make projected growth targets for my students. This is unacceptable.

These were set for us using the formula.

This was poor due to the need to discuss scoring. Also, because the assessment allowed students to guessing correctly, it was hard to establish true growth targets.

I used the Austin Formula. The excel spread sheet was thankfully very easy to fill out. There was quite a bit of confusion regarding the growth targets among kindergarten teachers. Meetings were organized to help people come up with the targets. I was not able to attend the meetings so my building decided to use the Austin formula.

SLO Survey 2016

We as a team of intelligent teachers set our growth measure. Austen (Austin?) method was not usable for a 20 question test

A student growth measure must be set reasonably and it should be set "differentiated" for each student.

Thankful for the CHTU website for having the Excel sheet readily available.

Guidelines for growth targets were unclear.

Since the period of assessment ends in February, it's been more frustrating to gauge those targets.

I have had experience with making recommendations in the past about appropriate goals for students, but that option was not given this year. According to the Austin formula, the students who score the lowest should make the most growth. I understand that we want these students on-grade level, but is that a realistic goal for them? I am concerned about how appropriate that is for these children.

I used the Austin Formula, which made it very easy.

Growth targets were set for me

Austin formulas are unrealistic growth targets especially for above grade level students.

Using the Austin Formula, most students had a projected growth of less than 60%, but nothing below 60% is accepted by principal. There was another sheet that growth targets were to be submitted on which wasn't made clear.

SLO Survey 2016

What could have been done to make the process better?

Not having to do it.

Return to using MAP

I feel that the curriculum specialists and others responsibly for the design and implementation of this process should have had a clearer more thought-out process. It is not fair that the teachers have to scramble so late into the school year and that we essentially are not given credit for the items that we taught at the beginning of the year because these arrangements were so last minute.

Reviewing the calculation of growth targets. How do you calculate when scoring computer generated tests and all students are at different levels Below Basic.

Perhaps have more than a blanket 50% growth target?

see above, above comment

Eliminate SLO's they prove nothing and are time consuming for no purpose!

More communications about how to do the SLOs. I felt like I was just guessing and running around asking other teachers. I never got feed back from last year's SLO and didn't know if I did it correctly.

It would have been helpful to have the SLO completed before school started so that teachers would have had plenty of time for helpful input. Principals and teachers could benefit from understanding how to set a reasonable growth target. There was a lot of confusion around this and scores seemed arbitrary.

The district could have been more prepared, from the first day of school.

Teachers could have sat in on the creation of the SLO assessments or been given the option to create their own.

The district could have given teachers set criteria for growth measures for all grades and all subjects.

The district curriculum people could have assisted in grading SLO assessments.

This could have been WAY more organized.

This could have been a positive process.

ARC could have been more prepared for implementation.

Principals could have been more prepared and informed about SLO changes.

Have the pre assessments ready before the first day of school. Some of the material on the pre assessment had already been taught by me by th e time the SLO was given.

See above.

We could have used our assessment from last year.

Clarification on what exactly needs to be completed in turned in to administrated.

An answer on exactly what growth measures will be used to assess teacher effectiveness.

SLO Survey 2016

Including teachers when making changes in the SLO process, especially changing the entire assessment. Sending it out and asking our opinion during the first 6 weeks of school is not the best method of asking our opinion. I need time to administer it and test it out before I can truly understand whether an assessment that is going to decide my effectiveness is worth giving to my students.

Let us use established assessments like TRC or MAP. Listen to the teacher input. I am tired of answering district surveys only to be ignored every single time.

Shorter test based on the Proficient level the the Air Test indicators

Making the spread sheet with names and id numbers is not easy, then finding all the demographic data to include we had to go to another source to find that.   And then to put it all into another sheet.....

An in-person meeting about how to correctly complete the SLO process, with ONE person giving us directions and all the information/links we need.

Training/ PD

Make a decision on how to score the tests and then just let us know in a timely manner.

It seems like the district did not tell us early enough what we should be using for our SLOs. The earlier we know exactly what we are using for our slos, the earlier we can administer them. This makes it easier to meet the growth targets for each student. I feel that there was a lot of indecision and flailing around at the district level this year that should not have been.

ARC could have met before school started so that we could begin the year with an approved process instead of being told after the year started and after several TBTs had administered their SLO pre-assessment that we needed to wait OR ARC or someone could have communicated with staff that we needed to wait before the year started.

A very bad time of year to give the slow when you are trying to assess others.

Using a test that has the students demonstrate their work and thinking rather than just pick a random answer if they don't know. Having a set scale assigned to an assessment makes it standardized for all- such as a DSA assessment.

Use MAP testing. Students already have to take it and it gives us more information. They are taking too many assessments.

More user-friendly templates and documents (esp. spreadsheets), more understanding from administrators.

The Growth Targets using MAP don't seem to be aligned with the longitudinal data.

A word template would be helpful in order to be able to pre-write your answers before cutting and pasting the information into the form.

For ELA, it was still a discussion of grading and scoring at our monthly Delisle Center meeting. Our supervisor could not answer questions regarding the SLO and it became ridiculous. I was under the assumption that the test and information would be ready by the beginning of the school year!

To streamline SLO with TBT data. There is a disconnect with the paperwork. Teachers are spending a huge amount of time setting up SLO information and working on separate TBTs.

SLO Survey 2016

We should have the slo test when school starts so that they can be administered in the first few weeks.

Principal could have communicated expectations for setting growth targets and could've been more clear about what needed to be submitted. Also, the system in place does not seem to be fair. There are teachers who don't have to do SLOs, teachers who do one SLO and there are teachers who have to do two SLOs.

We need ReadyGen PD so that we can ask more questions. We had one PD session before we were given materials and had ever used the program. Now that we have used it, it would be nice to have a question and answer session with areas teachers are having trouble with. I would like to be walked through the online portal as well because it was so challenging to administer and score this assessment.

Using the MAP assessment would have been a better choice for a reading/comprehension SLO, and the growth targets are set and reasonable.

Have a time given to us to input scores, complete forms and create the growth chart with student numbers for the principals. Or not do them at all!

shorter math assessment

It would be helpful to have a consistent SLO form that we submit to the committee. The google form makes it difficult to record what has been submitted and it is always changing. A document that can be used every year, preferably the one created by the state and not by the district, would be much easier to fill out and would not need to be re-written every year.

Using the same SLO as last year for ELA

Not required it in the first place.

Allow teacher to have a say in the growth targets.

The formula to calculate growth measures should be collectively bargained. I think this should be a grieveable offense.

We already give the MAP assessments in the fall. Using data from this assessment would have made this process less time consuming and more efficient..

The administration should have to accept the growth targets that the teachers give.

Used an online end of year benchmark test.

PE is fine

Wish I knew the answer.

Have everything in place before requiring students and teachers to complete this process. It was incredibly frustrating and taxing for the students and teachers.

Better communication from administration and more consistency.

Don't bother me with a survey asking me for my thoughts/opinions about the SLO and then give the same exact test without a single change.

Plan the year prior so the test is ready to go at the beginning of the school year.

end it

More precise directives. All teachers should have the same basic SLOs and the same method for calculating growth should be used.

SLO Survey 2016

The assessment should be designed by the teachers and the growth targets should be established prior to days before the document is due. In addition, the spreadsheets were sent out with targets already set and there are some people who did not understand that those could be changed based on their expertise. All of this work should have been done in the spring of 2016 or at the very least, one of the first days of contractual time.

conference with administrators to discuss a fair and realistic growth target.

Subscribe to a standardized online test for world languages, such as the national tests.

Just pick one calculation and go with it, and then allow us to make changes based on individual students

Uniform and more specific directions from administration.

A different SLO, such as MAP would have been better.

We needed to be able to have the ability to create, print, and share the tests.

Use something that is graded for us so there is no subjectivity. Anyone can just mark their scores low to start with.

The test should have been given the first week of school and the questions that were omitted, should not have appeared on the test booklet. The test also should have been more easily accessible. Our whole downstairs wing had to click around for about a half hour before finally stumbling upon the SLO.

The test should have been given the first week of school.

1) Have test for teachers ready to administer by the first day of school.
2) make tests multiple choice for Illuminate scanning
3) growth targets should be reasonable

Eliminate this process. This data does not help me. Data collected once I have taught the information helps me. Post lesson data allows me to differentiate based on student needs. SLO data tells me that every year students come to me with very little to no pre-knowledge.

See scoring

Collaboration, clear guidelines, clear directions.

Collaboration, clear directions, clear guidelines and should have been done in the summer.

use the DSA for ELA and have the Math test cleaned up.

Links to all of the forms required to fill out. The SLO scoring template was not attached to the steps provided by Paul Lombardo. Luckily one of my colleagues kept a draft of the form from last year that we could use this year.

Suggested/research based growth target formulas.

I would like to have the assessment prior to the first day of school so that it can be administered the first week.

Conferred with teachers about the SLO at the August professional development meeting so important discussions could have taken place earlier.

Another test could have been cut and pasted (old school style with paper, tape and white out :-)) together and rescanned for ease of implementation and recording.

SLO Survey 2016

I appreciate the Austin formula excel spread sheet. I appreciate the Union's understanding of the ridiculousness of it all. Ari has been helpful in clearing up all the confusion around the SLO's in his emails to members.

Some planning by the administrators so SLO can be administered within the first two weeks of the school year.

They don't do enough to show us how to do this.

Have SLO tests, rubrics, and targets set and ready to go the first few weeks of school.

Spread deadlines out more. Everything is due in October!!!

Clear guidelines from administration across all buildings.

This is an onerous, time consuming process which really does nothing to illustrate the effectiveness of the teacher. Teachers are not mind readers and fortune tellers. There are so many things OUTSIDE of school that affect the learning process. In addition, there is a tremendous amount of instruction time lost to endless testing and meetings. As usual, the student takes a back seat to data collection that serves no real purpose.

If demographic information could be uploaded automatically.

Having a clear-cut guideline for how to reach student EOY goals (the Fountas and Pinnell chart was very reasonable with goals, and was a good example of realistic expectations).

Communication was not good. Different answers were given depending upon which administrator you spoke with.

The assessments should have been available at the beginning of the school year.

We should have known what we were using at the beginning of the school year. To give MAP and then have to give yet another assessment to our students is not fair to them or respectful of my teaching time.

Allowed the experts in the core who work at the board to create the assessments. They would not have to reinvent, there are resources they should find to make assessments that really mean something.

SLO Survey 2016

General comments

The communication about SLOs was inconsistent.

Each year the completion of SLO has become more difficult. This year using only a computer generated test from the textbook made it even more so since
many of the choices offered for a pre-assessment are not aligned to curriculum.
I hate SLO's.

The whole SLO process is just more paper work. It does not prove anything and detracts from teachers planning time. We already give MAPS AIR OGT's etc. The purpose of one more test to track if your teacher really taught you is silly and unnecessary.

* MAP is very specific and uses a specific formula to calculate student growth measure that we can understand and use as a true data point *Grading this test can be very subjective *A majority of the proposed test provided is written in a word problem format. Are our students allowed to have the test read to them like they would on AIR testing. As we all know some students can perform in MATH, however, they have reading deficiencies which can affect their ability to perform.
*Will we be giving this test online or paper pencil, I think that each school should be utilizing the same testing format. I see that it is on Illuminate Ed, but will teachers be required to give it online?
*Let's be honest, this makes it very easy for some teachers to Teach to the Test and utilize these questions in their classroom environment to ensure student growth.
*Why are we giving MAP if it doesn't matter any more. For another assessments? My kids are assessed enough.

I would like my SLO totally thrown out of the evaluation mix this year because I lack confidence in the adopted assessment. I feel like the upper administration is purposely backing us into a corner and finding ways to obscure our successes so we appear as total failures. Is this because we are in negotiations or because they don't like having accomplished teachers when the state tests are more of a predictor of socio-economic status?

we need one system that has all info easily accessible with all info and data.....
Will this ever end?

There was no one clear point person for the SLO process.
Different administrators sometimes gave conflicting directions about how to complete the process.
Lack of clarity in the process led to me re-doing work several times.

it seemed they had no idea what to do and they were scrambling to figure it out at the last minute

SLOs affect our evaluations and our careers, which affects our livelihoods. It is critical for the district to make sure they have SLO protocols in place early and that the growth target formulas are fair, equitable, achievable, and reasonable for all students.
Why didn't we get to vote on the SLO? Decisions are being made without teacher input.
Do away with meaningless testing and measurements

SLO Survey 2016

I would estimate that I spent 8 hours completing two SLOs so far. I graded each assessment, entered the data in IlluminatED, scored the writing in Ready Gen, completed the table/chart (with student names, ID numbers, baseline score, and growth target), read all of the emails containing directions of how to complete SLOs, and worked through the Google Doc with all of the demographic info. for a Math SLO and Reading SLO. It's so frustrating.

I wish there was more direction from the administration. My team felt very lost throughout this process and didn't feel like we were able to turn in quality work because we were unsure of what the expectations were.

I didn't get any guidance or help other than my colleagues.

While I know this is a state-implemented mandate, I do not think this is a reliable assessment and should not be a part of teacher evaluations.

Let educators spend their time focusing on instruction... not giving mandated tests and recording data

Administrators want growth but have no actual model or reasoning behind what they want. They want the teacher to guess, but then if the teacher guesses wrong the teacher gets punished. Administration has been rejecting growth targets because they say they are low, but have no evidence to back it up. THIS WHOLE PROCESS IS UNFAIR. The fact that teachers have to set goals with major consequences makes no sense.

The slows should have been developed last year and ready for the teachers on the first inservice day before school started.

I liked the shortened narrative for the SLO. Google form was easy to fill out.

What is the purpose of this? Not one school did the same thing as far as growth measures, etc. How can you measure teachers based on students that have varying needs all on the same assessment with the same growth measure? Isn't that what we are fighting with the state tests? Our district is doing the SAME thing!!

SLO Survey 2016

I suggested giving the TRC one more year until the kinks in superkids could be ironed out.

My lower kids will not reach the growth target and my higher kids will not reach the growth target. I was also told "at least your kids on IEP's won't count". I explained that without them, my class number is below 20 so now the percentage of kids that need to pass overall is higher. (and those kids are not on anyone's list...which I don't understand).

Giving the test a month after school has already started is also not accurate/fair.

My professional judgement doesn't matter because the growth target score that comes from using the Austin method is what we had to use.

I feel that both of these tests are developmentally inappropriate. You can explain the reason behind these tests to older students (telling them that it will not count toward anything) This logic does not work with younger children. Every year I have students who cry because they don't know how to do anything on the test. There is no reason to put this kind of stress on our students.

Last year when I was able to set growth targets based on my professional judgement my students were able to meet their target goals even though the target goal may not have been an 80%. If the teachers all meet their SLO growth targets but yet the building does not meet the 80% growth target overall, the principal will get dinged on their evaluation. I feel as though I am being set up to fail but the scores will now match for my principal.

I turned in my SLO growth targets to my principal today knowing that I already failed.
it is so arbitrary

The amount of time spent on completing SLOs could have been better used in planning and prep for lessons. The timing of progress reports, SLOs , and evaluations on top of the regular work load was highly stressful.

Sending a document out in the summer and asking for feedback is not an effective way to get good ideas and comments. In addition, without using the document it was impossible to know how the tool was going to meet, or in our case not meet, our needs. This process should not be left to last minute, lack of a plan and an unrealistic timeline.

I don't understand the process of writing a SLO in a document, using those provided by ODE as our guide, and then having to copy and paste chunks of it into the Google Form. It seems like an unnecessary second step, and I'm curious about the rationale. It seems that it would be much more efficient and less confusing to simple email our SLO document as an attachment.

SLO Survey 2016

The word document that we were told to send our supervisor was not easy to edit. I would also recommend us using a Google Sheet document so we can set up equations. This way we can also use the data generated from Illumiate Ed and download it straight from there.

The SLO was a waste of my time and my students.

The actual questions on the test were good questions. Its too bad the test will not serve as a tool for measuring student growth accurately.

This data does not help me. Data collected once I have taught the information helps me. Post lesson data allows me to differentiate based on student needs. SLO data tells me that every year students come to me with very little to no pre-knowledge.

SLO assessment selection and scoring guidelines should be completed in the summer and teachers should receive materials the first week of school. Assessments aren't valid when students have had weeks of instruction.

SLO assessment should have been created in the summer, so we were not giving the test after we taught Chapter 1. In my opinion, my SLO is not valid because we had already taught chapter 1.

We should be given a half day or professional time to complete these forms. I would say it took me about 5 hrs to complete this process at home and after hours.

Students treat this course as a special not commit enough time in learning. That makes the growth target hard to reach.

Is any of this necessary? September felt like one assessment after another for these poor four and five year olds. Is this really in our students' best interest? Does this truly motivate people? We are all understandably picking assessments and targets to ensure success. Does it really measure anything?

I want to teach, which is difficult when administering one assessment after another.

I am unsure why some people are paid a lot of money in this district working in positions in which it seems the teachers are doing their work. I am so disappointed with how this year started with the mess that is the SLO process.

I hate SLO

What a mess and a joke.

I think everyone is feeling super overwhelmed with SLO, TBT forms, Diagnostics, and Preconferences, all being scheduled and due in the same month. Also, with conferences and progress reports, plus intervention forms needed to be completed before next SAT meeting (did I mention we still have to teach and do lesson plans). Okay, enough said.