## **Richland Parish Schools SLT Vetting Tool**

As you review the SLT, consider it from the perspective of a busy principal with a school of busy teachers. You want your teachers to write high-quality SLTs, but you also want to distinguish between issues you can live with and those that make or break the quality of an SLT. SLTs must be evaluated for **Priority of Content, Rigor of Target and Quality of Evidence**. To be approved overall, an SLT must have an acceptable rating in each of these three categories. All SLTs approved will be eligible for performance-demand based compensation funds.

Teacher's Name: SLT Number:	School:	Grade:	Subject:	

### **Priority of Content**

Use this section to evaluate the **Priority of Content** of the SLT.

Priority of Content	Rating (Yes/No)	Justification for rating/Comments
Is the rationale broad enough that it captures the priority content of an extended instructional period, but focused enough that it clearly pertains to the course subject and grade and that it can be measured?		
Is the SLT based on the district's tier 1 curriculum?		
As far as you can tell from the information in the SLT, do the standards align with the rationale of the SLT?		
As far as you can tell from the information in the SLT, are the standards sufficient in number and scope for the interval of instruction?		
Based on your answers to the questions above, is the Priority of Content acceptable?		

### **Rigor of Target**

Use this section to evaluate the Rigor of Target of the SLT.

Rigor of Target	Rating	Justification for rating/Comments
	(Yes/No)	
Does the SLT describe the baseline knowledge of <b>all</b> current students using multiple data		
points?		
Does the SLT use a 10-15 percent range for attainment?		
Based on student starting points, is the target possible for <b>all</b> students taught and/or		
subgroup identified to realistically attain, while also representing a good year of learning		
with an effective teacher?		
Based on your answers to the questions above, would you rate the Rigor of Target as		
acceptable?		

# Richland Parish Schools SLT Vetting Tool

**Quality of Evidence** Use this section to evaluate the **Quality of Evidence** of the SLT.

Quality of Evidence	0	Justification for rating/Comments
	(Yes/No)	
Does the target describe how student progress will be measured and monitored?		
Does the target use an assessment aligned with the district's assessment recommendation		
and/or school performance score?		
Based on the answers above, would you rate the Quality of Evidence as acceptable?		

**Overall Quality** This page will ask you questions related to the **Overall Quality** of the SLO.

## **Overall Quality**

Which, if any, of the components of this SLT do you consider strong?	<ul><li>Priority of Content</li><li>Rigor of Target</li></ul>
	Quality of Evidence
	None of the above
	Please explain [open-ended]
Which, if any, of the components of this SLT do you consider weak?	Priority of Content
	Rigor of Target
	Quality of Evidence
	None of the above
	Please explain [open-ended]
How would you rate the overall quality of this SLT?	Approved – Exceeds Expectations: <u>Rated acceptable in all three</u>
	categories. An SLT you would approve without reservations.
	• Approved – Meets Expectations: <u>Rated acceptable in all three</u>
	<i>categories.</i> An SLT you would approve, but had areas that could be
	improved.
	• Not Approved – Slightly Below Expectations: <u>Rated acceptable in two</u>
	out of three categories. An SLT you would not approve, but only needs a
	few minor revisions or one major revision to be approvable.
	<ul> <li>Not Approved – Below Expectations: <u>Rated acceptable in one out of</u></li> </ul>
	three categories. An SLT you would not have approved, and requires
	major revisions in multiple areas
	• Not Approvable – Significantly Below Expectations: <u>Not rated as</u>
	acceptable in any of the three categories. An SLT you would not approve
	that requires major revisions in all 3 components and/or is completely
	unclear