Educator Perceptions of Educator Evaluation in South Carolina

July 2016

Catherine Jacques and Doug Fireside

American Institutes for Research

SOUTHEAST COMPREHENSIVE CENTER

Advancing Research, Improving Education

SEDL

An Affiliate of
American Institutes for Research

440 Knox Abbott Drive, Suite 200
Cayce, SC 29033-4353
803-936-0750

secc.sedl.org

Copyright© 2016 by SEDL, an affiliate of American Institutes for Research. All rights reserved.

AIR®
AMERICAN INSTITUTES FOR RESEARCH®

www.air.org

6657_07/16

AIR Report Team

Doug Fireside, Senior Technical Assistance Consultant (dfireside@air.org)
Catherine Jacques, Researcher (cjacques@air.org)
Don Doggett, M.Ed., South Carolina State Liaison
Beth Howard-Brown, Ed.D., SECC Director (bhoward-brown@air.org)
Tammie Causey-Konaté, Ph.D., SECC Deputy Director (tcausey@air.org)
Chris Times, M.B.A., SECC Senior Communications Associate (ctimes@air.org)

Copyright© 2016 by SEDL, an affiliate of American Institutes for Research. SECC is one of 15 regional centers established by the U.S. Department of Education (ED). The primary goal of the regional centers is to build the capacity of the state education agencies and statewide systems of support to implement ESEA. Links to the other regional centers, the content centers, and ED may be found on the SECC website (secc.sedl.org). The contents of this publication were developed under a grant from ED. The contents do not, however, necessarily represent the policy of ED, and one should not assume endorsement by the federal government.

Contents

Page

Introduction 1

Methodology 1

Survey 2

Focus Groups 4

Perceptions of the Expanded PADEPP Evaluation System 5

Training on Standard 10 5

Perceptions of PADEPP Components 6

Recommendations 8

Perceptions of the SLO Component of the Expanded ADEPT Evaluation System 10

IHE Perceptions of SLOs 10

Teacher and Principal Perceptions on SLOs 12

Impact of the SLO Process 25

Recommendations 31

Perceptions of the Professional Practice Component of the Expanded ADEPT Evaluation System 33

Teacher and Principal Perceptions of Professional Practice 33

Recommendations 35

Appendix. Survey Results A-1

Introduction

In the 2015–16 school year, the South Carolina Department of Education (SCDE) adopted updated teacher and principal evaluation models based on the previous SCDE system for Assisting, Developing, and Evaluating Professional Teaching (ADEPT). The updated teacher evaluation system, called the Expanded ADEPT Support and Evaluation System, includes district-chosen professional practice rubrics and student learning objectives (SLOs), which are measures of student growth. The previous administrator evaluation system, the Program for Assisting, Developing, and Evaluating Principal Performance (PADEPP) was also updated to include locally selected student growth measures and renamed Expanded PADEPP. The 2015-16 state guidelines for Expanded ADEPT and Expanded PADEPP are available on the state website. Throughout the 2015-16 school year, SCDE has been working to explore possible revisions to these guidelines to improve the educator evaluation and support process statewide.

To learn more about the implementation of these new teacher and principal evaluation models, SCDE has partnered with the Southeast Comprehensive Center (SECC) in this exploration of educator experiences and perspectives. SECC is one of 15 regional comprehensive centers funded by the U.S. Department of Education, which works as part of a technical assistance network with both content and regional centers to provide training and technical assistance to state education agencies (SEAs). A team of researchers and technical assistance specialists from SECC gathered feedback from teachers and principals across South Carolina as part of a needs assessment for SCDE. SECC conducted focus groups and administered a statewide survey focused on teacher and principal evaluation in spring 2016; this report captures an analysis of those findings and includes recommendations for policy and support based on these findings.

We sought to answer three overarching research questions through this work:

- What were teacher and principal experiences with training and support for the Expanded ADEPT and Expanded PADEPP systems?
- What were teacher and principal perspectives on the utility and value of the components of the Expanded ADEPT and PADEPP systems?
- What recommendations do teachers and principals have to improve the utility and value of the Expanded ADEPT and PADEPP systems?

Because the updated elements of these evaluation systems are primarily related to the addition of student growth measures, this report focuses on the implementation of SLOs and Standard 10 (the PADEPP student growth standard).

Methodology

The findings in this report are based on two methods of data collection: a survey of educator experiences and perspectives along with focus groups of teachers and administrators across South Carolina. The survey was designed to provide broad, quantitative feedback representative of teachers, principals, district staff, and stakeholders from institutions of higher education (IHEs) across South Carolina. The focus groups were designed to provide qualitative data

exploring the context for educator experiences and perspectives, the reasoning that may have led to these perspectives, and educators' ideas for improving the system. In combination, these two sources of data describe the common experiences and perceptions of educators teaching in South Carolina as well as including the variation between schools and districts. SCDE helped contribute to the survey and focus group protocol but delegated all research design, collection, and analysis to SECC. Some additional data, including interviews, targeted focus groups outside of the original study design, and other contextual data, were excluded from the main analysis; however, these data were included in a secondary analysis. The findings from this secondary analysis, while not included in this report, reflected the same themes and findings as the main analysis.

Survey

In March 2016, staff from SECC worked closely with SCDE to craft a survey instrument based on the research questions and initial findings from focus groups. The survey instrument was refined by experts in survey methodology from American Institutes for Research and SCDE leadership. The survey was administered between April 26 and May 18, 2016, using an online platform called SurveyGizmo. The survey was disseminated by SCDE with assistance from the South Carolina Education Association, the Palmetto State Teachers Association, and district offices across the state. The survey link was designed to be open to all users and did not link responses to any identifiable information due to two significant limitations. First, SCDE did not have access to e-mail addresses for educators statewide, which prevented SECC staff from tracking participation and completion rates based on e-mail addresses. Second, many respondents sought to complete the survey via their school computer systems with a single IP address, which prevented SECC staff from tracking participation and completion rates based on computer IP addresses. Although providing an open survey link may have reduced potential technical challenges related to survey administration, it is unclear to what extent these survey data include duplicate responses. However, given the overall consistency of survey results and focus group feedback, these survey data may be a meaningful representation of educator experiences and perspectives across the state.

About This Report

This report is designed to present quantitative data and overall findings in a clear and easily readable format.

- **Survey Results.** Graphs of survey results are linked to the text descriptions via endnotes. Readers may access the exact percentage or number of respondents for each survey item by referring to these endnotes. Graphs of selected results are also included in the main body of the report.
- **Focus Group Results.** The report uses footnotes to indicate the number of focus groups and the number of references for each theme discussed in the text.

The report presents both survey and focus group findings in tandem, organized by topic.

There were survey respondents from every district across South Carolina, ranging from just a few respondents to hundreds in each district. There were 11,664 total responses to the survey; of these, 9,999 respondents completed the survey.[1] Most respondents indicated that they were classroom teachers, while less than 10% indicated that they were

administrators (Figure 1). It is estimated that approximately one fifth (about 20%) of teachers statewide responded to the survey (SCDE, 2015).[i] Because schools across South Carolina vary in the number of administrators they have, it is more difficult to estimate the response rate for administrators; given available data, it is estimated that between 20% and 50% of administrators in the state responded to the survey (SCIWAY, 2015[ii]).

Figure 1. Survey Respondent Demographics by Role

Value	Percent	Count
Classroom teacher	77.6%	8,566
Coach or mentor (with part-time classroom teaching responsibilities)	1.6%	178
Administrator (principal or vice principal)	6.1%	668
Coach or mentor (without part-time classroom teaching responsibilities in administrative role)	2.2%	245
Central office staff (Please indicate your current position):	2.5%	277
Other (Please indicate your current position):	9.4%	1,040
I work in a university or college	0.6%	67
	Total	11,041

There were a large number of respondents who selected the "other" category for their position. [2] Of these, many indicated that they were in a role with direct instructional responsibilities (233 respondents). Others indicated that they were school counselors (190 respondents), media specialists or librarians (148 respondents), speech-language pathologists (150 respondents), and instructional coaches (45 respondents). Of the small number of central office staff respondents, there were many roles represented, from administrative assistant positions to those in key leadership roles.

The majority (about half) of respondents indicated that they worked in an elementary school setting, about a fifth indicated that they worked in a middle school setting, and about a quarter reported working in a high school setting. Less than 10% of respondents indicated that they worked in another setting, such as a career center, an early childhood center, or a school with a broader grade range.[3] Overall, most grades were fairly evenly represented across respondents. [4]

Most respondents were experienced teachers, with approximately a fifth of teachers indicating that they had 2–5 years of experience, 6–9 years of experience, or 10–15 years of experience. Only about 5% of respondents were in their first year of teaching.[5] Most teachers indicated that they had taught solely in South Carolina or had spent only a few years teaching elsewhere.[6]

[i] http://ed.sc.gov/scdoe/assets/File/data/Quick%20Facts/QuickFacts%202015%20May.pdf
[ii] http://www.sciway.net/facts/#e

Focus Groups

In February 2016, SCDE disseminated an e-mail asking teachers and administrators to volunteer to participate in focus groups on the expanded ADEPT and PADEPP systems. Teachers and administrators identified themselves by district, role, and participation in the evaluation process in an online survey. SCDE also secured six locations for focus groups across the state: three upstate locations (in the Lancaster, Spartanburg, and Greenwood regions), one Midlands location (in the Columbia region), and two Lowcountry locations (in the Florence and Beaufort regions). SECC staff used the data from the focus group nomination survey to randomly select teachers to participate in focus groups using a combination of Microsoft Excel and SPSS software. To ensure a representative sample from each region, SECC disaggregated potential focus group participants by their region and specific role then randomly selected potential participants based on that disaggregation. SECC staff sent invitations to randomly selected teachers and administrators to participate in focus groups in their regions. Each focus group was designed to have a minimum of two participants and no more than 12 participants to ensure both discussion and equity of voice. In two instances when only one person participated in the focus group, this session was treated as an interview and removed from the randomly sampled results, but still included in the secondary analysis. The number of individuals who participated in each focus group was dependent upon teacher availability, including transportation to the focus group site and local events (such as spring break travel). See Table 1 for more information about focus group participation.

Table 1. Focus Group Participation

Focus Group Location	Participant Type	Number of Participants	Participant Type	Number of Participants
Lancaster	Administrator	4	Teacher	6
	Administrator	6	Teacher	9
			Teacher	6
Spartanburg	Administrator	4	Teacher	7
	Administrator	5	Teacher	9
	Administrator	6	Teacher	10
Greenwood	Administrator	4	Teacher	6
	Administrator	2		
Columbia	Administrator	6	Teacher	6
	Administrator	8	Teacher	10
			Teacher	8
Florence	Administrator	3	Teacher	9
	Administrator	7	Teacher	10
			Teacher	7
Beaufort	Administrator	2	Teacher	9
			Teacher	2
			Teacher	4
TOTALS				

Focus Group Location	Participant Type	Number of Participants	Participant Type	Number of Participants
Six Focus Group Locations	12 Administrator Focus Groups	57 Administrators	16 Teacher Focus Groups	118 Teachers

For each of the focus groups, SCDE staff gave a brief introduction to the participants, and then SECC staff facilitated the focus group according to the protocol that had been developed. SCDE staff were not in the room during the focus group discussions. In each focus group, facilitators asked participants to describe their experiences with the ADEPT and/or PADEPP evaluation system in 2015–16, their perceptions of its utility, and their recommendations for improving or refining the system. Each focus group was audio recorded and transcribed. To protect participant confidentiality, the participant lists, audio recordings, and transcriptions have only been shared with the internal SECC project team and will at no time now or in the future be shared with SCDE.

Perceptions of the Expanded PADEPP Evaluation System

Training on Standard 10

Most administrators statewide indicated that they received some kind of training on the Expanded PADEPP evaluation system. About half of administrators reported that they learned about the addition of Standard 10 to the evaluation process in a district-led training, while about a quarter learned about it in a districtwide administrator meeting. [7] In the focus groups, most administrators indicated that they received a brief training or overview of Standard 10 during a districtwide meeting that typically included a brief orientation to the evaluation cycle phase and standards included that year. Some of the newer administrators indicated that they learned about Standard 10 in the state-led Principal Induction Program. Only a few participants indicated that they did not receive training; however, in the focus groups, many administrators shared that they skipped the typical midyear PADEPP meeting to focus on SLO conferences or other work.

In the focus groups, many administrators indicated that the training was brief, focused primarily on “dissemination of information.” However, most administrators agreed that the Standard 10 training provided them with the necessary information to engage in the evaluation process, including examples and models (Figure 2). Most administrators also indicated that the training had a positive impact on their practice, improving their understanding of their role and their conversations with their superintendent.[8]

Figure 2. Administrator Perceptions of Standard 10 Training

	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Provided me with the information I needed to engage in the evaluation process.	190 47.9%	170 42.8%	26 6.5%	11 2.8%
Provided me with examples and models to use in the evaluation process.	154 38.9%	181 45.7%	40 10.1%	21 5.3%
Helped me better understand the expectations for my role as a school leader.	172 43.4%	179 45.2%	34 8.6%	11 2.8%
Helped me better engage in conversations with my superintendent about my work as a school leader.	153 38.8%	169 42.9%	49 12.4%	23 5.8%

Perceptions of PADEPP Components

Most administrators reported that they perceived the PADEPP standards, including Standard 10, to be fair reflections on their work (Figures 3 and 4). Administrators in focus groups shared the perspective that the standards are comprehensive.[iii] One administrator stated that "the standards are very clearly written. They've outlined the expectation of what a good school leader should do and how they should respond…You should be able to provide easy evidence that you're meeting those standards." Administrators also discussed how the PADEPP process allows them to reflect on their work and receive feedback on their practice. One teacher shared that "when they're sitting with you and they're going through each of those different principles, talking about your strengths or areas of growth based off of the criteria and the data, that's helpful."[iv]

Many administrators expressed, however, that different schools need to prioritize different standards based on their population, context, and other needs. One administrator stated that "your kids change. What you need to focus on changes as the students change. One year it may be that community, or safety, different things are your focus." Another administrator shared that demographic shifts in schools and districts can cause major changes in school achievement and priorities in a short period of time, noting that "one particular standard can consume a lot of your time." Other administrators agreed with this view, emphasizing that many rural schools face different challenges than more urban or suburban schools, which contribute to differing priorities for administrators.

Most administrators reported that all the PADEPP standards help superintendents provide helpful feedback and encourage administrators to reflect on their practice.[9, 10] Slightly more respondents, however, disagreed that Standard 10 was fair and helpful, which may be at least partially explained by the focus group findings. Across focus groups, many administrators discussed the perceived challenges of including current student growth measures in administrator evaluations. Some administrators expressed concerns about the validity of certain assessment data; for

[iii] Five focus groups, nine references
[iv] 11 focus groups, 45 references

example, they indicated that although their district-selected assessment (e.g., Fountas and Pinnell) is a helpful instructional tool, it may be too subjective to be fairly used in evaluations. Administrators also expressed frustration with the late implementation and confusion about the South Carolina statewide tests[v] and the burdensome expectations for collecting and documenting evidence for PADEPP.[vi]

Figure 3. Administrator Perceptions of PADEPP Standards 1–9

	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Uses measures that are fair reflections of my work and the work of my students.	125 29.1%	237 55.1%	54 12.6%	14 3.3%
Has allowed my supervisor to provide me with formative feedback during the school year.	136 31.8%	214 50.0%	59 13.8%	19 4.4%
Helps me and my supervisor identify both my strengths and my challenges.	147 34.4%	216 50.6%	47 11.0%	17 4.0%
Provides useful feedback for me and for my supervisor.	139 32.7%	214 50.4%	54 12.7%	18 4.2%
Encourages me to reflect on my practice.	172 40.7%	201 47.5%	36 8.5%	14 3.3%
Leads to improved practices for me and other people in my position.	145 34.0%	203 47.7%	64 15.0%	14 3.3%

Many administrators believed that the addition of Standard 10 was redundant, as Standard 2 and Standard 8 already capture an administrator's impact as an instructional leader.[vii] Some administrators expressed a belief that student growth was outside of their control as a school leader, primarily due to the amount of time required to remove an ineffective teacher. One administrator described this challenge, saying:

> I have one [ineffective] teacher in my building and I'm taking them through an improvement plan, but they will still be here next year. The test scores are going to be horrible even though I'm providing documentation. All the time spent into this year is still not going to reflect me as a leader. It takes a process to put a teacher through an action plan, so you're talking about a two to three year impact on your achievement scores. When I think about how effective are we with instruction, [growth is impacted by] the factors that you have no control over. However, I can show you my PLCs that have

[v] Six focus groups, 23 references
[vi] Nine focus groups, 20 references
[vii] Eight focus groups, 24 references

> stayed intact for four years and I can show you their achievement and how it has grown. It's more about what evidence can I provide to you of my effective leadership than consistency.

Many administrators emphasized that the supports they provide as instructional leaders captured in Standard 2, including "handholding, coaching, helping teachers to [write SLOs], and helping teachers to set goals that are realistic," may be a better representation of their impact on student learning than Standard 10.

Figure 4. Administrator Perceptions of PADEPP Standard 10

	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Uses measures that are fair reflections of my work and the work of my students.	78 18.6%	191 45.5%	111 26.4%	40 9.5%
Has allowed my supervisor to provide me with formative feedback during the school year.	102 24.3%	191 45.6%	85 20.3%	41 9.8%
Helps me and my supervisor identify both my strengths and my challenges.	95 22.6%	190 45.1%	98 23.3%	38 9.0%
Provides useful feedback for me and for my supervisor.	98 23.4%	197 47.0%	90 21.5%	34 8.1%
Encourages me to reflect on my practice.	121 28.8%	210 50.0%	58 13.8%	31 7.4%
Leads to improved practices for me and other people in my position.	104 24.9%	198 47.5%	78 18.7%	37 8.9%

Recommendations

Require student growth data as an artifact or a source of supporting evidence for one or more of PADEPP Standards 1–9.[viii] Most administrators indicated that they would prefer for student growth data to be a source of evidence for the other PADEPP standards (Figure 5).[11] One administrator shared that one district has outlined "suggested artifacts for each standard to bring forward when we're having those meetings [with the superintendent]. It helps lay out the [school performance] story." SCDE may consider requiring student growth to be used as a form of evidence in the overall evaluation without requiring that it be used to inform performance on a specific standard or set specific growth expectations for administrators. However, some administrators did acknowledge that it would be helpful to have guidance on how to best use student data as evidence of practice and growth expectations.[ix] A few administrators suggested that they would like to use an administrator SLO process to set their own school goals.[x] In

[viii] 11 focus groups, 44 references
[ix] 10 focus groups, 27 references
[x] Five focus groups, eight references

addition to student growth data, SCDE may consider requiring secondary administrators to use another student outcome measure as a source of evidence, such as Advanced Placement (AP) or International Baccalaureate (IB) enrollment, college acceptance rates, or career placement rates.

Figure 5. Administrator Preferences for PADEPP Rules

	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know
Student growth was considered an artifact or supporting evidence for standards in the PADEPP system rather than a "stand-alone" component.	167 42.9%	157 40.4%	22 5.7%	13 3.3%	30 7.7%
It included other measures such as graduation and attendance rates, AP or IB enrollment, college acceptance rates, work or career placement rates, and other similar data.	85 21.9%	141 36.3%	38 9.8%	33 8.5%	91 23.5%
Principals were evaluated on all Expanded PADEPP standards every year.	53 13.7%	82 21.1%	74 19.1%	104 26.8%	75 19.3%
Principals were evaluated on all Expanded PADEPP standards every three to five years.	121 31.2%	130 33.5%	39 10.1%	24 6.2%	74 19.1%
Each PADEPP standard was weighted and the evaluator determined a final rating via a formula rather than a professional judgment.	75 19.4%	141 36.4%	56 14.5%	47 12.1%	68 17.6%

Have evaluators use their professional judgement to determine a final rating.[xi] In the survey, about half of administrators indicated that they would support weighting each of the PADEPP standards so that the evaluator could calculate a final rating. In focus groups, however, the majority of administrators indicated that the rating should be based on evaluator judgement because schools have different priorities and needs. The data from the survey and focus groups indicate that administrator opinions on this topic may vary: some administrators described how weighted standards may help protect school leaders who are unpopular but effective,[xii] while a substantial number of survey respondents indicated that they did not know whether the standards should be weighted. It may be beneficial for SCDE to continue to allow evaluators to use their professional judgement to determine a final rating, which allows administrators flexibility in setting school priorities.

Evaluate administrators every 3 to 5 years.[xiii] Most administrators agreed in both the survey and focus groups that it was more effective to have a full evaluation every 3 to 5 years. Administrators in focus groups shared that having the full evaluation every few years "makes it more meaningful, because if you're doing it every year, it's almost a practice of utility. You do it because you have to do it, but it doesn't really change your drive to move your building." By

[xi] 10 focus groups, 26 references
[xii] Five focus groups, 10 references
[xiii] Three focus groups, eight references

focusing on specific standards in the years leading up to the full evaluation, administrators were better able to reflect on their work and engage in meaningful conversations with their evaluator.

Perceptions of the SLO Component of the Expanded ADEPT Evaluation System

IHE Perceptions of SLOs

It is important for staff at IHE schools of education in the state to be knowledgeable about the SLO processes and policies across South Carolina. IHEs provide new teachers with initial information and experiences with SLOs, which may inform teachers' perceptions of the value and utility of SLOs for improving teaching practice. Although those in IHE positions did not participate in focus groups, they did respond to specific survey questions. The small number of survey respondents from IHEs had various roles, with about half serving as full- or part-time professors in the school of education (Figure 6).[12] Only about half of the respondents supervise student teachers in their role.[13]

Figure 6. IHE Respondents' Positions



Just under half of these respondents learned about the SLO component of the Expanded ADEPT system through SCDE trainings or resources, although many also learned about the SLO component from university or district colleagues. [14] About half of the respondents accessed SCDE online training modules, SCDE sample SLOs, and the ADEPT policy manual, and about a third accessed sample SLOs from other states. Few relied on district staff for information about the SLO system.[15] Of these, the SCDE in-person trainings, online training modules, and sample SLOs also were most commonly rated as the most helpful. [16]

The survey results indicate that these training materials may have helped IHE respondents build a better understanding of the Expanded ADEPT system. Most IHE respondents noted that they understood the purpose of SLOs and observations in the Expanded ADEPT system and that they understood the expectations for teachers when being observed and in completing the SLO process (Figure 7). IHE respondents also indicated that current teacher candidates graduate with a solid understanding of the SLO process. It is important to note that more IHE respondents shared that they did not fully understand the SLO process than the observation process, likely because the SLO process is a new requirement.[17]

Figure 7. IHE Perspectives on the Expanded ADEPT System

	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know
I fully understand the purpose of observations in the Expanded ADEPT system.	32 46.4%	26 37.7%	6 8.7%	1 1.4%	4 5.8%
I fully understand the purpose for teachers completing the SLO process.	26 38.2%	30 44.1%	8 11.8%	1 1.5%	3 4.4%
I fully understand the expectations for teachers being observed in the Expanded ADEPT system.	30 44.1%	28 41.2%	6 8.8%	2 2.9%	2 2.9%
I fully understand the expectations for teachers when completing the SLO process.	18 26.9%	33 49.3%	12 17.9%	1 1.5%	3 4.5%
The teacher candidates in our program graduate with a solid understanding of what is expected of them under the Expanded ADEPT system, including both the observations and SLO components.	10 16.1%	27 43.5%	12 19.4%	5 8.1%	8 12.9%

Most IHE respondents also indicated that teacher candidates had opportunities to practice components of the SLO process and discuss SLOs and the ADEPT process with a cooperating teacher (Figure 8).[18] The top three components these respondents thought teacher candidates needed the most help understanding were interrelated: assessments, growth targets, and baseline and trend data. Surprisingly, only about a quarter of respondents said that progress monitoring was in the top three components that teacher candidates needed help understanding, even though this component is related to the top three components.[19]

Figure 8. Teacher Candidate Experiences With SLOs

	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know
Our teacher candidates get to practice selecting high-priority standards while in our program.	33 62.3%	12 22.6%	1 1.9%	2 3.8%	5 9.4%
Our teacher candidates get to practice setting goals or expectations for growth while in our program.	29 55.8%	10 19.2%	3 5.8%	5 9.6%	5 9.6%
Our teacher candidates get to practice tracking student growth toward goals while in our program.	22 42.3%	18 34.6%	2 3.8%	5 9.6%	5 9.6%
While working with their cooperating teachers (in their student teaching placement), our teacher candidates have discussed the Expanded ADEPT system.	16 30.8%	20 38.5%	5 9.6%	1 1.9%	10 19.2%
While working with their cooperating teachers (in their student teaching placement), our teacher candidates have discussed the SLO process.	15 28.8%	17 32.7%	2 3.8%	0 0.0%	18 34.6%

Teacher and Principal Perceptions on SLOs

Training on SLOs

Training Experiences

Nearly all teachers participated in the SLO process in 2015–16,[20, 21] but administrators and teachers reported various experiences with SLO training and support across the state. In addition, administrators and teachers reported that their trainings varied in effectiveness. Most administrators or instructional coaches provided teachers with information on SLOs at staff meetings. About half of teachers indicated that they received in-person trainings through the district, from a school administrator, or from an instructional coach. Most administrators reported that teachers received ongoing training and support on SLOs from these staff; [22] however, only about half of teachers reported that they received this ongoing support.[23]

In general, administrators and teachers agreed that the trainings were comprehensive. The majority of administrators and teachers either strongly agreed or somewhat agreed that the trainings at the state, district, and school levels included detailed information and examples to use in the evaluation process and helped teachers better understand the expectations for their impact on student learning. Most of the discussion in teacher focus groups on training centered on conferences with administrators; in the survey, nearly all teachers indicated that they had a beginning-of-year conference with an administrator, and most teachers indicated that they had a midyear conference as well.[xiv] [24]

Training Effectiveness

Administrators and teachers reported that trainings on the SLO process at all levels addressed professional growth: most agreed that they helped teachers better engage in conversations about their practice or impact on student learning.[25, 26, 27, 28] Although only about half of teachers agreed that state- or district-level trainings helped them better engage in these conversations, most agreed that the school-level trainings helped them in this way. In general, slightly more administrators and teachers agreed that the school-level trainings had these elements and supports rather than the state- or district-led trainings.

Administrators and teachers also agreed that the trainings had a positive impact on teacher knowledge: most agreed that teachers understood the SLO process, felt prepared to write an SLO, and understood each SLO component (Figures 9 and 10).[29, 30] Most also reported that they believed the growth targets were both realistic and rigorous. Nearly all administrators and teachers indicated that teachers received helpful feedback on their SLOs from administrators or instructional coaches; likewise, many administrators and teachers reported that one of the top supports for teachers in the SLO process was school-level training. Although administrators and teachers reported that the state- or district-level trainings were comprehensive, only about a quarter of administrators and less than 10 percent of teachers reported that the state- or district-

[xiv] 11 sources, 26 references

level trainings or SCDE resources were a top support for teachers as they wrote their SLOs (Figures 11 and 12).[31]

Figure 9. Results After State- or District-Led Training Reported by Administrators[32]

	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know
The teachers in my building felt prepared to write their SLO.	41 16.6%	143 57.9%	45 18.2%	16 6.5%	2 0.8%
The teachers in my building clearly understood the SLO process	33 13.4%	128 52.0%	60 24.4%	24 9.8%	1 0.4%
The teachers in my building had a clear understanding of the assessment used for measuring growth in their SLO.	60 24.4%	119 48.4%	48 19.5%	17 6.9%	2 0.8%
The teachers in my building had a clear understanding of what contextual information to include about their students in their SLO.	52 21.1%	134 54.5%	47 19.1%	11 4.5%	2 0.8%
The teachers in my building had a clear understanding of how or why their SLO was based on specific standards.	58 23.5%	140 56.7%	32 13.0%	14 5.7%	3 1.2%
The teachers in my building had growth targets that were both realistic and rigorous.	75 30.4%	136 55.1%	24 9.7%	10 4.0%	2 0.8%
The teachers in my building received helpful feedback from myself, another school administrator, or an instructional coach on the SLO they submitted.	109 44.1%	112 45.3%	16 6.5%	8 3.2%	2 0.8%

Figure 10. Results After State- or District-Led Training Reported by Teachers[33]

	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree
I felt prepared to write my SLO.	1,017 24.4%	1,904 45.6%	851 20.4%	404 9.7%
I clearly understood the SLO process.	975 23.4%	1,811 43.4%	988 23.7%	399 9.6%
I had a clear understanding of the assessment used for measuring growth in my SLO.	1,537 36.8%	1,700 40.7%	617 14.8%	322 7.7%
I had a clear understanding of what contextual information to include about my students in their SLO.	1,343 32.2%	1,871 44.8%	672 16.1%	289 6.9%
I had a clear understanding of how or why my SLO was based on specific standards.	1,537 36.8%	1,792 42.9%	564 13.5%	281 6.7%
I had, or set, growth targets that were both realistic and rigorous.	1,871 44.8%	1,703 40.8%	390 9.3%	208 5.0%
I received helpful feedback from a school administrator or an instructional coach on my SLO.	1,847 44.3%	1,545 37.0%	495 11.9%	286 6.9%

Figure 11. Administrators' Top Three Supports for Writing SLOs

Value	Percent	Count
Support from the state- or district-provided training	25.7%	95
Support from the training or guidance provided to teachers by me, other school administrators, or instructional coaches	78.9%	292
Support from the materials made available by my district	43.8%	162
Support from the materials made available on the South Carolina State Department of Education's website	26.2%	97
Support from resources that I, or someone I know, found on the Web	26.5%	98
Support from another source (please specify):	6.5%	24

Figure 12. Teachers' Top Three Supports for Writing SLOs

Value	Percent	Count
Support from the state- or district-provided training	9.3%	403
Support from the training or support provided by school administrators or instructional coaches	49.6%	2,144
Support from the support materials made available by my district	10.9%	469
Support from the support materials made available on the South Carolina State Department of Education's website	3.3%	141
Support from resources that I, or someone I know, found on the Web	13.3%	574
Support from another source (please specify):	13.7%	590
	Total	4,321

School-Level Support, Collaboration, and Communication

The focus group participants echoed these survey data, describing how their administrators and fellow teachers provided helpful training and support throughout the SLO process. One teacher described how the administrator "took some of the pressure off" and worked to alleviate teacher anxiety about the process. An administrator shared how the SLO process was tied to existing school goals and processes: "We tie it with our 'The Leader in Me' work and we set school writing goals this year based on the SLOs. All of that tied together so it wasn't one more thing our teachers…We were able to track data and it was something the teachers were already doing." This administrator also acknowledged that integrating the SLO process with existing work was important for teachers, saying, "We had a good experience with the SLO process just because we tied that together, but I could definitely see that if we didn't have a focus on it, school-wide, to get the teachers through the process and offer all of the support that we could, it would be very overwhelming."

Focus group respondents also shared that peer training, support, and collaboration helped teachers understand and engage in the SLO process. One teacher described how administrators met with all teachers through every step of the SLO process, supporting them throughout assessment design and growth target setting. Other teachers reported that administrators not only provided comprehensive trainings, but also set up support teams with specific points of contact for help on SLO components. Some teachers across focus groups served in these school-level support teams, helping other teachers to design performance-based assessments, set growth targets, and write the SLO rationale. One teacher shared that the school-level instructional coaches and lead teachers "were fantastic" and "did a really great job," saying that "if [they] had not helped us, I don't know what we would have done. She literally held our hands all the way through it." Other teachers reported having common planning periods to collaborate and work on SLO development with colleagues and teacher-trainers.

Some teachers reported that they collaborated on their SLOs with similar teachers, in some cases writing a team SLO. One teacher shared that this process alleviated some of the stress related to SLO implementation, saying:

> I did enjoy that our school, we met as a faculty four Tuesdays over September to write our SLO. It wasn't so overwhelming, all this paperwork and writing that you had to do, at least it was done. We all got together with guidance counselors, we all brought our devices, and we really specifically walked through what that should look like. It was nice to have that. It gets you started off not feeling stressed, instead of continually writing SLO drafts over and over.

Focus group participants emphasized that it was important for teachers to have ongoing, "hands-on" support at the school level as they were learning how to write SLOs. One teacher described how "meeting in a group, peer reviewing each other, and brain storming out loud is very beneficial." Another teacher explained that, in one school, many teachers felt overwhelmed by the SLO process at first and "couldn't see the big picture because they're up to their eyeballs in everything, even with the training." Some of these teachers emphasized that these supports "were not given through the district," indicating that, in many cases, supports were provided based on school context and initiative rather than a district implementation plan. In general, these supports seemed to be in place more often when teachers had more autonomy or choice over the SLO components. Likewise, these supports seemed to be in place more often in schools with existing support staff, such as coaches and teacher leaders, and collaborative structures, such as common planning time or grade-level teams.

Although there were many positive experiences with school-level support for SLOs, some focus group participants reported that they had limited or no school-level support on SLOs. Although those who described positive training experiences often linked them to knowledgeable administrators and teacher leaders, others noted that their administrators or teacher leaders were ill prepared to train or support others through the SLO process. One teacher shared, "I wish I had someone there who knew the answers to the questions and who wasn't also haphazardly trained by someone who was probably also haphazardly trained." Another teacher shared that "there were just a lot of questions that no one in my building had the answers to."

Many teachers in focus groups expressed the perspective that their administrators were not at fault because they were not adequately training or prepared to support teachers through the process. One teacher shared that "I've got an amazing principal, so I know that she passed out the information as she got it." Another teacher explained that, in one school, "administrators didn't get the full blow from the district until a few days before they were supposed to [implement SLOs]." Other teachers shared that their administrators were "learning on the fly" alongside the rest of school staff. In four focus groups, teachers described how their district did not make any decisions about SLO implementation, but rather left these decisions up to school principals. This left some administrators confused about the SLO process, which led to confusion among teachers as well.

The main reason teachers cited for the insufficient SLO training and support was problems with district planning or preparation for SLO implementation. A few teachers expressed the belief that the change in the state superintendent in 2015 led some district leaders to assume that SLOs would not be required. As one teacher stated:

> The idea that the [district] administration responsible for providing training [on SLOs] for teachers just happened is sort of a falsehood…There was this idea that a new state superintendent was going to change all of that. Everybody just kind of sat around and waited it out, and nobody was really prepping and making it happen. Finally, when they realized that wasn't the case, [teachers] get slapped with, oh, we really need to do this now.

Other teachers expressed frustration with the changing information about the timeline for SLO implementation. According to one teacher, "One of my main grievances was the timeline, because when I first heard, it was 'we're coming out with this. You have a year.' Then it went to, 'You've got two weeks.'" Although it is unclear what the relationship was between school culture and implementation success, the teachers who expressed frustration about the rushed timeline for SLO implementation also often cited a lack of time or support to collaborate with others and analyze data. This may indicate that the variations in implementation quality may mirror other variations in equity, resources, and school culture.

SLO Conferences With Administrators

Across focus groups, teachers reported that they continued to learn about the SLO process during initial and midyear SLO conferences with their administrators. For some teachers, these conferences helped them better understand the SLO process, how to improve the quality of their written SLO, or how to use the SLO process to improve student learning. One teacher described how the administrator helped connect the SLO goals with student learning needs and lesson plans, saying "it was positive because…it was very intense. It forced me to go and look up [and implement teaching strategies]. It's best practice." Other teachers described a similar process of collaborative reflection in which reviewing student data and growth targets allowed them to plan and adjust instruction to promote better student learning. One teacher shared that "our midyear meetings with our administration were really effective because they kept teachers on track and understanding where your students are and where they need to be by the end of the year." Another teacher shared how the administrator focused on specific student groups in their midyear meeting, working with the teacher to improve their data-monitoring tools and processes.

Some teachers and administrators also expressed appreciation for the chance to have a face-to-face discussion about teaching and learning with their administrator in the midyear conferences. One teacher shared, "I really appreciated meeting with my administration in the middle of the year. You don't usually get that. It's just beginning and end. Collecting my data, taking it to my administration, talking through it, and seeing what professional development we might need to meet those goals by the end of the year was effective." A few administrators also described how conferences with teachers about SLOs were a helpful instructional tool. One administrator shared that, "Teachers that I would have not received a lot of attention [from] this year, possibly because they're not in those tested areas, they have an opportunity to sit down and speak about their craft."

Many administrators across focus groups, however, shared that the SLO conferences were burdensome in terms of the time they took to conduct. Some administrators described spending nearly two weeks in which they solely focused on holding midyear SLO conferences, while others described holding brief conferences of just a few minutes. One administrator described the

midyear conferences as "very short, basically 'What are your results? What are your numbers?'" Likewise, another administrator expressed that these short conferences did not feel fair to teachers because they "totally change what your focus is" to be more about accountability than instruction. A few administrators described how the time burden associated with conferences led to them becoming less meaningful over the course of the school year because administrators were "worn out" by the process. The perceived time burden on administrators to complete SLO conferences also may have contributed to a lack of buy-in from teachers. Some teachers across focus groups expressed frustration with the brevity of the midyear conference, explaining how they spent hours gathering student data and instructional evidence only to have a brief discussion focused simply on whether students were on track to meet their growth targets.

Recommendations for Training and Support

Although the majority of administrators and teachers reported that teachers felt prepared to write SLOs, the survey also asked on which topics teachers would benefit from more training. Respondents indicated that it would be beneficial to have more training on topics; however, those chosen most often by administrators and teachers were writing an SLO for specific content areas and setting growth targets (Figures 13 and 14). [34, 35] It is unsurprising that many respondents indicated that there was a need for more training on setting growth targets, as this has been a common challenge for many teachers in the SLO process in other states and districts. It is less clear why many respondents indicated that there was a need for more training on writing an SLO for specific content areas; however, this may reflect the common teacher preference to learn through practical application (Knowles, 2005). [xv]

Figure 13. Teachers Reported Wanting More Training on the Following Topics

Value	Percent	Count
Writing an SLO for specific content areas	41.1%	1,628
Identifying assessments that align with course grade-level content	32.7%	1,293
Identifying priority content standards	21.9%	866
Analyzing student baseline and trend data	27.0%	1,068
Setting growth targets	41.7%	1,652
Using formative assessments to help track students growth toward targets	26.1%	1,032
Using the SLO process to document teacher professional practice as identified in the Expanded ADEPT system	24.8%	980

[xv] Knowles M., et al. (2005). *The adult learner: The definitive classic in adult education and human resource development*. 6th edition. Amsterdam: Elsevier.

Figure 14. Administrators Reported That Teachers Needed More Training on the Following Topics

Value	Percent	Count
Writing an SLO for specific content areas	48.2%	178
Identifying assessments that align with course content or grade-level content	44.2%	163
Identifying priority content standards	22.2%	82
Analyzing student baseline and trend data	42.3%	156
Setting growth targets	47.7%	176
Using formative assessments to help track students growth toward targets	40.7%	150
Using the SLO process to document teacher professional practice as identified in the Expanded ADEPT system	20.1%	74

Across focus groups, teachers emphasized the importance of collaborative and hands-on learning about SLOs. In four focus groups, teachers expressed a desire for future trainings to be in-person and interactive to promote better engagement and learning. One teacher also noted that it is important that districts and schools make time for teachers to engage in this training during the school day or as part of dedicated professional development time to improve teacher buy-in. Another teacher suggested that the training could be delivered in increments during the school day, including follow-up activities to ensure that teachers are utilizing and processing the information over time.

Teachers across focus groups also described how collaborating on team SLOs can improve the SLO process. One group of teachers who wrote a team SLO were able to work together to promote more personalized learning, shifting students between teachers who were more effective at remediation and those were more effective at accelerated learning as needed to promote student growth because they had the same learning focus. This approach allowed teachers to work together and play to their instructional strengths, which also allowed them to better demonstrate their effectiveness in the evaluation. Another group of teachers who wrote a team SLO used a consensus-based model of decision making to determine the design of their SLO. This process helped teachers come to agreement about learning priorities for students and build buy-in for the SLO process. Team SLOs also allowed teachers to engage in collaborative reflection throughout the SLO cycle, which some teachers suggested may be more beneficial than solo reflection for improving practice.

For administrators, one common recommendation across focus groups was to remove the requirement for the midyear SLO conference, making it optional or only recommended in specific instances. One administrator shared that although “to have your exemplary teacher come in at midyear can be a little redundant. It’s really 10 to 15 percent of your teachers that you have to concern yourself with because they’re not doing what they need to do.” These administrators saw removing the midyear conference requirement as a way to reduce the time burden of conferences while still focusing on the teachers who require assistance. Other administrators

suggested that the midyear conference did not have to be held in-person, but instead could be documented over e-mail if teachers did not need to make any adjustments to their growth targets. One administrator suggested that the SLO could be documented online so that administrators could review and send feedback without having to schedule a face-to-face conference.

Perception of SLO Components

Autonomy and Choice

The majority of respondents indicated that teachers had some degree of autonomy and choice in the SLO process, with nearly three quarters of teachers able to choose their assessment and set their own growth targets (Figures 15 and 16). These data were slightly different than those from focus groups, in which there was a more even representation between discussion of teacher-chosen SLO components and school- or district-chosen SLO components.[xvi] This variance may reflect differences in the population of educators who responded to the survey and participated in focus groups; however, it may be more likely that the focus group participants who did not have autonomy or choice in these components provided more feedback across the focus groups.

Figure 15. Principals Reported That Teachers Were Able to Choose or Determine Components of SLOs[36]

Value	Percent	Count
Standards	68.6%	289
Student population	62.0%	261
Assessment	72.4%	305
Growth targets	77.2%	325
None of these	7.6%	32

[xvi] Across focus groups, there were 29 references to district-determined assessments, 38 references to teacher-chosen or –created assessments, 24 references to district-determined growth targets, and 16 references to teacher-set growth targets.

Figure 16. Teachers Reported Being Able to Choose or Determine Components of SLOs[37]

Value	Percent	Count
Standards	63.6%	4,714
Student population	53.5%	3,967
Assessment	66.8%	4,956
Growth targets	71.9%	5,329
None of these	10.7%	795

Across focus groups, there were positive and negative comments regarding both teacher autonomy and district control. A few teachers described how their districts had emphasized teacher choice in the SLO process to promote professional growth. Alternatively, many teachers suggested that some districts gave teachers limited autonomy to ease the implementation burden and prevent teachers from being overwhelmed; however, this may have negatively impacted teacher buy-in for the SLO process. As one teacher described:

> For some schools [the decisions] may have been left wide open, which I think was part of the original intent of SLOs: for the teacher to have ownership over the SLO and design the assessments to fit the students in their room. In some districts that freedom for the teacher to be the professional and to make those decisions was taken away. In some places it was very top-down implementation with not a lot of explanation. I think part of the frustration is that we had teachers who did have an understanding of what it was supposed to be, and they weren't getting what their understanding was. They didn't have that freedom to make those decisions like they thought they would.

Another teacher shared a similar perspective, describing how, for some teachers, the lack of autonomy and choice in the SLO process made it a less meaningful or helpful process:

> Ultimately, it seemed like the intent was that we make decisions about what is measured for our students, how to measure the growth. Then, the more we got into the process, we found those measures were going to be placed on us, either from the district or whomever. We had less and less control over the situation, which made it not very different from the things that have been used in the past. So, I think it started to feel arbitrary, just another random measure placed on us, that's easy to look at.

Overall, the teachers who did not have autonomy in the SLO process expressed that it was perceived as an accountability measure with no impact on teaching or learning. One teacher shared that "at our school, our administrator just sat down and said, 'this is what you're going to write,' so everybody in the school wrote exactly the same thing [for their SLO]. It did not help me in any way whatsoever. There was no reflective process." These data emphasize the importance of teacher autonomy in the SLO process and its influence on teachers' perceptions of the SLO process.

The following sections describe teacher perceptions of specific SLO components and how the level of teacher autonomy in the SLO process may have influenced these perceptions.

Assessments

Across focus groups, teachers indicated that schools and districts chose similar assessments statewide for use in SLOs. The most commonly cited assessment chosen by the school or district for teachers of all grade levels was the Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) test. Teachers of elementary grades also reported using STAR Reading and the Fountas & Pinnell Leveled Literacy Intervention system, while middle and high school teachers reported using USA Test Prep and state end-of-course exams. Teachers in focus groups did not provide any negative feedback on these assessments overall, but rather discussed reasons why these assessments did not present a meaningful or accurate representation of their impact on student learning in the SLO process.

One challenge that many teachers discussed across focus groups was the misalignment of assessments (most often MAP) with the South Carolina College- and Career-Ready standards. One teacher explained how this misalignment contributes to the perception that SLOs have no impact on instruction, saying, "There is no direct connection between all of this data that we are collecting from our students and what we are actually doing in the classroom, which is supposed to be standards based. It just feels very arbitrary when we are collecting that data but not really using it." Another teacher suggested that one district may have chosen MAP to improve consistency between SLOs, but that this prevented teachers from focusing their SLO on specific skills, such as applied writing. A few teachers also described how because the MAP testing dates were in mid-spring, they were unable to cover all the grade-level content when following the district pacing guide, which may have negatively impacted their students' attainment rates for their growth targets. Overall, these challenges related to standards alignment and pacing may have prevented teachers from connecting SLOs to their instructional practice.

Many of the teachers who indicated that they created or chose their own assessment described how this process helped support their instruction. For instance, one related arts teacher described how the process forced teachers to be reflective about student growth in a way they weren't before. Likewise, a career and technical education teacher was able to better target his instruction by assessing student prior knowledge using a written pretest, while also using a performance-based assessment for the posttest. Another teacher described how the process of selecting an assessment allowed teachers to engage in meaningful conversations about assessment design with colleagues, including how to use assessments to prioritize applied knowledge rather than memorization.

Focus group participants also discussed the challenges associated with teacher-created assessments. A few teachers expressed frustration over the lack of support or training in assessment design for teachers. One teacher shared that "the assessment piece has been a huge issue. Teachers have been asked to fine-tune the assessment down to 'you need to know why they are picking you're wrong answer.' That's getting pretty deep into assessment writing for people who haven't trained to write assessments." Teachers from smaller districts also echoed this concern, explaining that it was more difficult for them to write a valid, reliable, and unbiased assessment without the assistance of other staff and instructional coaches.

Some teachers also expressed concerns about the lack of consistency in assessment use between schools and districts, indicating that this could create an inconsistent and unfair SLO scoring pattern. Some teachers expressed concerns about how teacher-created assessments made it easier to "teach to the test" by overexposing students to the test items, skewing student growth data to produce a better teacher evaluation score on the SLO. One teacher explained that this gave some teachers an unfair advantage, saying "It's easy to show growth when you're creating a test. I can't prepare my kids for a MAP test. I just teach the standards and hope that they retain what we've learned enough to grow." Some teachers expressed similar concerns about some of the district-chosen assessments that had teacher-generated results because they were "subjective." Because SLO scores were not included in evaluation ratings in 2015–16 (all teachers were "presumed proficient"), these concerns may have been premature; however, they do highlight how the SLO scoring process can influence how teachers choose assessments and set goals for students.

Growth Targets and SLO Scoring

In the SLO process, the growth targets that teachers set for students are meant to be both rigorous and realistic; as mentioned in the previous section, the majority of administrators and teachers indicated in the survey that their growth targets met these criteria.[38,39,40, 41] In the focus groups, teachers who indicated that they were able to set their own growth targets stated that it was beneficial to use the target-setting process to focus on student learning. One teacher shared that "it was nice to be able to go back after a month or two and look at the students' progress compared to my projections. I did enjoy that second chance to rethink their goals." Another teacher shared that teachers liked the process of setting growth targets "because teaching [a course with a state end-of-course assessment], you get so wrapped up in this standardized test that everybody has to pass…In the SLO we were able to say, 'they didn't pass, but look how much they grew'…That was just astonishing. I did really like the data and the growth targets. I did enjoy seeing my students grow so fast." Other teachers indicated that they had training support from teacher leaders and administrators in the target-setting process, including how to use baseline and trend data to identify and anticipate trends, which may have contributed to this positive perspective.

Although some teachers reported that the target-setting process was helpful, others indicated they intentionally set low growth targets to ensure that most or all students would meet their targets and they would receive an "effective" or better SLO rating. One teacher explained that the SLO scoring process reduced the meaningfulness and rigor of growth targets, saying, "When you're given complete control over what your SLO is, and you know that it's how you're evaluated at the end of the year, they don't tend to be as rigorous as they might be if it was just what you really wanted for your kids." Likewise, some of the teacher leaders and administrators who provided ongoing training support to teachers indicated that they encouraged teachers to set low growth targets specifically due to the SLO scoring process.

Teachers who had growth targets set for them by the school or district also expressed concerns about the connection between growth targets and the SLO scoring process. Some teachers who had SLO targets based on district MAP projections explained how because the assessment is norm-referenced, it is unlikely that enough of their students would be able to meet or exceed their growth targets for them to be scored as "effective" in their SLO. The publisher of the MAP

assessment has also issued concerns about using MAP scores for SLOs for similar reasons (NWEA, 2015).[xvii] One teacher described this challenge as "depressing," saying "I feel like I do a great job, but when they give you back your scores and only 60 percent of students met their target…I might as well just stay home." Other teachers described concerns about the accuracy of MAP data due to its administration format and rules. Some teachers shared that because MAP is a computerized assessment, many students did not take it seriously and chose random answers to complete the test as quickly as possible, leading to invalid test data. Some teachers also shared that because the districts do not offer retests due to illness, missed medication, or incidents in students' home lives, teachers must sometimes use student test scores that are not accurate reflections of their typical academic abilities. Overall, teachers indicated that having growth targets set by the school or district contributed to the perception that SLOs were an accountability exercise that did not impact or influence teaching or learning.

Data Analysis and Data-Driven Instruction

As mentioned previously, most administrators and teachers indicated that there was a need for more training on setting growth targets; in focus groups, administrators and teachers also indicated that there was a need for additional training on analyzing data. Specifically, teachers described a need for training on "how you analyze data and how you incorporate it into your instruction" because "not everybody understands data." Some teachers also described a need for training on how to organize data, including how to efficiently track and enter data using spreadsheets and other technology. One teacher explained that "if you're already at an under-performing school, the more likely it is that you don't know how to look at data and you don't know what [to] do to cause growth." Another teacher described how a lack of time to collaborate, plus the perceived misalignment between assessments and learning standards, prevented teachers from engaging in progress monitoring:

> We are collecting [an] enormous amount of data and we are not really getting a lot of time to process that data, look at it, understand what it means. We use MAP, but it doesn't necessarily correlate to our standards or to the state assessment that we are giving later in the year, so there is no direct connection between all of this data that we are collecting from our students and what we are actually doing in the classroom, which is supposed to be standards based. It just feels very arbitrary when we are collecting that data but not really using it.

A few teachers described other challenges in data use that prevented them from using SLO data to inform their instruction. Specifically, teachers indicated that because they did not have access to differentiated data for their pretest, they could not use data to set instructional goals for students. Other teachers indicated that they did not have any information about the content or design of the posttest, which prevented them from connecting growth targets to student learning.

[xvii] https://www.nwea.org/resources/nwea-guidance-on-the-creation-of-student-learning-objectives-slos/

Impact of the SLO Process

Benefits

Most administrators and teachers reported that the SLO process was an accurate and beneficial process. Specifically, administrators and teachers reported that the SLO process helped respondents identify instructional strengths and challenges, provide useful instructional feedback, improve teaching practice, and learn more about their students' academic strengths and challenges (Figures 17 and 18). Teachers expanded on these benefits in the focus groups, explaining how the SLO process helped them improve in these ways.

Figure 17. Beliefs About the SLO Process for Teachers (Reported by Administrators)[42]

	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know
Uses measures that are fair reflections of my teachers' work and the work of their students.	63 17.4%	196 54.1%	65 18.0%	37 10.2%	1 0.3%
Helps me, fellow administrators, and teachers identify teachers' strengths and challenges in their practice.	68 18.7%	195 53.7%	67 18.5%	33 9.1%	0 0.0%
Allows me to provide useful feedback to my teachers about their practice.	96 26.7%	173 48.2%	64 17.8%	25 7.0%	1 0.3%
Allows me to encourage teachers to reflect on their practice.	130 35.9%	174 48.1%	38 10.5%	18 5.0%	2 0.6%
Helps teachers to improve their practice.	101 27.9%	169 46.7%	63 17.4%	26 7.2%	3 0.8%
Helps teachers learn more about their students' academic strengths and challenges.	124 34.2%	168 46.3%	49 13.5%	21 5.8%	1 0.3%

Figure 18. Beliefs About the SLO Process for Teachers (Reported by Teachers) [43]

	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Uses measures that are fair reflections of my work and the work of my students.	601 15.2%	1,662 42.1%	1,049 26.6%	634 16.1%
Helps me and my administrator(s) identify strengths and challenges in my practice.	668 16.9%	1,724 43.7%	978 24.8%	574 14.6%
Allows my evaluator to provide useful feedback to me about my practice.	697 17.7%	1,651 41.9%	1,005 25.5%	590 15.0%
Allows me to reflect on my practice.	1,021 25.9%	1,900 48.2%	632 16.0%	392 9.9%
Helps me to improve my practice.	900 22.8%	1,770 44.9%	791 20.1%	480 12.2%
Helps me learn more about my students' academic strengths and challenges.	929 23.6%	1,839 46.8%	736 18.7%	426 10.8%

Using Data to Identify Student Strengths and Challenges

About half of administrators and teachers reported that the SLO process made conversations more student-centered, increased the focus on growth, made conversations more data-driven, and improved progress monitoring (Figures 19 and 20).[44, 45] In focus groups, many teachers also described how the SLO process helped them use student data to drive and improve instruction.[xviii] One first-year teacher shared that the SLO process helped teachers better understand how student data describe learning progressions, saying "It really helped me focus on growth, to be able to see this is where they started, this is where I'm taking them, and this is where they ended up." More experienced teachers shared that the SLO process also helped them promote data-driven instruction. One teacher shared that "what I liked about it was it really got us into the data. It forced me to look at data that I never paid any attention to before." Another teacher explained that the SLO process helped teachers "learn how to aggregate data" and look for trends.

Most administrators also saw these benefits, explaining that the SLO process helped teachers improve their progress monitoring and focus on growth for all students.[xix] One administrator expressed that the SLO process had changed the school culture, saying:

> It's creating a new energy, a new focus on student growth. It's forcing teachers that never truly had a stock in progress monitoring really do it and realize they should have been doing it all along. That part of it has been great. Having those conversations and that dialogue with teachers, because those meetings aren't just about the SLO. We couple

[xviii] 14 focus groups, 41 references
[xix] Seven focus groups, 11 references

> those meetings with other things that are going on in the building, having in-depth conversations that we may not get to have during the year unless we set it up intentionally.

Other administrators described the SLO process as "empowering" because it allowed teachers to focus on growth and identify what learning factors they could and could not control. Likewise, administrators expressed that they appreciated the opportunity to discuss instruction with teachers. One administrator shared that "I had an opportunity to understand things that they thought the students really struggle with, that I didn't know. That was beneficial for me."

Figure 19. How Using Student Data in the Teacher SLO Process Helped Change Conversations About Student Learning (Reported by Administrators)



Value	Percent	Count
It has made conversations more student-centered.	59.5%	220
It has increased the focus on growth and impact on learning.	64.3%	238
It has made conversations more data-driven.	64.1%	237
It has increased the focus on formative assessment and progress monitoring.	47.6%	176
It has not had an impact on professional conversations.	17.3%	64
In some other way (please specify):	4.3%	16

Figure 20. How Using Student Data in the Teacher SLO Process Helped Change Conversations About Student Learning (Reported by Teachers)



Value	Percent	Count
It has made conversations more student-centered.	33.0%	1,290
It has increased the focus on growth and impact on learning.	40.6%	1,584
It has made conversations more data-driven.	46.0%	1,795
It has increased the focus on formative assessment and progress monitoring.	31.4%	1,228
It has not had an impact on professional conversations.	31.2%	1,218
In some other way (please specify):	5.0%	195

Collaboration

Many teachers indicated that the SLO process provided them with additional opportunities to collaborate with other teachers and administrators.[xx] For example, one teacher shared that "it's provided opportunities for teachers to collaborate or forced them to collaborate where they ordinarily wouldn't. I think there have been some positive shifts because of it." Other teachers described how the opportunities to collaborate were the "best part" of the SLO process, noting that they helped teachers feel like they were "all on the same path" because they had similar

[xx] Six focus groups, 14 references

learning goals. Teachers also described how the SLO process was especially beneficial for some high school teachers who typically had fewer opportunities for collaboration. One teacher shared that "at the High School level, some teachers come in, they close the doors, and they do their high school thing. The SLO pulls us out of that mode. You have to collaborate, you have to look at your kids, and you have to constantly look at the data. I liked the process."

Instructional Strategies

Many teachers indicated that the collaboration and focus on data in the SLO process helped them to identify and improve their instructional strategies. As one teacher shared, "There are great things that came out of the SLO such as targeting your students, really understanding their data, understanding instructional practices that you need to push from one tier to the next tier. That was amazing." Many teachers specified the opportunities for collaboration on the SLO process; for example, one teacher shared that "the collaboration process allowed us to look at each other's goals and our successes and failures there. Being able to talk about having the same goal gave us the chance to say, 'this lesson worked well for me with my kids, [so] let's do this.' It helped us in the process of meeting goals."

Administrators also discussed how the SLO process improved conversations about instruction.[xxi] One administrator shared that "it's the first time that we sat down and really talked about why we are doing certain things and what was our goal of doing things with kids, and how has this related to where they need to be. It was life changing, or career changing, I should say in high school particularly, because there hasn't been that piece before." Other administrators shared that these conversations helped them better identify what supports teachers needed to improve instruction. One administrator expressed that "it's that conversation that is so powerful and understanding where the teacher is coming from, what the challenges are for the teacher and where we as professionals may need to step in to provide some support that maybe the teacher has not requested. Those I think are some really strong things of the SLO process." Many administrators indicated that these conversations helped energize teachers to learn from each other and better promote student learning.

Challenges

Lack of Collaboration or Support

Although many teachers expressed that the SLO process was beneficial, other teachers shared that the process had no impact on their practice. In many cases, these teachers indicated that they did not have opportunities for collaboration or support; for example, one teacher expressed that "I could see that being a good thing, those conversations, but I don't think they're happening, and I don't think this had made any difference." Other teachers emphasized that they wanted these opportunities but did not consider the SLO process meaningful; for example, one teacher said "I want to be coached, I want to be on a team, I want to collaborate with my teachers in the same building, and in the same district, and in different districts. I don't want to do more and more paperwork that's meaningless." Likewise, another teacher shared that "we were figuring it out by ourselves. There was discussion of 'this is what it's going to be used for. This is how it's

[xxi] Five focus groups, nine references

being productive.' …We have no idea what it is or how it's going to be used." These feedback underscore the importance of communication at the district and school levels, ensuring that administrators and teachers have a clear understanding of the purpose of SLOs and how they can support instructional improvement.

Unclear Purpose of the SLO Process

Across all focus groups, many teachers also expressed confusion about the purpose of the SLO process.[xxii] Specifically, many teachers expressed that they were unclear on whether the purpose of the SLO process was to hold teachers accountable for student learning or whether it was to promote professional growth, describing these in opposition to each other. One teacher explained that teachers saw the SLO process as "evaluation, not growth," while others described the system as "individual professional growth, to see how we can improve student learning." Most teachers indicated that they wanted to have a clear message about the purpose of the SLO process; for example, one teacher shared that "communication is going to be a key. Communication to the districts, to the administrators, and to the teachers." Other teachers asked specific questions about the use of SLO data; for example, one teacher asked, "When we turn in our SLO and it goes to our administrator, where does it go from there? Nowhere? Sits in their office?" Many teachers emphasized that it was important for teachers to not only understand the purpose of SLOs, but also how SLOs help promote student learning. One teacher shared that "at this point, it needs to be something that's going to be beneficial for them to use for the students, and I don't really see that happening." Likewise, teachers expressed a need for clarity on the different purposes for the SLO and other requirements, such as the long-range plan, SAFE-T, and ADEPT certificate renewal process.

Burden of Paperwork

Across focus groups, some teachers indicated that the SLO process was redundant or burdensome. Other teachers indicated that their administrators required extensive written explanations in their SLOs, creating an undue paperwork burden on teachers that they did not perceive having any impact on their practice.[xxiii] A few teachers also indicated that these expectations differed between administrators in their building, which led to inconsistent expectations for teachers depending on who provided feedback or approval for their SLO.[xxiv]

According to one teacher, "It was very redundant because for that, they had to do and say they have to do the unit org sample and they have to do the long range plan. On top of that, you got an SLO that is basically the unit org sample and the long range plan stuck together."

[xxii] 13 focus groups, 35 references
[xxiii] Nine focus groups, 22 references
[xxiv] Nine focus groups, 12 references

Recommendations

Provide statewide assessment options and guidance on assessment use. In both the survey and focus groups, teachers provided mixed feedback about assessment choice in SLOs. About half of survey respondents agreed that SCDE should use consistent standards and assessments for teachers of the same grade and subject area across all districts; however, about half of survey respondents also disagreed with this statement (Figure 21).[46] In focus groups, many teachers also suggested that the state should promote consistency in the system, with some suggesting that SCDE should create common benchmark assessments and others suggesting that SCDE should offer a number of valid and reliable assessment options for each grade and subject.[xxv] However, many of these recommendations focused on the perceived lack of fairness between teacher-created assessments and standardized assessments as well as the variance in district SLO scoring policies. As one teacher explained, "The data needs to come from a standard source that way everyone agrees upon. Because [in] one school site, a teacher could be stellar. In another school site, they could be failing. That shouldn't be arbitrary. I should be able to be an exemplary educator no matter what the school site is." Other teachers expressed that more consistent assessments would reduce confusion and allow for better training statewide. For example, one teacher said:

> I wish it would be more uniform. We shouldn't ask what's a TT1? What's PASST? What's ADEPT? I think as a state we need to come together. If we're going to do the SLO, then yes, we need the training. …There needs to be some uniformity. If not, there's going to be chaos…I think in order for the SLOs to really work statewide it needs to look uniform. We need to use the same form. We need to have the same training.

Other teachers, however, indicated that they would prefer to have the flexibility to choose or design their own assessments. Some teachers described how they used multiple assessments in their SLO, which allowed them to offset lower scores that may have been due to outside factors, such as students coming to school hungry or ill on testing day. In some cases, these teachers chose all standardized assessments, whereas in others teachers balanced teacher-created performance-based assessments with standardized assessments. One teacher who used this approach said, "I think that was better. In our district, they didn't say you had to do this. It was, 'what do you want, how do you want to do it? These are your options.' We had more choices." Another teacher who used this approach shared, "What we teach in [our] county is a little different from what's taught in [other counties]. I know we have certain standards, but we use different materials to teach those standards. I would prefer having teachers come up with their own test." Other teachers emphasized that choice was more important than assessment design, allowing teachers to have choice in the SLO process without requiring teachers to become assessment design experts.

To address these concerns, SCDE may implement multifaceted solutions. First, SCDE may consider supporting districts in creating benchmark exams that are aligned to the South Carolina College- and Career-Ready Standards, Second, SCDE may consider creating a bank of performance-based rubric assessments (state or locally created) with accompanying training

[xxv] 11 focus groups, 26 references

resources. These approaches would allow all teachers across South Carolina to have access to appropriate assessments for their grade or subject area to use in their SLOs while also allowing SLOs to promote authentic assessments and applied knowledge. Third, SCDE may consider revising SLO business rules to require teacher choice in assessment, preventing district or school leaders from reducing teacher autonomy in the SLO process. Fourth, SCDE may consider providing teachers with additional guidance on how to select assessment(s) for their SLOs based on their grade, subject, or learning goals. Considerations for amending SLO scoring for fairness are included in the next recommendation.

Figure 21. Teacher Preferences for SLO Rules

	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree
SCDE should use the same standards and assessments in SLOs for teachers in the same grades and subject areas.	849 21.6%	1,459 37.1%	879 22.3%	747 19.0%
SCDE should have all teachers set their own growth targets.	1,932 49.1%	1,546 39.3%	325 8.3%	132 3.4%
SLOs should be used as an artifact of evidence of professional practice.	604 15.4%	1,841 46.9%	895 22.8%	588 15.0%
SCDE should use a consistent SLO scoring methodology throughout the state.	1,120 28.5%	1,574 40.1%	790 20.1%	446 11.3%
SCDE should continue to allow districts to define the criteria for each of the SLO performance levels so that districts have flexibility.	1,914 48.7%	1,494 38.0%	294 7.5%	230 5.8%

Include SLOs as artifacts in teacher evaluation as opposed to separate weighted measures. Many respondents agreed that SLOs should be used as artifacts of professional practice rather than as individually weighted evaluation measures. In focus groups, many teachers expressed confusion when asked their preference, as they were unclear on what the other evaluation measures would be or how the SLO would be used as evidence. Through discussion, nearly all teachers across focus groups indicated that they were in favor of using the SLO as a required artifact or source of evidence of professional practice (Figure 21).[xxvi] Many teachers indicated that because they had previously believed that the SLO was their sole evaluation measure, making the SLO an artifact used to support professional practice was "appealing" because districts would be "not just grading the teacher based on the kids' grade." Others indicated that making the SLO an artifact would improve its use as a professional growth measure. For example, one teacher shared the following:

> If it's an artifact, then hopefully there would be a less likelihood of people wanting to manipulate their numbers in order to show some type of growth for teacher evaluation. If it's an artifact, you're just using the data to help you as a teacher to help them. That's what it's for. Our district has talked from the very beginning, this is about growth. We're

[xxvi] 14 focus groups, 29 references

> not supposed to meet some magic number or anything like that. All we want to make sure is that our students are growing from one thing, from one level to another, and that it's a reasonable growth.

Nearly all teachers expressed that they needed more information on how the SLO would be used as an artifact and how it would contribute to their evaluation rating. A few teachers indicated that because they saw the SLO process as beneficial, they would not want the policies allowing the SLO to be used as an artifact to lessen the rigor or importance of the SLO for teachers. SCDE may consider providing clear rules and examples on how to use the SLO as an artifact in evaluations, along with additional training resources.

Perceptions of the Professional Practice Component of the Expanded ADEPT Evaluation System

Teacher and Principal Perceptions of Professional Practice

Most teachers reported having an informal or formal observation in 2015–16,[47] and, as mentioned previously, most administrators and teachers reported that they understood the purpose of teacher observations as well as the expectations for teachers when being observed. Most teachers reported that they have been observed or had a walk-through from an administrator and received timely feedback, including specific suggestions; teachers also reported that administrators spent enough time completing observations or walk-throughs to provide them with meaningful feedback (Figure 22). [48] In focus groups, many teachers differentiated between walk-throughs (which teachers described as "five or ten minutes at the most") and full observations, which typically lasted a full class period. Many teachers indicated that although they may have had some walk-throughs, they did not receive full observations or feedback from their evaluator.[xxvii] Teachers also indicated that they often received superficial feedback from these visits focused on physical classroom elements rather than instruction.[xxviii] However, a few teachers described using a tool called Classroom Mosaic that allowed them to receive brief and immediate feedback from their administrator.

[xxvii] 11 focus groups, 22 references
[xxviii] Six focus groups, 13 references

Figure 22. Teacher Observation Experiences

	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Administrators at my school have conducted observations in my classroom (i.e., walk-throughs).	4,792 69.7%	1,563 22.7%	296 4.3%	227 3.3%
I have received timely feedback from administrators based on observations.	4,199 61.2%	1,644 24.0%	517 7.5%	501 7.3%
The feedback I have received based on observations provided me with specific suggestions that have allowed me to make meaningful changes to my instructional practices.	3,207 46.9%	2,023 29.6%	904 13.2%	709 10.4%
My administrators have conducted sufficient walk-throughs or observations to provide meaningful feedback on my practice.	3,755 54.8%	1,648 24.1%	806 11.8%	639 9.3%

In the survey, most teachers reported that they perceived the observation process as fair and beneficial, allowing administrators to provide useful feedback and helping teachers reflect on and improve their practice (Figure 23).[49] Most teachers also reported that their administrator provided enough time for feedback and to allow for questions in postobservation conferences. In focus groups, the few teachers who had full observations shared these perspectives, indicating that they appreciated the support from their administrator; however, teachers also indicated that their administrators debriefed full observations with reflection questions rather than instructional feedback. Although teachers indicated that these opportunities for reflection were helpful, they also indicated a desire for more direct instructional feedback. In some cases, teachers in focus groups discussed the need for instructional feedback in reaction to the SLO process, indicating that they would prefer instructional feedback over data-driven discussions. As one teacher shared:

> It would be more beneficial to me to sit down and have a post conference with [the administrator] after they have observed a lesson where they give me feedback on what they noticed about the students. [They could say] 'maybe next time you try this lesson or maybe try this a little differently.' That's more meaningful to me than 'oh let's look at this number, why isn't this student achieving?'

Other focus group participants described how the implementation of the SLO process reduced the focus on observations in 2015–16, noting that "the professional component is not even discussed." Some teachers indicated that they were not aware that observations or professional practice was part of the evaluation system prior to participating in focus groups. One teacher shared this view, saying "Tell me what the rest of the evaluation is because I think in the minds of most teachers, the SLO is the evaluation. I think most classroom teachers probably don't even know the other 80 percent exists. They just think the SLO is it." Therefore, the desire for more instructional feedback may be due in part to the reduced focus on professional practice. Teachers also indicated that the lack of feedback may be partly due to the limited administrator capacity at some schools, noting that they believed there were not enough administrators to provide this

support for all teachers in their buildings. [xxix] One teacher noted that for their administrators, "classroom visits are a luxury" due to the number of other administrative responsibilities they must balance.

Figure 23. Teacher Perspectives on the Observation Process

	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Is a fair reflection of my work and the work of my students.	2,202 32.2%	2,986 43.7%	1,015 14.9%	629 9.2%
Helps me and administrators identify the strengths and challenges in my practice.	2,356 34.5%	2,996 43.9%	918 13.4%	556 8.1%
Allows my evaluator to provide useful feedback to me about my practice.	2,557 37.5%	2,937 43.0%	801 11.7%	531 7.8%
Allows me to reflect on my practice.	2,727 39.9%	2,958 43.3%	680 10.0%	465 6.8%
Helps me to improve my practice.	2,593 38.0%	2,888 42.3%	825 12.1%	519 7.6%

Recommendations

Hold administrators accountable for providing regular walk-throughs:[xxx] Many teachers explained that although full observations were helpful, they also appreciated regular walk-throughs by administrators. A few teachers expressed that their administrators "don't know where the problems are because they are not in the classrooms." These teachers suggested that more regular walk-throughs may improve instructional leadership and support for teachers; however, they also recognized that "districts need to find a way to take [other responsibilities] off administrators' plates so they can get into classrooms."

Provide training or support on how administrators can provide brief and meaningful feedback:[xxxi] Many teachers expressed that the most beneficial feedback for them would be brief and targeted on instruction or student learning. One teacher suggested that teachers would like their administrator to share "two things they noticed and two suggestions" after each walk-through or observation, providing support without requiring the time needed for a postobservation conference. Other teachers explained that they wanted "as immediate feedback as you can get" so that they could make timely adjustments to their practice.

[xxix] Nine focus groups, 21 references
[xxx] Eight focus groups, 10 references
[xxxi] Eight focus groups, 14 references

Appendix. Survey Results

1

1. Response Counts



2

2. What is your current position? (Please select one response.)



Value	Percent	Count
Classroom teacher	77.6%	8,566
Coach or mentor (with part-time classroom teaching responsibilities)	1.6%	178
Administrator (principal or vice principal)	6.1%	668
Coach or mentor (without part-time classroom teaching responsibilities in administrative role)	2.2%	245
Central office staff (Please indicate your current position):	2.5%	277
Other (Please indicate your current position):	9.4%	1,040
I work in a university or college	0.6%	67
	Total	11,041

5. Which of the following best describes the school in which you work.



Value	Percent		Count
An elementary school	45.9%		4,329
A K-8 school	3.4%		316
A middle school	20.5%		1,935
A high school	25.5%		2,405
Other - please specify	4.7%		439
		Total	9,424

4

8. Which of the following subjects is the primary focus of your current position?



5

6. How many years of experience do you have have in the State of South Carolina?



Value	Percent		Count
This is my first year with the State of South Carolina.	5.6%		506
2–5 years	20.0%		1,807
6–9 years	15.5%		1,398
10–15 years	21.0%		1,897
16–20 years	15.3%		1,383
More than 21 years	22.5%		2,033
		Total	**9,024**

6

7. How many years of experience do you have outside of the State of South Carolina?



Value	Percent		Count
0 years	71.8%		6,428
1–5 years	15.3%		1,374
6–9 years	4.9%		440
10–15 years	4.5%		400
16–20 years	1.7%		153
More than 21 years	1.8%		159
		Total	**8,954**

7

22. What kind of training or support did you receive on the Expanded PADEPP evaluation system? (Please select all that apply.)



Value	Percent	Count
District-led in-person training on the Expanded PADEPP evaluation system, including Standard 10 (Student Growth)	48.5%	315
State-provided online or virtual training on the Expanded PADEPP evaluation system, including Standard 10 (Student Growth)	12.2%	79
Information from my superintendent at a group meeting with other principals	26.6%	173
Information from my superintendent at an individual meeting	8.8%	57
Other training or support (please specify):	8.9%	58
I did not receive training or support.	33.7%	219

8

23. How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements about the training you received related to the Expanded PADEPP evaluation system? The training I received related to the Expanded PADEPP evaluation system…

	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Provided me with the information I needed to engage in the evaluation process.	190 47.9%	170 42.8%	26 6.5%	11 2.8%
Provided me with examples and models to use in the evaluation process.	154 38.9%	181 45.7%	40 10.1%	21 5.3%
Helped me better understand the expectations for my role as a school leader.	172 43.4%	179 45.2%	34 8.6%	11 2.8%
Helped me better engage in conversations with my superintendent about my work as a school leader.	153 38.8%	169 42.9%	49 12.4%	23 5.8%

[9] Was 9

24. How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements about the professional practice component (Standards 1–9) of the Expanded PADEPP system? The professional practice component (Standards 1–9) of the Expanded PADEPP system…

	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Uses measures that are fair reflections of my work and the work of my students.	125 29.1%	237 55.1%	54 12.6%	14 3.3%
Has allowed my supervisor to provide me with formative feedback during the school year.	136 31.8%	214 50.0%	59 13.8%	19 4.4%
Helps me and my supervisor identify both my strengths and my challenges.	147 34.4%	216 50.6%	47 11.0%	17 4.0%
Provides useful feedback for me and for my supervisor.	139 32.7%	214 50.4%	54 12.7%	18 4.2%
Encourages me to reflect on my practice.	172 40.7%	201 47.5%	36 8.5%	14 3.3%
Leads to improved practices for me and other people in my position.	145 34.0%	203 47.7%	64 15.0%	14 3.3%

[10] Was 10

25. How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements about the student growth component (Standard 10) of the Expanded PADEPP system? The student growth component (Standard 10) of the Expanded PADEPP system…

	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Uses measures that are fair reflections of my work and the work of my students.	78 18.6%	191 45.5%	111 26.4%	40 9.5%
Has allowed my supervisor to provide me with formative feedback during the school year.	102 24.3%	191 45.6%	85 20.3%	41 9.8%
Helps me and my supervisor identify both my strengths and my challenges.	95 22.6%	190 45.1%	98 23.3%	38 9.0%
Provides useful feedback for me and for my supervisor.	98 23.4%	197 47.0%	90 21.5%	34 8.1%
Encourages me to reflect on my practice.	121 28.8%	210 50.0%	58 13.8%	31 7.4%
Leads to improved practices for me and other people in my position.	104 24.9%	198 47.5%	78 18.7%	37 8.9%

[11] Was 11

26. How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements about the meaningfulness and accuracy of the Expanded PADEPP? The Expanded PADEPP would be more meaningful or more accurately capture the impact of my work if…

	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know
Student growth was considered an artifact or supporting evidence for standards in the PADEPP system rather than a "stand-alone" component.	167 42.9%	157 40.4%	22 5.7%	13 3.3%	30 7.7%
It included other measures such as graduation and attendance rates, AP or IB enrollment, college acceptance rates, work or career placement rates, and other similar data.	85 21.9%	141 36.3%	38 9.8%	33 8.5%	91 23.5%
Principals were evaluated on all Expanded PADEPP standards every year.	53 13.7%	82 21.1%	74 19.1%	104 26.8%	75 19.3%
Principals were evaluated on all Expanded PADEPP standards every three to five years.	121 31.2%	130 33.5%	39 10.1%	24 6.2%	74 19.1%
Each PADEPP standard was weighted and the evaluator determined a final rating via a formula rather than a professional judgment.	75 19.4%	141 36.4%	56 14.5%	47 12.1%	68 17.6%

[12] Was 12

13. Which of the following best describes your current position?



Value	Percent	Count
A full-time professor in the school of education or in the teacher preparation program	36.5%	27
A part-time professor in the school of education or in the teacher preparation program	10.8%	8
A department head or dean	17.6%	13
Other (please specify)	35.1%	26
	Total	74

[13] Was 13

14. In your current position, do you supervise student teachers?



Value	Percent		Count
Yes	48.2%		40
No	51.8%		43
		Total	83

[14] Was 14

15. How did you first learn about the SLO component of the Expanded ADEPT system?



Value	Percent	Count
From the South Carolina State Department of Education trainings, workshops, presentations, or meetings	40.0%	36
From a colleague at my college or university or in my professional network	22.2%	20
From a school or district leader	27.8%	25
From a K–12 classroom teacher	3.3%	3
From a formal workshop or meeting (not led by SCDE)	2.2%	2
Other (please specify):	4.4%	4
	Total	90

[15] Was 15

16. Which of the following South Carolina Expanded ADEPT resources have you accessed? (Please select all that apply.)



Value	Percent	Count
In-person trainings from the South Carolina Department of Education.	43.8%	35
Virtual or online trainings from the South Carolina Department of Education.	30.0%	24
The SLO training modules on the South Carolina Department of Education website.	52.5%	42
Sample SLOs from the South Carolina Department of Education website.	56.3%	45
The Expanded ADEPT policy manual from the South Carolina Department of Education website.	41.3%	33
SLO resources from states other than South Carolina.	25.0%	20
Other (please specify):	11.3%	9

[16] Was 16

19. Which resources have you found to be the most helpful for supporting teacher candidates' understanding of SLOs? (Please select the top three most helpful resources to you.)



Value	Percent	Count
In-person trainings from the South Carolina Department of Education	54.2%	26
Virtual or online trainings from the South Carolina Department of Education	25.0%	12
The SLO training modules on the South Carolina Department of Education website	47.9%	23
Sample SLOs from the South Carolina Department of Education website	56.3%	27
The Expanded ADEPT policy manual from the South Carolina Department of Education website	16.7%	8
SLO resources from states other than South Carolina	14.6%	7
Some other resource (please specify):	12.5%	6

[17] Was 18

17. How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements about your understanding of the teacher evaluation systems in South Carolina?

	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know
I fully understand the purpose of observations in the Expanded ADEPT system.	32 46.4%	26 37.7%	6 8.7%	1 1.4%	4 5.8%
I fully understand the purpose for teachers completing the SLO process.	26 38.2%	30 44.1%	8 11.8%	1 1.5%	3 4.4%
I fully understand the expectations for teachers being observed in the Expanded ADEPT system.	30 44.1%	28 41.2%	6 8.8%	2 2.9%	2 2.9%
I fully understand the expectations for teachers when completing the SLO process.	18 26.9%	33 49.3%	12 17.9%	1 1.5%	3 4.5%
The teacher candidates in our program graduate with a solid understanding of what is expected of them under the Expanded ADEPT system, including both the observations and SLO components.	10 16.1%	27 43.5%	12 19.4%	5 8.1%	8 12.9%

[18] Was 18

18. How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements about the preparation of teacher candidates in your program?

	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know
Our teacher candidates get to practice selecting high-priority standards while in our program.	33 62.3%	12 22.6%	1 1.9%	2 3.8%	5 9.4%
Our teacher candidates get to practice setting goals or expectations for growth while in our program.	29 55.8%	10 19.2%	3 5.8%	5 9.6%	5 9.6%
Our teacher candidates get to practice tracking student growth toward goals while in our program.	22 42.3%	18 34.6%	2 3.8%	5 9.6%	5 9.6%
While working with their cooperating teachers (in their student teaching placement), our teacher candidates have discussed the Expanded ADEPT system.	16 30.8%	20 38.5%	5 9.6%	1 1.9%	10 19.2%
While working with their cooperating teachers (in their student teaching placement), our teacher candidates have discussed the SLO process.	15 28.8%	17 32.7%	2 3.8%	0 0.0%	18 34.6%

[19] Was 19

20. With which components of SLOs do your teacher candidates need the most support to understand? (Please select the top three.)



Value	Percent	Count
Rationale	21.8%	12
Focus (standards or students included)	18.2%	10
Assessment	60.0%	33
Baseline and trend data	49.1%	27
Growth targets	54.5%	30
Progress monitoring	25.5%	14

[20] Was 23

9. Which of the following evaluation activities have you experienced during the 2015-16 school year? (Please select all that apply.)



Value	Percent	Count
I have written a SLO.	90.6%	7,638
I have been informally observed by an administrator (e.g., walk-through observations).	84.4%	7,115
I have been formally or informally observed by an administrator.	77.2%	6,513
I have been observed by a peer.	44.3%	3,740
I have received feedback on my observation(s) from an administrator.	77.8%	6,558
I had a preobservation conference.	23.8%	2,008
I had a postobservation conference.	39.6%	3,339
None of these.	1.2%	97

[21] Was 24

27. How many teachers in your building wrote an SLO this year?



Value	Percent		Count
All of the teachers in my building wrote an SLO this year.	67.0%		284
Most of the teachers in my building wrote an SLO this year.	29.5%		125
Some of the teachers in my building wrote an SLO this year.	2.4%		10
Few teachers in my building wrote an SLO this year.	0.2%		1
No teachers in my building wrote an SLO this year.	0.9%		4
		Total	424

[22] Was 25

29. What kind of training or support did your teachers receive on the SLO process? (Please select all that apply.)



Value	Percent	Count
District-led in-person training on the SLO process	53.4%	225
State-provided online or virtual training on the SLO process	24.0%	101
Information from me or another school administrator or instructional coach at a school meeting	79.3%	334
Information from me or another school administrator or instructional coach at an individual meeting	58.2%	245
Ongoing training and support from school administrators or instructional coaches	62.2%	262
Some other training or support (Please specify):	5.0%	21
They did not receive any training or support.	1.0%	4

[23] Was 26

39. What kind of training or support did you receive on the SLO process? (Please select all that apply.)



Value	Percent	Count
District-led in-person training on the SLO process	53.9%	3,952
State-provided online or virtual training on the SLO process	17.8%	1,304
Information from a school administrator or instructional coach at a school meeting	83.3%	6,106
Information from a school administrator or instructional coach at an individual meeting	37.7%	2,761
Ongoing training and support from school administrators or instructional coaches	42.4%	3,110
Other (please specify):	3.5%	256
I did not receive training or support	1.5%	113

[24] Was 27

10. Which of the following evaluation activities have you experienced during this school year (2015–16)? (Please select all that apply.)

Value	Percent	Count
I have had a beginning of year conference or conversation with my supervisor to discuss this year's evaluation.	91.7%	709
I have had a midyear conference with my supervisor to discuss my evaluation.	72.8%	563

[25] Was 28

30. How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements about state- or district-provided training for teachers on the SLO process? The state- or district-provided training for teachers on the SLO process…

	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know
Included detailed information that teachers needed to engage in the evaluation process.	9 24.3%	20 54.1%	5 13.5%	3 8.1%	0 0.0%
Included examples and models to use in the evaluation process.	8 21.6%	18 48.6%	5 13.5%	6 16.2%	0 0.0%
Helped teachers better understand the expectations for their role and impact on student learning.	8 21.6%	17 45.9%	7 18.9%	4 10.8%	1 2.7%
Helped teachers better engage in conversations with me or other administrators or instructional coaches about their practice or impact on student learning.	6 17.1%	19 54.3%	5 14.3%	4 11.4%	1 2.9%

[26] Was 29

31. How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements about the training or support provided to teachers by you, other school administrators, or instructional coaches on the SLO process? The training or support provided to teachers by you, other school administrators, or instructional coaches on the SLO process…

	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know
Included detailed information that teachers needed to engage in the evaluation process.	177 49.2%	145 40.3%	23 6.4%	14 3.9%	1 0.3%
Included examples and models to use in the evaluation process.	170 47.2%	138 38.3%	32 8.9%	20 5.6%	0 0.0%
Helped teachers better understand the expectations for their role and impact on student learning.	142 39.4%	164 45.6%	33 9.2%	19 5.3%	2 0.6%
Helped teachers better engage in conversations with me or other administrators or instructional coaches about their practice or impact on student learning.	157 43.5%	156 43.2%	27 7.5%	18 5.0%	3 0.8%

[27] Was 30

40. How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements about state- or district-provided training for teachers on the SLO process? The state- or district-provided training on the SLO process…

	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Included detailed information that I needed to engage in the evaluation process.	153 20.5%	355 47.6%	147 19.7%	91 12.2%
Included examples and models to use in the evaluation process.	151 20.4%	324 43.7%	160 21.6%	107 14.4%
Helped me better understand the expectations for my role and impact on student learning.	131 17.7%	299 40.3%	175 23.6%	137 18.5%
Helped me better engage in conversations with my principal or other administrators, or instructional coaches about my practice or impact on student learning.	120 16.2%	271 36.6%	196 26.5%	153 20.7%

[28] Was 31

41. How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements about the training or support provided by school administrators or instructional coaches on the SLO process?The training or support provided by school administrators or instructional coaches on the SLO process…

	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Included detailed information that I needed to engage in the evaluation process.	2,831 40.6%	3,038 43.5%	770 11.0%	342 4.9%
Included examples and models to use in the evaluation process.	2,750 39.4%	2,642 37.9%	1,046 15.0%	537 7.7%
Helped me better understand the expectations for my role and impact on student learning.	2,422 34.7%	2,897 41.5%	1,119 16.0%	537 7.7%
Helped me better engage in conversations with my principal or other administrators, or instructional coaches about my practice or impact on student learning.	2,241 32.1%	2,833 40.6%	1,246 17.9%	654 9.4%

[29] Was 34

32. How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements about the state- or district-provided training the teachers in your building received? After receiving training provided by the state or district…

	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know
The teachers in my building felt prepared to write their SLO.	41 16.6%	143 57.9%	45 18.2%	16 6.5%	2 0.8%
The teachers in my building clearly understood the SLO process	33 13.4%	128 52.0%	60 24.4%	24 9.8%	1 0.4%
The teachers in my building had a clear understanding of the assessment used for measuring growth in their SLO.	60 24.4%	119 48.4%	48 19.5%	17 6.9%	2 0.8%
The teachers in my building had a clear understanding of what contextual information to include about their students in their SLO.	52 21.1%	134 54.5%	47 19.1%	11 4.5%	2 0.8%
The teachers in my building had a clear understanding of how or why their SLO was based on specific standards.	58 23.5%	140 56.7%	32 13.0%	14 5.7%	3 1.2%
The teachers in my building had growth targets that were both realistic and rigorous.	75 30.4%	136 55.1%	24 9.7%	10 4.0%	2 0.8%
The teachers in my building received helpful feedback from myself, another school administrator, or an instructional coach on the SLO they submitted.	109 44.1%	112 45.3%	16 6.5%	8 3.2%	2 0.8%

[30] Was 35

33. How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements about the training or support provided to teachers by you, other school administrators, or instructional coaches? After the training or support provided to teachers by you, other school administrators, or instructional coaches…

	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree
The teachers in my building felt prepared to write their SLO.	79 23.4%	190 56.2%	54 16.0%	15 4.4%
The teachers in my building clearly understood the SLO process.	69 20.4%	188 55.6%	66 19.5%	15 4.4%
The teachers in my building had a clear understanding of the assessment used for measuring growth in their SLO.	102 30.2%	179 53.0%	46 13.6%	11 3.3%
The teachers in my building had a clear understanding of what contextual information to include about their students in their SLO.	93 27.5%	193 57.1%	44 13.0%	8 2.4%
The teachers in my building had a clear understanding of how or why their SLO was based on specific standards.	110 32.5%	178 52.7%	40 11.8%	10 3.0%
The teachers in my building had, or set, growth targets that were both realistic and rigorous.	114 33.7%	186 55.0%	32 9.5%	6 1.8%
The teachers in my building received helpful feedback from myself, another school administrator, or an instructional coach on the SLO they submitted.	156 46.4%	153 45.5%	21 6.3%	6 1.8%

[31] Was 36

34. In your opinion, which were the most valuable support teachers received as they wrote their SLOs? (Please select the top three supports.)



Value	Percent	Count
Support from the state- or district-provided training	25.7%	95
Support from the training or guidance provided to teachers by me, other school administrators, or instructional coaches	78.9%	292
Support from the materials made available by my district	43.8%	162
Support from the materials made available on the South Carolina State Department of Education's website	26.2%	97
Support from resources that I, or someone I know, found on the Web	26.5%	98
Support from another source (please specify):	6.5%	24

[32] Was 32

32. How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements about the state- or district-provided training the teachers in your building received? After receiving training provided by the state or district…

	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know
The teachers in my building felt prepared to write their SLO.	41 16.6%	143 57.9%	45 18.2%	16 6.5%	2 0.8%
The teachers in my building clearly understood the SLO process	33 13.4%	128 52.0%	60 24.4%	24 9.8%	1 0.4%
The teachers in my building had a clear understanding of the assessment used for measuring growth in their SLO.	60 24.4%	119 48.4%	48 19.5%	17 6.9%	2 0.8%
The teachers in my building had a clear understanding of what contextual information to include about their students in their SLO.	52 21.1%	134 54.5%	47 19.1%	11 4.5%	2 0.8%
The teachers in my building had a clear understanding of how or why their SLO was based on specific standards.	58 23.5%	140 56.7%	32 13.0%	14 5.7%	3 1.2%
The teachers in my building had growth targets that were both realistic and rigorous.	75 30.4%	136 55.1%	24 9.7%	10 4.0%	2 0.8%
The teachers in my building received helpful feedback from myself, another school administrator, or an instructional coach on the SLO they submitted.	109 44.1%	112 45.3%	16 6.5%	8 3.2%	2 0.8%

[33] Was 33

42. How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements about the helpfulness of state- or district-provided SLO training? After the state- or district-provided SLO training…

	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree
I felt prepared to write my SLO.	1,017 24.4%	1,904 45.6%	851 20.4%	404 9.7%
I clearly understood the SLO process.	975 23.4%	1,811 43.4%	988 23.7%	399 9.6%
I had a clear understanding of the assessment used for measuring growth in my SLO.	1,537 36.8%	1,700 40.7%	617 14.8%	322 7.7%
I had a clear understanding of what contextual information to include about my students in their SLO.	1,343 32.2%	1,871 44.8%	672 16.1%	289 6.9%
I had a clear understanding of how or why my SLO was based on specific standards.	1,537 36.8%	1,792 42.9%	564 13.5%	281 6.7%
I had, or set, growth targets that were both realistic and rigorous.	1,871 44.8%	1,703 40.8%	390 9.3%	208 5.0%
I received helpful feedback from a school administrator or an instructional coach on my SLO.	1,847 44.3%	1,545 37.0%	495 11.9%	286 6.9%

[34] Was 37

35. In which of the following areas would you like teachers to receive more training? (Please select your top three choices.)



Value	Percent	Count
Writing an SLO for specific content areas	48.2%	178
Identifying assessments that align with course content or grade-level content	44.2%	163
Identifying priority content standards	22.2%	82
Analyzing student baseline and trend data	42.3%	156
Setting growth targets	47.7%	176
Using formative assessments to help track students growth toward targets	40.7%	150
Using the SLO process to document teacher professional practice as identified in the Expanded ADEPT system	20.1%	74

[35] Was 38

45. On which of the following topics would you like to receive more training? (Please check your top three choices.)



Value	Percent	Count
Writing an SLO for specific content areas	41.1%	1,628
Identifying assessments that align with course grade-level content	32.7%	1,293
Identifying priority content standards	21.9%	866
Analyzing student baseline and trend data	27.0%	1,068
Setting growth targets	41.7%	1,652
Using formative assessments to help track students growth toward targets	26.1%	1,032
Using the SLO process to document teacher professional practice as identified in the Expanded ADEPT system	24.8%	980

[36] Was 39

28. What components of the SLO were teachers able to choose or determine themselves? (Please select all that apply.)



Value	Percent	Count
Standards	68.6%	289
Student population	62.0%	261
Assessment	72.4%	305
Growth targets	77.2%	325
None of these	7.6%	32

[37] Was 40

38. What components of the SLO were you able to choose or determine yourself? (Please select all that apply.)



Value	Percent	Count
Standards	63.6%	4,714
Student population	53.5%	3,967
Assessment	66.8%	4,956
Growth targets	71.9%	5,329
None of these	10.7%	795

[38] Was 41

32. How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements about the state- or district-provided training the teachers in your building received? After receiving training provided by the state or district…

	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know
The teachers in my building felt prepared to write their SLO.	41 16.6%	143 57.9%	45 18.2%	16 6.5%	2 0.8%
The teachers in my building clearly understood the SLO process	33 13.4%	128 52.0%	60 24.4%	24 9.8%	1 0.4%
The teachers in my building had a clear understanding of the assessment used for measuring growth in their SLO.	60 24.4%	119 48.4%	48 19.5%	17 6.9%	2 0.8%
The teachers in my building had a clear understanding of what contextual information to include about their students in their SLO.	52 21.1%	134 54.5%	47 19.1%	11 4.5%	2 0.8%
The teachers in my building had a clear understanding of how or why their SLO was based on specific standards.	58 23.5%	140 56.7%	32 13.0%	14 5.7%	3 1.2%
The teachers in my building had growth targets that were both realistic and rigorous.	75 30.4%	136 55.1%	24 9.7%	10 4.0%	2 0.8%
The teachers in my building received helpful feedback from myself, another school administrator, or an instructional coach on the SLO they submitted.	109 44.1%	112 45.3%	16 6.5%	8 3.2%	2 0.8%

[39] Was 42

42. How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements about the helpfulness of state- or district-provided SLO training? After the state- or district-provided SLO training…

	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree
I felt prepared to write my SLO.	1,017 24.4%	1,904 45.6%	851 20.4%	404 9.7%
I clearly understood the SLO process.	975 23.4%	1,811 43.4%	988 23.7%	399 9.6%
I had a clear understanding of the assessment used for measuring growth in my SLO.	1,537 36.8%	1,700 40.7%	617 14.8%	322 7.7%
I had a clear understanding of what contextual information to include about my students in their SLO.	1,343 32.2%	1,871 44.8%	672 16.1%	289 6.9%
I had a clear understanding of how or why my SLO was based on specific standards.	1,537 36.8%	1,792 42.9%	564 13.5%	281 6.7%
I had, or set, growth targets that were both realistic and rigorous.	1,871 44.8%	1,703 40.8%	390 9.3%	208 5.0%
I received helpful feedback from a school administrator or an instructional coach on my SLO.	1,847 44.3%	1,545 37.0%	495 11.9%	286 6.9%

[40] Was 43

32. How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements about the state- or district-provided training the teachers in your building received? After receiving training provided by the state or district…

	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know
The teachers in my building felt prepared to write their SLO.	41 16.6%	143 57.9%	45 18.2%	16 6.5%	2 0.8%
The teachers in my building clearly understood the SLO process	33 13.4%	128 52.0%	60 24.4%	24 9.8%	1 0.4%
The teachers in my building had a clear understanding of the assessment used for measuring growth in their SLO.	60 24.4%	119 48.4%	48 19.5%	17 6.9%	2 0.8%
The teachers in my building had a clear understanding of what contextual information to include about their students in their SLO.	52 21.1%	134 54.5%	47 19.1%	11 4.5%	2 0.8%
The teachers in my building had a clear understanding of how or why their SLO was based on specific standards.	58 23.5%	140 56.7%	32 13.0%	14 5.7%	3 1.2%
The teachers in my building had growth targets that were both realistic and rigorous.	75 30.4%	136 55.1%	24 9.7%	10 4.0%	2 0.8%
The teachers in my building received helpful feedback from myself, another school administrator, or an instructional coach on the SLO they submitted.	109 44.1%	112 45.3%	16 6.5%	8 3.2%	2 0.8%

[41] Was 44

33. How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements about the training or support provided to teachers by you, other school administrators, or instructional coaches? After the training or support provided to teachers by you, other school administrators, or instructional coaches…

	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree
The teachers in my building felt prepared to write their SLO.	79 23.4%	190 56.2%	54 16.0%	15 4.4%
The teachers in my building clearly understood the SLO process.	69 20.4%	188 55.6%	66 19.5%	15 4.4%
The teachers in my building had a clear understanding of the assessment used for measuring growth in their SLO.	102 30.2%	179 53.0%	46 13.6%	11 3.3%
The teachers in my building had a clear understanding of what contextual information to include about their students in their SLO.	93 27.5%	193 57.1%	44 13.0%	8 2.4%
The teachers in my building had a clear understanding of how or why their SLO was based on specific standards.	110 32.5%	178 52.7%	40 11.8%	10 3.0%
The teachers in my building had, or set, growth targets that were both realistic and rigorous.	114 33.7%	186 55.0%	32 9.5%	6 1.8%
The teachers in my building received helpful feedback from myself, another school administrator, or an instructional coach on the SLO they submitted.	156 46.4%	153 45.5%	21 6.3%	6 1.8%

[42] Was 45

36. How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements about the SLO process for teachers? I believe that the SLO process for teachers…

	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know
Uses measures that are fair reflections of my teachers' work and the work of their students.	63 17.4%	196 54.1%	65 18.0%	37 10.2%	1 0.3%
Helps me, fellow administrators, and teachers identify teachers' strengths and challenges in their practice.	68 18.7%	195 53.7%	67 18.5%	33 9.1%	0 0.0%
Allows me to provide useful feedback to my teachers about their practice.	96 26.7%	173 48.2%	64 17.8%	25 7.0%	1 0.3%
Allows me to encourage teachers to reflect on their practice.	130 35.9%	174 48.1%	38 10.5%	18 5.0%	2 0.6%
Helps teachers to improve their practice.	101 27.9%	169 46.7%	63 17.4%	26 7.2%	3 0.8%
Helps teachers learn more about their students' academic strengths and challenges.	124 34.2%	168 46.3%	49 13.5%	21 5.8%	1 0.3%

[43] Was 46

36. How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements about the SLO process for teachers? I believe that the SLO process for teachers…

	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know
Uses measures that are fair reflections of my teachers' work and the work of their students.	63 17.4%	196 54.1%	65 18.0%	37 10.2%	1 0.3%
Helps me, fellow administrators, and teachers identify teachers' strengths and challenges in their practice.	68 18.7%	195 53.7%	67 18.5%	33 9.1%	0 0.0%
Allows me to provide useful feedback to my teachers about their practice.	96 26.7%	173 48.2%	64 17.8%	25 7.0%	1 0.3%
Allows me to encourage teachers to reflect on their practice.	130 35.9%	174 48.1%	38 10.5%	18 5.0%	2 0.6%
Helps teachers to improve their practice.	101 27.9%	169 46.7%	63 17.4%	26 7.2%	3 0.8%
Helps teachers learn more about their students' academic strengths and challenges.	124 34.2%	168 46.3%	49 13.5%	21 5.8%	1 0.3%

[44] Was 47

37. In what ways has the use of student data within the teacher SLO process allowed you to change the conversations you have with teachers or the conversations teachers have with each other about student learning? (Please select all that apply.)



Value	Percent	Count
It has made conversations more student-centered.	59.5%	220
It has increased the focus on growth and impact on learning.	64.3%	238
It has made conversations more data-driven.	64.1%	237
It has increased the focus on formative assessment and progress monitoring.	47.6%	176
It has not had an impact on professional conversations.	17.3%	64
In some other way (please specify):	4.3%	16

[45] Was 48

48. In what ways has the use of student data within the SLO process allowed you to change the conversations you have with your administrator or colleagues about student learning? (Please select all that apply.)



Value	Percent	Count
It has made conversations more student-centered.	33.0%	1,290
It has increased the focus on growth and impact on learning.	40.6%	1,584
It has made conversations more data-driven.	46.0%	1,795
It has increased the focus on formative assessment and progress monitoring.	31.4%	1,228
It has not had an impact on professional conversations.	31.2%	1,218
In some other way (please specify):	5.0%	195

[46] Was 49

49. How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements about possible changes to rules around the SLO process?

	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree
SCDE should use the same standards and assessments in SLOs for teachers in the same grades and subject areas.	849 21.6%	1,459 37.1%	879 22.3%	747 19.0%
SCDE should have all teachers set their own growth targets.	1,932 49.1%	1,546 39.3%	325 8.3%	132 3.4%
SLOs should be used an artifact or evidence of professional practice.	604 15.4%	1,841 46.9%	895 22.8%	588 15.0%
SCDE should use a consistent SLO scoring methodology throughout the state.	1,120 28.5%	1,574 40.1%	790 20.1%	446 11.3%
SCDE should continue to allow districts to define the criteria for each of the SLO performance levels so that districts have flexibility.	1,914 48.7%	1,494 38.0%	294 7.5%	230 5.8%

[47] Was 52

9. Which of the following evaluation activities have you experienced during the 2015-16 school year? (Please select all that apply.)



Value	Percent	Count
I have written a SLO.	90.6%	7,638
I have been informally observed by an administrator (e.g., walk-through observations).	84.4%	7,115
I have been formally or informally observed by an administrator.	77.2%	6,513
I have been observed by a peer.	44.3%	3,740
I have received feedback on my observation(s) from an administrator.	77.8%	6,558
I had a preobservation conference.	23.8%	2,008
I had a postobservation conference.	39.6%	3,339
None of these.	1.2%	97

[48] Was 53

52. How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements about the type of feedback you receive from your administrators outside of the formal observation process?

	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Administrators at my school have conducted observations in my classroom (i.e., walk-throughs).	4,792 69.7%	1,563 22.7%	296 4.3%	227 3.3%
I have received timely feedback from administrators based on observations.	4,199 61.2%	1,644 24.0%	517 7.5%	501 7.3%
The feedback I have received based on observations provided me with specific suggestions that has allowed me to make meaningful changes to my instructional practices.	3,207 46.9%	2,023 29.6%	904 13.2%	709 10.4%
My administrators have conducted sufficient walk-throughs or observations to provide meaningful feedback on my practice.	3,755 54.8%	1,648 24.1%	806 11.8%	639 9.3%

[49] Was 54

53. How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements about the observations conducted by your administrator as part of the ADEPT system? I believe that the administrator observation process that is a part of the ADEPT system…

	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Is a fair reflection of my work and the work of my students.	2,202 32.2%	2,986 43.7%	1,015 14.9%	629 9.2%
Helps me and administrators identify the strengths and challenges in my practice.	2,356 34.5%	2,996 43.9%	918 13.4%	556 8.1%
Allows my evaluator to provide useful feedback to me about my practice.	2,557 37.5%	2,937 43.0%	801 11.7%	531 7.8%
Allows me to reflect on my practice.	2,727 39.9%	2,958 43.3%	680 10.0%	465 6.8%
Helps me to improve my practice.	2,593 38.0%	2,888 42.3%	825 12.1%	519 7.6%