## Introduction

On June 28, 2011, the Board of Elementary and Secondary Education adopted [regulations](http://www.doe.mass.edu/lawsregs/603cmr35.html?section=06) for the evaluation of Massachusetts educators, informed by recommendations from a 40 member task force comprised of practitioners, association and union leaders, and policy experts. The Massachusetts Educator Evaluation Framework is designed to:

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

## Two Ratings

All Massachusetts educators will receive two independent but linked ratings that focus on the critical intersection of practice and impact, while creating a comprehensive picture of educator performance.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Summative Performance Rating** | **Student Impact Rating** |
| **Purpose** | The **Summative Performance Rating** assesses an educator's practice against four [Standards of Effective Teaching Practice](http://www.doe.mass.edu/lawsregs/603cmr35.html?section=03) in the case of teacher evaluation and four [Standards of Effective Administrator Leadership Practice](http://www.doe.mass.edu/lawsregs/603cmr35.html?section=04) in the case of administrator evaluation. These standards are defined in the regulations. The educator's progress toward attainment of his/her professional practice and student learning goals also factors into this rating. | The **Student Impact Rating** is a determination of an educator’s impact on student learning, informed by patterns and trends in student learning, growth, and/or achievement. This rating is based on results from statewide growth measures, where available, and other measures selected at the local level referred to as [district-determined measures (](http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeval/model/)DDMs). The regulations and Department guidance on DDMs recommend use of a broad range of assessment types, including portfolio assessment and capstone projects. |
| **Evidence** | The regulations specify three types of evidence:   * *Products of practice (observations & artifacts)* * *Multiple measures of student learning* * *Student and staff feedback* | Annual data for each educator from at least two measures collected from at least two years to establish patterns and trends.   * *Patterns* refer to results from at least two different measures of student learning, growth and achievement. * *Trends* refer to results from at least two years. |
| **Local Flexibility** | Districts select the evaluation tools (e.g., performance rubrics)[[1]](#footnote-1), establish timelines, determine the type and frequency of observations, set expectations for evidence collection (e.g., when/how/how much to collect). | Districts select the DDMs that will be used to ensure that measures are well-aligned to local curricula and provide meaningful information to educators about student performance. In March 2015, after consultation with stakeholders, the Department announced the availability of greater flexibility through the [Alternative Pathways Proposal](http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeval/model/). |
| **Rating Categories** | Educators earn ratings on each of the four standards that contribute to an overall rating of:   * ***Exemplary, Proficient, Needs Improvement****, or* ***Unsatisfactory***. | Educators earn one of three possible impact ratings:   * ***High, Moderate,*** or***Low***. |
| **Timeline** | Districts that participated in Race-to-the-Top began implementation in 2012-13. All other districts began in 2013-14. | The regulations called for rollout to begin in 2013-14. The Department provided extensions to reserve additional time for piloting, where necessary. Approximately 40 districts are on schedule to report ratings following the 2015-16 school year. All districts will report ratings for all educators by 2017-18. |

The Summative Performance Rating and Student Impact Rating are used together to determine the type and length of an educator’s [Educator Plan](http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeval/resources/QRG-EducatorPlans.pdf) based on the table below.

* The Summative Performance Rating determines the *type* of Educator Plan the educator completes for her/his next cycle.
* The Student Impact Rating determines the *length* of the Educator Plan (1 year or 2 years) for educators who earn Exemplary or Proficient ratings.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Performance Rating** | Exemplary | 1-yr Self-Directed Growth Plan | 2-yr  Self-Directed Growth Plan | | |
| Proficient |
| Needs Imp. | Directed Growth Plan | | | |
| Unsatisfactory | Improvement Plan | | | |
|  | | Low | | Moderate | High |
| **Impact Rating** | | | |

## The two ratings allow educators and evaluators to investigate discrepancies between conclusions about educator practice (Summative Performance Rating) and conclusions about educator impact on student learning (Student Impact Rating). The two ratings also allow district leaders to look across schools to gauge the health of the overall system (e.g., “is there a relationship between what educators are doing with students and how students are performing?”).

## Professional Judgment

The processes associated with both ratings are grounded in three main steps:

1. Educators and evaluators collect evidence
2. Educators and evaluators analyze the evidence
3. Evaluators apply professional judgment to the body of evidence and determine a rating

Unlike evaluation systems found in many states, the MA Framework does not use formulas or algorithms, but rather honors the professional judgment of evaluators and educators in considering a robust body of evidence. All evidence of educator effectiveness, including statewide growth measures and DDMs, can be placed in context before it is used to inform an educator’s Summative Performance Rating or Student Impact Rating.

## Other States

Most states use a numeric approach to educator evaluation that requires the translation of educator inputs and student outcomes into scores that are formulaically combined to determine a rating. The MA Framework is holistic. There are no numbers involved in deriving ratings. According to the Center on Great Teachers and Leaders’ [Database on State Teacher and Principal Evaluation Policies](http://resource.tqsource.org/stateevaldb/), over half of the states factor student performance data as at least 25% of a teacher’s evaluation rating, with 17 states weighting student growth measures at 50%. The MA Framework, by contrast, does not assign weights or numeric values to measures of impact. Rather, it uses the Student Impact Rating as a check on the Summative Performance Rating in an effort to drive conversations about how educator practice contributes to student learning.

## Conclusion

The two ratings, the Summative Performance Rating and the Student Impact Rating, are both critical to the Educator Evaluation Framework. Absent the Student Impact Rating the MA Framework is incomplete. The Summative Performance Rating alone focuses primarily on teacher inputs. The Student Impact Rating highlights the importance of keeping student learning at the center of the evaluation process.

1. Nearly all districts adopted or adapted [ESE’s Model System](http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeval/model/), including the four [model performance rubrics](http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeval/resources/rubrics/). [↑](#footnote-ref-1)