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| **PUBLIC COMMENT REPORT** |
| **PROPOSED REVISIONS TO EDUCATOR EVALUATION:**  |
| **Executive Summary** |
| The Department received 260 comments during the public comment period. The majority of comments were provided by current and former teachers. Additional comments were submitted by the Assabet Valley Collaborative member district curriculum leaders, the Cambridge Education Association, a joint letter from the Massachusetts Association of School Superintendents (MASS), Massachusetts Elementary School Principals Association (MESPA), and Massachusetts Secondary School Administrators Association (MSSAA), the Massachusetts Business Alliance for Education (MBAE), a joint letter from Massachusetts Teacher Association (MTA) and American Federation of Teachers - Massachusetts (AFT-MA), the Old Rochester Regional School District, the Quincy Education Association, the Sharon Public Schools, and the Somerville School Committee. The vast majority of the comments received argued against both the existing regulations and the proposed changes. Two comments from teachers spoke generally about the importance of using evidence of student learning in educator evaluation. Eight comments supported a specific modification to the proposed changes that would position the student learning indicator in Standard I, as opposed to Standard II. Three comments supported the proposed changes with modifications. Two public comments and the joint letter from MASS, MESPA, MSSAA, supported the proposed regulatory changes. The letter from MBAE argued against the proposed changes in favor of the existing regulatory framework. The Department has recommended modifying the proposed changes to the regulations in response to public comments. Public comments indicated the proposed changes could be construed to actually retain a requirement that evaluators make a separate judgment about an educator’s impact on student learning that stands apart from the educator’s performance rating on Standard 2. While most acknowledged this judgment is not a separate and reported rating, several commenters noted that determining whether an educator has had less than expected, expected, or more than expected impact on student learning (language included in the proposed changes released for comment) is akin to providing a Student Impact Rating of high, moderate, or low. Eliminating the separate impact rating was a main impetus for proposing regulatory changes. For that reason, the Department is recommending a modification to clarify that a separate, reported judgment of impact is not required. Rather, the student learning indicator serves to ensure that evidence of student learning is considered when determining educator ratings.  Other major themes extracted from public comments are summarized below with example comments to illustrate each theme. The Department’s responses to each theme are also provided. |
| **Key Theme from Public Comments: Clarify Shift from Separate Rating to an Indicator that is Part of the Standard 2 Rating** |
| Several public comments noted that the proposed changes retain a separate judgment of an educator’s impact on student learning that stands apart from the educator’s rating on Standard 2. While the proposed changes do not require evaluators to report a separate rating of an educator’s impact, there are multiple places where the proposed regulations do require evaluators to determine whether the educator has demonstrated expected impact on student learning. Comments illustrating this theme:* Alicia Jasiekiewicz: *Instead of rating educators’ impact on student learning as “low,* moderate *or high,” it would rate their impact as “less than expected” or “at least expected.” Educators are not fooled by this change in terminology.*
* Cathy Cummins on behalf of curriculum leaders from the member districts of Assabet Valley Collaborative: *We believe student learning data is vital to our work as evaluators and educational leaders, and believe that there are multiple locations throughout the system to locate student learning and growth as foundational to the evaluation system. Examples include student learning goals, assessment and adjustments to practice indicators.  We support the addition of a student learning indicator and think this strengthens the rubric.*

*For consideration: the inclusion of "expected growth" as a gate for decision-making on plan duration seems to be new language for the old "impact rating."  The "expected growth" threshold for being placed on a two year self-directed growth plan is the same outcome that "moderate or high impact" had in the original regulations.**We strongly advocate that DESE remove "expected growth" entirely from the plan type/duration segment of the regulations.  If experienced educators are rated as proficient or exemplary, they would be able to move to a two year evaluation cycle.    Elevating "expected impact" to have additional influence over plan type is contradictory to the weight of other indicators throughout the rubric** MTA and AFT-MA joint letter: *The proposal does not appear to require a separate rating on the Student Learning Indicator, but it does demand a determination of a teacher’s impact for three purposes: 1) as a factor in the Standard 2 rating, with the Student Learning Indicator presumably incorporated into a revised rubric (see third bullet below); 2) in determining the length and focus of self-directed growth plans; and 3) in determining which educators are eligible for leadership roles, additional responsibilities and compensation, etc.*

Department response: The Department is proposing modifications to the proposed regulatory changes to clarify that a separate, reported judgment of impact is not required, but rather the student learning indicator serves to ensure that evidence of whether students are attaining anticipated student learning gains on multiple measures must be considered when determining educator ratings.  |
| **Other Public Comment Themes** |
| **Theme:** Evaluatingeducators based on student performance is unfair because of differences in groups of students and factors that impact student learning outside of an educator’s control. Comments illustrating this theme:* Kathy Joyce: *Some teachers have a special ed degree, and therefore always seem to get the low kids, or the ones on IEP's. They are being penalized for having an advanced or additional degree if their student test scores are tied to their evaluations. These students generally do not perform as well as students who are not on an IEP.*
* Rob Sutton: *A couple years ago, I had 3 sections of Algebra 2.  One section routinely did at least 10-15% better on exams than another.  They had the same teacher (me), teaching the same content, at the same level, in the same manner.  I've had entire cohorts of students who, one year, were much stronger than students from other years.*
* Michael Gillen: *… there are factors in my students' lives over which I have no control, nor any means to meaningfully impact, yet which greatly influence their academic performance: home life, parental involvement, socioeconomic status, etc.  For me to be evaluated based on my student's performance would only be sound practice if I were in fact the only variable in their performance, which I am not.  Again, I am very happy to be evaluated based on the aspects of my job over which I do have control.*

Department response: No changes are recommended. The Educator Evaluation Framework was designed with the understanding that some factors that contribute to student learning are outside of an individual educator’s control. However, research demonstrates that educators do have an impact on student learning. The proposed changes are consistent with the current regulations, in that evidence of student learning is one of several types of evidence used to determine an educator’s rating and that multiple measures must be considered. The Department has also consistently emphasized the importance of measuring student growth as opposed to achievement alone, in order to account for differences among students before instruction.  |
| **Theme:** The inclusion of a separate student learning indicator is not necessary because student learning is already included in the Educator Evaluation framework. Comments illustrating this theme:* Mary Sterling: *I support the inclusion of evidence of student growth within the current evaluation instrument.  The evaluation instrument is already comprehensive and provides two appropriate and important sections for inclusion of information about the educator's capacity to use assessments to determine student growth and the educator's ability to make growth occur for students.*
* Cheryl Key: *Student learning is already embedded in other sections of the evaluation system, most notably in the creation of Student Learning Goals. Creating another Student Learning Indicator is duplicative, confusing and a waste of time.*

Department response: No changes are recommended. With the elimination of the separate Student Impact Rating, the evaluation framework would lack an explicit place to consider evidence of an educator’s impact on student learning in the determination of an overall performance rating. The student learning indicator included in the proposed changes is an important signal for evaluators and educators that evidence of impact informs the rating on Standard II.   |
| **Theme:** The requirement to develop additional measures of student learning is an unreasonable burden.Comments illustrating this theme:* Kara Dougherty: *I think that creating DDMs is also pointless. I do believe in common assessments and those should already be in use.*
* Santha Parke: *Teachers are already required to create measurable student learning goals and are evaluated on the success of these. Additional rating systems and learning indicators drain teacher motivation and energy to deliver quality instruction, the kind that advances students’ academic achievement.*
* **Adeline M. Bee:** *Please eliminate the Student Impact Rating and DDMs/Common Assessments altogether and instead focus educators’ and administrators’ efforts on a rich and robust system of local multiple measures of student engagement, student achievement and school quality. Allowing students to demonstrate what they know and can do through curriculum-embedded, standards-based performance assessments that measure deeper mastery of content and skills, prepares them for college, career, and life in a much more profound way.*
* David Piper: *Concerts, audio recordings, and in-class performances both alone and as a group are all part of assessment. But these things do not exist on paper.*

Department response: No changes are recommended. If a district has high-quality common assessments in place there is no need to create additional measures for the purpose of educator evaluation. The shift in language from district-determined measures to common assessments was made to clarify that the intent is not and has not been to create additional measures if there are well-aligned and useful common measures already in place. Where such measures are not in place, there should be a strong impetus to create them as part of a robust local assessment system.  |
| **Theme:** The assessments used to evaluate teachers are of poor quality.Comments illustrating this theme:* Laura Dolan: *I feel District Determined Measures are so unreliable and subjective. As much as a district tries to make them objective, it is not possible across grade levels and classrooms.*
* Susan Bergquist: *The results of these tests are unreliable and exacerbate the emphasis of standardized testing in public education.*

Department response: No changes are recommended. The common assessments and other classroom assessments used as evidence of educator impact on student learning in the evaluation process should be the same assessments used to make important educational decisions for students (e.g., to inform adjustments to practice, to contribute to student grades).  |
| **Theme**: Teaching should be creative and fun.* Eileen Claveloux: *Teaching used to be creative and fun. Most creativity and almost all of the fun have been well squeezed out of the profession. I entered public school teaching after some years as a higher ed adjunct. The stresses of the profession have become enormous.*
* Lynn Major: *I take my role as a teacher very seriously. Parents and the state ask me to help children to be happy, love learning and grow and be challenged everyday. I wish my students to have the most growth possible all while being joyful and appreciating the work required to improve in mind and body.*

Department response: No changes are recommended. Teaching should be a rewarding career. Every educator deserves regular feedback to improve practice. The Educator Evaluation Framework is designed to facilitate meaningful feedback about the range of educator skills, practices, and activities that contribute to overall effectiveness. Opportunities to reflect on whether instruction is positively impacting student learning must be part of the process and should not prevent creativity or joy in the classroom.  |
| **Comments from Associations and School Districts** |
| **Association** | **Summary of Comments** |
| Assabet Valley Collaborative Member Districts’ Curriculum Leaders | Support the elimination of the student impact rating: “The removal of the impact rating, in particular, will go a long way in assisting evaluators in restoring or sustaining a culture of risk-taking and authentic feedback that is built into so many other parts of the educator evaluation system.”Support for the student learning indicator: The curriculum leaders assert that the student learning indicator will be a helpful addition to the framework. “We believe student learning data is vital to our work as evaluators and educational leaders, and believe that there are multiple locations throughout the system to locate student learning and growth as foundational to the evaluation system… We support the addition of a student learning indicator and think this strengthens the rubric.”Opposition to “expected impact” as a determinant of plan length: The curriculum leaders assert that the use of expected impact to determine Educator Plan duration treats the student learning indicator differently than other indicators. “For consideration:   the inclusion of "expected growth" as a gate for decision-making on plan duration seems to be new language for the old "impact rating”…We strongly advocate that DESE remove "expected growth" entirely from the plan type/duration segment of the regulations.” |
| Cambridge Education Association | Evidence of student learning in evaluation: The association asserts that educators should be accountable for using assessments effectively but results should not be part of the overall rating. “We are in favor of effective use of assessments, in favor of holding educators accountable for using assessment effectively, and opposed to these amendments because they will reduce the effectiveness of the use of assessments… Moreover, we believe that increasing the stakes for assessment results by including them as a part of the Overall Rating is detrimental to the professional culture of our schools.”  |
| M.A.S.S./MSSAA/ MESPA Joint Letter | Evidence of student learning in evaluation: M.A.S.S., MSSAA, and MESPA assert that evidence of student learning should be part of the educator evaluation process. “Our associations are unified in the belief that student learning outcomes are legitimate and meaningful data which should be discussed as part of the evaluation process… indicators of student performance provide an opportunity for discussion and judgement [sic] in the overall assessment of educator performance.”Support for the student learning indicator: M.A.S.S., MSSAA, and MESPA support the inclusion of a student learning indicator within the standards of effective practice. “It is our belief that eliminating the separate impact rating and placing impact on student learning as one of the five indicator’s [sic] in Standard 2 will provide a reasonable balance for reflection of pedagogy and student outcomes in the assessment of educator performance.” |
| MBAE | Objection to the elimination of the student impact rating: MBAE asserts that the proposed changes are too vague and ambiguous. “Our primary objection is the elimination of the separate **student impact rating** and its replacement with a vague and subjective “expected impact” measure as a component of a teacher’s summative evaluation. That, combined with the removal of “trends” using multiple years of data, results in a system that leaves far too much of an educator’s evaluation to ambiguous and inconsistent measures which can vary dramatically across districts.”Evidence of student learning in evaluation: MBAE asserts that impact on student learning must be a central consideration in educator evaluation. “MBAE also believes accurate, multiple measures of a **teacher’s impact on student learning and growth must be the predominant factor in teacher evaluation**. Such measures are essential to academic progress – the goal of teaching – and must be the primary focus of evaluation.”Ratings differentiation: MBAE asserts that the proposed amendments do not address the lack of differentiation in educator ratings. “Unfortunately, the lack of differentiation between “proficient” and “exemplary” perpetuated the situation where the vast majority of teachers are ranked the same. The proposed amendments fail to correct this problem. We urge the Board to direct the Department to further amend the regulations to plainly distinguish among the four distinct ratings and to preclude the higher ratings for teachers whose efforts do not improve the performance of their students.”Goals for educator evaluation: MBAE asserts that neither the current regulations nor the proposed amendments support the Department’s goals for educator evaluation. “MBAE agrees with [the Department’s goals for educator evaluation]. Unfortunately, we do not see how either the current or the proposed regulations will support or achieve them.” |
| MTA/AFT-MA Joint Letter | Board authority: MTA and AFT-MA assert that the current and proposed regulations exceed the Board’s authority. “While the Board establishes the guidelines, or principles, for local use, the establishment of evaluation systems themselves clearly occurs in the school districts, and it should not be the subject of the extensive state regulations found in 603 CMR 35.00.”Proposed changes are not responsive: MTA and AFT-MA assert that the proposed changes are the same as or potentially worse than the existing regulations. “Nonetheless, the commissioner’s proposals are not simply the *same* as the existing unsuccessful program, they are in fact *more* of the same and arguably *worse* than the existing regulations. When a revision simply slaps new names on old concepts, it is safe to suggest that no meaningful revision was intended. For example, and as previously pointed out, when a reform idea is to change the terminology for a teacher’s impact on student test outcomes from “low, moderate or high” to “less than expected” or “at least expected,” no genuine change is afoot. When “Student Impact Rating” becomes “Student Learning Indicator,” nothing has changed.”Evidence of student learning in evaluation: MTA and AFT-MA assert that evidence of student learning should be for educator reflection and not used for “high stakes” in evaluation. “A system that treats student learning as a quantifiable and supposedly objective teacher performance standard makes it less likely that the educators — both the evaluators and the evaluated alike — can engage in an open and authentic discussion of how the evidence of student learning can be used most effectively… The best approach to address the problems of the current system is to eliminate the use of student test results to inform any rating of a teacher’s performance.” |
| Old Rochester Regional School District Joint Letter from Superintendent and Union Leader | Proposed changes are not responsive: The district and educators association assert that the proposed changes are the same as the existing regulations. “Unfortunately, the proposed amendments made by Commissioner Chester, simply provides new names for the same unworkable system.”Opposition to the student learning indicator: The district and educators association assert that the student learning indicator will incentivize educators to focus more on testing. “Using student test scores as the basis determining [sic] a standard that is required for an educator to be proficient is methodologically not sound and potentially harmful. Raising the stakes for educators only incentivizes educators to focus more on testing and less on developing life-long learners.  |
| Quincy Education Association | Opposition to the student learning indicator: The association asserts that the student learning indicator creates new concerns for educators. “As good as our labor-management relations are in Quincy, I expect this language will create an impossible requirement — the determination of ‘anticipated student learning gains’ and ‘expected impact’.  Both terms are equally imprecise and equally unattainable.  For these reasons, we feel the Student Learning indicator is invalid and unfair as evidence of educator proficiency and adds no value to the Educator Evaluation process… The placement of the Student Learning indicator in Standard II compounds the concerns we have around its validity” |
| Sharon Public Schools | Evidence of student learning in evaluation: The district opposes the use of student test results in educator evaluation. “Now that the Race to the Top program and the No Child Left Behind Act are both defunct – and parents, teachers, and students are increasingly repudiating a culture of over-testing – the time is now to reject the practice of linking test scores to teacher evaluations.” |
| Somerville School Committee Resolution | Opposition to the student learning indicator: The committee asserts concerns about the validity of student learning indicator. “WHEREAS, the definition of “expected impact” in the proposed amendments and how it will be measured for each educator is ambiguous, and… showing causality between student achievement on only a select number of assessments and educator performance may lead to a faulty correlation, and… an educator’s performance on the proposed student learning indicator could impact both the plan duration and the overall summative rating that an educator receives, greatly increasing the stakes of the outcome on this indicator.”Evidence of student learning in evaluation: The committee asserts that district improvement is possible without connecting student performance to individual educators. “BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Committee believes that a district can make significant growth without having to tie student performance to individual teachers.” |
| **Full List of Commenters** |
| **Comment**  | **Name** | **Affiliation** | **Role** |
| 1 | Nancy MacLachlan | Marshfield Public School District | Teacher |
| 2 | Johanna Wilson | Hamilton Wenham Regional School District | 6-12 Digital Learning Coach |
| 3 & 180 | Rick Tancrati | Unknown | Unknown |
| 4 | David Piper | Cambridge Public School District | Teacher |
| 5 | Erin Hogan | Unknown | Teacher |
| 6 | Stefanie Mattera | Unknown | Unknown |
| 7 | Mike (no last name given) | Unknown | Teacher |
| 8 | Edward  Weissman | Unknown | Teacher |
| 9 | Zachary Rogers | Fall River Public Schools | Unknown |
| 10 | Erin Dominov | Fall River Public Schools | Teacher |
| 11 | Ben Coleman | Unknown | Teacher |
| 12 | Sue Densmore | Triton Regional | Teacher/President Triton Regional Teachers Assn |
| 13 | Linda Juliano | Unknown | Retired Teacher |
| 14 | Ann O'Keeffe | MTA | Member |
| 15 | Christine Mandeville | Fall River Public Schools | Teacher |
| 16 | Cheryl Key | Unknown | Parent & Teacher |
| 17 | Dawn Richardson | Unknown | Unknown |
| 18 | Christine Cosgrove | Silver Lake Regional School District | Teacher |
| 19 | Joel Patterson | Unknown | Teacher |
| 20 | Nancy P. McLellan  | Marshfield Public Schools | Teacher |
| 21 | Brad Burns | Brandeis University | Unknown |
| 22 | Lynn Major | Unknown | Teacher |
| 23 | Jessica Harms  | Acton-Boxborough Regional High School | Teacher |
| 24 | Jennifer A. Vacca | Acton-Boxborough Public Schools | Teacher |
| 25 | Deborah Bookis  | The Acton-Boxborough Regional School District Administration and the Acton-Boxborough Education Association | Unknown |
| 26 | Glenn Brand | The Acton-Boxborough Regional School District Administration and the Acton-Boxborough Education Association | Unknown |
| 27 | Patrick Grucela | Acton-Boxborough Public Schools | Unknown |
| 28 | Kristine Daniels | Unknown | Teacher |
| 29 | Sharon Alwardt | Unknown | Teacher |
| 30 | Sara Mann  | Acton-Boxborough Regional School District | Teacher |
| 31 | Erin Taylor | Unknown | Unknown |
| 32 | Anna Tarshish | Unknown | Unknown |
| 33 | Unknown | Unknown | Teacher |
| 34 | Katrina Lutkus | Lowell Public Schools | Teacher |
| 35 | Rob Sutton | Unknown | Teacher |
| 36 | Rosemary Linc | Unknown | Unknown |
| 37 | Craig McMahan  | Belmont Public Schools | Teacher |
| 38 | Rachel Silver | Unknown | Teacher |
| 39 | Santha Parke | Unknown | Unknown |
| 40 | Judy Roberts | Unknown | Teacher |
| 41 | Eric Goldstein  | Unknown | Teacher |
| 42 | Adeline M. Bee | Tri-County Regional Vocational Technical High School Committee | AEA PresidentMTA District 38E Director |
| 43 | Alison Sanders-Fleming | Unknown | Unknown |
| 44 | Doreen Whalen-Shea | Unknown | Teacher |
| 45 | James Murphy | Flavin and Flavin Real Estate  | Teacher & Parent |
| 46 | Donna J. Buckley | Unknown | Unknown |
| 47 | Robert Deveau | Tri-County | Teacher |
| 48 | Elisabeth H. Zimmer | Wellesley Public Schools | School Librarian |
| 49 | Lisa M. Quental | Unknown | Teacher |
| 50 | Ann Paulus | Nauset Regional Middle School | Teacher |
| 51 | Melissa Mager | Wrentham | Teacher |
| 52 | Eileen Claveloux | Easthampton Public Schools | Teacher |
| 53 | Mary Sterling | Unknown | Educational Consultant |
| 54 | Cynthia McCabe-Holmes | Unknown | Teacher |
| 55 | Mike Gillen | Unknown | Teacher |
| 56 | Karen Tokos | Newton Public Schools | Unknown |
| 57 | Kathy Joyce  | Hingham Public Schools | Teacher |
| 58 | Brian Fitzgerald | Unknown | Unknown |
| 59 | Susan Bergquist | Taunton Public Schools | Unknown |
| 60 | Kara Dougherty | MFA | President |
| 61 | Susan Boyer | Norwell Public Schools | Teacher |
| 62 | Maryann Morrill | Unknown | Unknown |
| 63 | Karen Thorn | Ralph C. Mahar Regional School | Library Media Specialist |
| 64 | Maureen Sullivan | Plymouth Public Schools | Teacher |
| 65 | Irene McGinnis | Plymouth Public Schools | Teacher |
| 66 | Ann Nadler | Plymouth Public Schools | Teacher |
| 67 | Unknown | MTA ITS | Teacher |
| 68 | Anne-Marie Ross | Plymouth Public Schools | Teacher |
| 69 | Barbara M. Pagnotti | Unknown | Teacher |
| 70 | Jennifer Marchesiani | Unknown | Teacher |
| 71 | Timothy Walt | Plymouth Public Schools | Teacher |
| 72 | Amanda Pinto  | Plymouth Public Schools | Teacher |
| 73 | Jaime S. Barry | Plymouth Public Schools | Teacher |
| 74 | Katuska Lecaro- McGrath | Plymouth Public Schools | Teacher |
| 75 | Laura Dolan  | Unknown | Teacher |
| 76 | Thomas Matias | Unknown | Unknown |
| 77 | Beverley A. Daniel | Unknown | Retired Teacher |
| 78 | Lyndsay Caron | Unknown | Teacher |
| 79 | Christina Smith | Unknown | Unknown |
| 80 | Dennis Heaton | Unknown | Retired Massachusetts Teacher and MTA Member |
| 81 | John Daley | Unknown | Teacher |
| 82 | Michael C. Csorba | Unknown | Teacher |
| 83 | Bill Hayes | Unknown | Retired Teacher |
| 84 | Julianne Barry | Plymouth Public Schools | Teacher |
| 85 | Michael Breda | Everett Public Schools | Teacher |
| 86 | Barbara Pisano | Somerville Public Schools | Teacher |
| 87 | Tim Lane | Unknown | Teacher |
| 88 | Mark Kirwan | Somerville Public Schools | Teacher |
| 89 | Amanda Patrick | Unknown | Teacher |
| 90 | Gretchen Lane | Unknown | Teacher |
| 91 | Carole Phillips | Somerville Public Schools | Teacher |
| 92 | Amy Stubblefield | Brockton Public Schools | Teacher |
| 93 | Judith Haughey | Unknown | Teacher |
| 94 | Peter Schoonmaker | Sharon Public Schools | Teacher |
| 95 | Jennifer C. Thibert  | Taunton Public Schools | Teacher |
| 96 | Melissa Hogan | Unknown | Teacher |
| 97 | Karen LaPointe | Unknown | Teacher |
| 98 | Tim Marshall | Plymouth Public Schools | Teacher |
| 99 | Jessica Alderman | Unknown | Teacher |
| 100 | Barbara Coughlin  | Wayland Public Schools | Mathematics Department Head |
| 101 | Linda Small | Unknown | Speech-Language Pathologist (Retired) |
| 102 | Garrett Zecker | Unknown | Unknown |
| 103 | Steven Bredberg | Unknown | Unknown |
| 104 | Margaret Bodine | Unknown | Retired Teacher |
| 105 | Mary Jo Running | Norwell Public Schools | Teacher |
| 106 | Brittany Wright  | Marlborough Public Schools  | Teacher |
| 107 | Lynn Legiadre | Chicopee Public Schools | Teacher |
| 108 | Prosper Kasrel | Weston Public Schools | Teacher |
| 109 | Julianna Keyes | Unknown | Unknown |
| 110 | Julie Sahlas and Maria Medeiros | Somerville | Teachers |
| 111 | Janna Comeau | Unknown | Teacher |
| 112 | Eileen Vath | Dennis-Yarmouth Regional School District | Teacher |
| 113 | Jody Olson | Dennis-Yarmouth Regional School District | Unknown |
| 114 | Mike Logan | Taunton Public Schools | Unknown |
| 115 | Maureen Devlin  | Unknown | Unknown |
| 116 | Louise G. Anthony | Unknown | Retired Teacher |
| 117 | Robynne Ryan Lamber  | Unknown | Teacher |
| 118 | James Robson | Unknown | Teacher |
| 119 | Melissa Chaves | Taunton Public Schools | Teacher |
| 120 | Jen Legge | Dennis Yarmouth | Teacher |
| 121 | Susan Mucci | Unknown | Unknown |
| 122 | Jason Peledge | Lincoln Public Schools | Teacher |
| 123 | Barbara Garvey | Unknown | Teacher |
| 124 | Robin L. Quist  | Clinton Public Schools | Band Director |
| 125 | Danielle McMahon | Unknown | Unknown |
| 126 | Maureen Denney | Unknown | Teacher |
| 127 | Mike Mason | Medfield Public Schools | Teacher |
| 128 | Agnes Gallant | Somerville Public Schools | Teacher |
| 129 | Edward O'Brien | Somerville Public Schools | Teacher/Counselor |
| 130 | Mary Vaughn | Somerville Public Schools | Teacher |
| 131 | Elizabeth Doneghey | Somerville Public Schools | Crisis Counselor |
| 132 | Samantha Marcario | Unknown | Teacher |
| 133 | Timothy Dempsey  | Somerville Public Schools | Teacher/Counselor |
| 134 | Dawn Golf | Unknown | Unknown |
| 135 | Jamie Leahy | Unknown | Teacher |
| 136 | Laurie Foley | Somerville Public Schools | Teacher |
| 137 | Kristina Haugh | Dennis-Yarmouth Regional School District | School Counselor |
| 138 | Jamal Halawa | Somerville Public Schools | Teacher |
| 139 | Kathleen Bent | Cape Cod Community College | Professor |
| 140 | Ksenija Broks | Medfield Public Schools | Teacher |
| 141 | Sarah Brown | Unknown | Teacher |
| 142 | Mary Ellen Redmond | Unknown | Teacher |
| 143 | Anna Maria Melito | Melrose Public Schools | Teacher |
| 144 | Kathryn Keeley | Plymouth | Teacher |
| 145 | Kathy Kenney | Unknown | Unknown |
| 146 | Patrick Lamusta | Unknown | Unknown |
| 147 | Lori Silveira | Unknown | Teacher |
| 148 | Colleen Gordon | Unknown | Teacher |
| 149 & 227 | Colin Everett | Old Rochester Regional  | Teacher |
| 150 | Alicia Jasiekiewicz | Wachusett Regional School District | Teacher |
| 151 | Lisa Mac Donald | Unknown | Teacher |
| 152 | Elizabeth LaMonica | Unknown | Teacher |
| 153 | Milena Rosecan | Unknown | Parent & Teacher |
| 154 | Margaret Thomas | Melrose Public Schools | Teacher |
| 155 | Jill Juliano | Unknown | Teacher |
| 156 | Nicole Di Donato | Unknown | Teacher |
| 157 | Deborah Pacino | Somerville Public Schools | Teacher |
| 158 | Elizabeth Hellman | Dedham Public Schools | Teacher |
| 159 | Barbara Strell | Unknown | Unknown |
| 160 | Rachel Grodman | Unknown | Unknown |
| 161 | Matthew Koslowski | Somerville Public Schools | Teacher |
| 162 | Sarah Dorer | Bedford Public Schools | Teacher |
| 163 | Tom Serino | Somerville Public Schools | Teacher/Counselor |
| 164 | Theresa M. Nickerson | Unknown | Teacher |
| 165 | Melanie Lean  | Old Rochester Regional | Teacher |
| 166 | Chrissy Cleary | Somerville Public Schools | Teacher |
| 167 | Alison Kase | Somerville | Unknown |
| 168 | Alexandra Mastria,  | Somerville Public Schools | Teacher |
| 169 | Stevany Matthews | Milford Public Schools | Teacher |
| 170 | Cynthia Stern | Somerville Public Schools | Teacher |
| 171 | Brigid O’Donnell | Hamilton-Wenham Regional School District | Teacher |
| 172 | Alyssa Cavicchi | Plymouth Public Schools | Unknown |
| 173 | Heather Saniuk | Unknown | Teacher |
| 174 | Lisa Zullo | Unknown | Unknown |
| 175 | Malulani Sherlock | Northampton Public Schools | Educational Support Personnel |
| 176 | Louise Mahoney | Brockton Public Schools | Unknown |
| 177 | Elizabeth Cohen | Brockton Public Schools | Teacher |
| 178 | Colette Berard | Andover Public School District | Teacher |
| 179 | James Pringle | Tewksbury School District | Teacher |
| 180 | Katie Crow | Belmont Public Schools | Teacher |
| 181 & 3 | Rick Tancrati | Unknown | Unknown |
| 182 | Joel Blackmer | Unknown | Teacher |
| 183 | Sandra Ferrara | Unknown | Teacher |
| 184 | John Souto | Unknown | Teacher |
| 185 | Carole A. Gallo | Tewksbury Public Schools | Teacher |
| 186 | Cliff Gallant | Belmont Public Schools | Teacher |
| 187 | Cordae M Higgins | Unknown | Teacher |
| 188 | Aveva Manning | Somerville Public Schools  | Teacher |
| 189 | Lorie Kelly  | Lynnfield Teachers' Association | President |
| 190 | Gina Garro | Unknown | Teacher |
| 191 | Adriana Nastari | Unknown | Teacher |
| 192 | Maureen Colgan Posner | Unknown | Teacher |
| 193 | Maureen Robichaux | Somerville Public Schools | Teacher |
| 194 | Jose Libano | Sharon Public Schools | Principal |
| 195 | Mary Kaplan | Sharon Public Schools | School Committee Chair |
| 196 | Bernadette Murphy | Sharon Public Schools | STA President |
| 197 | Timothy Farmer | Sharon Public Schools | Superintendent |
| 198 | Nicole DaSilva  | Unknown | Teacher |
| 199 | Tim Dunphy | Somerville Public Schools | Teacher |
| 200 | Jennifer A. Loftus | Brockton Public Schools  | Teacher |
| 201 | Noreen Sacca | Belmont Public Schools | Teacher |
| 202 | William Broaddus | Hampshire Regional School District | Teacher |
| 203 | Janet Flaherty | Belmont Public Schools | Teacher |
| 204 | Heather Hughes | Scituate Public Schools | Teacher |
| 205 | Eliza B. Greene | Acton-Boxborough Regional School District | Teacher |
| 206 | Jack Haverty | Somerville Public Schools | Special Education Coordinator  |
| 207 | Emma Mrozicki | Somerville Public Schools | Teacher |
| 208 | MaryAnn Beaton | Somerville Public Schools | Clinical Coordinator |
| 209 | Becky Cogbill | Medford Public Schools | Teacher |
| 210 | Jaime Lane | Unknown | Unknown |
| 211 | Jo M. Sullivan | Unknown | (Retired) Principal and Assistant Supt.  |
| 212 | Nili Pearlmutter | Cambridge Public Schools | Match Coach |
| 213 | Jeremy Wein | Melrose Public Schools | Teacher |
| 214 | Kerri A. Scott | Melrose Public Schools | Teacher |
| 215 | Nancy Canducci​  | Unknown | Teacher |
| 216 | Patrice Hobbs | Somerville Public Schools | Unknown |
| 217 | Gloria Salazar | Somerville Public Schools | Teacher |
| 218 & 225 | Andrea Lavin | Plymouth Public Schools | Teacher |
| 219 | Sarah E. Pierson | Belmont Public Schools | Teacher |
| 220 | Linda M. Walsh | Somerville Public Schools | Teacher |
| 221 | Erin A. LaBelle | Unknown | Teacher |
| 222 | Deborah A. Lewis | Somerville Public Schools | Teacher |
| 223 | Margaret Colman | Somerville Public Schools | Teacher |
| 224 | Eduardo Cruz | Somerville Public Schools | Teacher |
| 225 & 218 | Andrea Lavin | Plymouth Public Schools | Teacher |
| 226 | Allison Graham Cox | Quincy Education Association | President |
| 227 & 149 | Colin Everett | Old Rochester Professional Educators Association | President |
| 228 | Mary Beth Morgan | Somerville Public Schools | Teacher |
| 229 | Patricia Smith | Hamilton-Wenham Regional School District | Teacher |
| 230 | Robyn Hakala | Town of Tewksbury | Unknown |
| 231 | Elizabeth A. Keane | Brockton Public Schools | Teacher |
| 232 | Kate Hayashi | Belmont Public Schools | Teacher |
| 233 | Jenna DiNovis | Somerville Public Schools | Teacher |
| 234 | Emily Tersoff | Unknown | School Librarian |
| 235 | Cathy Cummins | Assabet Valley Collaborative | Executive Director |
| 236 | Carla Cafarella | Old Rochester Regional District | Teacher |
| 237 | Dan Monahan | President | Cambridge Education Association |
| 238 | Diane Palombo | Old Rochester Regional | Teacher |
| 239 | Christine Evans | Burlington Public Schools | Teacher |
| 240 | JoAnn Hall | Brockton Public Schools | Teacher |
| 241 | Michelle E. Dunn | Unknown | Teacher/ President, Dennis-Yarmouth Educators’ Association |
| 242 | Joan Dabrowski, Ed. D.  | Wellesley Public Schools | Assistant Superintendent |
| 243 | Fred Hopkins  | Andover Public Schools | Teacher |
| 244 | Ryan Sullivan | Brockton Public Schools | Unknown |
| 245 | Barbara Madeloni | Massachusetts Teachers Association  | President |
| 246 | Thomas J. Gosnell | AFT Massachusetts                      | President  |
| 247 | ​Renee Drueke | Andover Public Schools | Teacher |
| 248 | Kimberly DiNapoli | Unknown | Teacher |
| 249 | Lisa Donovan        | Melrose Education Association | Teacher/President |
| 250 | Linda M. Noonan  | Massachusetts Business Alliance for Education | Executive Director |
| 251 | Sarah Fisher | Unknown | Teacher |
| 252 | Robert Singer | Unknown | School Psychologist |
| 253 | Jessica U. MacMartin | Somerville Public Schools | Teacher |
| 254 | Marjorie Sheridan | Brockton Public Schools | Teacher |
| 255 | Roy Gardner | Somerville Public Schools | Teacher |
| 256 | Scott Andrade | Unknown | Parent |
| 257 | Susan Silva | Brockton Public Schools | Teacher |
| 258 | Thomas Scott  | Massachusetts Association of School Superintendents | Executive Director |
| 259 | Richard M. Rogers | MESPA | Executive Director |
| 260 | William Gaine | MSSAA | Executive Director |