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Intended Outcomes

Deepen your understanding of:

- The **requirements** of the new Educator Evaluation regulations
- The **challenges** they present in implementing them
- The **opportunities** they present for improving our schools
- The **resources** ESE will make available to support effective local implementation
Why focus on educator evaluation?

- No other school-based factor has as great an influence on student achievement as an effective teacher.

- Effective leaders create the conditions that enable powerful teaching and learning to occur.

Therefore,

- Ensuring that every child is taught by effective teachers and attends a school that is led by an effective leader is key to addressing the achievement gap.

Attracting, developing, and retaining an effective, academically capable, diverse, and culturally proficient educator workforce is essential.
Educators matter; but too often evaluation of educators doesn’t matter enough

Too often principals and teachers experience evaluations as:

- **Passive**: done to them rather than with them
- **Superficial**: based on very little evidence or conversation
- **Ritualistic**: emphasis on compliance and “dog and pony” shows
- **Missing the mark**: not adequately focused on student learning

A 40-member statewide task force helped shape the new regulations
The new regulations are designed to:

- Promote leaders’ and teachers’ growth and development
- Place student learning at the center using multiple measures of student learning
- Recognize excellence in teaching and leading
- Set a high bar for professional status
- Shorten timelines for improvement

The regulations apply to superintendents, principals, teachers, counselors, and every other position requiring a license.
Every educator is an active participant in the evaluation process

Every educator uses a rubric and data about student learning

Every educator proposes at least 1 professional practice goal and 1 student learning goal – team goals must be considered

Every educator earns one of four ratings of performance

Every educator & evaluator collects evidence and assesses progress

Every educator has a mid-cycle review

Collaboration and Continuous Learning are the focus
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Generally, the cycle is two years or one year.

For most experienced educators, the cycle is a two-year cycle. The formative evaluation occurs at the end of the first year and is focused on the goals.

For new educators, and those that are struggling, the cycle is a one-year cycle. The formative assessment comes mid-cycle.

Collaboration and Continuous Learning are the focus.
When fully implemented, the regulations require two separate ratings for each educator:

- **Summative Rating**: Exemplary, Proficient, Needs Improvement, Unsatisfactory
- **1-Year SELF-REPORT**: Direct Teaching GROWTH
- **District-determined, district-wide measures**

### Trends and Patterns
- **MCAS Student Growth Percentile (SGP) Scores**
- **MEPA Gain Scores**
- **District-determined, district-wide measures**

### Rating of Impact on Student Learning
(multiple measures of performance, including MCAS Student Growth Percentile and MEPA where available)

Districts are required to determine how to recognize and reward educators whose summative rating is exemplary and rating of impact on student learning is high or moderate.
4 standards of practice with rubrics defining 4 levels of performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principals &amp; Administrators</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Leadership*</td>
<td>Curriculum, Planning &amp; Assessment*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management and Operations</td>
<td>Teaching All Students*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family &amp; Community Partnerships</td>
<td>Family &amp; Community Engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Culture</td>
<td>Professional Culture</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Standards requiring proficient rating or above to achieve overall rating of proficient or above
The Structure of a Rubric
A Continuum of Professional Practice

Standards

Indicators

Elements

Descriptors

of each Element at 4 performance Levels
## Standards and Indicators of Effective Teaching Practice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I. Curriculum, Planning, &amp; Assessment</th>
<th>II. Teaching All Students</th>
<th>III. Family &amp; Community Engagement</th>
<th>IV. Professional Culture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. Curriculum and Planning</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Alignment</td>
<td>i. Instruction</td>
<td>i. Engagement</td>
<td>i. Reflection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Knowledge</td>
<td>ii. Student Engagement</td>
<td>ii. Cultural Sensitivity</td>
<td>ii. Professional Growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. Higher-Order Thinking</td>
<td>iii. Differentiation</td>
<td>iii. Community Resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iv. Learning Expectations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>v. Clarity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>vi. Materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>vii. Responsiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>viii. Connections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B. Assessment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Assessment Design</td>
<td>i. Learning Environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Application to Instruction</td>
<td>ii. Relationships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iii. Social-Emotional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Growth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C. Analysis</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Analysis</td>
<td>i. Cultural Proficiency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Feedback</td>
<td>ii. Advocacy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iii. Diversity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iv. Perspectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D. Expectations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Mindset</td>
<td>i. Expectations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Student Support</td>
<td>ii. Clarity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. Student Ownership</td>
<td>iii. Materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iv. Responsiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>v. Connections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. Instruction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Student Engagement</td>
<td>i. Concerns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Differentiation</td>
<td>ii. Community Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. Learning Expectations</td>
<td>iii. Enrichment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv. Clarity</td>
<td>iv. Collaboration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. Materials</td>
<td>v. Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi. Responsiveness</td>
<td>vi. Collaboration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vii. Connections</td>
<td>vii. Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B. Learning Environment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Relationships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Social-Emotional Growth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. Routines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv. Physical Environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. Behavior Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C. Cultural Proficiency</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Advocacy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Diversity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. Perspectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D. Expectations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Mindset</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Student Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. Student Ownership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Each Standard is defined by regulation*

*Each Indicator is defined by regulation*

*Each Element is described at each performance level*
Standard #1: Instructional Leadership
Indicator: Evaluation
Element: Supervision
Descriptors:

Exemplary: Ensures that each educator has challenging and measurable professional practice and student learning goals and an effective system for monitoring progress.

Proficient: Ensures that each educator has measurable professional practice and student learning goals.

Needs Improvement: Ensures each educator has goals, but does not vet them for quality and/or relevance to their own and the school’s needs.

Unsatisfactory: Does not ensure that each educator has goals, or the goals are not of good quality.

We expect that most educators will be rated proficient. An exemplary rating will be reserved for educators who model practice at the highest levels. Rubrics that make clear the difference between “proficient” and “exemplary” practice are essential.
Multiple sources of evidence inform the summative performance rating

- Products of Practice (e.g., observations)
- Multiple Measures of Student Learning
- Other Evidence (e.g., student surveys)

Unannounced observations are required; announced observations are not

Including Classroom, School, District and State Measures when available & applicable

Student and Staff Survey Data required in 2013-14 based on ESE Guidance by June 2013
Putting the two ratings together

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Products of Practice (e.g., observations)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Measures of Student Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Evidence (e.g., student surveys)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RUBRIC**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standard 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summative Performance Rating**
- Exemplary
- Proficient
- Needs Improvement
- Unsatisfactory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educator Goal Attainment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Educator Practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Learning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
When fully implemented, the regulations require two separate ratings for each educator:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summative Rating</th>
<th>1-YEAR SELF-DIRECTED GROWTH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exemplary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proficient</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs Improvement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Trends and Patterns**
- MCAS Student Growth Percentile (SGP) Scores
- MEPA Gain Scores
- District-determined, district-wide measures

**Rating of Impact on Student Learning**
(multiple measures of performance, including MCAS Student Growth Percentile and MEPA where available)

Districts are required to determine how to recognize and reward educators whose summative rating is exemplary and rating of impact on student learning is high or moderate.
“Multiple measures” of student learning

- **MCAS student growth percentiles** (available for about 17% of educators)
- **MEPA** gain scores, when available
- **Other assessments comparable district-wide** across grade or subject, “including but not limited to”:
  - portfolios
  - approved commercial assessments
  - district-developed pre/post unit and course assessments
- **School-wide and teacher-developed** assessments (individual and/or team)
Can this be Done?

- **10 Urban Districts from the Level 4 Schools Network:** Boston, Chelsea, Fall River, Holyoke, Lawrence, Lowell, Lynn, Springfield, Worcester

- **11 Early Adopter Districts:** Ashland, Attleboro, Everett, Franklin, Greater Lawrence RVTS, Mashpee, Reading, Revere, Wachusett, Wareham, Whitman-Hansen

- **4 Early Adopter Collaboratives (Special Education focus):** BiCounty, Collaborative for Educational Services, Lower Pioneer, South Coast.

ESE is learning from 25 pioneers
Can this be done?

8 Features in the regulations that can support efficient and effective implementation

1. Rubrics
2. Educator Self-Assessment
3. Educator-proposed Goals
4. Team Goals
5. Unannounced Observations “of varied duration”
6. Educator Collection of Evidence
7. Formative Evaluation Rating for 2-year plans
8. Distributed Leadership: Peer Assistance and/or Review
Can this be done?
Phased Implementation

★ January 2012 – ESE issues Model System forms, templates, and guidance; RTTT districts begin collective bargaining at the local level

★ June 2012 – ESE provides guidance on district-determined measures of student learning, growth, and achievement

★ Summer 2012 – RTTT districts submit their proposed educator evaluation systems to ESE for review, including collective bargaining agreements

★ September 2012 – RTTT districts implement system with at least 50% of educators and begin to identify district-determined measures of student learning

★ By January 2013 – All remaining districts begin collective bargaining

★ May 2013 – ESE issues direction on gathering student and staff feedback; ESE reports to the Board on feasibility of parent feedback

★ By August 2013 – All districts submit plans for district-determined measures of student learning to ESE

★ September 2013 – All districts implement educator evaluation
Can this be done? ESE’s Model System for Districts to Adopt or Adapt

Release Date: January 10, 2012

- Procedure and rubric for superintendent evaluation
- Procedure and rubric for principal evaluation
- Rubrics differentiated for different roles, e.g., classroom teacher, caseload teacher, counselor
- Contract language
  - Process, Timelines & Forms

A comprehensive Implementation Guide
Later additions to the Implementation Guide

★ Guidelines for
★ Developing and using multiple measures of student learning, growth and achievement
★ Determining low, moderate and high impact on student learning

★ Examples and Resources on:
★ Multiple measures of student learning
★ Determining educator impact
★ Ways to collect and use feedback from students & staff

ESE plans to collect and disseminate Promising Practices at the local level
Supports planned for the Model

- Orientation tools and resources
- “Getting Started”
  - Regional workshops in January/February
  - For district teams: Superintendent, School Committee Chair/Vice Chair, Union President, Human Resources Administrator, 1-2 Principals
- On-line, face-to-face, and hybrid professional development workshops, including:
  - Self-assessment
  - Goal setting & educator plan development
  - Observation and collecting evidence
- Networks of Practice

Eventually...MA will have a web-based rubric “library” of resources
Putting it all together: 
A Professional Practice Goal for a district’s administrators

We will ensure every educator has a challenging and measurable professional practice goal by:

- Researching and practicing effective SMART team goal setting with the administrative team
- Completing 100% of beginning-of-year goal setting conferences with each grade/subject team by October 15th
- Seeking feedback from peers about the quality of our teams’ goals
- Using mid-year formative assessment team conferences to help teams critique and revise their practice goal.

To do this well, agendas for district administrator meetings may have to be different
Putting it all together: Goals of a middle school music teacher

**Professional Practice goal:** I will collaborate with my colleagues in the music department to research, develop, pilot, analyze, revise and share 2 performance-based assessments.

**Student Learning goal:** My students will be able to identify and apply music terms, symbols and definitions in the curriculum guide for 6th, 7th and 8th grade. Using a department-developed pre- and post-performance assessment, 100% of my students will demonstrate progress, and 85% will demonstrate proficiency on the third quarter assessment.

Finding time for teams to meet will be both a challenge and an opportunity.
Six District “Take Aways” (we hope!)

★ “Yes, we have a lot of work ahead of us – but what an opportunity we have!”
★ “This is going to require ALL of us to re-think how we do our work.”
★ “We’re going to need to learn how to develop “smarter” goals – and better ways to monitor progress toward achieving them.”
★ “We better be sure we know how the MCAS Student Growth Percentile works and can interpret and explain it!”
★ “Effective collaboration will be our key to success.”
★ “We can count on useful help from ESE.”
How do I learn more?

Visit the ESE educator evaluation website:

www.doe.mass.edu/edeval

Contact ESE with questions and suggestions:

EducatorEvaluation@doe.mass.edu

Study the MCAS Growth Model:

www.doe.mass.edu/mcas/growth/

Kerry Callahan
kcallahan@doe.mass.edu
Questions? Comments? Suggestions?

Thank you for all you do to serve the Commonwealth’s children and their families
Challenging a Level 4 School

Median Student Growth Percentile
English Language Arts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Murkland School</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>57.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln School</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>66.5</td>
<td>68.0</td>
<td>68.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

source: www.doe.mass.edu/sda/dart