The DDSD Matrix for Summative Evaluations for Teachers & Administrators  
(Revised from the Oregon Matrix Model)

Beginning in the 2014-15 school year all districts will use the Oregon Matrix Model for their summative evaluations. In the Oregon Matrix, Professional Practice (PP) and Professional Responsibilities (PR) intersects with Student Learning and Growth (SLG) culminating in a Professional Growth Path and summative performance level. When there is a discrepancy between PP/PR level and SLG level, further inquiry is triggered to explore and understand the reasons for the discrepancy in order to determine the Professional Growth Path and corresponding summative performance level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 4 (Exemplary)</th>
<th>COLLABORATIVE PATH</th>
<th>FACILITATIVE or COLLABORATIVE PATH</th>
<th>FACILITATIVE PATH</th>
<th>FACILITATIVE PATH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>With focus on SLG Goals</td>
<td>With focus on SLG Goals Determined post inquiry</td>
<td>Educator leads development of Professional Growth Path</td>
<td>Educator leads development of Professional Growth Path</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*SLG INQUIRY due to LOW level of fidelity between measures</td>
<td>*SLG INQUIRY due to only SOME level of fidelity between measures</td>
<td>GOOD level of fidelity between measures</td>
<td>HIGHEST level of fidelity between measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 3 (Proficient)</td>
<td>COLLABORATIVE or CONSULTING PATH</td>
<td>COLLABORATIVE PATH</td>
<td>COLLABORATIVE PATH</td>
<td>COLLABORATIVE PATH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>With focus on SLG Goals Determined post inquiry</td>
<td>With focus on SLG Goals</td>
<td>Educator and evaluator collaboratively develop Professional Growth Path</td>
<td>Educator and evaluator collaboratively develop Professional Growth Path</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*SLG INQUIRY due to SOME level of fidelity between measures</td>
<td>GOOD level of fidelity between measures</td>
<td>HIGHEST level of fidelity between measures</td>
<td>GOOD level of fidelity between measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2 (Basic)</td>
<td>CONSULTING PATH</td>
<td>CONSULTING PATH</td>
<td>CONSULTING PATH</td>
<td>COLLABORATIVE or CONSULTING PATH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>With focus on SLG Goals</td>
<td>With focus on SLG Goals</td>
<td>Evaluator consults with the educator and guides development of Professional Growth Path</td>
<td>Determined post inquiry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluator consults with the educator and guides development of Professional Growth Path</td>
<td>Evaluator consults with the educator and guides development of Professional Growth Path</td>
<td>GOOD level of fidelity between measures</td>
<td>*PP/PR INQUIRY due to only SOME level of fidelity between measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GOOD level of fidelity between measures</td>
<td>HIGHEST level of fidelity between measures</td>
<td>GOOD level of fidelity between measures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 1 (Unsatisfactory)</td>
<td>DIRECTED PATH</td>
<td>DIRECTED PATH</td>
<td>CONSULTING or DIRECTED PATH</td>
<td>CONSULTING PATH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>With focus on SLG Goals</td>
<td>With focus on SLG Goals</td>
<td>Determined post inquiry</td>
<td>Evaluator consults with the educator and guides development of Professional Growth Path</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluator determines Professional Growth Path</td>
<td>Evaluator determines Professional Growth Path</td>
<td>*PP/PR INQUIRY due to only SOME level of fidelity between measures</td>
<td>*PP/PR INQUIRY due to LOW level of fidelity between measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Highest level of fidelity between measures</td>
<td>GOOD level of fidelity between measures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

X-axis: Student Learning and Growth  
Y-axis: Professional Practices and Responsibilities
*SLG & PP/PR Inquiry Process:
In order to determine an educator’s Professional Growth Path and resulting summative performance level an inquiry may be initiated by the evaluator. See description of the process in the handbook.

Professional Growth Paths

Taking the performance levels for PP/PR and SLG, find where the X-axis intersects with the Y-axis on the matrix. The PP/PR will then be compared to the SLG to determine the educator’s Professional Growth Path and overall summative performance level. The four types of Professional Growth Paths are defined as follows:

Facilitative Growth Path: The educator leads the collaborative conversation, and with the evaluator chooses the focus of the Professional Growth Path and professional goal(s).
*If the educator had a SLG performance level of 2, the path/professional goal(s) should also include a focus on increasing the educator’s overall aptitude for this measure.

Collaborative Growth Path: The educator and evaluator collaboratively develop the educator’s Professional Growth path.
* If the educator had a SLG performance level of 1 or 2, the path/professional goal(s) should also include a focus on increasing the educator’s overall aptitude in this measure.

Consultative Growth Path: The evaluator consults with the educator and uses the information gathered to inform the educator’s Professional Growth path/professional goal(s).
* If the educator had a SLG performance level of 1 or 2, the path/professional goal(s) should also include a focus on increasing the educator’s overall aptitude in this measure.

Directed Growth Path: The evaluator directs the educator’s Professional Growth path/professional goal(s). This plan should involve a focus on the most important area(s) to improve educator performance.
* If the educator had a SLG performance level of 1 or 2, the path/professional goal(s) should also include a focus on increasing the educator’s overall aptitude in this measure.

Inquiry Processes

Evaluators may engage in an Inquiry Process when the educator scores a 3 or 4 on the Y-Axis, but a 1 or 2 on the X-Axis or vice versa. This indicates a low level of fidelity between an educator’s professional practice and responsibilities and the student learning and growth goals. In order to determine an educator’s Professional Growth Path and resulting performance level, the evaluator may initiate the following with the educator:

Student Learning and Growth Inquiry Process:
- Collaboratively examine student learning and growth data in conjunction with other evidence including observation, artifacts and other student and teacher information based on classroom, school, school district and state-based tools and practices; etc.
- Collaboratively examine circumstances, which may include one or more of the following: goal setting process including assessment literacy; content and expectations; extent to which standards, curriculum and assessment are aligned; etc.

The evaluator then decides the respective Professional Growth Path and if the summative performance level is a 1 or 2; or a 2 or 3.

Professional Practice and Professional Responsibility Inquiry Process:
• Re-examine evidence and artifacts and an outside evaluator (Supervisor, VP, other district administrator) may be called in
• Educator has the opportunity to provide additional evidence and/or schedule additional observations with focus on area of need
• Evaluator’s supervisor is notified and inter-rater reliability protocols are revisited

The evaluator then decides the respective Professional Growth Path and if the summative performance level is a 2 or 3; or a 3 or 4.

Determining Levels for the Y-Axis and X-Axis, and Finding the Summative Rating on the Oregon Matrix for Summative Evaluations for Teachers & Administrators

Y-Axis: Professional Practice and Professional Responsibilities (PP/PR)
Using the ratings for each component/standard on the summative evaluation form, you will find the average score.
• Add up all component/standard scores to get the total points scored.
• Divide by 22 (total number of components/standards)
• Use the following thresholds to determine PP/PR level:
  \[
  \begin{align*}
  3.6 – 4.0 &= 4 \\
  2.81 – 3.59 &= 3 \\
  1.99 – 2.8 &= 2^* \\
  <1.99 &= 1
  \end{align*}
  \]

* PP/PR Scoring Rule:
If the educator scores two 1s in any PP/PR component/standard and his/her average score falls between 1.99-2.499, the educator’s performance level cannot be rated above a 1.

X-Axis: Student Learning and Growth (SLG)
• Using the Oregon SLG Goal scoring rubric, determine the performance level of each SLG.
• Use the following thresholds to determine SLG level:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unsatisfactory (Level 1)</th>
<th>Basic (Level 2)</th>
<th>Proficient (Level 3)</th>
<th>Exemplary (Level 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 on both goals</td>
<td>2 on both goals</td>
<td>3 on both goals</td>
<td>4 on both goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 on one goal &amp; 2 on one goal</td>
<td>2 on one goal &amp; 3 on one goal</td>
<td>3 on one goal &amp; 4 on one goal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 on one goal &amp; 1 on one goal</td>
<td>4 on one goal &amp; 2 on one goal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 on one goal &amp; 1 on one goal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Final Summative Performance Level and Professional Growth Path:
• Taking the performance levels for PP/PR and SLG, find where the X-Axis intersects with the Y-Axis on the matrix.
• The PP/PR will then be compared to the SLG to determine the educator’s Professional Growth Path and overall summative performance level.

⇒ The Matrix summative rating is to be used for state reporting purposes as required by the ESEA Flexibility Waiver.