

---

# How states use student learning objectives in teacher evaluation systems: a review of state websites

---

Natalie Lacireno-Paquet  
Claire Morgan  
Daniel Mello  
WestEd

## Summary

---

Student learning objectives (SLOs) are one way to measure individual teachers' contributions to their students' learning growth. The SLO process is a "participatory method of setting measurable goals, or objectives, based on the specific assignment or class, such as the students taught, the subject matter taught, the baseline performance of the students, and the measurable gain in student performance during the course of instruction." This method is an alternative to the more generally used value-added modeling with standardized test scores, which may not be available or appropriate for all teachers and subjects. This report presents information on the use of SLOs in teacher evaluation systems in 30 states. It aims to inform state and local policymakers engaged in creating or supporting the development of teacher evaluation systems that include SLOs.

REL 2014–013

The National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance (NCEE) conducts unbiased large-scale evaluations of education programs and practices supported by federal funds; provides research-based technical assistance to educators and policymakers; and supports the synthesis and the widespread dissemination of the results of research and evaluation throughout the United States.

March 2014

This report was prepared for the Institute of Education Sciences (IES) under Contract ED-IES-12-C-0009 by Regional Educational Laboratory Northeast & Islands administered by Education Development Center, Inc. The content of the publication does not necessarily reflect the views or policies of IES or the U.S. Department of Education nor does mention of trade names, commercial products, or organizations imply endorsement by the U.S. Government.

This REL report is in the public domain. While permission to reprint this publication is not necessary, it should be cited as:

Lacireno-Paquet, N., Morgan, C., & Mello, D. (2014). *How states use student learning objectives in teacher evaluation systems: a review of state websites* (REL 2014–013). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Regional Educational Laboratory Northeast & Islands. Retrieved from <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/edlabs>.

This report is available on the Regional Educational Laboratory website at <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/edlabs>.

## **Summary**

Motivated by the need to improve teaching and learning and by federal priorities reflected in requirements for grant programs such as Race to the Top and the Teacher Incentive Fund, many states are developing teacher evaluation systems that include measures of individual teachers' contributions to their students' learning growth. One way to measure teacher impact is with student learning objectives (SLOs)—an alternative to the more generally used value-added modeling with standardized test scores, which may not be available or appropriate for all teachers and subjects. This report gathers information on the use of SLOs in educator evaluation systems in 30 states. It aims to inform state and local policymakers involved in creating or supporting the development of teacher evaluation systems that include SLOs.

## Contents

|  |       |
|--|-------|
| Summary  | i     |
| Why this review?   | 1     |
| What are student learning objectives?  | 1     |
| Which teachers are affected?   | 3     |
| What types of student learning objectives are there?   | 3     |
| To which students do student learning objectives apply?  | 4     |
| What targets and growth measures do states specify?  | 5     |
| What assessments are used to measure student attainment of learning goals?                                 | 5     |
| How are student learning objectives set, approved, and evaluated?  | 6     |
| Appendix A. Searchable tables of state-by-state use of student learning objectives for educator evaluation | A-1   |
| Appendix B. Links to downloadable sample student learning objective forms and guidance developed by states | B-1   |
| References   | Ref-1 |
| <b>Boxes</b>   |       |
| 1 The methods used in this review  | 1     |
| 2 What does the research say about student learning objectives?  | 2     |
| 3 Sample definitions of student learning objectives  | 2     |
| 4 Examples of teachers required to develop student learning objectives                                     | 3     |
| 5 Examples of types of student learning objectives   | 4     |
| 6 Examples of setting student learning objectives  | 6     |
| 7 Examples of evaluating student learning objectives   | 6     |
| <b>Tables</b>  |       |
| 1 Common elements of state definitions of student learning objectives                                      | 2     |
| 2 Types of student learning objectives   | 4     |
| 3 Students targeted in student learning objectives   | 4     |
| 4 Types of targets for assessing student attainment of learning goals                                      | 5     |
| 5 Assessments used to evaluate the attainment of student learning objectives                               | 5     |
| A1 State use of student learning objectives in educator evaluation   | A-1   |
| A2 Definitions and features of student learning objectives, by state                                       | A-3   |
| A3 Use of student learning objectives in educator evaluation systems, by state                             | A-13  |
| A4 Characteristics of student learning objectives, by state  | A-20  |
| A5 Additional requirements in state educator evaluation systems that address student learning objectives   | A-29  |
| A6 Additional requirements in state educator evaluation student learning objectives                        | A-34  |
| B1 Tools to help in developing policies for student learning objectives                                    | B-1   |

## Why this review?

Research has established that teachers are the most powerful school-based factor affecting student achievement (Hanushek & Rivkin, 2010; Kane & Staiger, 2008). Motivated by the need to improve teaching and learning and by federal priorities reflected in grant programs like Race to the Top and the Teacher Incentive Fund, many states are developing teacher evaluation systems that include measures of individual teachers' contributions to their students' learning growth. One way to measure teacher impact is with student learning objectives (SLOs)—an alternative to the more generally used value-added modeling with standardized test scores, which may not be available or appropriate for all teachers and subjects. This report presents the findings of a nationwide review of policies and recommendations related to SLOs for state and local policymakers involved in creating or supporting the development of teacher evaluation systems that include SLOs (see table A1 in appendix A). Box 1 outlines the methods used in the review.

## What are student learning objectives?

The SLO process is “a participatory method of setting measurable goals, or objectives, based on the specific assignment or class, such as the students taught, the subject matter taught, the baseline performance of the students, and the measurable gain in student performance during the course of instruction” (Race to the Top Technical Assistance, 2010, p. 1). SLOs may be based on state or national standards or teacher- or district-established goals and may be assessed with classroom, district, or other measures. Progress toward meeting SLOs may be evaluated through a variety of measures, including externally developed or district-developed tests or other school-based tests and classroom assessments. SLOs may involve student growth models, such as value-added models or student growth percentiles. Box 2 summarizes emerging research on SLOs and educator and student performance.

Twenty-five states include definitions of SLOs—also called student learning targets, student learning goals, and SMART (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Results-oriented and Relevant, and Time-bound) goals—as part of their teacher evaluation systems. The definitions vary widely across states (box 3). Most definitions refer to student growth and achievement and to SLOs as being measurable. Table 1 lists common features of SLO definitions; table A2 in appendix A lists each state's definition.

---

### Box 1. The methods used in this review

The researchers reviewed publicly available information from the education agency websites of all 50 states and the District of Columbia. On 30 state websites the researchers found policies or recommendations on student learning objectives (SLOs) in newly enhanced teacher evaluation systems that include multiple measures of teacher effectiveness.<sup>1</sup> This report summarizes the characteristics and use of SLOs in those 30 states. Appendix A provides more detail in searchable tables, and appendix B provides links to downloadable sample SLO forms and guidance developed by states, such as teacher SLO forms, SLO rating worksheets, and guidance around choosing assessments.

#### Note

**1.** State department of education websites for all 50 states and the District of Columbia were searched for information on SLOs, and information was found for 30 states. States may not post all relevant documents on the use of SLOs in teacher evaluations on their websites, especially states that are piloting or developing policies. Because this policy area is moving so fast, documents may have been posted or removed from websites between when the websites were searched and this document was published.

*One way to measure teacher impact is with student learning objectives—an alternative to value-added modeling with standardized test scores, which may not be available or appropriate for all teachers and subjects*

---

## Box 2. What does the research say about student learning objectives?

Student learning objectives (SLOs) originated as a feature of performance-based compensation systems (Community Training and Assistance Center, 2013). Nonexperimental research on the three best-known examples of SLO implementation in such systems (Austin REACH, Denver ProComp, and Charlotte TIF-LEAP) indicates a positive correlation between the quality of SLOs and student achievement and between the number of objectives met by teachers and student achievement. More research is needed on the relationship between teachers meeting SLOs and student achievement (Tyler, 2011). Because the use of SLOs in teacher evaluation is fairly new, rigorous research on its effectiveness is not yet available.

---

---

## Box 3. Sample definitions of student learning objectives

*Arizona.* A student learning objective is a classroom-level standards-based measure relevant to the content area taught during the current school year that is specific and measurable, based on available prior student learning data, and based on growth or achievement.

*Connecticut.* Student learning objectives are broad statements about the knowledge and skills a teacher wants students to demonstrate as a result of instruction, address the central purpose of a teacher’s assignment, take into account baseline data on student performance, pertain to a large proportion of a teacher’s students, reflect content mastery or skill development, and reflect ambitious but attainable goals for student learning.

*Washington.* A student learning goal is a standards-based, rigorous, and relevant learning target that teachers set for groups or subgroups of students. It is specific and measurable, based on prior learning data, and aligned with state and content standards and school and district priorities.

**Source:** State education agency websites (see table A2 in appendix A).

---

---

**Table 1. Common elements of state definitions of student learning objectives**

| Element   | Number of states |
|---|------------------|
| Measurable  | 12               |
| Based on student growth and achievement <sup>a</sup>    | 16               |
| Aligned with state or local standards                   | 9                |
| Based on prior student learning data                    | 9                |
| Measure teacher impact on student learning <sup>b</sup> | 4                |
| Aligned with course content                             | 4                |

**a.** While student learning objectives in educator evaluation systems are used to measure teacher impact on student learning, student achievement is not always an explicit part of state definitions.

**b.** While student learning objectives in educator evaluation systems are used to measure teacher impact on student learning, teacher impact on learning is not always an explicit part of state definitions.

**Source:** State education agency websites (see table A2 in appendix A).

---

## Which teachers are affected?

One aspect of the variability across states is whether SLOs apply to all teachers or just to certain teacher groups (box 4; see also table A3 in appendix A). In 21 states SLOs apply to all teachers (statewide or within pilot schools), in 3 states they apply only to teachers in subjects or grades in which student progress is not assessed using standardized state tests, in 1 state the determination is left to the discretion of each district, and 5 states do not specify.

## What types of student learning objectives are there?

SLOs can be developed for individual teachers, teams of teachers, or an entire school (table 2; box 5). SLOs for individual teachers are the most common type in teacher evaluation systems (see table A4 in appendix A).

- *SLOs for individual teachers (required in 23 states, optional in 2 states).* These vary by state in their exact specifications but are evaluated or assessed at the teacher level and may apply to all of a teacher's students, classes, or courses or a subset of them. Most states encourage teachers to collaborate in developing SLOs.
- *SLOs for teams of teachers or grade levels (required in 3 states, optional in 7 states).* Recognizing that most teachers have shared responsibility for and impact on student learning, six states require or allow the use of SLOs for teams of teachers or grade levels. Teams are generally charged with co-developing SLOs and are assessed as a team, not as individuals, on whether SLOs are met.
- *Schoolwide SLOs (required in 3 states, optional in 4 states).* These SLOs apply to all teachers or educators in a school. They are generally developed by the principal in consultation with teachers. Achievement of SLOs is measured at the school level, and all teachers are accountable for the results.

**Student learning objectives can be developed for individual teachers, teams of teachers, or an entire school**

---

### Box 4. Examples of teachers required to develop student learning objectives

*Georgia.* For teachers of subjects or grades in which student progress is not assessed using standardized state tests, this component consists of Georgia Department of Education–approved student learning objectives (SLOs) using district-identified achievement growth measures.

*Ohio.* All teachers in pilot districts should develop at least one SLO to gain experience. Under full implementation districts can determine which teachers develop SLOs and what portion of the 50 percent of student growth they should account for.

*Rhode Island.* Every teacher in the state will set two to four SLOs. SLOs allow for the use of multiple measures of assessment, including commercial assessments and assessments developed by teams of educators. Teachers and administrators will set targets based on available data and information for their specific population of students.

**Source:** State education agency websites (see table A3 in appendix A).

---

---

**Table 2. Types of student learning objectives**

| Student learning objective type       | Number of states where required | Number of states where optional |
|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| For individual teachers               | 23                              | 2                               |
| For teams of teachers or grade levels | 3                               | 7                               |
| Schoolwide                            | 3                               | 4                               |

**Source:** State education agency websites (see table A4 in appendix A).

---

### Box 5. Examples of types of student learning objectives

*Connecticut (description of student learning objectives for individual teachers).* Broad goals for student learning, they address a central purpose of the teacher’s assignment and pertain to a large proportion of his or her students. Student learning objectives should reflect at least a year’s worth of growth (or a semester’s worth for shorter courses) and should be aligned to relevant standards for the grade level or course.

*Minnesota (description of schoolwide student learning objective).* They are known as “shared performance goals.” All teachers in the same school will receive the same performance rating for this measure, which counts for 5 percent of their summative evaluation score.

*West Virginia (description of student learning objective for a team of teachers).* Educators may collaborate to establish student learning goals for their grade levels, departments, or curricular teams. The highest performance level requires accomplishing at least one collaborative student learning goal.

**Source:** State education agency websites (see table A4 in appendix A).

---

### To which students do student learning objectives apply?

Of the 20 states that specify the student groups to which SLOs apply, 14 require SLOs to apply to all of a teacher’s students and 5 make it optional for SLOs to apply to all or a subset of a teacher’s students; 6 require SLOs to apply to targeted subgroups, such as lowest performing students or English language learner students; and 7 make it optional for SLOs to apply to subgroups (table 3; see also table A5 in appendix A). SLO policies often stipulate that while individual SLOs may target specific groups of students, taken together, teachers’ SLOs should cover the majority of their students, with any exclusions justified.

---

**Table 3. Students targeted in student learning objectives**

| Students targeted | Number of states where required | Number of states where optional |
|-------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| All students      | 14                              | 5                               |
| Subgroups only    | 6                               | 7                               |

**Source:** State education agency websites (see table A5 in appendix A).

---

## What targets and growth measures do states specify?

Nineteen states stipulate that measurable targets be identified to assess student attainment of learning goals (table 4; see also table A5 in appendix A). Twelve states further stipulate the use of measures of academic growth, such as pre- and post-tests that establish two data points showing growth in achievement over time; one state makes this optional. Seven states require teachers to differentiate learning targets, referencing baseline data, for different subgroups and individual students (for example, the lowest performing students are not expected to show the same amount of growth as the highest performing students); four states make this optional.

## What assessments are used to measure student attainment of learning goals?

State education agency websites indicate that teachers may generally choose from a variety of assessments to measure student attainment of SLOs, subject to evaluator approval. These assessments include nationwide and state standardized assessments, tests with vendor-developed content, district-developed assessments, and a variety of schoolwide and classroom measures (table 5; see also table A5 in appendix A).

When provided, state guidance on choosing an appropriate assessment includes that the assessment be rigorous, be aligned with state standards, allow comparability across classrooms, and be valid and reliable. At least four states provide rubrics or similar tools for determining the most appropriate assessment to measure the attainment of SLOs.

*State education agency websites indicate that teachers may generally choose from a variety of assessments to measure student attainment*

**Table 4. Types of targets for assessing student attainment of learning goals**

| Type of target    | Number of states where required | Number of states where optional |
|-------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Differentiated    | 7                               | 4                               |
| Measure of growth | 12                              | 1                               |
| Measurable target | 19                              | 0                               |

**Source:** State education agency websites (see table A5 in appendix A).

**Table 5. Assessments used to evaluate the attainment of student learning objectives**

| Assessment type or feature                      | Number of states |
|---|------------------|
| Nationwide or statewide standardized assessment | 14               |
| Districtwide or schoolwide measure              | 12               |
| Classroom-based measure                         | 12               |
| Test vendor-developed content                   | 3                |
| Comparable across classrooms                    | 5                |
| Valid and reliable                              | 3                |
| Aligned with state standards                    | 2                |
| Rigorous  | 2                |

**Source:** State education agency websites (see table A5 in appendix A).

## How are student learning objectives set, approved, and evaluated?

---

Documents from 24 states describe the processes for setting, approving, and evaluating the attainment of SLOs. In 17 states the process involves teachers setting their own SLOs; in 9 states teachers collaborate with other teachers or with their evaluators to set their goals, and in 1 state teachers develop their own individual-level SLOs that fit within district-developed SLOs (box 6; see also table A6 in appendix A).

Twenty-one states require an evaluator—usually a principal or district leader—to approve teacher SLOs. States have two main approaches for assessing the attainment of teacher SLOs (box 7). In 14 states teachers track their progress toward agreed on metrics and submit their data and evidence to evaluators. In 10 states the process is more collaborative, involving teachers and evaluators together reviewing evidence on the attainment of SLOs.

**Twenty-one states require an evaluator to approve teacher student learning objectives**

---

### Box 6. Examples of setting student learning objectives

*Oklahoma.* Teachers decide on an academic area of focus and administer a preassessment or locate baseline data. They then choose an assessment and develop a SMART (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Results-oriented and Relevant, and Time-bound) goal and a five-point rating scale.

*Oregon.* Teachers review baseline data and create SMART goals that measure the learning of all students.

*Rhode Island.* Teachers determine the most important standards and content in grades and subject taught, align student learning objectives horizontally with other teachers in the same grade level or content area, and align them vertically with building administrator's objectives.

**Source:** State education agency websites (see table A6 in appendix A).

---

---

### Box 7. Examples of evaluating student learning objectives

*Connecticut.* At the end of the school year, teachers submit evidence and a completed self-assessment to evaluators who assign a rating to each student learning objective (did not meet, partially met, met, or exceeded).

*Indiana.* Teachers collect evidence to submit to evaluators, who calculate the effectiveness score.

*Louisiana.* Teachers collect and present evidence of student progress, and evaluators assess the evidence and rate each student learning target according to its scoring plan.

**Source:** State education agency websites (see table A6 in appendix A).

---

## Appendix A. Searchable tables of state-by-state use of student learning objectives for educator evaluation

**Table A1. State use of student learning objectives in educator evaluation**

| State                | Using or planning to use student learning objectives (SLOs) for educator evaluation? | Note  |
|----------------------|--|---|
| Alabama              | No evidence  | No information on SLOs found on the Alabama Department of Education website.  |
| Alaska               | No evidence  | No information on SLOs found on the Alaska Department of Education website or in documents reviewed.  |
| Arizona              | Yes  |   |
| Arkansas             | No evidence  | No information on SLOs found on the Arkansas Department of Education website.   |
| California           | No evidence  | No information on SLOs found on the California Department of Education website.   |
| Colorado             | Yes  |   |
| Connecticut          | Yes  |   |
| Delaware             | No evidence  | No information on SLOs found on the Delaware Department of Education website.   |
| District of Columbia | No evidence  | No information on SLOs found on the District of Columbia Department of Education website.   |
| Florida              | No evidence  | Florida requires the use of student achievement and student growth as a major part of their teacher evaluation system, but these are not specified as teacher-specific measurable student learning goals. 2010/11 was the development year. |
| Georgia              | Yes  |   |
| Hawaii               | Yes  |   |
| Idaho                | No evidence  | No information on SLOs found on the Idaho Department of Education website.  |
| Illinois             | Yes  |   |
| Indiana              | Yes  |   |
| Iowa                 | No evidence  | No information on SLOs found on the Iowa Department of Education website.   |
| Kansas               | No evidence  | No information on SLOs found on the Kansas Department of Education website.   |
| Kentucky             | Yes  |   |
| Louisiana            | Yes  |   |
| Maine                | No evidence  | No information on SLOs found on the Maine Department of Education website.  |
| Maryland             | Yes  |   |
| Massachusetts        | Yes  |   |
| Michigan             | Yes  |   |
| Minnesota            | Yes  |   |
| Mississippi          | Yes  |   |
| Missouri             | No evidence  | No information on SLOs as used in educator evaluation found on the Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education website.   |

*(continued)*

**Table A1. State use of student learning objectives in educator evaluation** *(continued)*

| State          | Using or planning to use student learning objectives (SLOs) for educator evaluation? | Note  |
|----------------|--|---|
| Montana        | No evidence  | No information on SLOs as used in educator evaluation found on the Montana Office of Public Instruction website. Documents from the Evaluation Systems Workgroup dated May 8, 2013, suggest that the new evaluation system will be unveiled shortly.  |
| Nebraska       | Yes  |   |
| Nevada         | No evidence  | No information on SLOs found on the Nevada Department of Education website.   |
| New Hampshire  | Yes  |   |
| New Jersey     | Yes  |   |
| New Mexico     | Yes  |   |
| New York       | Yes  |   |
| North Carolina | Yes  |   |
| North Dakota   | Yes  |   |
| Ohio           | Yes  |   |
| Oklahoma       | Yes  |   |
| Oregon         | Yes  |   |
| Pennsylvania   | No evidence  | No information on SLOs found on the Pennsylvania Department of Education website.   |
| Rhode Island   | Yes  |   |
| South Carolina | No evidence  | No information on SLOs found on the South Carolina Department of Education website.   |
| South Dakota   | No evidence  | No information on SLOs found on the South Dakota Department of Education website.   |
| Tennessee      | No evidence  | No information on SLOs found on the Tennessee Department of Education website.  |
| Texas          | No evidence  | No information on SLOs found on the Texas Department of Education website.  |
| Utah           | Yes  |   |
| Vermont        | No evidence  | No information on SLOs found on the Vermont Department of Education website.  |
| Virginia       | Yes  |   |
| Washington     | Yes  |   |
| West Virginia  | Yes  |   |
| Wisconsin      | Yes  |   |
| Wyoming        | No evidence  | By July 2013 new rules and regulations will be in place for teacher evaluation based in part on linking student achievement to teachers (Wyoming Accountability in Education Act, 2012. Retrieved September 10, 2013, from <a href="http://edu.wyoming.gov/sf-docs/publications/draft-overview-of-the-wy-accountability-in-education-act.pdf">http://edu.wyoming.gov/sf-docs/publications/draft-overview-of-the-wy-accountability-in-education-act.pdf</a> ).<br><br>It appears that the Board of Education is considering the inclusion of SLOs in the new evaluation system (Wyoming State Board of Education Work Session Agenda, November 2012. Retrieved September 10, 2013, from <a href="http://edu.wyoming.gov/sf-docs/default-document-library/november-1-2-2012-meeting-packet.pdf">http://edu.wyoming.gov/sf-docs/default-document-library/november-1-2-2012-meeting-packet.pdf</a> ). |

**Source:** Authors' review of state education agency websites and documents.

**Table A2. Definitions and features of student learning objectives, by state**

| State       | Definition  | Measurable? | Based on student growth and achievement? | Aligned with state or local standards? | Based on prior student learning? | Measure teacher impact on student learning? | Aligned with course content? | Additional information  | Source   |
|-------------|---|-------------|--|--|----------------------------------|---|------------------------------|---|--|
| Arizona     | A classroom-level standards-based measure relevant to the content area taught during the current school year that is specific and measurable, based on available prior student learning data, and based on growth or achievement.   | ✓           | ✓  | ✓                                      | ✓                                |   |                              | 2012/13 is the pilot year for four districts and two charter schools.               | The SLO Process Part I, Arizona Department of Education, January 2013. Retrieved April 1, 2013, from <a href="http://www.azed.gov/teacherprincipal-evaluation/files/2013/01/slo-process-pt1-1_15_13.pdf">http://www.azed.gov/teacherprincipal-evaluation/files/2013/01/slo-process-pt1-1_15_13.pdf</a> |
| Colorado    | A participatory method of setting measurable goals or objectives for a specific assignment or class, in a manner aligned with the subject matter taught and that allows for the evaluation of the baseline performance of students and the measurable gains in student performance during the course of instruction.  | ✓           | ✓  |  | ✓                                |   | ✓                            | Draft guidance provided in January 2013 for consideration by districts and schools. | Student Learning Outcomes: Draft Guidance, Colorado Department of Education, January 2013. Retrieved April 1, 2013, from <a href="http://www.cde.state.co.us/EducatorEffectiveness/StudentGrowthGuide4.asp">http://www.cde.state.co.us/EducatorEffectiveness/StudentGrowthGuide4.asp</a>               |
| Connecticut | A broad statement about the knowledge and skills the teacher wants students to demonstrate as a result of instruction that addresses the central purpose of the teacher's assignment, takes into account baseline data on student performance, pertains to a large proportion of a teacher's students, reflects content mastery or skill development, and reflects ambitious but attainable goals for student learning. |             |  |  | ✓                                |   | ✓                            |   | Connecticut's System for Educator Evaluation and Development, Connecticut State Department of Education, n.d. Retrieved April 6, 2013, from <a href="http://www.connecticutseed.org/?page_id=451">http://www.connecticutseed.org/?page_id=451</a>  |

(continued)

**Table A2. Definitions and features of student learning objectives, by state** *(continued)*

| State    | Definition   | Measurable? | Based on student growth and achievement? | Aligned with state or local standards? | Based on prior student learning? | Measure teacher impact on student learning? | Aligned with course content? | Additional information  | Source  |
|----------|--|-------------|--|--|----------------------------------|---|------------------------------|---|---|
| Georgia  | Content-specific grade-level learning objective determined by each district that is measurable, focused on growth in student learning, and aligned with curriculum standards. As a measure of teachers' impact on student learning, a student learning objective (SLO) gives educators, school systems, and state leaders an additional means by which to understand, value, and recognize success in the classroom. | ✓           | ✓  | ✓                                      | ✓                                | ✓   | ✓                            | Currently being piloted in 53 state courses.  | <p>Student Learning Objectives Operations Manual, Georgia Department of Education, 2012. Retrieved April 6, 2013, from <a href="http://www.doe.k12.ga.us/School-Improvement/Teacher-and-Leader-Effectiveness/Documents/SLO%20Operations%20Manual.October%202012.pdf">http://www.doe.k12.ga.us/School-Improvement/Teacher-and-Leader-Effectiveness/Documents/SLO%20Operations%20Manual.October%202012.pdf</a></p> <p>Student Learning Objectives Overview and Resources, Georgia Department of Education, n.d. Retrieved April 6, 2013, from <a href="http://www.doe.k12.ga.us/School-Improvement/Teacher-and-Leader-Effectiveness/Pages/Student-Learning-Objectives.aspx">http://www.doe.k12.ga.us/School-Improvement/Teacher-and-Leader-Effectiveness/Pages/Student-Learning-Objectives.aspx</a></p> |
| Hawaii   | Refers to both the process that teachers engage in when setting specific objectives for their students and the objectives themselves (what progress students will attain in a given timeframe). A student learning objective provides an excellent opportunity for teachers of any content area and grade to measure student growth and achievement.   |             | ✓  |  |                                  |   |                              | Began pilot in 2011/12. Initial expansion statewide in 2013/14.   | Introduction to Student Learning Objectives, Hawaii Department of Education, 2012. Retrieved April 11, 2013, from <a href="http://eesteacher.weebly.com/uploads/1/4/0/3/14039000/slo_pilot_information_2012-11-16.pdf">http://eesteacher.weebly.com/uploads/1/4/0/3/14039000/slo_pilot_information_2012-11-16.pdf</a>   |
| Illinois | A set of goals that measure educators' progress in achieving student growth targets.   |             | ✓  |  |                                  | ✓   |                              | SLOs recommended as part of state performance evaluation model in 2012 but not required unless the district defaults to the state performance evaluation model. | Guidebook on Student Learning Objectives for Type III Assessments, Illinois Department of Education Guidance Document, 2013. Retrieved April 11, 2013, from <a href="http://www.isbe.net/PEAC/pdf/guidance/13-4-te-guidebook-slo.pdf">http://www.isbe.net/PEAC/pdf/guidance/13-4-te-guidebook-slo.pdf</a>   |

*(continued)*

**Table A2. Definitions and features of student learning objectives, by state** (continued)

| State         | Definition  | Measurable? | Based on student growth and achievement? | Aligned with state or local standards? | Based on prior student learning? | Measure teacher impact on student learning? | Aligned with course content? | Additional information  | Source   |
|---------------|---|-------------|--|--|----------------------------------|---|------------------------------|---|--|
| Indiana       | A long-term academic goal that teachers and evaluators set for groups of students. It must be specific and measurable, based on available prior student learning data, aligned with state standards, and based on growth and achievement. | ✓           | ✓  | ✓                                      | ✓                                |   |                              | SLOs piloted with new RISE teacher evaluation system in 2011/2012; SLOs are optional, but districts must evaluate measures of student learning. | RISE Evaluation and Development System: Student Learning Objectives Handbook, Indiana Department of Education, n.d. Retrieved April 10, 2013, from <a href="http://www.isbe.net/peac/pdf/IN_SLO_handbook_022412.pdf">http://www.isbe.net/peac/pdf/IN_SLO_handbook_022412.pdf</a>   |
| Kentucky      | Not explicitly defined  |             |  |  |                                  |   |                              | New evaluation system field tested in 54 districts in 2012/13.  | Kentucky Teacher Professional Growth and Effectiveness System Field Test Guide, Kentucky Department of Education, 2012. Retrieved April 10, 2013, from <a href="http://education.ky.gov/teachers/HiEffTeach/Pages/PGES-Field-Test-Districts-.aspx">http://education.ky.gov/teachers/HiEffTeach/Pages/PGES-Field-Test-Districts-.aspx</a>                                 |
| Louisiana     | (Called student learning target.) A measurable goal for student achievement over a given period of time.  | ✓           | ✓  |  |                                  |   |                              |   | Setting Student Goals, Compass Update, Louisiana Department of Education, 2012. Retrieved April 10, 2013, from <a href="http://www.louisianabelieves.com/resources/classroom-support-toolbox/teacher-support-toolbox/student-learning-targets">http://www.louisianabelieves.com/resources/classroom-support-toolbox/teacher-support-toolbox/student-learning-targets</a> |
| Maryland      | A specific, rigorous, long-term goal for groups of students that educators create to guide their instruction and administration efforts.  |             |  |  |                                  |   |                              |   | Chapter 15 Maryland State Model for Educator Effectiveness Student Learning Objectives, Maryland State Department of Education, n.d. Retrieved April 10, 2013, from <a href="http://msde.state.md.us/tpe/15_MDTeacherPrincipalEvaluation.pdf">http://msde.state.md.us/tpe/15_MDTeacherPrincipalEvaluation.pdf</a>  |
| Massachusetts | A measure of student progress on learning goals set between the educator and evaluator for the school year.   |             | ✓  |  |                                  |   |                              |   | Final Regulations on Evaluation of Educators 603 CMR 35.07; 2011. Retrieved April 10, 2013, from <a href="http://www.doe.mass.edu/lawsregs/603cmr35.html?section=07">http://www.doe.mass.edu/lawsregs/603cmr35.html?section=07</a>   |

(continued)

**Table A2. Definitions and features of student learning objectives, by state** (continued)

| State       | Definition  | Measurable? | Based on student growth and achievement? | Aligned with state or local standards? | Based on prior student learning? | Measure teacher impact on student learning? | Aligned with course content? | Additional information  | Source   |
|-------------|---|-------------|--|--|----------------------------------|---|------------------------------|---|--|
| Michigan    | Not explicitly defined  |             |  |  |                                  |   |                              |   | A Framework for Michigan's Educator Evaluations, American Federation of Teachers–Michigan, Michigan Education Association, Michigan Association of Secondary School Principals, and Michigan Association of Elementary and Middle School Principals, n.d. Retrieved April 15, 2013, from <a href="http://www.michigan.gov/documents/mde/MDE-RTTT2-Framework_for_Mich_Edu_Eval_320545_7.pdf">http://www.michigan.gov/documents/mde/MDE-RTTT2-Framework_for_Mich_Edu_Eval_320545_7.pdf</a> |
| Minnesota   | A measurable, long-term student academic growth target that a teacher sets at the beginning of the school year. The goal demonstrates a teacher's impact on student learning within a given interval of instruction based on baseline data gathered at the beginning of the course. | ✓           | ✓  |  | ✓                                | ✓   |                              | Minnesota will pilot its evaluation system in 2013/14.  | Student Learning Goals Handbook, Minnesota Department of Education, n.d. Retrieved April 15, 2013, from <a href="http://education.state.mn.us/mdeprod/idcplg?IdcService=GET_FILE&amp;dDocName=049728&amp;RevisionSelectionMethod=latestReleased&amp;Rendition=primary">http://education.state.mn.us/mdeprod/idcplg?IdcService=GET_FILE&amp;dDocName=049728&amp;RevisionSelectionMethod=latestReleased&amp;Rendition=primary</a>  |
| Mississippi | Not explicitly defined  |             |  |  |                                  |   |                              | Field testing of new teacher evaluation system in 2013/14. Piloted in 2011/12. SLOs are referenced as part of the Mississippi Statewide Teacher Appraisal Rubric teacher evaluation system for teachers in nontested areas, but SLOs are not defined. | Mississippi Statewide Teacher Appraisal Rubric (M-STAR), Mississippi Department of Education, 2013. Retrieved April 15, 2013, from <a href="http://www.mde.k12.ms.us/docs/sped-powerpoints-page/special-education-directors-on-january-31-20131.ppt">http://www.mde.k12.ms.us/docs/sped-powerpoints-page/special-education-directors-on-january-31-20131.ppt</a>   |

(continued)

**Table A2. Definitions and features of student learning objectives, by state** (continued)

| State         | Definition   | Measurable? | Based on student growth and achievement? | Aligned with state or local standards? | Based on prior student learning? | Measure teacher impact on student learning? | Aligned with course content? | Additional information   | Source   |
|---------------|--|-------------|--|--|----------------------------------|---|------------------------------|--|--|
| Nebraska      | Not explicitly defined   |             |  |  |                                  |   |                              | The leadership committee developing the state model evaluation system recommended that the Nebraska Board of Education adopt an evaluation model that includes SLOs. In November 2012 the board adopted the recommendations. No details of the plan have been released as of this writing. | Memo: Teacher and Principal Effectiveness, Rice, D., and Havelka, J., 2012. Retrieved April 15, 2013, from <a href="http://www.education.ne.gov/StateBoard/Support_materials/2012/November/SB_11_12_dr_Teacher_Principal_Evaluation_Update.pdf">http://www.education.ne.gov/StateBoard/Support_materials/2012/November/SB_11_12_dr_Teacher_Principal_Evaluation_Update.pdf</a> |
| New Hampshire | A tool used to document student academic performance by all teachers, whether in “tested grades and subjects” or not, in accordance with guidance developed by the task force. A general approach (also called student growth objectives or student learning evidence) whereby educators establish important goals for individual or groups of students (in conjunction with peers and administrators) and then evaluate the extent to which the goals have been achieved. | ✓           |  |  |                                  |   |                              |  | ESEA Flexibility Waiver Concept Review, New Hampshire Department of Education, 2012. Retrieved March 18, 2013, from <a href="http://www.education.nh.gov/accountability-system/documents/concept-paper.pdf">http://www.education.nh.gov/accountability-system/documents/concept-paper.pdf</a>  |
| New Jersey    | An academic goal for groups of students that is aligned with state standards and can be tracked using objective measures.  | ✓           |  | ✓                                      |                                  |   |                              |  | AchieveNJ: Student Growth Objectives in 2013–14, New Jersey Department of Education, n.d. Retrieved April 10, 2013, from <a href="http://www.state.nj.us/education/AchieveNJ/teacher/SGOOoverview.pdf">http://www.state.nj.us/education/AchieveNJ/teacher/SGOOoverview.pdf</a>   |

(continued)

**Table A2. Definitions and features of student learning objectives, by state** *(continued)*

| State          | Definition  | Measurable? | Based on student growth and achievement? | Aligned with state or local standards? | Based on prior student learning? | Measure teacher impact on student learning? | Aligned with course content? | Additional information  | Source   |
|----------------|---|-------------|--|--|----------------------------------|---|------------------------------|---|--|
| New Mexico     | A teacher-designed and -created clear and specific goal that aligns with the state standards for each grade level and subject area.   |             |  | ✓                                      |                                  |   |                              | House Bill 589 stipulates that SLOs be part of a new teacher evaluation system to be developed beginning June 2013. | House Bill 589, 51st Legislature State of New Mexico, First Session, 2013. Retrieved April 1, 2013, from <a href="http://ped.state.nm.us/ped/DDashDocs/BillAnalysis/HB0589.pdf">http://ped.state.nm.us/ped/DDashDocs/BillAnalysis/HB0589.pdf</a>   |
| New York       | An academic goal for a teacher's students that is set at the start of a course. It represents the most important learning for the year (or semester, where applicable). It must be specific and measurable, based on available prior student learning data, and aligned with Common Core, state, or national standards, as well as any other school and district priorities. Teachers' scores are based upon the degree to which their goals were attained. | ✓           | ✓  | ✓                                      | ✓                                |   |                              |   | Guidance on the New York State District-wide Growth Goal-Setting Process: Student Learning Objectives, New York State Department of Education, 2012. Retrieved March 18, 2013, from <a href="http://engageny.org/sites/default/files/resource/attachments/slo-guidance.pdf">http://engageny.org/sites/default/files/resource/attachments/slo-guidance.pdf</a>  |
| North Carolina | A targeted, long-term goal for advancing student learning. This data-informed process involves diagnosing and improving specific student learning needs.  |             |  | ✓                                      |                                  |   |                              | Beginning in 2010/11 SLOs may be included as one of two examples of student growth for teacher evaluations.         | Teacher Effectiveness Workgroup Proposal for Federal Reporting, Language for Student Growth Standards and Annual Evaluation Requirement, North Carolina State Board of Education, 2011. Retrieved April 14, 2013, from <a href="http://www.ncpublicschools.org/docs/sbe-archives/meetings/2011/revisions/06tcp03rev.pdf">http://www.ncpublicschools.org/docs/sbe-archives/meetings/2011/revisions/06tcp03rev.pdf</a> |

*(continued)*

**Table A2. Definitions and features of student learning objectives, by state** (continued)

| State        | Definition   | Measurable? | Based on student growth and achievement? | Aligned with state or local standards? | Based on prior student learning? | Measure teacher impact on student learning? | Aligned with course content? | Additional information   | Source  |
|--------------|--|-------------|--|--|----------------------------------|---|------------------------------|--|---|
| North Dakota | Not explicitly defined   |             |  |  |                                  |   |                              | The North Dakota Department of Public Instruction is currently developing guidance for how districts should incorporate student growth as a factor in the evaluation of teachers. Currently, SLOs are one of several optional measures for teacher evaluation. | North Dakota Teacher Evaluation Guidelines, North Dakota Department of Public Instruction, 2012. Retrieved April 15, 2013, from <a href="http://www.dpi.state.nd.us/ESEA/North%20Dakota%20Teacher%20Evaluation%20Guidelines,%20Final%20Approved%20Version,%207.0.pdf">http://www.dpi.state.nd.us/ESEA/North%20Dakota%20Teacher%20Evaluation%20Guidelines,%20Final%20Approved%20Version,%207.0.pdf</a>   |
| Ohio         | A measure of a teacher's impact on student learning within a given interval of instruction. An SLO is a measurable, long-term academic goal informed by available data that a teacher or team of teachers sets at the beginning of the year for all students or for subgroups of students. The teacher and students work toward the SLO growth targets throughout the year and use interim, benchmark, and formative assessments to assess progress. At the end of the year the teacher meets with a principal or building team to discuss attainment of the SLO and determine the teacher's impact on student learning. | ✓           | ✓  |  | ✓                                | ✓   |                              | SLOs currently being piloted.  | A Guide to Using SLOs as a Locally-Determined Measure of Student Growth, Ohio Department of Education, 2013. Retrieved December 10, 2013, from, <a href="http://education.ohio.gov/getattachment/Topics/Academic-Content-Standards/New-Learning-Standards/Student-Learning-Objective-Examples/041113-SLO_Guidebook.pdf.aspx">http://education.ohio.gov/getattachment/Topics/Academic-Content-Standards/New-Learning-Standards/Student-Learning-Objective-Examples/041113-SLO_Guidebook.pdf.aspx</a> |

(continued)

**Table A2. Definitions and features of student learning objectives, by state** *(continued)*

| State    | Definition  | Measurable? | Based on student growth and achievement? | Aligned with state or local standards? | Based on prior student learning? | Measure teacher impact on student learning? | Aligned with course content? | Additional information  | Source  |
|----------|---|-------------|--|--|----------------------------------|---|------------------------------|---|---|
| Oklahoma | (Called other academic measure.) An additional alternative instrument ensuring a robust teacher evaluation, capturing unique facets of effective teaching, and reflecting the teacher's impact on student academic performance.   | ✓           |  |  |                                  |   |                              | Other academic measures will be implemented beginning in 2013/14. | Other Academic Measures: Adopted Policies for the Implementation of Teacher & Leader Effectiveness (TLE), Oklahoma State Department of Education, 2012. Retrieved April 15, 2013, from <a href="http://www.ok.gov/sde/sites/ok.gov.sde/files/documents/files/TLE_e-Brochure.pdf">http://www.ok.gov/sde/sites/ok.gov.sde/files/documents/files/TLE_e-Brochure.pdf</a>                                  |
| Oregon   | (Referred to as student learning and growth goal and measure.) A goal that aligns with the standards the teacher is expected to teach and students are expected to learn. The goal should reflect students' progress toward proficiency or mastery of academic standards, cognitive skills, academic behaviors, and transitional skills. All measures must be aligned with standards and be valid and developmentally appropriate for the curriculum and the students being taught. The collective set of a teacher's goals should apply to all the teacher's students. District priorities, school goals, and classroom goals should be aligned wherever possible. | ✓           | ✓  |  |                                  |   | ✓                            | New evaluation framework being piloted in 2012/13.                | Oregon Framework for Teacher and Administrator Evaluation and Support Systems, Oregon Department of Education, 2012. Retrieved April 15, 2013, from <a href="http://www.ode.state.or.us/wma/teachlearn/educatoreffectiveness/oregon-framework-for-eval-and-support-systems.pdf">http://www.ode.state.or.us/wma/teachlearn/educatoreffectiveness/oregon-framework-for-eval-and-support-systems.pdf</a> |

*(continued)*

**Table A2. Definitions and features of student learning objectives, by state** (continued)

| State        | Definition   | Measurable? | Based on student growth and achievement? | Aligned with state or local standards? | Based on prior student learning? | Measure teacher impact on student learning? | Aligned with course content? | Additional information  | Source  |
|--------------|--|-------------|--|--|----------------------------------|---|------------------------------|---|---|
| Rhode Island | A long-term academic goal that educators set for groups of students. An SLO can be set for the school year or an interval of instruction appropriate to the teaching assignment (such as a single semester for a semester-length course). It must be specific and measurable, based on available prior student learning data and information, and aligned with standards and any school and district priorities. | ✓           |  | ✓                                      | ✓                                |   |                              |   | Rhode Island Measures of Student Learning Edition II, Rhode Island Department of Education, 2012. Retrieved December 10, 2013, from <a href="http://www.ride.ri.gov/Portals/0/Uploads/Documents/Teachers-and-Administrators-Excellent-Educators/Educator-Evaluation/Education-Eval-Main-Page/Measures-of-Student-Learning-GB-Edition-II.pdf">http://www.ride.ri.gov/Portals/0/Uploads/Documents/Teachers-and-Administrators-Excellent-Educators/Educator-Evaluation/Education-Eval-Main-Page/Measures-of-Student-Learning-GB-Edition-II.pdf</a> |
| Utah         | A general approach (often called student growth objective) whereby educators establish goals for individual or groups of students (often in conjunction with administrators) and then evaluate the extent to which the goals have been achieved.   |             | ✓  |  |                                  |   |                              | SLOs will be piloted in 2013/14.  | Content Area SLOs, Utah State Office of Education, 2012. Retrieved March 20, 2013, from <a href="http://www.schools.utah.gov/assessment/Testing-Director-Resources/Testing-Directors-Meetings/TD_Asmt_Dir_Mtg_2012_Sept_SLO_Presentation.aspx">http://www.schools.utah.gov/assessment/Testing-Director-Resources/Testing-Directors-Meetings/TD_Asmt_Dir_Mtg_2012_Sept_SLO_Presentation.aspx</a>   |
| Virginia     | A SMART (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Results-Oriented and Relevant, and Time-bound) goal.  |             |  |  |                                  |   |                              | “Student achievement goal setting” specified as one option for measure of student progress in 2012 teacher evaluation guidelines. | Guidelines for Uniform Performance Standards and Evaluation Criteria for Teachers, Virginia Board of Education, 2012. Retrieved March 20, 2013, from <a href="http://www.doe.virginia.gov/teaching/performance_evaluation/guidelines_ups_eval_criteria_teachers.pdf">http://www.doe.virginia.gov/teaching/performance_evaluation/guidelines_ups_eval_criteria_teachers.pdf</a>  |

(continued)

**Table A2. Definitions and features of student learning objectives, by state** (continued)

| State         | Definition  | Measurable? | Based on student growth and achievement? | Aligned with state or local standards? | Based on prior student learning? | Measure teacher impact on student learning? | Aligned with course content? | Additional information                                   | Source  |
|---------------|---|-------------|--|--|----------------------------------|---|------------------------------|--|---|
| Washington    | A standards-based, rigorous, and relevant learning target that teachers set for groups or subgroups of students that is specific and measurable, based on prior learning data, aligned with state and content standards, and aligned with school and district priorities. | ✓           |  | ✓                                      | ✓                                |   |                              | New evaluation system currently being piloted.           | Teacher and Principal Professional Growth and Evaluation, RIG Presentation, Koval, J., & Miller, M., OSPI, 2013. Retrieved March 20, 2013, from <a href="http://tpep-wa.org/wp-content/uploads/RIG%20101%20Presentation%20March%202013.pdf">http://tpep-wa.org/wp-content/uploads/RIG%20101%20Presentation%20March%202013.pdf</a> |
| West Virginia | Student Learning Goals are not specifically defined but follow SMART (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Results-Oriented and Relevant, and Time-bound) goal specifications.   |             |  |  |                                  |   |                              | Piloted in 2011/12.                                      | Educator Evaluation Pilot Guide, 2011/12. West Virginia Department of Education, 2011. Retrieved March 20, 2013, from <a href="http://wvde.state.wv.us/teacherevalpilot/evaluationpilot_guide.pdf">http://wvde.state.wv.us/teacherevalpilot/evaluationpilot_guide.pdf</a>   |
| Wisconsin     | A detailed, measurable goal developed collaboratively by teachers and their evaluators based on identified student learning needs across a specified time period (typically an academic year).  | ✓           |  |  |                                  |   |                              | New educator evaluation system to be piloted in 2013/14. | Teacher Evaluation Process Manual, Full Pilot 2013/14, Wisconsin Department of Education, 2013. Retrieved April 1, 2013, from <a href="http://ee.dpi.wi.gov/files/ee/FPtraining/EETeacherEvaluationProcessManual-version1.pdf">http://ee.dpi.wi.gov/files/ee/FPtraining/EETeacherEvaluationProcessManual-version1.pdf</a>         |
| Total         |   | 12          | 16                                       | 9                                      | 9                                | 4   | 4                            |  |   |

**Source:** State education agency websites.

**Table A3. Use of student learning objectives in educator evaluation systems, by state**

| State       | Application level of student learning objectives (SLOs) |                                     |                                  | Percentage of overall teacher rating | Other  | Details and sources  |
|-------------|---|-------------------------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|--|
|             | All teachers  | Only teachers in nontested subjects | Teachers determined by districts |                                      |  |  |
| Notes       |   |                                     |                                  |                                      |  |  |
| Arizona     | ✓   |                                     |                                  |                                      | Teachers can choose to be evaluated on schoolwide/grade-level data alone or on schoolwide/grade-level data and SLOs. | <p>The SLO Process Part I, Arizona Department of Education, 2013. Retrieved April 1, 2013, from <a href="http://www.azed.gov/teacherprincipal-evaluation/files/2013/01/slo-process-pt1-1_15_13.pdf">http://www.azed.gov/teacherprincipal-evaluation/files/2013/01/slo-process-pt1-1_15_13.pdf</a></p> <p>Teacher Evaluation Process: An Arizona Model for Measuring Teacher Effectiveness, Arizona Department of Education, 2013. Retrieved April 1, 2013, from <a href="http://www.azed.gov/teacherprincipal-evaluation/files/2012/10/teacher-evaluation-web.pdf">http://www.azed.gov/teacherprincipal-evaluation/files/2012/10/teacher-evaluation-web.pdf</a></p>                                      |
| Colorado    | ✓   |                                     |                                  | Determined by districts              |  | <p>Measures of Student Learning Guidance, Colorado Department of Education, n.d. Retrieved April 1, 2013, from <a href="http://www.cde.state.co.us/EducatorEffectiveness/StudentGrowthGuide5.asp">http://www.cde.state.co.us/EducatorEffectiveness/StudentGrowthGuide5.asp</a></p>   |
| Connecticut | ✓   |                                     |                                  | 45 percent                           |  | <p>Teachers whose students take a standardized assessment will create one SLO based on standardized indicators and one SLO based on a minimum of one nonstandardized indicator and a maximum of one additional standardized indicator. All other teachers will develop two standardized learning objectives based on nonstandardized indicators.</p> <p>SEED: Connecticut's System for Educator Evaluation and Development. Pilot State Model, Connecticut State Department of Education, 2012. Retrieved March 18, 2013, from <a href="http://www.connecticutseed.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/10/SEED_Handbook.pdf">http://www.connecticutseed.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/10/SEED_Handbook.pdf</a></p> |

(continued)

**Table A3. Use of student learning objectives in educator evaluation systems, by state** *(continued)*

| State     | Application level of student learning objectives (SLOs) |                                     |  | Percentage of overall teacher rating   | Other | Details and sources   |
|-----------|---|-------------------------------------|--|--|-------|---|
|           | All teachers  | Only teachers in nontested subjects | Teachers determined by districts                             |  |       |   |
|           |   |                                     | Notes  |  |       |   |
| Georgia   | ✓   |                                     |  | Not specified. The SLO evaluation rubric that will be used to determine a teacher's effectiveness rating is being revised. |       | Teacher Keys Effectiveness Handbook, Georgia Department of Education, 2012. Retrieved April 6, 2013, from <a href="http://www.doe.k12.ga.us/School-Improvement/Teacher-and-Leader-Effectiveness/Documents/TKES%20Handbook%20LINKED%20to%20ALL%20Docs%207-26-2012.pdf">http://www.doe.k12.ga.us/School-Improvement/Teacher-and-Leader-Effectiveness/Documents/TKES%20Handbook%20LINKED%20to%20ALL%20Docs%207-26-2012.pdf</a> |
| Hawaii    | ✓   |                                     |  | Exact weighting not specified  |       | Exact weighting not yet determined for each of the four components of the educator evaluation system. Student outcomes (SLOs and student growth) will account for 50 percent.   |
| Illinois  | ✓   |                                     |  | Not specified  |       | Applies to all teachers if using state model, but districts decide.   |
| Indiana   | ✓   |                                     | In pilot and other districts that choose to implement model. | 10–20 percent  |       | 10 percent for teachers with growth model data for more than half of students, 15 percent for teachers with growth model data for less than half of students, and 20 percent for teachers without growth model data, including high school teachers.  |
| Kentucky  | ✓   |                                     | In field test districts.                                     | Not specified  |       |   |
| Louisiana | ✓   |                                     |  | 50 percent   |       | Student Learning Targets Overview, Louisiana Department of Education, n.d. Retrieved April 10, 2013, from <a href="http://www.louisianabelieves.com/resources/classroom-support-toolbox/teacher-support-toolbox/student-learning-targets">http://www.louisianabelieves.com/resources/classroom-support-toolbox/teacher-support-toolbox/student-learning-targets</a>   |

*(continued)*

**Table A3. Use of student learning objectives in educator evaluation systems, by state** *(continued)*

| State         | Application level of student learning objectives (SLOs) |                                     |                                  | Percentage of overall teacher rating   | Other | Details and sources  |
|---------------|---|-------------------------------------|----------------------------------|--|-------|--|
|               | All teachers  | Only teachers in nontested subjects | Teachers determined by districts |  |       |  |
| Maryland      | ✓   |                                     |                                  | 20–35 percent  |       | Understanding Student Learning Objectives, Maryland State Department of Education, n.d. Retrieved April 12, 2013, from <a href="http://marylandpublicschools.org/NR/rdonlyres/CFDE85C4-6B03-483D-8F79-043CD2418EB1/34237/MSDE_Phase_1_SLO_Regional_Training_122012_.pdf">http://marylandpublicschools.org/NR/rdonlyres/CFDE85C4-6B03-483D-8F79-043CD2418EB1/34237/MSDE_Phase_1_SLO_Regional_Training_122012_.pdf</a> |
| Massachusetts | ✓   |                                     |                                  | Not specified  |       | Applies to all teachers in districts that choose to adopt the Massachusetts Model System.<br><br>The Massachusetts Model System for Educator Evaluation Part II: School-Level Planning and Implementation Guide, Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, 2012. Retrieved March 18, 2013, from <a href="http://www.doe.mass.edu/eeval/model/">http://www.doe.mass.edu/eeval/model/</a>        |
| Michigan      | ✓   |                                     |                                  | 2011/12 and 2012/13 = significant part<br><br>2013/14 = 25 percent<br><br>2014/15 = 40 percent<br><br>2015/16 = 50 percent |       | Understanding Educator Evaluations in Michigan: Results from Year 1 of Implementation, Michigan Department of Education, 2012. Retrieved May 16, 2013, from <a href="http://www.michigan.gov/documents/mde/Educator_Effectiveness_Ratings_Policy_Brief_403184_7.pdf">http://www.michigan.gov/documents/mde/Educator_Effectiveness_Ratings_Policy_Brief_403184_7.pdf</a>  |

*(continued)*

**Table A3. Use of student learning objectives in educator evaluation systems, by state** *(continued)*

| State       | Application level of student learning objectives (SLOs) |                                     |                                  | Percentage of overall teacher rating   | Other  | Details and sources  |
|-------------|---|-------------------------------------|----------------------------------|--|--|--|
|             | All teachers  | Only teachers in nontested subjects | Teachers determined by districts |  |  |  |
| Minnesota   | ✓   |                                     |                                  | <p>Teachers who spend 100 percent of day as teacher of record in tested areas: shared performance goal = 5 percent.</p> <p>Teachers who spend any portion of their day as teacher of record in tested area and portions in nontested areas: shared performance goal = 5 percent, student learning goal = 10 percent.</p> <p>Teachers who spend 100 percent of day in nontested areas: shared performance goal = 5 percent, targeted need student learning goal = 10 percent, class student learning goal = 20 percent.</p> |  | <p>The Teacher Development, Evaluation, and Peer Support Model: Implementation Handbook, Minnesota Department of Education, 2013. Retrieved December 11, 2013, <a href="http://education.state.mn.us/mdeprod/idcplg?IdcService=GET_FILE&amp;dDocName=049728&amp;RevisionSelectionMethod=latestReleased&amp;Rendition=primary">http://education.state.mn.us/mdeprod/idcplg?IdcService=GET_FILE&amp;dDocName=049728&amp;RevisionSelectionMethod=latestReleased&amp;Rendition=primary</a></p> |
| Mississippi |   | ✓                                   |                                  | Not specified  | Shared schoolwide growth for teachers in tested and nontested areas. |  |
| Nebraska    |   | Not specified                       |                                  | Not specified  |  |  |

*(continued)*

**Table A3. Use of student learning objectives in educator evaluation systems, by state** *(continued)*

| State         | Application level of student learning objectives (SLOs) |                                     |                                  | Percentage of overall teacher rating | Other   | Details and sources   |
|---------------|---|-------------------------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---|---|
|               | All teachers  | Only teachers in nontested subjects | Teachers determined by districts |                                      |   |   |
| New Hampshire | ✓   |                                     |                                  | Not specified                        | Shared attribution schoolwide must focus on school improvement.   | <p>According to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act Flexibility Waiver Request, these requirements are for districts following the state model.</p> <p>New Hampshire ESEA Flexibility Request for Window 3, New Hampshire Department of Education, 2012. Retrieved December 11, 2013, from <a href="http://www.education.nh.gov/accountability-system/documents/flexibility-waiver-request20130605.pdf">http://www.education.nh.gov/accountability-system/documents/flexibility-waiver-request20130605.pdf</a></p> |
| New Jersey    | ✓   |                                     |                                  | 15 percent                           |   | <p>AchieveNJ: Student Growth Objectives in 2013–14, New Jersey Department of Education, n.d. Retrieved April 12, 2013, from <a href="http://www.state.nj.us/education/AchieveNJ/teacher/SGOOverview.pdf">http://www.state.nj.us/education/AchieveNJ/teacher/SGOOverview.pdf</a></p>   |
| New Mexico    |   | Not specified                       |                                  | Not specified                        |   | <p>SLOs will be a part of New Mexico's new teacher evaluation system, which has been in development since June 2013.</p>  |
| New York      |   |                                     |                                  | 20 percent                           | <p>Student achievement accounts for 40 percent of a teacher's evaluation score. Specifically, 20 percent is from growth on state assessments or growth using a comparable measure, and 20 percent is from four locally selected measures of student achievement (including one student learning objective). The remainder is not from student measures.</p> | <p>Not required of all teachers. May be used by any teacher as a locally selected measure of student achievement. Required for teachers, both those in tested and nontested subjects, with less than 50 percent of students covered by the state-provided growth measure.</p>   |

*(continued)*

**Table A3. Use of student learning objectives in educator evaluation systems, by state** *(continued)*

| State          | Application level of student learning objectives (SLOs) |                                      |                                  | Percentage of overall teacher rating | Other | Details and sources  |
|----------------|---|--------------------------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-------|--|
|                | All teachers  | Only teachers in non-tested subjects | Teachers determined by districts |                                      |       |  |
| North Carolina |   |                                      |                                  | Not specified                        |       | SLOs are one eligible example of student growth data that teachers may submit.   |
| North Dakota   |   |                                      |                                  | Not specified                        |       | Regulations under development.   |
| Ohio           |   |                                      | ✓                                | Not specified                        |       | All teachers in pilot districts should develop at least one SLO to gain experience. Under full implementation districts can determine which teachers develop SLOs and what portion of the 50 percent of student growth they should account for.  |
| Oklahoma       | ✓   |                                      |                                  | 15 percent                           |       |  |
| Oregon         | ✓   |                                      |                                  | Not specified                        |       |  |
| Rhode Island   | ✓   |                                      |                                  | Not specified                        |       | Every teacher in the state will set two to four SLOs, which allow for the use of multiple measures of assessment, including commercial assessments and assessments developed by teams of educators. Teachers and administrators will set targets based on available data and information for their specific population of students.<br><br>Rhode Island Measures of Student Learning Edition II, Rhode Island Department of Education, 2012. Retrieved December 10, 2013, from <a href="http://www.ride.ri.gov/Portals/0/Uploads/Documents/Teachers-and-Administrators-Excellent-Educators/Educator-Evaluation/Education-Eval-Main-Page/Measures-of-Student-Learning-GB-Edition-II.pdf">http://www.ride.ri.gov/Portals/0/Uploads/Documents/Teachers-and-Administrators-Excellent-Educators/Educator-Evaluation/Education-Eval-Main-Page/Measures-of-Student-Learning-GB-Edition-II.pdf</a> |
| Utah           |   | ✓                                    |                                  | Not specified                        |       |  |

*(continued)*

**Table A3. Use of student learning objectives in educator evaluation systems, by state** *(continued)*

| State         | Application level of student learning objectives (SLOs) |                                     |                                  | Notes            | Percentage of overall teacher rating | Other   | Details and sources |
|---------------|---|-------------------------------------|----------------------------------|------------------|--------------------------------------|---|---------------------|
|               | All teachers  | Only teachers in nontested subjects | Teachers determined by districts |                  |                                      |   |                     |
| Virginia      | ✓   |                                     |                                  |                  | 20–40 percent                        | May be used as measure of student progress counting for 20 percent of evaluation of teachers of tested subjects and grades and 40 percent of teachers of nontested subjects and grades. |                     |
| Washington    | ✓   |                                     |                                  | In pilot schools | Not specified                        |   |                     |
| West Virginia | ✓   |                                     |                                  | In pilot schools | 15 percent                           |   |                     |
| Wisconsin     | ✓   |                                     |                                  | In pilot schools | 15 percent                           |   |                     |
| Total         | 21  | 3                                   | 1                                |                  |                                      |   |                     |

**Source:** State education agency websites.

**Table A4. Characteristics of student learning objectives, by state**

| State       | Schoolwide student learning objectives (SLOs) |               |   | SLOs for teams of teachers |               |             | SLOs for individual teachers |               |  | Other/notes  |
|-------------|---|---------------|---|----------------------------|---------------|-------------|------------------------------|---------------|--|--|
|             | Used?   | Number        | Description   | Used?                      | Number        | Description | Used?                        | Number        | Description  |  |
| Arizona     |   | Not specified |   |                            | Not specified |             | ✓                            | 1             | A classroom SLO is a measure of student mastery within a specific content area and must include all students in the class.   | Targeted SLOs are defined as a measure of student growth for a particular group of students in the lowest level of preparedness in order to master a content area, but it is not specified how many or by which teachers these should be used.           |
| Colorado    |   | Not specified |   |                            | Not specified |             |                              | Not specified |  | No characteristics were specified.   |
| Connecticut | ✓   | Not specified | Optional. Districts can use a schoolwide student learning indicator (meaning that a teacher's indicator rating is the aggregate of multiple student learning indicators established for the principal's evaluation rating at that school), student feedback, or a combination of the two. |                            | Not specified |             | ✓                            | 2             | Broad goals for student learning. Address a central purpose of the teacher's assignment and pertain to a large proportion of the teacher's students. SLOs should reflect at least a year's worth of growth (or a semester's worth for shorter courses) and should align with relevant standards for the grade level or course.<br><br>Contain three component parts: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Broad goals for student learning.</li> <li>• A rationale.</li> <li>• At least one indicator of academic growth and development, with a quantitative target.</li> </ul> | Teachers are encouraged to collaborate with grade-level and subject-matter colleagues in creating SLOs. Teachers with similar assignments may have identical objectives, although they will be individually accountable for their own students' results. |

(continued)

**Table A4. Characteristics of student learning objectives, by state** *(continued)*

| State    | Schoolwide student learning objectives (SLOs) |               |             | SLOs for teams of teachers |               |             | SLOs for individual teachers |               |  | Other/notes |
|----------|---|---------------|-------------|----------------------------|---------------|-------------|------------------------------|---------------|--|-------------|
|          | Used?   | Number        | Description | Used?                      | Number        | Description | Used?                        | Number        | Description  |             |
| Georgia  |   | Not specified |             |                            | Not specified |             | ✓                            | 1             | Teachers are evaluated using one district-developed SLO for each nontested subject they teach.   |             |
| Hawaii   |   | Not specified |             |                            | Not specified |             | ✓                            | Not specified | <p>SLOs should be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Aligned with the state strategic plan, complex area and schoolwide goals, state standards, and Common Core standards.</li> <li>• Based on knowledge of students through the data collected.</li> <li>• Created by the teacher and agreed on by teacher and administrator.</li> <li>• SMART (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Results-Oriented and Relevant, and Time-bound).</li> </ul> |             |
| Illinois |   | Not specified |             | ✓                          | Not specified | Optional    | ✓                            | 1–2           | Teachers who use a statewide or districtwide test should have one accompanying SLO. Teachers who do not use these tests should have two SLOs.  |             |
| Indiana  |   | Not specified |             |                            | Not specified |             | ✓                            | 2             | Teachers set one whole-class SLO and one targeted SLO for students at the lowest preparedness level.   |             |

*(continued)*

**Table A4. Characteristics of student learning objectives, by state** *(continued)*

| State     | Schoolwide student learning objectives (SLOs) |               |             | SLOs for teams of teachers |               |             | SLOs for individual teachers |        |   | Other/notes |
|-----------|---|---------------|-------------|----------------------------|---------------|-------------|------------------------------|--------|---|-------------|
|           | Used?   | Number        | Description | Used?                      | Number        | Description | Used?                        | Number | Description   |             |
| Kentucky  |   | Not specified |             | ✓                          | Not specified | Optional    | ✓                            | 1      | Teachers establish a student learning goal that meets all SMART (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Results-oriented and Relevant, and Time-bound) criteria and identify strategies and measures that will be used to determine success. They also specify what evidence will be provided to document progress toward goal attainment. |             |
| Louisiana |   | Not specified |             |                            | Not specified |             | ✓                            | 2      | A student learning target defines the content and standards, identifies an assessment for measurement, identifies the student group, sets the expectation for growth, and provides a rationale.   |             |

*(continued)*

**Table A4. Characteristics of student learning objectives, by state** *(continued)*

| State         | Schoolwide student learning objectives (SLOs) |               |             | SLOs for teams of teachers |               |  | SLOs for individual teachers |               |   | Other/notes  |
|---------------|---|---------------|-------------|----------------------------|---------------|--|------------------------------|---------------|---|--|
|               | Used?   | Number        | Description | Used?                      | Number        | Description  | Used?                        | Number        | Description   |  |
| Maryland      |   | Not specified |             | ✓                          | Not specified | Team SLOs are designed to focus on critical objectives common to grade-level or content-area teams but are still individualized for each teacher's students. The required elements—the learning content, instruction interval, and evidence of growth—are the same for all teachers. | ✓                            | 2–4           | The practitioner will draft two to four SLOs for an appropriate instruction interval (typically a quarter, semester, or year). The SLOs are aligned with Maryland Common Core Standards and curricular frameworks, other recognized standards or curricular outcomes, national or industry standards, school improvement and master plans, and local education agency priorities. |  |
| Massachusetts |   | Not specified |             | ✓                          | Not specified | Optional. Student learning goal to improve the learning, growth, and achievement of the students under the educator's responsibility.  | ✓                            | Not specified | Optional. Student learning goal to improve the learning, growth, and achievement of the students under the educator's responsibility.   | One total student learning goal required (can be for an individual or a team). |
| Michigan      |   | Not specified |             | ✓                          | Not specified | All educators are part of a team. Team goals are developed by teams and based on school improvement plan goals and student performance data for the group.   | ✓                            | Not specified | As part of the individual professional growth plan, the educator sets student growth goals based on current student performance data. The goals must be consistent with school improvement plan and team goals.   |  |

*(continued)*

**Table A4. Characteristics of student learning objectives, by state** *(continued)*

| State         | Schoolwide student learning objectives (SLOs) |               |  | SLOs for teams of teachers |               |             | SLOs for individual teachers |               |   | Other/notes   |
|---------------|---|---------------|--|----------------------------|---------------|-------------|------------------------------|---------------|---|---|
|               | Used?   | Number        | Description  | Used?                      | Number        | Description | Used?                        | Number        | Description   |   |
| Minnesota     | ✓   | Not specified | Known as shared performance goals. All teachers in the same school will receive the same performance rating for this measure, which counts as 5 percent of summative evaluation score. |                            | Not specified |             | ✓                            | Not specified | For all teachers except those who spend 100 percent of their time in tested subjects for which there is value-added data. Student learning goals must include or specify six elements.  |   |
| Mississippi   |   | Not specified |  |                            | Not specified |             | ✓                            | Not specified | Nontested areas only.   | Schoolwide growth is a measure for all teachers, but it is unclear whether it is considered an SLO. |
| Nebraska      |   | Not specified |  |                            | Not specified |             |                              | Not specified |   | No characteristics were specified.  |
| New Hampshire | ✓   | 1             | Schoolwide SLOs apply to all teachers as a shared measure for student learning.  |                            | Not specified |             | ✓                            | At least 1    | All teachers should document student academic performance yearly using SLOs. SLOs should have a three-level classification system (low, medium or average, high).   |   |
| New Jersey    | ✓   | Not specified | Teachers are encouraged to collaborate on the student growth objective process with colleagues in the school and at the same grade level.  |                            | Not specified |             | ✓                            | 1–2           | The number of required student growth objectives varies by grade and subject area taught. Teachers of grades and subjects that are tested on the New Jersey Assessment of Skills and Knowledge must create one or two student growth objectives. Teachers of nontested grades and subjects must create two. |   |

*(continued)*

**Table A4. Characteristics of student learning objectives, by state** (continued)

| State          | Schoolwide student learning objectives (SLOs) |               |   | SLOs for teams of teachers |               |   | SLOs for individual teachers |               |  | Other/notes   |
|----------------|---|---------------|---|----------------------------|---------------|---|------------------------------|---------------|--|---|
|                | Used?   | Number        | Description   | Used?                      | Number        | Description   | Used?                        | Number        | Description  |   |
| New Mexico     |   | Not specified |   |                            | Not specified |   |                              | Not specified |  | No characteristics were specified.  |
| New York       | ✓   | 1             | Optional. One schoolwide or Board of Cooperative Educational Services (BOCES)–wide SLO is permitted as a substitute for or supplement to any SLO, except for grades 6–8 science and social studies or any grade or subject with a state assessment. | ✓                          | 1             | Optional. One group or team SLO permitted as a substitute for or supplement to any SLO, except for grades 6–8 science and social studies or any grade or subject with a state assessment. | ✓                            | At least 1    | For locally comparable measures, “the same locally selected measures of student achievement or growth across all classrooms in same grade/subject in district or BOCES.”<br><br>Multiple SLOs and multiple locally comparable measures (measures of learning that are comparable across classrooms) may be selected for different groups of teachers within a grade. | Guidance on the New York State District-wide Growth Goal-Setting Process: Student Learning Objectives, New York State Department of Education, 2013. Retrieved March 18, 2013, from <a href="http://engageny.org/sites/default/files/resource/attachments/slo-guidance.pdf">http://engageny.org/sites/default/files/resource/attachments/slo-guidance.pdf</a><br><br>Evaluation Plans Guidance Memo, New York State Department of Education, 2012. Retrieved March 18, 2013, from <a href="http://engageny.org/resource/summary-of-revised-appr-provisions-2012-13-the-purple-memo">http://engageny.org/resource/summary-of-revised-appr-provisions-2012-13-the-purple-memo</a> |
| North Carolina |   | Not specified |   |                            | Not specified |   | ✓                            | Not specified | Through the SLO process, teachers and administrators work together to identify specific Standard Course of Study-related areas of focus for each class, and local education agency central office staff audit the plans and their implementation to ensure that they are appropriate and are implemented with fidelity.  |   |

(continued)

**Table A4. Characteristics of student learning objectives, by state** *(continued)*

| State        | Schoolwide student learning objectives (SLOs) |               |             | SLOs for teams of teachers |               |             | SLOs for individual teachers |               |   | Other/notes   |
|--------------|---|---------------|-------------|----------------------------|---------------|-------------|------------------------------|---------------|---|---|
|              | Used?   | Number        | Description | Used?                      | Number        | Description | Used?                        | Number        | Description   |   |
| North Dakota |   | Not specified |             |                            | Not specified |             |                              | Not specified |   | No characteristics were specified.  |
| Ohio         |   | Not specified |             |                            | Not specified |             | ✓                            | 2–4           | SLO should articulate specific concepts and skills the students will gain in the course and should be based on needs identified in baseline data analyses. The teacher should specify how the SLO will address applicable standards such as the Common Core and Ohio and national content standards. SLOs should represent a teacher’s range of courses and students. |   |
| Oklahoma     |   | Not specified |             |                            | Not specified |             | ✓                            | 1             | SMART goal and accompanying assessment measure.   | Districts may choose to allow two other academic measures that are averaged together.   |
| Oregon       |   | Not specified |             |                            | Not specified |             | ✓                            | 1–2           | Teachers establish student learning goals and identify strategies and measures that will be used to determine goal attainment. They also specify what evidence will be provided to document progress toward each goal.  | Teachers of tested subjects and grades should select one additional measure, and teachers of nontested subjects and grades should choose at least two measures of student growth. |

*(continued)*

**Table A4. Characteristics of student learning objectives, by state** *(continued)*

| State        | Schoolwide student learning objectives (SLOs) |               |  | SLOs for teams of teachers |               |   | SLOs for individual teachers |        |   | Other/notes  |
|--------------|---|---------------|--|----------------------------|---------------|---|------------------------------|--------|---|--|
|              | Used?   | Number        | Description  | Used?                      | Number        | Description   | Used?                        | Number | Description   |  |
| Rhode Island | Not specified                                 |               | Building administrators develop a set of schoolwide SLOs, which do not count in teacher evaluation. Teachers should align SLOs with those of their administrators. | ✓                          | Not specified | Teachers of the same course for the same school should have the same SLOs—but with different targets if student starting points differ substantially. | ✓                            | 2–4    | Required elements include objective statement, rationale, aligned standards, students to whom SLO applies, interval of instruction, baseline data, targets, rationale for targets, evidence source, how measure will be administered, and how evidence will be scored. School year or interval of instruction appropriate to the teaching assignment. | Rhode Island Model Teacher Evaluation & Support System Edition II, Rhode Island Department of Education, 2013. Retrieved December 10, 2013, from <a href="http://www.ride.ri.gov/Portals/0/Uploads/Documents/Teachers-and-Administrators-Excellent-Educators/Educator-Evaluation/Education-Eval-Main-Page/Measures-of-Student-Learning-GB-Edition-II.pdf">http://www.ride.ri.gov/Portals/0/Uploads/Documents/Teachers-and-Administrators-Excellent-Educators/Educator-Evaluation/Education-Eval-Main-Page/Measures-of-Student-Learning-GB-Edition-II.pdf</a> |
| Utah         | ✓   | Not specified | Optional   | ✓                          | Not specified | Optional  | ✓                            | 2–4    | Objectives should be related to the school improvement goals and Utah core content standards and focus on specific content standards. Objectives should be as representative of the set of a teacher’s courses and subjects as possible. Objectives should be ambitious and tied to varying levels of performance.                                    | Two statewide SLOs will be required for measuring student growth in each nontested subject and grade. Districts may create or use additional SLOs at the district, school, or classroom level. Districts may also require additional SLOs for tested subjects and grades.  |
| Virginia     |   | Not specified |  |                            | Not specified |   | ✓                            | 1      | Describes the setting and population, content area, baseline data, goal statement, and means for obtaining the goal.  |  |

*(continued)*

**Table A4. Characteristics of student learning objectives, by state** (continued)

| State         | Schoolwide student learning objectives (SLOs) |               |             | SLOs for teams of teachers |               |   | SLOs for individual teachers |               |   | Other/notes   |
|---------------|---|---------------|-------------|----------------------------|---------------|---|------------------------------|---------------|---|---|
|               | Used?   | Number        | Description | Used?                      | Number        | Description   | Used?                        | Number        | Description   |   |
| Washington    |   | Not specified |             | Not specified              |               | Student growth data elements may include the teacher's performance as a member of a grade-level, subject-matter, or other instruction team within a school when the use of these data is relevant and appropriate.  | Not specified                |               | In collaboration with students, parents, and other school staff, teacher establishes appropriate student growth goals for subgroups of students not reaching full potential. Goals identify multiple, high-quality sources of data to monitor, adjust, and evaluate achievement of goals. |   |
| West Virginia |   | Not specified |             | ✓                          | Not specified | Optional. Educators may collaborate to establish student learning goals for their grade levels, departments, or curricular teams. The highest performance level requires accomplishing at least one collaborative student learning goal.  | ✓                            | Not specified | Optional. Educators establish two student learning goals and identify strategies and measures that will be used to determine success. They also specify what evidence will be provided to document progress on both goals.  | Two goals total are required (either team or individual goals). Educators at the elementary level will select a content area for each goal. Educators at the secondary level will select a class for each goal. Goals span a school year, semester, or quarter. |
| Wisconsin     | ✓   | Not specified | Optional    | ✓                          | Not specified | Optional. Identify the student population in the identified course or grade level that the SLO will target, as well as the teachers who agree to work collaboratively on the team SLO. Students covered by the team SLO should have the same needs, and the same assessment is utilized to determine growth or mastery. | ✓                            | 2             | Teachers use a rubric to write goals that are informed by baseline data and include strategies and measures, following SMART goal guidelines.   |   |

**Table A5. Additional requirements in state educator evaluation systems that address student learning objectives**

| State       | For all students | For subgroups | Differentiated targets for students | Measurable targets | Measures of growth required | Assessments used  | Note/source   |
|-------------|------------------|---------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------------|---|---|
| Arizona     | ✓                | ✓             | Not specified                       | Not specified      | Not specified               | Statewide assessments (preferred), vendor-provided content assessments with validity and reliability (second choice). Content assessments used local education agency-wide and classroom assessments may be used with evaluator approval. | Teachers get preapproval for assessments by submitting to the evaluator an assessment rigor analysis depth of knowledge chart aligning standards and assessment items. Teachers also decide on a scoring rubric and mastery level needed to meet standards and complete an assessment approval checklist form for review by the evaluator.  |
| Colorado    | Optional         | Optional      | Optional                            | ✓                  | ✓                           | Principal and teacher agree on a baseline and an assessment aligned with Colorado academic standards.   | The assessment review tool can be used to rate an assessment's potential for measuring student academic growth against Colorado academic standards.<br><br>Content Assessment Review Tool, Colorado Department of Education, n.d. Retrieved April 1, 2013, from <a href="http://www.cde.state.co.us/educatoreffectiveness/assessmentreviewtool">http://www.cde.state.co.us/educatoreffectiveness/assessmentreviewtool</a> |
| Connecticut | ✓                | Optional      | ✓                                   | ✓                  |                             | May include standardized and nonstandardized measures. Teachers and their evaluators agree on a balance in the weighting of standardized and nonstandardized indicators.  | Each indicator should make clear what evidence will be examined, what level of performance is targeted, and what proportion of students is projected to achieve the targeted performance level.   |
| Georgia     | ✓                |               | Optional                            | ✓                  | ✓                           | Districts may use commercial measures or create their own measures, including public domain measures to share among districts.  | Georgia Department of Education-trained district teams use a table of specifications tool and an SLO criteria table to help them choose valid and reliable assessments.   |
| Hawaii      | Not specified    | Not specified | Not specified                       | ✓                  | No (see note)               | Not specified   | Covers all subjects and grade levels. Student growth model is separate from SLO.  |

(continued)

**Table A5. Additional requirements in state educator evaluation systems that address student learning objectives** (continued)

| State         | For all students | For subgroups | Differentiated targets for students | Measurable targets | Measures of growth required | Assessments used   | Note/source   |
|---------------|------------------|---------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------------|--|---|
| Illinois      | Optional         | Optional      | Optional                            | ✓                  | ✓                           | Teacher and evaluator choose a “Type III Assessment” (assessments other than statewide and districtwide) that covers at least three learning standards, has a variety of response types, is valid and reliable, and is scored in such a way that a growth model can be used. | Teachers decide the percentage of students to include in the SLO and provide rationale. Teachers determine whether to differentiate targets.  |
| Indiana       | ✓                | ✓             | ✓                                   | Not specified      | Optional                    | For class SLO, most standardized assessments available. For targeted SLO, assessment that best measures progress of targeted group. Schoolwide or classroom measures must be evaluator-approved, while statewide and districtwide assessments are preapproved.               | Teachers who teach the same course or grade should use a common assessment wherever available. When choosing assessments that are not preapproved, teachers complete a standards alignment coverage check chart and an assessment rigor analysis chart. |
| Kentucky      | ✓                | Not specified | Not specified                       | ✓                  | Not specified               | Assessment should be aligned closely with classroom instruction and state standards.   |   |
| Louisiana     |                  | Optional      | Not specified                       | ✓                  | Not specified               | Consult available local education agency guidance and the Louisiana Department of Education common assessment list.  | SLO should cover most of a teacher’s students.  |
| Maryland      | Optional         | Optional      | Not specified                       | ✓                  | ✓                           | State and national external data, benchmark assessment data, school- or grade-level common assessments, and ongoing classroom assessments.   | Teacher SLOs may focus on all students or students in particular classes or subgroups.  |
| Massachusetts | ✓                | Not specified | Not specified                       | Not specified      | Not specified               | Not specified  | Does not specify level of evidence or type of assessments.  |
| Michigan      | Not specified    | Not specified | Not specified                       | ✓                  | ✓                           | A nonexhaustive list included surveys, observation rubrics, portfolios, rubrics, and assessment and other student data.  |   |

(continued)

**Table A5. Additional requirements in state educator evaluation systems that address student learning objectives** (continued)

| State          | For all students | For subgroups   | Differentiated targets for students | Measurable targets | Measures of growth required | Assessments used  | Note/source   |
|----------------|------------------|-----------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------------|---|---|
| Minnesota      | ✓<br>(see note)  | ✓<br>(see note) | Not specified                       | Not specified      | ✓                           | Not specified   | Teachers with 100 percent of time in nontested subjects must have a student learning goal for the class overall and for targeted students.  |
| Mississippi    | Not specified    | Not specified   | Not specified                       | Not specified      | Not specified               | Not specified   | Not specified   |
| Nebraska       | Not specified    | Not specified   | Not specified                       | Not specified      | Not specified               | Not specified   | Not specified   |
| New Hampshire  | Not specified    | Not specified   | Not specified                       | Not specified      | Not specified               | Not specified   | Waiver application and website search revealed no SLO requirements. SLOs and student growth percentiles are both to be included in evaluating teacher impact on student performance in the New Hampshire educator evaluation model. |
| New Jersey     | Optional         | Optional        | ✓                                   | ✓                  | Not specified               | Assessments used to track progress on student growth objectives can include national standardized tests, statewide assessments, or locally developed measures such as tests and portfolios.   |   |
| New Mexico     | Not specified    | Not specified   | Not specified                       | Not specified      | Not specified               | Not specified   |   |
| New York       | ✓                |                 | ✓                                   | Not specified      | ✓<br>(see note)             | Teachers without a state-provided growth measure may use any state assessment, a state-approved third-party assessment, or district, regional, or Board of Cooperative Educational Services–developed assessment that is rigorous and comparable across classrooms. | For any course or section that requires SLOs that has a state-provided growth measure, the state-provided growth measure must be used.  |
| North Carolina | Not specified    | Not specified   | Not specified                       | ✓                  | Not specified               | Standardized tests or district- or school-developed tests.  |   |
| North Dakota   | Not specified    | Not specified   | Not specified                       | Not specified      | Not specified               | Not specified   |   |

(continued)

**Table A5. Additional requirements in state educator evaluation systems that address student learning objectives** *(continued)*

| State        | For all students | For subgroups | Differentiated targets for students | Measurable targets | Measures of growth required | Assessments used  | Note/source  |
|--------------|------------------|---------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------------|---|--|
| Ohio         | ✓<br>(see note)  | ✓             | ✓                                   | ✓                  | ✓                           | Consult guidance on selecting assessments in the SLO guide and the district list of acceptable assessments.   | Aim to include as many students as possible and justify any exclusions.  |
| Oklahoma     | Not specified    | Not specified | Not specified                       | ✓                  | Not specified               | Choose from an approved list that includes state assessments, value-added model score, off-the-shelf assessments, A–F report card components, surveys, and student competitions.  |  |
| Oregon       | ✓                | Not specified | Not specified                       | Not specified      | ✓                           | State, national, international, or common district assessments; other valid and reliable measures of student learning, growth, and proficiency, such as formative assessments, end-of-course tests, and performance-based assessments; and collections or portfolios of student work. |  |
| Rhode Island | ✓                | ✓             | ✓                                   | ✓                  |                             | Various assessments may be used as evidence of target attainment, ranging from teacher-created performance tasks to commercial standardized assessments.  | All teachers who teach the same course (grade-level and subject combination) should use the same sources of evidence for the objectives related to that course.  |
| Utah         | ✓                | Not specified | Not specified                       | ✓                  | ✓<br>(see note)             | State criterion-referenced tests, where available; common benchmark tests; criteria for quality student assessments will be established, state models and examples will be provided, and local districts and schools will be taught how to create quality assessments.                | Each district shall create a process for ensuring that objectives across the district are as comparable as possible. Further, the principal shall consider comparability when approving all objectives in the building.<br><br>Growth-based objectives should be employed only where possible to do so in technically defensible ways. |

*(continued)*

**Table A5. Additional requirements in state educator evaluation systems that address student learning objectives** (continued)

| State         | For all students | For subgroups | Differentiated targets for students | Measurable targets | Measures of growth required | Assessments used  | Note/source   |
|---------------|------------------|---------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------------|---|---|
| Virginia      | Not specified    | Not specified | Not specified                       | ✓                  | ✓                           | Criterion-referenced tests; norm-referenced tests; standardized achievement tests; school-adopted interim, common, and benchmark assessments; and authentic measures (such as portfolio, recitation and performance).                       |   |
| Washington    | ✓                | ✓             | ✓                                   | ✓                  | ✓                           | Classroom-, school-, district-, and state-based tools.  |   |
| West Virginia | ✓                | Not specified | Not specified                       | ✓                  | ✓                           | A variety of measures may be used, including both published and teacher-created assessments. However, all measures must meet three essential criteria: they must include two data points, be rigorous, and be comparable across classrooms. | Rigorous assessments must be aligned with the West Virginia content standards and objectives and challenge all learners. “Comparable across classrooms” means the assessments used to validate progress are equivalent forms of assessments that can be consistently applied in a variety of contexts. Measures with the greatest degree of comparability are those that can be used in all classrooms for a specific grade or subject. |
| Wisconsin     | Optional         | Optional      | Optional                            | ✓                  | ✓                           | District-developed common assessments and portfolios or projects of student work (when accompanied by a rigorous scoring rubric and baseline data providing a comparison of progress across the year).                                      | Teachers must select evidence sources that do not double count or overly emphasize any one source of data within the system. Specifically, teachers preparing SLOs should not use standardized, summative state assessment data as evidence of SLO growth, as these measures will comprise only a portion of a teacher’s overall outcome score during full system implementation.   |
| <b>Totals</b> |                  |               |                                     |                    |                             |   |   |
| Yes (✓)       | 14               | 6             | 7                                   | 19                 | 14                          |   |   |
| No            | 1                | 2             | 0                                   | 0                  | 3                           |   |   |
| Optional      | 5                | 7             | 4                                   | 0                  | 1                           |   |   |
| Not specified | 10               | 15            | 19                                  | 11                 | 12                          |   |   |

**Source:** State education agency websites.

**Table A6. Additional requirements in state educator evaluation student learning objectives**

| State       | Setting student learning objectives (SLOs)   | Who sets SLOs?                             | Review and approval of SLOs   | Assessment of achievement  | Note/source   |
|-------------|--|--|---|--|---|
| Arizona     | Teachers collect evidence from the previous year and rank their students from most prepared to least prepared, and groupings are approved by an evaluator.   | Teachers                                   | Approved by evaluator   | Not specified  | It was indicated in the webinar referenced below that a follow-up webinar in January 2013 would detail the process for setting and evaluating SLOs, but this second webinar does not appear to be available on the Arizona Department of Education website.<br><br>The SLO Process Part I, Arizona Department of Education, 2013. Retrieved April 1, 2013, from <a href="http://www.azed.gov/teacherprincipal-evaluation/files/2013/01/slo-process-pt1-1_15_13.pdf">http://www.azed.gov/teacherprincipal-evaluation/files/2013/01/slo-process-pt1-1_15_13.pdf</a> |
| Colorado    | Teachers analyze baseline data and set rigorous learning targets.  | Teachers                                   | Principal or evaluator  | Teachers assess student progress using agreed on assessments.  |   |
| Connecticut | Gather baseline data about students. Collaborate with grade-level or subject-matter colleagues to write SLOs. Identify indicator for academic growth and development for each SLO. Document rationale, technical information, and baseline data used to set indicator. | Teachers, in collaboration with each other | Approval required by evaluator  | At end of school year teacher submits evidence to evaluator, plus completed self-assessment. Evaluator assigns rating to each SLO (did not meet, partially met, met, or exceeded). |   |
| Georgia     | Districts develop an SLO for each nontested subject and submit to the Georgia Department of Education for approval.  | Districts                                  | Georgia Department of Education approves district-developed SLOs. Teachers develop SLO instruction plans that are approved by an evaluator. | Teachers assess students' growth toward the SLO goal and submit post-test results to Georgia Department of Education.  | Evaluator assigns end-of-year teacher rating (exemplary, proficient, needs development, ineffective) using evaluation rubric.   |
| Hawaii      | Created by teachers based on student data, aligned with state standards, Common Core standards, and area and school priorities.  | Teacher                                    | Agreed on by teacher and administrator  | Teachers collect and review data with principal and adjust SLOs throughout year.   | For pilot year, SLOs were for information only.   |

*(continued)*

**Table A6. Additional requirements in state educator evaluation student learning objectives** *(continued)*

| State     | Setting student learning objectives (SLOs)   | Who sets SLOs?          | Review and approval of SLOs   | Assessment of achievement  | Note/source  |
|-----------|--|-------------------------|---|--|--|
| Illinois  | Teachers choose the class, course, or group of students for the SLO and analyze baseline data with evaluator.  | Teachers with evaluator | Evaluator   | Teacher and evaluator review pre- and post-test data to determine student growth.  |  |
| Indiana   | Teachers review baseline data to identify student area of need and develop a SMART (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Results-oriented and Relevant, and Time-bound) goal. | Teachers                | Evaluator   | Teacher collects evidence to submit to the evaluator, who calculates the effectiveness score.  | For class SLOs, whether a teacher earns the highly effective, effective, improvement necessary, or ineffective rating depends on the extent to which the teacher moves students from their starting points to achieve content mastery. |
| Kentucky  | Teachers review baseline data and collaborate with colleagues to set ambitious but achievable goals.   | Teachers                | Evaluator   | Teachers submit data at the end of the year and discuss results and implications for professional growth with evaluator.   |  |
| Louisiana |  | Teachers                | Evaluator   | Teachers collect and present evidence of student progress, and an evaluator assesses the evidence and rates each student learning target according to its scoring plan.  |  |
| Maryland  |  | Set by teachers         | Evaluators confer with practitioners to review, discuss, and approve objectives and criteria. | Practitioners collect and analyze data at appropriate intervals to document student growth. Practitioners use evidence to assign accurate ratings for achievement of SLOs. Practitioners are evaluated on whether they meet their SLO targets at the end of the instruction interval. The rating process and evidence for meeting the targets is determined by the practitioner and evaluator in the conference when the SLOs are defined. |  |

*(continued)*

**Table A6. Additional requirements in state educator evaluation student learning objectives** *(continued)*

| State         | Setting student learning objectives (SLOs)  | Who sets SLOs?   | Review and approval of SLOs  | Assessment of achievement  | Note/source   |
|---------------|---|--|--|--|---|
| Massachusetts | The educator develops an educator plan that includes student learning goals.  | Teachers working in teams to analyze student data, propose shared goals to collectively pursue, and identify professional practices that teams need to engage in to attain student learning goals. | Evaluator approves educator plan developed by each teacher that includes at least one student learning goal. | The educator prepares a brief analysis of evidence and brings both the analysis and the evidence to a conference with the evaluator.   |   |
| Michigan      | Goals should be based on a school improvement plan. Individual goals include applicable components of team goals.   | For a team goal, team collaborates. For an individual goal, teacher collaborates with supervisor.  | Not specified  | Not specified  |   |
| Minnesota     | Teachers develop in their professional learning communities.  | Teachers collaborate.  | Yes, approved by summative evaluator.  | Teachers collect interim data on progress toward goals. Confer with professional learning communities and evaluators as appropriate. Teachers share data on achievement of student learning goals with evaluators at end of cycle.             |   |
| Mississippi   | Not specified   | Not specified  | Not specified  | Not specified  |   |
| Nebraska      | Not specified   | Not specified  | Not specified  | Not specified  | Not specified   |
| New Hampshire | Not specified   | Not specified  | Not specified  | Not specified  | SLOs and student growth percentiles are both to be included in evaluating teacher impact on student performance in the New Hampshire educator evaluation model. |
| New Jersey    | As part of the student achievement component of evaluation under AchieveNJ, each teacher sets student growth objectives with input and approval from a principal or supervisor at the start of the year. Specifically, teachers and principals or supervisors are expected to collaborate on the content that will be covered and the skills and knowledge that will be measured. | Set by teachers  |  | Administer the post-test. Collect student performance data and consult with the evaluator to determine the rating. Discuss with the evaluator the next steps for setting student growth objectives in the following year based on the results. |   |

*(continued)*

**Table A6. Additional requirements in state educator evaluation student learning objectives** *(continued)*

| State          | Setting student learning objectives (SLOs)  | Who sets SLOs?   | Review and approval of SLOs                            | Assessment of achievement  | Note/source   |
|----------------|---|--|--|--|---|
| New Mexico     | Not specified   | Not specified  | Not specified  | Not specified  |   |
| New York       | State and district policies must be followed.   | In consultation with lead evaluator, educator proposes SLOs and targets. | Lead evaluator approves each teacher's SLOs and goals. | Lead evaluator tracks progress and assesses results on SLOs.   | SLOs are not required but can be used as a comparable growth measure or as a locally selected measure of student achievement.   |
| North Carolina | Teachers and administrators work together to identify areas of focus for each class.  | Teachers and administrators  | Local education agency central office staff            | Not specified  |   |
| North Dakota   | Not specified   | Not specified  | Not specified  | Not specified  |   |
| Ohio           | Teachers should refer to SLO checklist and submit SLO materials such as baseline data and needs assessment and assessment to be used to measure SLOs.   | Teachers   | Building SLO team or designated SLO approval person    | Teachers complete scoring template that incorporates baseline data, established growth targets, and post-test scores.  | Teacher determines SLO score (most effective, above average, average, approaching average, least effective) based on the percentage of students that meet growth target.  |
| Oklahoma       | Teachers decide on an academic area of focus and administer a preassessment or locate baseline data. They then choose an assessment and develop a SMART goal and a five-point rating scale.                                       | Teachers   | Evaluator  | Teachers and evaluators determine whether SMART goal was reached and what rating to assign.  | Documentation of student performance should be provided.  |
| Oregon         | Teachers review baseline data and create SMART goals that measure the learning of all students.   | Teachers   | Supervisor or evaluator                                | Teachers and supervisor or evaluator reflect on the results and determine implications for future professional growth planning.  |   |
| Rhode Island   | Determine the most important standards and content in grade levels and subjects taught. Align SLOs horizontally with teachers in the same grade level or content area. Vertically align with building administrator's objectives. | Teachers, individually and in collaboration with other teachers          | Evaluator  | Teachers submit all available student data to evaluator prior to end-of-year conference. Documentation needed to score SLOs varies. Evaluators review results and rate each objective (did not meet, nearly met, met, exceeded). Once individual SLOs are scored, an overall SLO rating is determined (minimal attainment, partial attainment, full attainment, exceptional attainment). | Teachers can use the electronic Educator Performance Support System to write their SLOs, submit them for evaluator approval, and upload evidence on their attainment. Evaluators can use the system to approve, give feedback on, and score SLOs. |

*(continued)*

**Table A6. Additional requirements in state educator evaluation student learning objectives** *(continued)*

| State         | Setting student learning objectives (SLOs)   | Who sets SLOs?          | Review and approval of SLOs                  | Assessment of achievement  | Note/source   |
|---------------|--|-------------------------|--|--|---|
| Utah          |  | Teachers and principals | Principals                                   | The rating for each educator for the student performance component of the evaluation shall be determined based on the various levels of student performance on the appropriate measures. For example, an index system can be developed for students scoring at various levels of a rubric or a simple point system based on the number of students meeting or not meeting a defined benchmark. | A state advisory review committee shall be established to review and support the SLO process, including evaluating the quality and rigor of objectives, measures, and performance expectations. This committee will be designed to ameliorate differences in SLOs across districts due in part to differences in district capacity. |
| Virginia      | Each teacher, using the results of an initial assessment, sets an annual goal for improving student achievement. The goal should be customized for the teaching assignment and the individual learners.  | Teachers                | Evaluator                                    | Teacher assesses growth toward the goal and submits documentation to evaluator.  |   |
| Washington    | Teachers use student growth rubrics to guide goal-setting.   | Teachers                | Evaluator                                    | Evaluator assesses student growth evidence, guided by student growth rubrics.  | Student growth rubrics, Washington State Teacher/Principal Evaluation Project, 2013. Retrieved May 12, 2013, from <a href="http://tpep-wa.org/wp-content/uploads/wa-student-growth-rubrics.pdf">http://tpep-wa.org/wp-content/uploads/wa-student-growth-rubrics.pdf</a>   |
| West Virginia | Educators review schoolwide data and current students' performance data, establish two student learning goals, and identify strategies and measures that will be used to determine success. They also specify what evidence will be provided to document progress on both goals. Educators complete two student learning goal forms and submit them electronically to their evaluators for review. | Teachers                | Evaluator (principal or assistant principal) | Educators submit evidence for each goal to validate progress of student learning and briefly describe results on both student learning goal forms. Evaluators review results and record a performance level for the student learning performance standard.   | Evaluators refer to the student learning rubric to identify a performance level based on the evidence collected for both goals. Evaluators make judgments using a preponderance of the evidence as with other critical standard elements.   |

*(continued)*

---

**Table A6. Additional requirements in state educator evaluation student learning objectives** *(continued)*

| State     | Setting student learning objectives (SLOs)  | Who sets SLOs? | Review and approval of SLOs | Assessment of achievement   | Note/source |
|-----------|---|----------------|-----------------------------|---|-------------|
| Wisconsin | Teachers first review student data to identify area of academic need and a targeted student population. Teachers document baseline data using some type of assessment (either a formal pretest measure or other appropriate indicator). | Teachers       | Evaluator                   | Teacher submits evidence to evaluator, and evaluator rates the SLOs using the scoring rubric. |             |

---

**Source:** State education agency websites.

---

## Appendix B. Links to downloadable sample student learning objective forms and guidance developed by states

**Table B1. Tools to help in developing policies for student learning objectives**

| State         | Resource  | Source  |
|---------------|---|---|
| Arizona       | Student learning objective (SLO) teacher form   | <a href="http://www.azed.gov/highly-qualified-professionals/files/2012/02/ri-teach_sloform.pdf">http://www.azed.gov/highly-qualified-professionals/files/2012/02/ri-teach_sloform.pdf</a>   |
| Colorado      | Guidance and tool for determining weighting of SLOs   | <a href="http://www.cde.state.co.us/EducatorEffectiveness/StudentGrowthGuide5.asp">http://www.cde.state.co.us/EducatorEffectiveness/StudentGrowthGuide5.asp</a>   |
|               | Assessment review tool  | <a href="http://www.cde.state.co.us/educatoreffectiveness/assessmentreviewtool">http://www.cde.state.co.us/educatoreffectiveness/assessmentreviewtool</a>   |
| Connecticut   | SLO form  | <a href="http://www.connecticutseed.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/11/Teacher_45_percent_SLO_goal_form.pdf">http://www.connecticutseed.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/11/Teacher_45_percent_SLO_goal_form.pdf</a>   |
|               | SLO rating worksheet  | <a href="http://www.connecticutseed.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/11/Teacher_EOY_summative_45_percent_SLO_rating_worksheet_form.pdf">http://www.connecticutseed.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/11/Teacher_EOY_summative_45_percent_SLO_rating_worksheet_form.pdf</a> |
| Georgia       | SLO example form  | <a href="http://www.doe.k12.ga.us/School-Improvement/Teacher-and-Leader-Effectiveness/Documents/Chemistry%20I%20SLO%20Example.pdf">http://www.doe.k12.ga.us/School-Improvement/Teacher-and-Leader-Effectiveness/Documents/Chemistry%20I%20SLO%20Example.pdf</a> |
| Hawaii        | “Introduction to Student Learning Objectives,” including sample SLO development at end of document  | <a href="http://hawaiiidoereform.org/LiteratureRetrieve.aspx?ID=124069">http://hawaiiidoereform.org/LiteratureRetrieve.aspx?ID=124069</a>   |
| Illinois      | SLO guidebook, including SLO templates and examples and a guide to choosing assessments   | <a href="http://www.isbe.net/PEAC/pdf/guidance/13-4-te-guidebook-slo.pdf">http://www.isbe.net/PEAC/pdf/guidance/13-4-te-guidebook-slo.pdf</a>   |
| Louisiana     | Student learning target template  | <a href="http://www.louisianabelieves.com/docs/key-compass-resources/student-learning-targets---template.pdf?sfvrsn=5">http://www.louisianabelieves.com/docs/key-compass-resources/student-learning-targets---template.pdf?sfvrsn=5</a>                         |
| Massachusetts | Evaluation forms, including goal-setting forms  | <a href="http://www.doe.mass.edu/eval/resources/evalforms/">http://www.doe.mass.edu/eval/resources/evalforms/</a>   |
| Minnesota     | Student learning goal form  | <a href="http://education.state.mn.us/MDE/EdExc/EducEval/TeachEval/index.html">http://education.state.mn.us/MDE/EdExc/EducEval/TeachEval/index.html</a>   |
| New York      | SLO webinar series  | <a href="http://engageny.org/resource/student-learning-objectives-webinar-series-ii-fall-2012">http://engageny.org/resource/student-learning-objectives-webinar-series-ii-fall-2012</a>   |
|               | SLO template in English   | <a href="http://engageny.org/sites/default/files/resource/attachments/slo_template.doc">http://engageny.org/sites/default/files/resource/attachments/slo_template.doc</a>   |
|               | SLO template in Spanish   | <a href="http://engageny.org/sites/default/files/resource/attachments/slo_template_spanish_example.doc">http://engageny.org/sites/default/files/resource/attachments/slo_template_spanish_example.doc</a>   |
|               | SLO samples from New York teachers  | <a href="http://engageny.org/resource/student-learning-objective-models-from-new-york-state-teachers">http://engageny.org/resource/student-learning-objective-models-from-new-york-state-teachers</a>   |
| Ohio          | SLO template and checklist, guidance and checklist for selecting assessments, document on scoring the SLO, and template for analysis of baseline student data   | <a href="http://education.ohio.gov/GD/Templates/Pages/ODE/ODEDetail.aspx?page=3&amp;TopicRelationID=1230&amp;ContentID=125742">http://education.ohio.gov/GD/Templates/Pages/ODE/ODEDetail.aspx?page=3&amp;TopicRelationID=1230&amp;ContentID=125742</a>         |
| Rhode Island  | Webpage with SLO resources, including document on misconceptions and facts about SLOs, narrated video for teachers focusing on the SLO process, guide for teachers writing SLOs, SLO quality check tool, and archived workshop on developing SLOs | <a href="http://www.ride.ri.gov/EducatorQuality/EducatorEvaluation/SLO.aspx">http://www.ride.ri.gov/EducatorQuality/EducatorEvaluation/SLO.aspx</a>   |
| Washington    | Student growth rubrics  | <a href="http://tpep-wa.org/wp-content/uploads/wa-student-growth-rubrics.pdf">http://tpep-wa.org/wp-content/uploads/wa-student-growth-rubrics.pdf</a>   |
| West Virginia | Educator evaluation pilot guide, including goal-setting forms and rubrics   | <a href="http://wvde.state.wv.us/teacherevalpilot/evaluationpilot_guide.pdf">http://wvde.state.wv.us/teacherevalpilot/evaluationpilot_guide.pdf</a>   |

(continued)

---

**Table B1. Tools to help in developing policies for student learning objectives** *(continued)*

| State     | Resource   | Source  |
|-----------|--|---|
| Wisconsin | SLO selection/approval rubric                                      | <a href="http://ee.dpi.wi.gov/files/ee/pdf/WiSLOselectionApprovalRubric.pdf">http://ee.dpi.wi.gov/files/ee/pdf/WiSLOselectionApprovalRubric.pdf</a>                                     |
|           | SLO selection/approval form  | <a href="http://ee.dpi.wi.gov/files/ee/pdf/WiSLOselectionApprovalForm.pdf">http://ee.dpi.wi.gov/files/ee/pdf/WiSLOselectionApprovalForm.pdf</a>   |
|           | SLO evaluation form  | <a href="http://ee.dpi.wi.gov/files/ee/pdf/WiSLOevaluationform.pdf">http://ee.dpi.wi.gov/files/ee/pdf/WiSLOevaluationform.pdf</a>   |
| Other     | Community Training and Assistance Center SLO center                | <a href="http://www.ctacusa.com/studentlearningobjectives.html">http://www.ctacusa.com/studentlearningobjectives.html</a>   |
| Other     | Race to the Top Reform Support Network SLO quality control toolkit | <a href="http://www.engageny.org/sites/default/files/resource/attachments/rsn-slo-toolkit.pdf">http://www.engageny.org/sites/default/files/resource/attachments/rsn-slo-toolkit.pdf</a> |

**Note:** URLs were active at time of study; some links may no longer be active.

**Source:** State education agency websites.

---

## References

- Community Training and Assistance Center. (2013). *It's more than money: Teacher Incentive Fund—Leadership for educators' advanced performance*. Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools. Boston: Author.
- Hanushek, E., and Rivkin, S. (2010). Generalizations about using value-added measures of teacher quality. *American Economic Review*, 100(2): 267–271.
- Kane, T., and Staiger, D. (2008). *Estimating impacts on student achievement: An experimental evaluation*. NBER Working Paper No. 14607. Cambridge, MA: National Bureau of Economic Research. <http://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED503840>
- Race to the Top Technical Assistance Network. (2010). *Measuring student growth for teachers in non-tested grades and subjects: A primer*. Washington, DC: ICF International. Retrieved October 28, 2013, from [http://nassauboces.org/cms/lib5/NY18000988/Centricity/Domain/156/NTS\\_\\_PRIMER\\_FINAL.pdf](http://nassauboces.org/cms/lib5/NY18000988/Centricity/Domain/156/NTS__PRIMER_FINAL.pdf)
- Tyler, J. (2011). *Designing high quality evaluation systems for high school teachers: Challenges and potential solutions*. Washington, DC: Center for American Progress. <http://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED535653>

