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Guidance on Template Use

The Student Performance Measure (SPM) Template, crafted as a customizable document, is designed to facilitate active participation in the evaluation process while:
- Aligning an identified student challenge or need to related school-level objectives and/or LEA-level priorities,
- Encouraging instructional innovation based on latest research and trends, and
- Improving educator practice.

The use of this template is optional; however, a Student Performance Measure (SPM) is required as part of the evaluation of Educator Effectiveness for professional employees serving as classroom teachers and for the interim rating of all professional employees.

At the beginning of the rating period: (Initial Conference)
- Prior to the initial conference, the educator should reflect on student challenges/needs and draft a plan of action, referencing the Framework for Observation and Practice to inform the response.
- During the initial conference, the educator and supervising administrator should review and revise the draft, as appropriate, aligning the work to related school-level objectives and/or LEA-level priorities.
- During the initial conference, the educator and supervising administrator should agree upon the student performance measure(s) and criteria for delineating the four levels of student performance used to inform the educator rating. If using multiple measures, the educator and supervising administrator should pre-determine the proportional significance (i.e., weighting) to be assigned to each measure.
- Part I and Part II of the SPM Template should be completed, with the educator and supervising administrator providing signatures, dates, and any comments in the Initial Conference and SPM Approval fields under Part V.

During the agreed-upon interval of the rating period: (Mid-Point Review)
- Prior to the mid-point review, the educator should complete the Mid-Point Reflection field under Part III.
- During the mid-point review, the educator and supervising administrator should examine initial evidence of student performance and discuss progress, unanticipated barriers, and needed supports, revising the SPM Template as appropriate and agreed upon by the educator and supervising administrator.
- The educator and supervising administrator should sign, date, and provide any comments in the Mid-Point Review field, and if applicable, the SPM Revision Approval field, under Part V.

At the conclusion of the rating period: (End-of-Rating Review)
- Prior to the end-of-rating review, the educator should complete the Final Reflection field under Part III.
- During the end-of-rating review, the educator and supervising administrator should examine final evidence of student performance and discuss successes, unanticipated barriers, and any supports that might have been useful to the educator, which shall be used cumulatively to inform the Educator Rating in Part IV.
- The educator and supervising administrator should sign, date, and provide any comments in the End-of-Rating Review field under Part V.
- The rating in Part IV should be entered into the LEA-Selected Measures section of the corresponding PDE rating form to be factored as part of the overall rating of Educator Effectiveness for the professional employee.
PART I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Challenge/Need</th>
<th>% Weighting 100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The students in culinary have several areas where they do not perform well on the NOCTI credentialing assessment. Based on the data and my analysis, I have determined that there are five specific areas within the NOCTI credentialing assessment competencies where the students do not perform well. My goal would be to improve student performance on the 5 culinary competencies as described below.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What is the current context, corresponding evidence, and/or anecdotal information that informs your identification of this challenge or need?  

Based on my reflection of 51 prior students over multiple years within a NOCTI credentialing assessment summary report as well as current class NOCTI credentialing assessment data, the student class mean for some competencies are below an acceptable level to meet industry standards.

These areas are:

- Take physical and perpetual inventory (3 Questions)
- Describe primary functions and food sources of major nutrients (3 Questions)
- Calculate food costs, percentages, and mark-up (3 Questions)
- Identify quality and grade of fruits and vegetables (3 Questions)
- Prepare standard dessert items (4 Questions)

PLAN OF ACTION:

What is your proposed response?  

My plan is to address these issues within the program curriculum, instruction, and assessment practices to elevate the class mean for those items to improve student performance on the NOCTI credentialing assessment.

What resources are available to assist you in addressing the student challenge/need?  

NOCTI credentialing assessment summary report for longitudinal data analysis
Current student NOCTI credentialing assessment competency group report (pretest from current year or posttest from most recent graduates.)
NOCTI credentialing assessment posttest analysis report
ACF curriculum as well as KP-Compass online curriculum.

There are no additional resources needed for this plan.

**Specific Actions:**

- Obtain NOCTI credentialing assessment summary report for analysis of longitudinal data
- Obtain current NOCTI credentialing assessment pretest report
- Create new curriculum, instruction, and assessment practices to address issues.
- Analyze local assessments data to monitor progress
- Obtain NOCTI credentialing assessment posttest data report
- Determine if plan was successful

**Timeline:**

- September 15
- October 31st
- November 30th
- Ongoing
- April 30th
- May 5th

**Framework Domain Alignment**

- Planning & Preparation
- Instruction
- Professional Responsibilities

**Part II**

**Student Performance Measure (SPM)**

**Describe the LEA Selected Measure(s):**

- Locally Developed School District Rubric
- District-Designed Measure & Examination
- Nationally Recognized Standardized Test
- Industry Certification Examination
- Student Projects Pursuant to Local Requirements
- Student Portfolios Pursuant to Local Requirement
and effectiveness of your response?

**Evaluation**

Describe the specific criteria that will inform the Educator Effectiveness rating.

*NOTE: Student Performance Measures may be reused on an annual basis if the responses are updated and the educator continues to offer reflections.*

**Distinguished:** 80% Mean for items.

Explanation: If there are seven (7) items for a competency, 80% the class mean would need to be 5.6 or higher (Distinguished). \(7 \times 0.8 = 5.6\)

**Proficient:** 51% to 79% Mean for items.

Explanation: If there are seven (7) items for a competency, 51% to 79% the class mean would need to be greater than 3.5 but less than 5.6 (Proficient)

**Needs Improvement:** 50% to 40% Mean for items.

Explanation: If there are seven (7) items for a competency, 50% to 40% the class mean would need to be between 3.5 and 2.8 (Needs Improvement)

**Failing:** Below 40% Mean for items.

Explanation: If there are seven (7) items for a competency, below 40% the class mean would need lower than 2.8 \(7 \times 0.4 = 2.8\) (Needs Improvement)

---

**PART III**

**Educator Reflection:**

Reflect on your success, unanticipated barriers, any supports that could have been useful, and next steps.

*(NOTE: Response to student challenge/need may be revised mid-academic year, if agreed upon by both the administrator and educator.)*

**Mid-Point Reflection:**

---

**Final Reflection:**

---

**PART IV**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educator Rating:</th>
<th>☐ 0 Failing</th>
<th>☐ 1 Needs Improvement</th>
<th>☐ 2 Proficient</th>
<th>☐ 3 Distinguished</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PART V: Signatures &amp; Comments</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Initial Conference</strong></th>
<th>Supervisor Comments:</th>
<th>Educator Comments:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Signature:</td>
<td>Signature:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>Date:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>SPM Approval</strong></th>
<th>Supervisor Comments:</th>
<th>Educator Comments:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Signature:</td>
<td>Signature:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>Date:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Mid-Point Review</strong></th>
<th>Supervisor Comments:</th>
<th>Educator Comments:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Signature:</td>
<td>Signature:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>Date:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>SPM Revision Approval</strong> (if applicable)</th>
<th>Supervisor Comments:</th>
<th>Educator Comments:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Signature:</td>
<td>Signature:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>Date:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>End-of-Rating Review</strong></th>
<th>Supervisor Comments:</th>
<th>Educator Comments:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Signature:</td>
<td>Signature:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>Date:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- I acknowledge that I have read the information contained herein and that I have been provided an opportunity to discuss it with the rater.
Considerations

What is the current context, corresponding evidence, and/or anecdotal information that informs your identification of this challenge or need?
- What indicators led you to identify this challenge/need?
- Why did you choose this student challenge/need as a priority?
- What internal and/or external factors are driving this student challenge/need?
- What population(s) of the school community will be affected by implementing this response?

What is your proposed response?
- Why did you choose this response?
- How did you determine the appropriateness of this response to the identified challenge/need?
- How does your response align with school-level objectives and/or LEA-level priorities?
- Is your response supported by research-based best practices and/or educational innovation?

What resources are available to assist you in addressing the student challenge/need?
- What expertise do you possess to respond to the student challenge/need?
- How are identified resources appropriate to the response?
- How does collaboration contribute to the available resources and/or expertise?

If applicable, what additional expertise, resources, and/or other supports would assist you in meeting the student challenge/need?
- What obstacles exist to your response to the student challenge/need?
- What resources are needed to overcome these obstacles (budgetary, material, time, professional learning, and/or personnel)?
- What might the role of collaboration be in overcoming these obstacles?

What action steps will you implement to address this student challenge/need?
- What strategies will you utilize in your response to the student challenge/need?
- What are realistic timeframes and/or benchmarks throughout the process?
- How will you monitor, reflect, and adjust your plan if necessary?

What student performance evidence or artifacts will you use to measure the progress and effectiveness of your response?
- What artifacts could demonstrate the effectiveness of your response to the student need?
What evidence would be necessary to answer questions you might ask yourself mid-point?