**Table 4: DEMO Expanded Rating Scales for Student Learning and Growth Measures**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **DEMO Rating Scales for Student Learning and Growth Measures** A successful evaluation system is able to differentiate the performance of teachers. In order to differentiate the effectiveness of instructional practice of teachers, for example, evaluators rely on detailed standards and indicators of practice as well as rubrics. Differentiating the impact that individual teachers have on student learning and growth requires, among other factors, a rating scale that is expanded. Below are two examples of scales expanded to the 100th decimal place. The first scale is for use with an approach that uses the percent of students who meet growth targets as the basis of a rating for a teacher, and the second is for use with the performance-gap-reduction approach. **To adjust the cut scores up or down, change the lowest or highest point value and recalculate the rest of the values accordingly.** | |
| |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | \*Percent-Met Rating Scale | | | | | | % students meeting growth targets | **Rating** |  | **% students meeting growth targets** | **Rating** | | 85+ | 4 |  | 56 | 2.5 | | 83.6 | 3.9 |  | 53 | 2.4 | | 82.2 | 3.8 |  | 50 | 2.3 | | 80.8 | 3.7 |  | 47 | 2.2 | | 79.4 | 3.6 |  | 44 | 2.1 | | 78 | 3.5 |  | 41 | **2** | | 76.6 | 3.4 |  | 36.9 | 1.9 | | 75.2 | 3.3 |  | 32.8 | 1.8 | | 73.8 | 3.2 |  | 28.7 | 1.7 | | 72.4 | 3.1 |  | 24.6 | 1.6 | | 71 | **3.0** |  | 20.5 | 1.5 | | 68 | 2.9 |  | 16.4 | 1.4 | | 65 | 2.8 |  | 12.3 | 1.3 | | 62 | 2.7 |  | 8.2 | 1.2 | | 59 | 2.6 |  | 4.1 | 1.1 | |  |  |  | 0.0 | 1.0 | | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | \*Performance Gap Reduction Rating Scale | | | | | | | | | PGR | **Rating** |  | **PGR** | **Rating** |  | **PGR** | **Rating** | | 0-24% | 0.95 |  | 50% | 2.15 |  | 76% | 3.35 | | 25% | 1.00 |  | 51% | 2.19 |  | 77% | 3.39 | | 26% | 1.04 |  | 52% | 2.24 |  | 78% | 3.44 | | 27% | 1.09 |  | 53% | 2.28 |  | 79% | 3.49 | | 28% | 1.13 |  | 54% | 2.33 |  | 80% | 3.53 | | 29% | 1.18 |  | 55% | 2.38 |  | 81% | 3.58 | | 30% | 1.23 |  | 56% | 2.42 |  | 82% | 3.62 | | 31% | 1.27 |  | 57% | 2.47 |  | 83% | 3.67 | | 32% | 1.32 |  | 58% | 2.52 |  | 84% | 3.72 | | 33% | 1.36 |  | 59% | 2.56 |  | 85% | 3.76 | | 34% | 1.41 |  | 60% | 2.61 |  | 86% | 3.81 | | 35% | 1.46 |  | 61% | 2.65 |  | 87% | 3.86 | | 36% | 1.50 |  | 62% | 2.70 |  | 88% | 3.90 | | 37% | 1.55 |  | 63% | 2.75 |  | 89% | 3.95 | | 38% | 1.59 |  | 64% | 2.79 |  | 90%-100% | **4.00** | | 39% | 1.64 |  | 65% | 2.84 |  |  |  | | 40% | 1.69 |  | 66% | 2.89 |  |  |  | | 41% | 1.73 |  | 67% | 2.93 |  |  |  | | 42% | 1.78 |  | 68% | 2.98 |  |  |  | | 43% | 1.82 |  | 69% | **3.02** |  |  |  | | 44% | 1.87 |  | 70% | 3.07 |  |  |  | | 45% | 1.92 |  | 71% | 3.12 |  |  |  | | 46% | 1.96 |  | 72% | 3.16 |  |  |  | | 47% | 2.01 |  | 73% | 3.21 |  |  |  | | 48% | 2.05 |  | 74% | 3.26 |  |  |  | | 49% | 2.10 |  | 75% | 3.30 |  |  |  | |

\* \* For a comparative analysis of the two rating systems, see [**Student Learning and Growth — Approaches to Measuring Teacher Effectiveness**](http://www.maine.gov/doe/effectiveness/documents/Student-Learning-and-Growth.pptx). Note: the PowerPoint does not include the expanded scales shown here as it was developed prior to the scales.