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On June 28, 2011, the Board of Elementary and Secondary Education adopted new regulations to guide the evaluation of all educators serving in positions requiring a license. The regulations and the evaluation system they define are intended to:

* Promote the 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.

The Massachusetts educator evaluation framework comprises two independent but linked ratings:

* **Summative Performance Rating:** rates an educator's practice against four statewide [Standards of Effective Teaching](http://www.doe.mass.edu/lawsregs/603cmr35.html?section=03)[[1]](#footnote-1) or [Administrator Leadership Practice](http://www.doe.mass.edu/lawsregs/603cmr35.html?section=04)[[2]](#footnote-2), as well as an educator's progress toward attainment of professional practice and student learning goals.
* **Student Impact Rating:** a determination of an educator’s impact on student learning, informed by patterns and trends in student learning, growth, and/or achievement based on results from statewide growth measures, where available, and district-determined measures (DDMs).

Taken together, these two ratings are designed to help educators reflect not only on their professional practice, but also the impact they are having on their students’ learning. At the November 25th meeting, I will present to the Board the statewide Summative Performance Rating data from the 2013-14 school year. I will be joined by Department staff members Robert Curtin, Simone Lynch and Claire Abbott.

#

# Background: Intersection between the Summative Performance and the Student Impact Ratings

As described above, a Summative Performance Rating is a rating of educator practice and a Student Impact Rating is a rating of educator impact on student learning, growth, and/or achievement. These two ratings are independent, but intersect to provide educators and evaluators with a more complete picture of educator effectiveness (see Figure 1).

Figure 1: Intersection of Summative Performance and Student Impact Ratings

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

This intersection results in a number of opportunities for educator growth and development.

* **Type and Length of Plan:** The Summative Performance Rating determines the type of plan; the Student Impact Rating has a direct impact on the length of the plan for experienced educators rated *proficient* or *exemplary*.
* **Rewards and Recognition:** The intersection of Summative Performance Ratings of *proficient* or *exemplary* and Student Impact Ratings of *moderate* or *high* result in opportunities for educator recognition and reward.
* **Investigating Discrepancies:** A discrepancy between an educator’s two ratings serves as a signal for further exploration between the evaluator and educator.

**Implementation Timeline**

Districts are implementing the new educator evaluation framework and submitting Summative Performance and Student Impact Ratings in accordance with the following timeline:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| SY: 2012-13  | Race to the Top (RTTT) districts implement and issue Summative Performance Ratings for a minimum of 50% of educators |
| SY: 2013-14  | RTTT districts implement and issue Summative Performance Ratings for 100% of educators, and non-RTTT districts implement and issue Summative Performance Ratings for at least 50% of educators |
| SY:2014-15  | All districts issue Summative Performance Ratings for 100% of educators; all districts collect year 1 student data to inform Student Impact Ratings\* |
| SY:2015-16 | All districts issue Summative Performance Ratings and Student Impact Ratings with 100% of educators |

\*As noted above, Student Impact Ratings will not be available until the end of the 2015/16 school year.

**The 2013-14 Summative Performance Ratings Data**

Close to 71,700 educators in 372 districts were evaluated using systems aligned to the new state framework in 2013-14. Statewide, 86.5 percent of educators evaluated last year were rated Proficient. Smaller percentages of educators received the highest performance rating of Exemplary (8.1 percent) or a rating of Needs Improvement (4.8 percent). Less than one percent of educators were rated as Unsatisfactory (0.5 percent).

Below is the overall state rating summary by group:

* **All Educators:** Statewide, 8.1 percent were rated Exemplary, 86.5 percent were Proficient, 4.8 percent were Needs Improvement, and 0.5 percent were Unsatisfactory.
* **Administrators:** Statewide, 12.9 percent were rated Exemplary, 83.5 percent were Proficient, 3.4 percent were Needs Improvement, and 0.1 percent were Unsatisfactory.
* **Principals:** Statewide, 11.3 percent were rated Exemplary, 84.1 percent were Proficient, 4.4 percent were Needs Improvement, and 0.2 percent were Unsatisfactory.
* **Teachers with Professional Teacher Status:** Statewide, 8.3 percent were rated Exemplary, 88.2 percent were Proficient, 3.1 percent were Needs Improvement, and 0.4 percent were Unsatisfactory.
* **Teachers without Professional Teacher Status:** Statewide, 3.5 percent were rated Exemplary, 85.3 percent were Proficient, 10.4 percent were Needs Improvement, and 0.9 percent were Unsatisfactory.
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