Writing a Quality SLO

BASELINE DATA & RATIONALE

High-quality SLOs start with a plan. The SLO plan should provide enough detail to support the peer or evaluator in their review and monitoring of the plan over the course of the interval. This walkthrough uses an example to depict common challenges in the development of the SLO, to provide reflection/coaching prompts, and to demonstrate suggested revision.



Original Example BEFORE:

I examined ACCESS for English learner data and last year's district writing assessment results when developing my SLO. I noticed that overall, my learners struggled in the writing domain of ACCESS.

REVIEW & ANALYZE the example using:

The Quality Indicators Does the information provided reflect that: ☐ Multiple data sources are used to complete a thorough review of student achievement data, including subgroup analysis. ☐ Achievement gap data is examined, and student equity is considered in the goal statement. Does the information provided demonstrate that: ☐ The data analysis supports the rationale for the chosen SLO. ☐ The baseline data indicates the individual starting point for each student included in the target population.

Self-reflection or coach prompts

- What specific skill will you focus on in order to improve writing?
- How might you design and implement a <u>strategic assessment</u> <u>system</u> which includes assessments *for* learning?
- How do baseline assessment results for these learners compare to that of their peers? Is there a gap? How does this inform the rest of the SLO plan?
- How might you use student work as effective formative assessment?
- What about your observations of learners in their classes? How do these observations provide you with evidence of learners' baseline skills and abilities?
- What information you might gather from previous teachers? School counselors?



Analysis of the BEFORE

- Two evidence sources are identified, which is a solid start. However, additional data can be added to the analysis to better understand learner baseline skills and abilities.
- The teacher will need to include specific results for *each* of the learners included within the identified student population.
- Additional qualitative and/or historical data can be added to help ensure that appropriate growth targets are established for each of the learners within the student population.



AFTER the review and analysis, the original example of Baseline Data and Rationale has been rewritten to now include the Rationale, as well as ACCESS data, results of baseline writing assessment, and additional or historical information for specific learners.

The Example AFTER:

Rationale

Defending an opinion relies on the use of content-specific vocabulary, which is a challenge for English learners. Focusing the SLO specifically on the use of content-specific vocabulary will help learners improve their ability to argue (defend answers) through written English. This is a competency that can be used in all content areas. Our district has identified writing as a district initiative as district-level data reflects achievement gaps in and across subgroups, in both writing and vocabulary acquisition. This goal and its related instructional strategies support both building and district ELA goals.

Baseline Evidence

I reviewed the previous ACCESS exam results and the written constructed response scale and proficiency score results for the learners in my EL caseload. I was particularly concerned with the scores related to writing. I noted challenges in providing specific evidence to defend opinion. Beginning of year ice-breakers allowed me to observe my learners in multiple content areas working with groups and partners. In several instances the learners were asked to provide evidence to support their opinion, both orally and in writing. This was particularly challenging because the EL learners do not have a full command of content vocabulary.

ACCESS data:

ACCESS scale scores allow me to assess typical student growth over time within a domain. In my data analysis, a critical learning need for each of my grade 7 EL caseload emerged in the area of writing, specifically in their ability to defend answers or provide detail needed to support an argument. This is particularly challenging for learners unfamiliar with English language content vocabulary. Results from the ACCESS writing domain for Argue are included below:

- **Emerging:** Argue by Stating opinions using evaluative language related to content (e.g., "I agree. Metric is better.")
 - Connecting simple sentences to form content-related ideas

- **Developing:** Argue by Substantiating opinions with content-related examples and evidence
 - Providing feedback to peers on language used for claims and evidence

Further, the "can do" Writing/Arguing descriptors help me articulate where the learner falls in his/her continuum of learning related to written English:

Student	ACCESS Results	ACCESS "Can do" observed abilities:
Student A	Level 2, Emerging	expresses opinion but does not provide examples/evidence
Student B	Level 3, Developing	is able to support opinions with basic evidence but inconsistently uses content-related examples when providing feedback to peers
Student C	Level 3, Developing	is able to provide some evidence in both writing and feedback
Student D	Level 2, Emerging	expresses opinion but is inconsistent with examples/evidence

To confirm the learning need, as well as to determine a focus area related to the ACCESS writing competencies, I administered a baseline prompt in our structured study session. I read the prompt orally to the group, and asked them to provide evidence to support their answer in writing. I analyzed results from the student work samples using the WIDA writing rubric indictors for Vocabulary Usage. This type of writing assessment will be the basis for monitoring growth prior to the next administration of the ACCESS exam.

Baseline Writing Assessment Results

Student A: Entering/Emerging: inconsistent use of general and high frequency content vocabulary.

Student B: Developing: some use of specific content terms, expressions and has appropriate use of selected words.

Student C: Developing/Expanding: appropriate use and selection of words which served the purpose of task.

Student D: Emerging: consistent use of high frequency, inconsistent use of general.

Additional/Historical Evidence

Student A: Data may include:

• attendance history

length of time in district

• preferred learning modality

• learning strengths

Student D: • additional instructional support

• effective methods for parent/guardian communication