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# Executive Summary

Massachusetts has much to be proud of in K-12 public education. Our schools are recognized as best in class among the states, and our students perform at academic levels commensurate with the highest performing education systems in the world. Yet despite our overall success, substantial gaps in student outcomes persist in our state, and too often, those gaps are correlated with students’ racial/ethnic identification, family economic background, disability status, and English language proficiency.

In Massachusetts, students who are economically disadvantaged, students of color, English Learners, and students with disabilities are more likely than their peers to be assigned to teacher and principals who are inexperienced, teaching out of field, and/or lowerrated. These student groups also experience gaps in educational attainment across multiple measures, such as state assessment performance levels and graduation rates. The root causes of these educational gaps are complex. The [2015 Massachusetts State Equity Plan](http://www.doe.mass.edu/educators/equitableaccess/Plan.docx) outlines how the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (ESE) is tackling a key root cause: lower rates of access to experienced, in-field and highly rated educators. As research routinely shows, teachers and principals are the in-school factors with the greatest influence on students’ academic and post-academic success.[[1]](#footnote-1)

This update to the 2015 Equity Plan describes ESE’s continued work at the state level to ensure that students who are most at-risk have access to excellent educators. In addition to providing an overview of recent, current and ongoing ESE initiatives to promote equitable access to educators, this document also provides an introduction and links to resources that districts can use when developing local equity strategies. Many strategies aimed at equity are better-suited to the district level, and some appear in discussion of the Educational Equity Professional Learning Network (page 28). Achieving more equitable access to educators will be the joint work of ESE, districts and schools—as well as partner organizations such as educator preparation programs and community advocacy groups.

This document provides updated information on the key strategies outlined in the 2015 Equity Plan, analyzes additional forms of equity data, and describes new Department initiatives related to equitable access. Such information will be useful to a variety of stakeholders: district leaders can learn about existing resources to support local equity work; community and advocacy groups can learn more about issues where they can effect change; and all stakeholders can learn about statewide equity data and how it relates to diverse areas of education policy.

**The Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (ESE)’s Role**  
ESE’s role regarding equitable access is to:

1. Clearly define and communicate the measures of excellent educators and the meaning of equitable access;
2. Examine and make available the data on inequities in access to educators;
3. Identify and share with districts the research and best practices in eliminating equity gaps;
4. Implement state-level policies and strategies to support districts in this work;
5. Monitor, assess and report on progress in closing equity gaps;
6. Support districts in their analysis of access data, development of equity strategies, and progress monitoring of those strategies;
7. Use our position as a state agency to communicate the importance of providing students—especially those with the greatest need—with access to the educators who will serve them best. This communication aims to catalyze action and reinforce the importance of equitable access.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Examples of state gaps in access to educators** | | |
| Experienced educators | In-field educators | Educators rated Exemplary/Proficient (E/P) |
| Hispanic/Latino and African American/Black students are 50% more likely than white students to be assigned to a teacher with fewer than three years of experience. | Classes in high-poverty schools are more than eight times as likely to be taught by out-of-field teachers, compared to classes in more affluent schools. | In schools with the largest populations of economically disadvantaged students and students of color, the turnover rate of teachers rated E/P is about twice that of schools with the lowest populations of these student groups. |

# Definitions

The following are definitions of terms for use in this report:

**Economically Disadvantaged Students:**

* Prior to the 2014–15 school year, “low income students” referred to students enrolled in or eligible for free or reduced price lunch
* In 2014–15 school year and beyond: “economically disadvantaged students” are students who are participating in one or more of the following state-administered programs: the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP); the Transitional Assistance for Families with Dependent Children (TAFDC); the Department of Children and Families’ (DCF) foster care program; and eligible MassHealth programs (Medicaid).

**Educator:**  Any person employed by a school or school district in a position requiring a license ([603 CMR 7.02](http://www.doe.mass.edu/lawsregs/603cmr7.html?section=02)), including teachers and administrators ([603 CMR 35.02](http://www.doe.mass.edu/lawsregs/603cmr35.html?section=02)).

**Educator Preparation:** All steps involved in the ways in which prospective teachers and administrators can be prepared for a career in education. This includes Institutes of Higher Education and other educator preparation programs (EPPS); multiple pathways to the profession; and licensure.

**English Learners** [are children who](http://www.doe.mass.edu/ell/):

1. have indicated a language other than English on the Home Language Survey; AND
2. are less than proficient on an English language proficiency assessment; AND
3. are unable to perform ordinary classroom work in English

**Evaluation Ratings:** The [Massachusetts Evaluation Framework](http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeval/) leads to a Summative Performance Rating. The two higher ratings are **Exemplary and Proficient**, while the two lower ratings are **Needs Improvement and Unsatisfactory**. The roll-out for implementation of the Evaluation Framework is now complete. All districts are expected to be evaluating all educators, including teachers and administrators. According to the implementation timeline, at the end of the 2014–15 school year, every educator will have a Summative Performance Rating based on the 2014–15 school year (and some may have a rating from a previous evaluation cycle).[[2]](#footnote-2)

* Summative Performance Rating: At the end of the five-step evaluation cycle, each educator is assigned a [Summative Performance Rating](http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeval/resources/QRG-SummativeRating.pdf). This rating assesses an educator’s practice against four statewide Standards of Effective Teaching or Administrator Leadership Practice, as well as an educator’s progress toward attainment of his/her professional practice and student learning goals. In the Summative Performance Rating, the evaluator classifies the teacher or administrator’s “professional practice” into one of four performance levels: Exemplary, Proficient, Needs Improvement, or Unsatisfactory. The evaluator applies her/his professional judgment to determine this rating based on multiple categories of evidence related to the four Standards, including classroom observations and artifacts of instruction; multiple measures of student learning, growth, and achievement; and student feedback (in the case of all educators) and staff feedback (in the case of administrators). The evaluator also applies her/his professional judgment to assess all of the evidence related to an educator’s goals and determines the extent to which the educator is progressing toward each goal.
* Student growth plays a significant factor in the Summative Performance Rating in three ways. First, multiple measures of student learning, growth, and achievement are a required source of evidence. An evaluator will review outcomes from student measures that an educator has collected to make judgments about the effectiveness of the educator’s practice related to one or more of the four Standards. Such evidence may be from classroom assessments, projects, portfolios, and district or state assessments. Second, evaluators must consider progress toward attainment of the educator’s student learning goal when determining the Summative Performance Rating. Third, the Board of Elementary and Secondary Education (BESE) recently voted to amend the regulations to educator evaluation and include a student learning indicator within the Summative Performance Rating. Student growth is a significant factor in the student learning indicator, as the judgment about an educator’s progress is derived from the evaluator’s judgment of student outcomes based on multiple measures of learning, growth, and achievement.

**Excellent Educators:** Excellent educators are successful on a variety of measures, with no one-size-fits-all formula for qualifying as “excellent.” The one criteria is that excellent educators receive a Proficient or Exemplary Summative Performance Rating on the Educator Evaluation Framework. The combination of other characteristics to consider includes: teacher performance, impact on students, years of experience, and in-field status. This does not mean that an educator must have each characteristic, such as many years of experience, in order to be considered “excellent” when taking a holistic view of educator quality. ESE recognizes that a single measure is not what can or should define an Excellent Educator, and that by taking a broader view of educator quality, we can better see the picture of student access to Excellent Educators across the state.

**High Poverty Quartile Schools (HPQs):** The highest poverty schools are those schools within the highest quartile in the state for enrollment of low income students. The data source for this definition changed during the 2014–15 school year (see above, “economically disadvantaged students”).

**High Needs Students:** An unduplicated count of all students in a school or district belonging to at least one of the following individual subgroups: students with disabilities, English Learners (ELs) and former ELs (FLEP)[[3]](#footnote-3), or low income students. Students may be included in more than one category.

**High Minority Quartile Schools (HMQs):** The highest minority schools are those schools within the highest quartile in the state for enrollment of students of color.

**Highly Qualified Teacher (HQT):** A teacher who has demonstrated [subject matter competency](http://www.doe.mass.edu/educators/title-iia/hq/hq_faq.html?section=competency) in one of the [core academic subjects](http://www.doe.mass.edu/educators/title-iia/hq/hq_faq.html?section=subjects), is fully licensed, and holds a bachelor’s degree.

**Out-of-Field:**

* Out-of-Field Teacher: a core academic teacher[[4]](#footnote-4) who has not demonstrated an understanding of the content, and is therefore not Highly Qualified for the subject/s he or she teaches for more than 20 percent of his or her schedule[[5]](#footnote-5)
* Out-of-field Administrator: an administrator who does not hold the specific license for the role he or she performs for more than 20 percent of his or her schedule

**Quartiles:** ESE has used quartiles to identify certain equity gaps, comparing the top and bottom quartiles (one quarter of a designated group). Unless otherwise stated, this group is statewide. For the purposes of this plan, ESE has specifically used the following:

* HPQ versus LPQ: high poverty quartile versus low poverty quartile
* HMQ versus LMQ: high minority quartile versus low minority quartile

**Students of Color:** Students who are American Indian/Alaska Native, Asian, Black, Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander, Hispanic, or two or more races. The term “students of color” is used interchangeably with the term “minority.”

**Unqualified Educator:** An educator who does not hold a valid Massachusetts license.

**Unprepared Educator:** A teacher who only holds a Preliminary License, meaning the educator has a Bachelor’s degree and has demonstrated subject knowledge but has not completed an educator preparation program.

**Waiver:** Also referred to as a “hardship waiver,” a waiver is an exemption accorded during the time period of any one school year. The waiver excuses the school district from the requirement to employ licensed or certified personnel in accordance with Massachusetts state regulations.

This waiver is granted to a district by the Commissioner upon the request of a superintendent, with demonstration to the Commissioner that the district has made a good faith effort to hire licensed or certified personnel and has been unable to find a licensed or certified candidate qualified for the position. Persons employed under waivers must demonstrate that they meet minimum requirements as established by ESE and are [making continuous progress toward meeting the licensure or certification requirements](http://www.mass.gov/edu/government/departments-and-boards/ese/programs/educator-effectiveness/licensure/districts/how-continuous-progress-is-calculated-for-an-additional.html) in the field in which they are employed.

# Equity Gap Data

## Equity Gap 1: Educator Experience

During their first years in the classroom, teachers are disproportionately serving children who are economically disadvantaged, students of color, and/or English Learners (ELs)[[6]](#footnote-6) —and are disproportionately working in low performing schools. Similarly, students in these subgroups are more likely than their peers to have novice principals.[[7]](#footnote-7) An educator’s years of experience do not always correspond with impact on student outcomes; however, research tends to indicate that on average, inexperienced teachers are less effective than their colleagues.

#### Inexperienced Teachers

When analyzing statewide data at the student level, students who are economically disadvantaged, students of color, or ELs are more likely to be assigned to first-year teachers. The graph below shows the proportion of students in a subgroup assigned to at least one first-year teacher. While ESE does not assume that less experienced educators are uniformly less effective, the substantial gaps in student access to experienced teachers call for further analysis and action.[[8]](#footnote-8)

![% of students assigned to first-year teachers

Non-economically disadvantaged: 30.8%
Economically disadvantaged: 35.5%
White students: 30%
Students of color: 35.9%
Non-EL: 31.9%
EL: 35.4%
Non-SWD: 32.5%
SWD: 30.7%]()

*Data from SY 2015-16*

The following table indicates the proportion of students’ teacher assignments that were with teachers who were in their first year or did not have Professional Teacher Status (PTS) —an indicator of experience in teachers’ current districts. The data also disaggregates students of color by racial and ethnic groups.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Years in MA | | |  |
|  | % <1 | % 1-2 | % 3+ | % PTS |
| **MA All** | **5.8%** | **10.3%** | **83.9%** | **77.1%** |
| Non-economically disadvantaged | 5.4% | 9.8% | 84.8% | 78.4% |
| Economically disadvantaged | 7.0% | 11.8% | 81.2% | 73.4% |
| Asian | 5.1% | 9.7% | 85.3% | 78.4% |
| Hispanic or Latino | 8.1% | 13.2% | 78.7% | 70.4% |
| African American/Black | 7.6% | 13.2% | 79.2% | 73.2% |
| American Indian or Alaskan Native | 6.0% | 10.7% | 83.3% | 77.2% |
| Multi-race, non-Hispanic or Latino | 5.7% | 10.3% | 84.0% | 76.7% |
| Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander | 5.9% | 9.8% | 84.3% | 77.4% |
| White | 4.9% | 9.2% | 85.8% | 79.2% |
| Students of color (all) | 7.3% | 12.3% | 80.4% | 73.1% |
| Non-EL | 5.7% | 10.2% | 84.1% | 77.5% |
| EL | 7.7% | 12.8% | 79.5% | 70.6% |
| Non-SWD | 5.8% | 10.3% | 83.9% | 77.4% |
| SWD | 5.7% | 10.5% | 83.8% | 75.5% |

*Aggregated data from SY 2013-14, 2014-15, and 2015-16.*

The gaps between some subgroups are not limited to the 2015–16 school year. The data above comes from the previous three years. For example, Hispanic/Latino and African American/Black students were about 50% more likely than white students to be assigned to a teacher with fewer than three years of experience.

Note that the the data in the bar graph on page 9 is different from the data in the table above; the former shows the percentage of students assigned to one or more first-year teachers in 2015–16, while the latter shows the percentage of students’ classes that were taught by first-year teachers, over three years. Bear in mind that elementary students typically have multiple teachers (i.e. homeroom, music, art), and secondary students have even more teachers in a given year.

A notable trend across these data sets shows that students with disabilities (SWDs) are not assigned to first-year teachers at noticeably different rates than their peers, and in the 2015–16 school year, SWDs were slightly less likely to be assigned to one or more novice teachers.

School-level data provides a different perspective on disparities in access to educators. This table shows that teachers working in High Poverty Quartile schools (HPQs) or High Minority Quartile schools (HMQs) are more than twice as likely to be in their first year of practice, compared to teachers in Low Poverty Quartile schools (LPQs) and Low Minority Quartile schools (LMQs), respectively.

*Schools with large populations of economically disadvantaged students and students of color employ novice teachers at more than twice the rate of schools in the lowest quartile of these populations.*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Percent of first-year teachers | | | | |
| MA All | HPQ | LPQ | HMQ | LMQ |
| 7.0 | 11.4 | 5.3 | 11.1 | 5.0 |
| *Data from SY 2015-16* | | | | |

#### Inexperienced School Leaders (Principals and Assistant Principals)

Principals generally grow in effectiveness as they gain experience—significantly so in their first three years.[[9]](#footnote-9) Studies have found that principal effectiveness increases over time at about the same rate as teacher effectiveness.[[10]](#footnote-10)

*High-poverty schools are 85% more likely than more affluent schools to have a first-year school leader.*

Students who are economically disadvantaged, students of color, and ELs are more likely to attend a school with at least one first-year school leader.

![% of students assigned to schools with first-year school leaders

Non-economically disadvantaged: 11.0%
Economically disadvantaged: 13.6%
White students: 10.2%
Students of color: 14.4%
Non-EL: 11.4%
EL: 15.4%
Non-SWD: 11.7%
SWD: 11.8%]()

*Data from SY 2015-16*

Compared to LPQs, about 85% more HPQs have first-year school leaders. Proportionately, the rate of first-year leaders in LPQs and LMQs is noticeably lower than the rate for the state overall (seven percent). The average Massachusetts public school is 46% more likely to have a first-year principal or assistant principal, compared to schools in the lowest poverty quartile.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Percent of first-year school leaders | | | | |
| MA All | HPQ | LPQ | HMQ | LMQ |
| 7.0 | 8.9 | 4.8 | 9.1 | 5.5 |
| *Data from SY 2015-16* | | | | |

## Equity Gap 2: Educator Preparation

Analysis of the educator preparedness gap compares rates of access to teachers who are teaching in their area of licensure, and to school leaders who are working in a role for which they are licensed. These educators are working “in field.” Examining access to in-field teachers shows some of the largest gaps, proportionally, of all statewide equity data. The gaps appear for economically disadvantaged students, students of color, ELs, and SWDs. This section also provides data on groups’ rates of assignment to Long-Term Substitutes—another way to learn about differences in how often students experience teachers with different levels of certification.

*Classes in high poverty schools are more than eight times as likely to be taught by out-of-field teachers, compared to low poverty schools.*

#### Out-of-field teachers

While Massachusetts has nearly reached its goal of Highly Qualified Teachers (HQTs) teaching 100 percent of classes—the rate was 96.3 percent in 2015–16—some schools and subgroups of students are more likely to experience those teachers who are out-of-field.

![% of students assigned to out-of-field teachers

Non-economically disadvantaged: 7.4%
Economically disadvantaged: 16.2%
White students: 5.5%
Students of color: 17.1%
Non-EL: 8.9%
EL: 20.1%
Non-SWD: 9.6%
SWD: 11.7%]()

*Data from SY 2015-16*

The data above shows that more than three times as many students of color are assigned to out-of-field teachers, compared to white students. Furthermore, economically disadvantaged students and ELs are more than twice as likely to have at least one out-of-field teacher, in relation to their comparison groups.

Given that HPQs and HMQs have far higher rates of classes taught by non-HQT teachers (see table on page 14), we can expect that many of the economically disadvantaged students and students of color who are reflected in the data above were actually assigned to multiple out-of-field teachers. When comparing HPQs to LPQs, and HMQs to LMQs, the out-of-field teacher gap is proportionally larger than the experience and evaluation ratings gaps. A class in an HPQ is more than eight times as likely to be taught by an out-of-field teacher, and a class in a HMQ is more than five times more likely to be taught by an out-of-field teacher.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Percent of classes taught by out-of-field teachers | | | | |
| MA All | HPQ | LPQ | HMQ | LMQ |
| 3.7 | 6.5 | 0.8 | 6.2 | 1.3 |
| *Data from SY 2015-16* | | | | |
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|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Subgroup | % out-of-field | % Long-Term Subs |
| **MA All** | **4.0%** | **1.4%** |
| Non-economically disadvantaged | 3.2% | 1.3% |
| Economically disadvantaged | 6.4% | 1.4% |
| Asian | 3.2% | 1.3% |
| Hispanic or Latino | 7.9% | 1.5% |
| African American/Black | 8.6% | 1.5% |
| American Indian or Alaskan Native | 4.1% | 1.1% |
| Multi-race, non-Hispanic or Latino | 3.7% | 1.4% |
| Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander | 4.7% | 1.3% |
| White | 2.4% | 1.3% |
| All students of color | 6.8% | 1.5% |
| Non-EL | 3.6% | 1.3% |
| EL | 10.0% | 2.1% |
| Non-SWD | 3.7% | 1.4% |
| SWD | 5.9% | 1.3% |

*Aggregated data from SY 2013-14, 2014-15, and 2015-16.*

Hispanic/Latino and African American/Black students are assigned to classes with out-of-field teachers at more than three times the rate of white students. Unlike most sets of equity data, the table above also shows a disparity between SWDs and students without disabilities that does not favor SWDs: they are 59% more likely to be assigned to classes with out-of-field teachers.

*Compared to white students, Hispanic/Latino and African American/Black students were four times as likely to be assigned to an out-of-field teacher.*

This data includes the proportions of subgroups’ assignment to long-term substitute teachers over the past three years—data which represents another important consideration when we compare student access to teachers with different qualifications. Although the proportions of students’ experiences with long-term substitutes are quite low, the magnitude of the disparities is worth noting. For example, ELs are assigned to long-term substitutes at twice the rate of non-ELs.

#### Out-of-field school leaders

*![% of students assigned to schools with out-of-field school leaders

Non-economically disadvantaged: 11.9%
Economically disadvantaged: 12.7%
White students: 10.9%
Students of color: 14.3%
Non-EL: 12.1%
EL: 12.7%
Non-SWD: 12.2%
SWD: 11.7%]()*

*Data from SY 2015-16*

Students of color are more likely to attend schools where the principal and/or an assistant principal is working out-of-field. However, gaps are much smaller for economically disadvantaged students and ELs.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Percent of out-of-field school leaders | | | | |
| MA All | HPQ | LPQ | HMQ | LMQ |
| 8.7 | 12.0 | 6.1 | 14.3 | 6.3 |
| *Data from SY 2015-16* | | | | |

When comparing schools by quartile, school leaders in HPQs and HMQs are about twice as likely to be out-of-field. These disparities, combined with the similar rates of students in comparison subgroups attending schools with at least one out-of-field leader, suggest that there are higher concentrations of out-of-field leaders in HPQs and HMQs; that is, HPQs and HMQs are more likely to have multiple out-of-field school leaders than are LPQs and LMQs.

## Equity Gap 3: Educator Evaluation Summative Ratings

Data showing gaps in student access to educators with Exemplary/Proficient (E/P) ratings reflects patterns in student access to experienced and/or highly qualified educators. Indeed, experience and preparation can affect an educator’s evaluation rating. It is useful to examine the data not only by educators’ summative ratings, but also by their ratings on each of the four [Standards and Indicators of Effective Teaching Practice](http://www.doe.mass.edu/lawsregs/603cmr35.html?section=03).

*Hispanic/Latino students were more than twice as likely as white students to be assigned to a lower-rated teacher.*

#### Lower rated teachers

As with data on access to first-year and out-of-field teachers, SWDs are *not* assigned to teachers rated Needs Improvement/Unsatisfactory (NI/U) at a higher rate than their peers, but we do see equity gaps for other subgroups, albeit a relatively small one for ELs.

*![% of students assigned to teachers rated NI/U

Non-economically disadvantaged: 11.7%
Economically disadvantaged: 16.0%
White students: 11.5%
Students of color: 15.3%
Non-EL: 12.9%
EL: 14.0%
Non-SWD: 12.7%
SWD: 12.7%]()*

*Data from SY 2015-16*

Inequities in access to higher rated teachers are especially striking when comparing the teachers employed by school quartile. HPQs employ lower rated teachers at more than three times the rate of LPQs.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Percent of teachers rated NI/U | | | | |
| MA All | HPQ | LPQ | HMQ | LMQ |
| 3.8 | 6.6 | 2.1 | 5.9 | 3.1 |
| *Data from SY 2015-16* | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Subgroup | Overall NI/U | Standard 1 NI/U | Standard 2 NI/U | Standard 3 NI/U | Standard 4 NI/U |
| **All** | **5.0%** | **5.0%** | **3.9%** | **3.3%** | **3.0%** |
| Non-economically disadvantaged | 4.2% | 4.2% | 3.3% | 2.7% | 2.7% |
| Economically disadvantaged | 7.2% | 7.2% | 5.8% | 4.9% | 4.1% |
| Asian | 3.8% | 3.8% | 2.9% | 2.3% | 2.3% |
| Hispanic or Latino | 8.6% | 8.6% | 7.0% | 6.0% | 4.8% |
| African American/Black | 7.1% | 7.1% | 5.7% | 4.5% | 4.2% |
| American Indian or Alaskan Native | 5.4% | 5.4% | 4.4% | 3.5% | 3.0% |
| Multi-race, non-Hispanic or Latino | 4.9% | 4.9% | 3.8% | 3.1% | 2.8% |
| Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander | 4.5% | 4.5% | 3.5% | 2.8% | 2.9% |
| White | 3.8% | 3.8% | 2.9% | 2.5% | 2.5% |
| All students of color | 7.1% | 7.1% | 5.7% | 4.7% | 4.0% |
| Non-EL | 4.8% | 4.8% | 3.8% | 3.2% | 3.0% |
| EL | 7.7% | 7.7% | 6.1% | 5.2% | 4.2% |
| Non-SWD | 4.9% | 4.9% | 3.9% | 3.3% | 3.0% |
| SWD | 5.4% | 5.4% | 4.3% | 3.5% | 3.4% |

*Aggregated data from SY 2013-14, 2014-15, and 2015-16.*

ESE analyzed data on assignments to teachers receiving higher or lower ratings on each of the four [Standards and Indicators of Effective Teaching Practice](http://www.doe.mass.edu/lawsregs/603cmr35.html?section=03), in addition to overall ratings. Hispanic/Latino students are more than twice as likely as white students to take a class with a teacher rated NI/U, and economically disadvantaged students are 71% as likely to do so as their non-economically disadvantaged peers.

Educator Evaluation Standard 3 includes teachers’ cultural proficiency and parent/family engagement. Students of color are almost twice as likely as white students to be assigned to teachers rated NI/U on Standard 3; in particular, Hispanic/Latino students are more than twice as likely as white students.

#### Lower rated school leaders

![% of students assigned to schools with school leaders rated NI/U

Non-economically disadvantaged: 5.4%
Economically disadvantaged: 8.7%
White students: 5.3%
Students of color: 8.0%
Non-EL: 6.1%
EL: 8.7%
Non-SWD: 6.3%
SWD: 6.2%]()*Data from SY 2015-16*

*Schools with large populations of students of color and economically disadvantaged students are more than three times as likely to have lower-rated school leaders, compared to schools with low populations of these student groups.*

Compared to disparities in student subgroups’ assignments to lower rated teachers, the gaps in experiences with lower rated school leaders are proportionately larger. In particular, economically disadvantaged students are 61% more likely than their peers to attend a school with at least one school leader rated NI/U.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Percent of school leaders rated NI/U | | | | |
| MA All | HPQ | LPQ | HMQ | LMQ |
| 4.6 | 8.6 | 2.7 | 9.1 | 2.4 |
| *Data from SY 2015-16* | | | | |

The proportion of school leaders rated NI/U by school quartile is similar to the proportion of teachers rated NI/U by school quartile. As shown in the data above, students in HPQs and HMQs are more than three times as likely to have lower rated school leaders, compared to students in LPQs and LMQs.

## Turnover rates: lower rated vs. higher rated educators

High rates of educator turnover can impede a school’s progress, and also exacerbate existing achievement gaps, as struggling schools tend to face higher turnover rates.[[11]](#footnote-11) Statewide, HPQs and HMQs generally see higher rates of turnover for both higher and lower rated educators.

#### Teacher turnover rates

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Turnover Rate of Teachers Rated E/P | | | | |
| MA All | HPQ | LPQ | HMQ | LMQ |
| 12.6 | 18.6 | 9.2 | 18.1 | 9.4 |
| Turnover Rate of Teachers Rated NI/U | | | | |
| MA All | HPQ | LPQ | HMQ | LMQ |
| 43.9 | 48.3 | 44.5 | 48.9 | 38.6 |
| *Data from SY 2015-16* | | | | |

For schools in each quartile, lower rated teachers leave at much higher rates than do higher rated teachers. Bear in mind, however, that this does not mean the teachers leave the profession; they may continue working as teachers in another school, district or state.

HMQs and HPQs experience higher rates of turnover for teachers in both sets of summative ratings. However, the discrepancy in turnover rates is larger with higher rated teachers than it is with lower rated teachers. Teachers with E/P ratings leave HMQs and HPQs at about twice the rate of those who leave LMQs and LPQs. From the data on page 16, we know that schools with the highest numbers of students of color and students living in poverty already employ lower rates of teachers rated E/P. Regardless of Educator Evaluation rating, when a teacher leaves a school for any reason, this creates an open position that can potentially be filled by a first-year teacher. Thus, higher rates of turnover in HMQs and HPQs may also exacerbate inequities in students’ access to more experienced teachers.

#### School leader turnover rates

Inequities in rates of principal turnover are especially noteworthy, as they are tied to higher rates of teacher turnover, and diverse other challenges within a school.[[12]](#footnote-12) Even when higher rated principals leave one school for another, they take about five years to settle in and reach their potential to improve that school’s performance.[[13]](#footnote-13)

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Turnover Rate of School Leaders Rated E/P | | | | |
| MA All | HPQ | LPQ | HMQ | LMQ |
| 16.8 | 19.6 | 12.1 | 18.2 | 12.8 |
| Turnover Rate of School Leaders Rated NI/U | | | | |
| MA All | HPQ | LPQ | HMQ | LMQ |
| 40.0 | 28.0 | 30.0 | 35.3 | 46.7 |
| *Data from SY 2015-16* | | | | |

Overall, HMQs and HPQs have higher rates of principal turnover. [[14]](#footnote-14) When comparing turnover rates by summative evaluation ratings, there are inconsistent differences. This applies across years as well. The 2014–15 principal turnover rate data showed much larger differences—and in the opposite direction—between turnover rates of lower rated school leaders by quartile. When viewing this data, note that the number of lower rated school leaders in each quartile is quite small, though HPQs and HMQs have far greater numbers of school leaders rated NI/U.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Number of School Leaders Rated NI/U | | | | |
| MA All | HPQ | LPQ | HMQ | LMQ |
| 110 | 50 | 10 | 51 | 15 |
| *Data from SY 2015-16* | | | | |

Nationally, when a principal leaves a low performing school, the replacement tends to be less experienced and effective than the previous principal. Research on a large urban district found that the effective principals who depart struggling schools are more likely to move on to schools that are already higher performing, and/or have fewer economically disadvantaged students and students of color.[[15]](#footnote-15)

# Strategies to Eliminate Equity Gaps

## Strategy 1: Improve Educator Impact through Educator Preparation (locus of impact: Pipeline and Classroom)

**Addresses**: preparation gap; inadequate preparation; need for training to meet diverse student needs

Addressing educator effectiveness begins with educator preparation. By consistently working to better prepare teacher candidates to serve diverse learners, educator preparation programs (EPPs) can effect lasting outcomes on the performance of all students. Furthermore, as stated above, schools with larger populations of economically disadvantaged students and students of color are more likely to employ novice teachers. Ensuring that these new teachers have experienced quality EPPs helps to mitigate the effects of the gap in student subgroups’ access to experienced teachers.

*The schools with the largest populations of students of color and economically disadvantaged students employ first-year teachers at twice the rate of schools with the smallest populations of these student groups.*

Over the past several years, the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (ESE) has significantly shifted the expectations for EPP design, review and accountability, resulting in a data- and evidence-driven review process, and in more meaningful field-based experiences and assessments for educator candidates.

The [Candidate Assessment of Performance (CAP)](https://mail.doe.mass.edu/owa/redir.aspx?C=spocXiVwYEukv6ZagJ0XLW2VAk_uUtQILCiitkqLLWbFfsiWoZcDfzm9cBm28EgRGTR5smelTno.&URL=http%3a%2f%2fwww.doe.mass.edu%2fedprep%2fcap%2f) is aligned to the [Professional Standards for Teachers](http://www.doe.mass.edu/lawsregs/603cmr7.html?section=08)  and is required of teacher preparation program completers. All Massachusetts teacher preparation programs piloted CAP in the 2015–16 school year. Now in 2016–17, the assessment is fully implemented for all teacher candidates. The corresponding assessment for principal candidates—the [Performance Assessment for Leaders (PAL)](https://mail.doe.mass.edu/owa/redir.aspx?C=spocXiVwYEukv6ZagJ0XLW2VAk_uUtQILCiitkqLLWbFfsiWoZcDfzm9cBm28EgRGTR5smelTno.&URL=http%3a%2f%2fwww.doe.mass.edu%2fpal%2f) —uses performance-based tasks and is in its second year of full implementation. Both CAP and PAL include components emphasizing readiness to serve diverse learners.

The Department, in partnership with EPPs and districts, is also pursuing the goal of preparing all teachers to serve all students from day one in the classroom through a portfolio of projects called [Elevate Preparation: Impact Children (EPIC)](http://www.doe.mass.edu/edprep/EPIC/). The EPIC work aims to address the disproportionate rates at which novice teachers are working in lower performing schools and teaching student subgroups with lower overall academic performance. EPIC includes work to support EPP-district partnerships that improve teacher pipelines, particularly in hard-to-staff roles, and with the aim of recruiting and retaining effective teachers. This is particularly advantageous to some urban districts that typically face recruiting challenges and higher rates of educator turnover. As part of the Partnership Innovation Grant, six districts received grants to partner with EPPs on specific pipeline issues such as Special Education and English as a Second Language teachers. Two of these districts and one other district also receive more targeted support from ESE through the Student Teaching Partnership Consortium. These three districts work to develop stronger, more valuable student teacher placements in urban schools.

A further component of EPIC will develop Educator Preparation Annual Snapshots. Beginning in 2018, EPPs will be able to access an [Edwin Analytics](http://www.doe.mass.edu/edwin/analytics/) report that synthesizes existing data points to provide an indication of programs’ performance. In addition to the snapshots, Edwin Analytics will provide four more new educator preparation reports. Through these new tools, EPPs can learn more about their candidates’ assessment data (including CAP and PAL); analyze trends in their program completers’ CAP scores; and view responses from surveys about candidate and program effectiveness. Finally, a report for districts will summarize educator outcome data—such as educator evaluation ratings and [Student Growth Percentiles](http://www.doe.mass.edu/mcas/growth/)—for each EPP. New data tools play an important role in EPPs’ processes of self-assessment and improvement. ESE will also use this data as part of the data triangulation process for [EPP Reviews](http://www.doe.mass.edu/edprep/reviewers/).

## Strategy 2: Improve Educator Effectiveness by Supporting Effective Implementation of the Educator Evaluation Framework (locus of impact: district)

**Addresses**: evaluation rating gap; hiring practices; educator assignment practices

Robust systems of evaluation and support can enhance the effectiveness of all educators in the Commonwealth and especially educators who work with students from traditionally disenfranchised groups**.** The Massachusetts Educator Evaluation Framework does not call for a standardized, calibrated set of ratings data across districts. Instead, it requires a standardized process for developing ratings. This process hinges on the delivery of high quality feedback to educators and on the integration of educator evaluation data into an educator’s professional learning plan. We believe that if districts implement robust educator evaluation systems to promote professional learning and growth, gaps in equitable access to excellent educators will close.

ESE’s efforts to support implementation of educator effectiveness systems that provide high quality feedback, differentiated professional development opportunities, and a culture of distributed leadership have generated several resources and opportunities for schools and districts.

*In each of the four Educator Evaluation Standards, economically disadvantaged students are more likely than their peers to be assigned to a teacher with an ineffective rating.*

In the past year, the Educator Effectiveness team at ESE merged with the Curriculum and Instruction office and the Office of English Language Acquisition and Academic Achievement, to form a comprehensive unit focused on supporting quality instruction in the Center for Instructional Support. An example of the intersection between the two areas are new “What to Look For” [observation guides](http://www.doe.mass.edu/candi/observation/), describing the practices and student capacities observers should expect to see in classrooms of particular grade levels and subject areas.

Enhancements to the [Educator Effectiveness Video Resource Library](http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeval/resources/VideoLibrary.html) are designed to promote effective evaluation at the school and district levels. Like the observation guides, the interactive [Online Calibration Training Tool](http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeval/resources/calibration/tool/) can help observers reach common expectations of practice. Through the tool, evaluators practice providing high quality feedback in response to a selected lesson. Real-time data displays allow participants to calibrate their assessments of practice and written feedback with one another, as well as with educators throughout the state. EPPs have also used this tool with faculty, and educators with various roles can use it to develop a shared understanding of high quality instruction. New teachers and administrators can learn about ratings and the Five-Step Evaluation Cycle through the [Educator Evaluation Framework Video Series](http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeval/resources/eef/). All educators seeking a better understanding of Educator Evaluation—including those who are charged with designing and implementing it—can use the [Transforming Educator Evaluation in Massachusetts (TEEM) Videos](http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeval/resources/teem/), created in collaboration with school districts.

Developing common measures of performance allow districts to track student progress from year to year, and to identify their more effective educators and those in need of improvement in certain areas. Using common assessments also works to establish equitable curriculum across a district. Educator-designed [example common assessments](http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeval/sir/assessments.html)—including assessments for administrators and Specialized Instructional Support Personnel—can guide districts as they develop and implement their own common assessments.

The Board of Elementary and Secondary Education (BESE) recently voted to amend the regulations to educator evaluation and include a student learning indicator within the Summative Performance Rating. Student growth is a significant factor in the student learning indicator, as the judgment about an educator’s progress is derived from the evaluator’s judgment of student outcomes based on multiple measures of learning, growth, and achievement.

A commitment to shared leadership also advances equity by expanding the peer-to-peer impact of high performing teachers, building a culture of shared responsibility for the outcomes of all students, and providing additional supports for new and less effective teachers. In 2015–16, Massachusetts’s Distributed Leadership Professional Learning Network (PLN) focused on how schools and districts distributed leadership in order to provide educators with high quality feedback.

Approaches to Distributing Leadership
Peer Assistance and Review
Secondary Evaluators
Instructional Coaches
Collaborative Learning


The participating districts collaborated on an [Interactive Planning Guide for Distributed Leadership](http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeval/leadership/DistributedLeadershipIPG.pdf), for use by district teams who are building a system to support distributed leadership. The tool identifies four key approaches to distributing leadership:

* Peer Assistance and Review
* Secondary Evaluators
* Instructional Coaches
* Collaborative Learning

The public reporting of aggregated educator evaluation ratings is an essential mechanism for ESE to assess the implementation of the Educator Evaluation Framework at a statewide level. Public reporting of educator evaluation data is established by statute ([M.G.L. c.69, §1B](https://malegislature.gov/Laws/GeneralLaws/PartI/TitleXII/Chapter69/Section1B)) to enable ESE to assess the effectiveness of educator evaluation implementation statewide. The Department strives to ensure that schools and districts have robust educator evaluation systems in place that promote professional learning and growth as means to close gaps in equitable access. Appendix C (page 45) includes aggregated educator evaluation data for the 2015–16 school year. This data should not be considered as comparative across districts but rather as evidence of robust educator effectiveness systems functioning in districts. While viewing local educator evaluation data, districts should consider how to use the data to inform strategies to address local equity gaps, and to pursue other district priorities.

## Strategy 3: Focus on the Student Learning Experience (locus of impact: school)

**Addresses**: Preparation, experience and evaluation rating gaps; hiring practices; educator assignment practices

To successfully address inequities in access to educators, schools and districts must first accurately identify specific gaps and answer the question, “For individual students, which teachers and administrators are they being assigned to?” The Student Learning Experience (SLE) Report, an [Edwin Analytics](http://www.doe.mass.edu/edwin/analytics/) data tool, allows users to identify just the type of gaps that the Equity Plan aims to close—and more. Beyond teacher experience, in-field status, and evaluation rating, the report includes other characteristics such as Professional Teacher Status. The tool also allows districts to focus attention on specific students, and to change or alter the educator assignment pattern. The SLE Report has been in development with districts since the 2015–16 school year. ESE will continue to pilot and refine the Report in 2016–17 with the goal of releasing it for 2017–18.

*The SLE Report indicates gaps in student access to teachers with a variety of characteristics. For example, Hispanic/Latino students are 43% more likely than white students to be assigned to a teacher without PTS.*

In this tool, a “student learning experience” refers to each time a student is assigned to a teacher of record in a Massachusetts public school. Thus, students have multiple learning experiences each year, including teachers for different secondary subjects and “specials” teachers such as music and art. The report is intentionally named for *students’* experiences, rather than teachers’ experiences, because the Equity Plan focuses on improving student access rather than on moving teachers around.

This report allows districts to view students’ experiences and teacher assignment before the students came into their district. More to the point of equity, the report disaggregates data by student subgroup. Users can run the report for a whole district, for specific school/s within a district, or at the individual student level. They can also choose to show data for a specific content area or combination of areas, and the number of years of data to include.

## Strategy 4: Develop and Implement the Educator Effectiveness Guidebook for Inclusive Practice (locus of impact: classroom)

**Addresses**: preparation and evaluation rating gaps; need for training to meet diverse student needs

*Economically disadvantaged students and students of color are twice as likely as their peers to be assigned to a teacher rated ineffective in Standard II: Teaching All Students.*

In Massachusetts, economically disadvantaged students with disabilities attend classes in substantially separate settings at twice the rate of students who are not economically disadvantaged. We also know that the teachers in these substantially separate classrooms are typically teaching out-of-field for at least part of the day, according to a  [review of special education in Massachusetts](http://www.doe.mass.edu/sped/hehir/2014-09synthesis.pdf) conducted by Dr. Thomas Hehir and associates.[[16]](#footnote-16) Note that many experiences with special education teachers are not reflected in the Student Learning Experience Report, because some districts do not report pull-out or push-in teachers as teachers of record.

The [Educator Effectiveness Guidebook for Inclusive Practice](http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeval/guidebook/) —developed in response to recommendations from the Hehir report—aims to align best practices in inclusive instruction and positive behavior support with core aspects of the Educator Evaluation Framework. Educators from across the state collaborated to create the Guidebook tools, which are designed to be actionable for districts, schools and individual educators (both the evaluators and the evaluated). For example, [one tool](http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeval/guidebook/4a-observations.pdf) that lists “what to look for” in an effective inclusive classroom can support teachers in improving their practice and can help administrators identify the extent of inclusion implementation.

During the 2015–16 school year, ESE partnered with 128 educators (Guidebook Partners) who field-tested Guidebook tools and provided feedback on their impact and accessibility. Using this feedback, and additional work from the Guidebook Partners and original Guidebook authors, ESE developed a revised edition of the Guidebook. The Guidebook Partners’ work generated new tools such as the [Job-Embedded Professional Development Planning Guide](http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeval/guidebook/JobEmbedGuide.pdf) and [Quick Tips for Guidebook Professional Development](http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeval/guidebook/QuickPDTips.pdf), in response to an expressed need for more support in integrating the Guidebook into professional development.

Members of the Massachusetts Secondary School Administrators’ Association and select educational collaborativesreceived training on Guidebook tools. They then disseminated their learning by providing regional training to other educators.

Massachusetts Playbook
Equitable Access to Excellent Educators
The Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education's Commitment: All students should have equitable access to great educators
Key Question: How can we ensure equitable access to great educators for every student in the state? In your district? In your school?

ESE has provided information and technical assistance on Guidebook tools to school districts and educational organizations throughout the 2015–16 school year (see Appendix A for examples), including 20 educator preparation programs. Beyond the initial plans for dissemination of Guidebook and equity work, ESE worked with statewide education organizations to organize and train 20 “Ambassadors.” These Ambassadors (largely current and retired administrators experienced with inclusive practice) conducted in-person visits with nearly 1,000 principals statewide, as well as with other school and district personnel. This initiative will increase principals’ awareness of state and local equity issues and share available ESE resources to address such issues—particularly Equity Plan strategies and Guidebook tools. Ambassadors will hold follow-up conversations with about half of the participating principals to provide additional support.

ESE developed the [Massachusetts Playbook: Equitable Access to Excellent Educators](http://www.doe.mass.edu/educators/equitableaccess/Playbook.pdf) as a user-friendly overview of equity and inclusion data and resources, and as a jumping-off point for Ambassadors’ conversations with principals. The Playbook also features many of the resources referenced throughout this report.

As of February 2017, Ambassadors had met with more than 950 principals and 1,200 district-based administrators. In a feedback survey, 96 percent of participating principals said they agreed or strongly agreed that the Ambassador visit “was a good use of my time.” Seventy-one percent responded that “the information in this visit was new to me.”

The [Foundations for Inclusive Practice Online Courses](http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeval/guidebook/CourseOverview.docx) for teachers and administrators—another initiative associated with the Guidebook work—has also seen success thus far. These self-paced, open-enrollment courses focus on strategies for effective schooling for students with disabilities, and instruction of students with diverse learning styles. Users build their understanding of frameworks for inclusion: Social and Emotional Learning, Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports, and Universal Design for Learning. Throughout the course, participants apply their learning to construct a plan for their own practice. As of January 2017, 2,380 teachers and 601 administrators enrolled in the courses. Of those who enrolled, 468 have completed a course, and the long-term goal is to reach 1,200 completers within three years.

In 2017–2018, ESE will continue to promote equity and effective inclusive practices through the Foundations for Inclusive Practice courses, and continued technical assistance. Feedback from the field—particularly principal survey data from the Ambassadors project and a report analyzing this data—will inform what kind of support ESE continues to provide to schools and districts.

Through educator and administrator training, and in educator preparation programs, the Guidebook promotes a set of evidence-based best practices for inclusion. This addresses root causes identified in the 2015 Equity Plan, such as the preparedness of educators and educator candidates to serve diverse student needs.

Effective inclusion also indirectly addresses pipeline, recruitment and retention issues that result in a lack of highly qualified special educators; if students are placed in a more inclusive setting, the district’s need of teachers for substantially separate settings decreases.

Broadly, the Guidebook work addresses gaps in access to effective educators. Administrators and teachers who effectively implement inclusive practices are able to better serve the needs of both students with disabilities and their peers without disabilities. As mentioned previously, in Massachusetts economically disadvantaged students with disabilities are twice as likely to be educated in a substantially separate setting, compared to non-economically disadvantaged students.[[17]](#footnote-17) Thus, increasing the effective use of inclusive practice also addresses inequities in access to educators for students with disabilities from low income families.

## Strategy 5: Pilot Equity Approaches through a Professional Learning Network (PLN) (locus of impact: district)

**Addresses**: Preparation, experience and evaluation rating gaps; hiring practices; educator assignment practices; retention/attrition; pipeline issues; readiness for diverse student needs; climate and culture

The nine diverse school districts participating in the Educational Equity PLN developed and began implementation of strategies to address local equity gaps during the 2015–16 school year. The following districts and groups of schools comprised the network:

* Amherst-Pelham
* Boston
* Everett
* Lawrence
* Milton
* Randolph
* Springfield Empowerment Zone
* Taunton
* UP Network

Through self-assessment sessions, participants used the SLE Report and other state and local data to identify gaps and analyze root causes. These led to local strategies focused on evaluator calibration; cultural proficiency; partnerships with educator preparation programs; inclusive practice; and disproportionate disciplinary practices, among other topics. In December 2015, all members convened to share strategies, identify associated metrics, and plot trajectories for these metrics.

Involving personnel who work with data and communicating with partner districts to share progress proved useful for PLN members. ESE and the PLN districts collaborated to produce a series of resources to support districts pursuing similar strategies. See [Appendix B](#_Appendix_B:_Education) for more information on these resources.

## Developing and ongoing work that addresses equity gaps

Beyond the key strategies noted above, several other ongoing programs at the Department also support equitable access to experienced, prepared and highly rated teachers. This section describes new work as of 2016–17 that addresses equity, and provides updates on initiatives included in the 2015 Equity Plan.

The following initiatives promote equitable access while also intersecting with ESE’s five core priorities. The core priorities are:

1. Strengthening standards, curriculum, instruction, and assessment
2. Promoting educator development
3. Supporting social-emotional learning, health and safety
4. Turning around the lowest performing districts and schools
5. Enhancing resource allocation and data use

**Title II, Part A of the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act**

**Addresses**: preparation and evaluation rating gaps

**ESE Core Priority**: promoting educator development

ESE has begun to focus on the equity implications and possibilities for Title IIA. Nationally, the bulk of Title IIA funding—up to 75 percent—is spent on professional development and class-size reduction, with little data as to how effective these activities are in improving educator effectiveness.[[18]](#footnote-18) The same trend appears in Massachusetts, in an analysis of Title IIA applications facilitated by SRI International.

Title IIA monitoring in Massachusetts also focuses on equity. In addition to existing indicators addressing equitable distribution of in-field and highly rated teachers, Massachusetts added indicators to ensure that districts are implementing quality mentoring and educator evaluation programs, and to identify exemplar districts or those needing technical assistance.

Technical assistance sessions over the past year have also reinforced the connection between Title IIA and equity, such as how Title IIA funds can support access to effective educators for students with disabilities.

**Low Income Education Access Project (LEAP): Appropriate Special Education Identification and Placement of Low Income Students**

**Addresses**: preparation and evaluation rating gaps

**ESE Core Priority**: strengthening standards, curriculum, instruction, and assessment; supporting social-emotional learning, health and safety; enhancing resource allocation and data use

LEAP aims to address the high rates of economically disadvantaged students identified as students with disabilities (SWDs), and of SWDs placed in substantially separate classrooms.       Building upon data provided from the completion of several reports by Dr. Thomas Hehir and Associates[[19]](#footnote-19), the Department’s Special Education Policy and Planning office has initiated a strategic plan to address the over-identification of low-income students and the subsequent over-placement of low-income students in more separate educational environments. This initiative is called the Low Income Educational Access Project (LEAP). LEAP is comprised of 15 districts—about half of which place SWDs in substantially separate settings at particularly high rates, and about half of which over-identify economically disadvantaged students as having disabilities.

In cooperation with multiple offices in the Department also addressing poverty in various ways, the LEAP project brought a national expert, Dr. Eric Jensen, to speak to local educators and Department staff members on the impact of poverty in the brain as well as how to mitigate the effects of poverty in the classroom. Over 200 individuals participated in the LEAP training with Dr. Jensen and multiple Department offices are following up to further coordinate initiatives related to poverty.

Since the LEAP training in November 2015, the Department, local educator partners and educational collaboratives have been in constant communication to ensure that the Low-income Education Access Project (LEAP) initiative work keeps moving forward in a collaborative and meaningful way.

* Educators have developed and implemented district specific activities to support the successful outcomes for students living in poverty. A common theme is addressing the impact of trauma and the social-emotional needs of students. This work is supported by the Department through direct communication, resource sharing, federal special education grants, and ESE Institutes.
* A free [online interactive training module](http://www.doe.mass.edu/sped/LEAP/pd.html) was developed in June 2016 by the Department and guided by ongoing work with [Low-income Education Access Project (LEAP)](http://www.doe.mass.edu/sped/LEAP/) districts and educational collaboratives. It provides the user with a fundamental understanding of the impact of poverty on student outcomes. This tool was recently updated to allow educators to earn professional development points (PDPs).
  + The tool has received very positive feedback and its users have expanded from districts to include higher education institutions.
* A new cadre of [trainers from 12 educational collaboratives](http://www.doe.mass.edu/sped/leap/trainers.html) recently completed a six day LEAP training conducted by CES, and are available to support districts' efforts to deepen their understanding of poverty's impact on the identification, placement, and academic outcomes of students with disabilities. Trainers can help districts address these issues through appropriate systems and strategies in the classroom, school environment, and community.
* The LEAP Convening, held in October was attended by Department staff, LEAP district teams, and educational collaborative trainers. The agenda included presentations by several districts on their work, introductions of the new trainers, and opportunities for trainers and districts to collaborate and identify next steps.
* An associated incentive grant provides funds for the LEAP districts to hire the trainers who participated in the train-the-trainer sessions.

While LEAP has its origin in the Special Education Planning and Policy Development Office (SEPP), it has robust connections to other school improvement initiatives in the Department. LEAP showcases the Department's commitment to collaboration with partners both inside and outside of the Department, thus expanding and deepening partnerships across Department offices and with sister agencies, school district personnel, and community members.

**Economic Disadvantage Working Group**

**Addresses**: evaluation rating gap

**ESE Core Priority**: supporting social-emotional learning, health and safety

Following the November 2015 LEAP training, ESE staff decided to continue conversations and connections around serving economically disadvantaged students by forming an Economic Disadvantage Working Group. To gain more context about poverty-focused work throughout the Department, the working group sent out a survey to every ESE unit to learn how different offices’ work aligns with equity. Group members from across ESE also conducted a resource inventory to identify gaps in equity work that the working group can address, and gaps in messaging around economic disadvantage.

**Inclusive Schools Project**

**Addresses**: evaluation rating gap

**ESE Core Priority**: strengthening standards, curriculum, instruction, and assessment

The Inclusive Schools Project aims to expand inclusive practices and, more broadly, to improve outcomes for the student subgroups that this report identifies as having lower rates of access to excellent educators: economically disadvantaged students, students of color, ELs, and SWDs. The project’s steering committee first met in September 2016.

Over two years, the committee will:

* Identify/develop a self-assessment process that schools and districts can use to measure their practices against best practices
* Identify models and resources for inclusive practices
* Develop and deliver training on inclusive practices for ESE staff who provide targeted assistance, such as DSAC teams
* Plan a statewide celebration of inclusive practices

**Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning (CASEL)**

**Addresses**: evaluation rating gap

**ESE Core Priority**: supporting social-emotional learning, health and safety

In 2015, ESE added a fifth core strategy: attending to the social/emotional/health needs of students and families. This addition reflects the Department’s commitment to diverse approaches for supporting students. The Board of Elementary and Secondary Education solicited stakeholder input on Social and Emotional Learning (SEL) in April 2016. The meeting also addressed a variety of existing [ESE resources and initiatives](http://www.doe.mass.edu/boe/docs/fy2016/2016-04/spec-item1-SEL-Related-Work.docx) that support social and emotional education needs.

Developing educators’ SEL capacity is integrated across several ESE offices, and several equity strategies. SEL is a core framework of inclusive practice, and educators who understand SEL will be better-equipped to serve diverse learners and to avoid disproportionate use of suspensions and expulsions. The Guidebook includes three tools specific to SEL: an overview of the [SEL Framework](http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeval/guidebook/sel.pdf), an [SEL Planning Tool](http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeval/guidebook/5d-SELPlanningTool.pdf), and [Key Characteristics of SEL](http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeval/guidebook/7d-sel.pdf). Ultimately, educators who are prepared to support SEL are better able to serve all students, and are thus more effective for diverse learners.

As part of its SEL work, Massachusetts joined seven other states participating in a two-year CASEL initiative. The member states will collaborate on developing policies, learning standards, goals, and guidelines to support SEL implementation. Through this partnership, ESE aims to establish a common language and shared vision of positive social and emotional competencies for all students. This will involve development of aligned resources; integration of SEL with existing policies, resources and initiatives; and stakeholder engagement. Indeed, broad-based engagement and partnerships are a defining characteristic of the initiative.

Beyond participation in CASEL, ESE has other ongoing and forthcoming SEL projects and resources, many of which are available on the new [SEL website.](http://www.doe.mass.edu/candi/SEL/)

**Rethinking Discipline**

**Addresses**: evaluation rating gap

**ESE Core Priority**: supporting social-emotional learning, health and safety

Both nationally and in Massachusetts, SWDs, Latino students, and Black students are suspended at higher rates than their peers.[[20]](#footnote-20) For example, in the 2015–16 school year, 2.7 percent of white students were suspended in Massachusetts public schools, compared to 7.7 percent of Latino students and 9.3 percent of Black students. Moreover, 4.3 percent of all students received at least one suspension, while the rate for SWDs was 8.3 percent.[[21]](#footnote-21)

Through the Rethinking Discipline Professional Learning Network (PLN), 31 schools and districts will work to reflect on and address local discipline practices. The work focuses on two issues: overreliance on removals (expulsions and suspensions), and/or the use of removal practices that disproportionately affect students based on race/ethnicity or disability status. ESE selected a diverse group of school and district participants by examining 2014–15 [student discipline data](http://profiles.doe.mass.edu/state_report/ssdr.aspx). The participants held their first in-person gathering in October 2016, and will have further opportunities to collaborate throughout the school year. They will also be submitting action plans in August 2017.

PLN members will learn from one another about challenges and effective practices, and will also provide ESE with insight into the root causes of overuse and disproportionate use of removal practices. ESE is working with teams of PLN participants to share model programs and best practices that can reduce the use of suspensions and expulsions, improve school climate, and boost student engagement. Ultimately, lessons learned may be helpful to other districts as well, as all schools are required to review discipline data, assess the impact of disciplinary actions, and determine whether it is helpful to modify practices due to overreliance on or disproportionate use of removal practices ([603 CMR 53.00](http://www.doe.mass.edu/lawsregs/603cmr53.html?section=53.14) ).

Addressing disproportionate practices can have an impact on addressing inequitable access as well. When SWDs, Latino students, and/or Black students are removed from the classroom at higher rates, then by default they have a lower level of access to educators in the regular classroom. Additionally, the goals and objectives of this PLN align with goals for implementation of SEL in schools, as PLN participants will work to identify intermediate steps that both address classroom management issues and encourage positive school climates.

**Resource Allocation and District Action Reports (RADAR)**

**Addresses**: evaluation rating gap

**ESE Core Priority**: enhancing resource allocation and data use

ESE recognizes that districts face many demands and limited resources. Using a State Longitudinal Data Systems grant from the US Education Department, ESE is developing a new set of data reports, called RADAR. The reports provide more powerful and actionable information about how districts use their people, time and money to support student achievement and address resource inequities. By creating actionable reports, providing technical assistance to a group of pilot districts, and disseminating information to stakeholders statewide, ESE will encourage and inform strategic resource allocation decisions—including decisions about staffing, scheduling and course offerings. While some data and reports on these topics already exist, RADAR goes further by providing more visual reports that incorporate new school- and classroom-level metrics. The reports allow districts to make comparisons to other districts, and provide a resource for district leaders to communicate findings with the community.

9th Grade Percent of Time Spent in Subjects by 8th Grade Performance on Math MCAS and Special Education Status
This chart shows the distribution of student time in 9th grade by performance on the 8th grade Math MCAS and Special Education status
For students who are special education: full inclusion and student who are in general education, shows proportion of class time spent in: English/Language Arts; Math; History/Social Science; Science; Arts; Foreign Language; Miscellaneous - Other Miscellaneous; Miscellaneous - Tert Prep/Student Skills; and Reading

Examples of questions that RADAR tools can answer:

* How likely are SWDs in inclusion to move to a more restricted setting? How likely are they to exit special education? How do placement trajectories in our district compare with those in other districts?
* In recent years, how have enrollment trends corresponded with staffing and funding decisions?
* In what categories does our district spend more or less than other districts?
* Compared to other districts, do we assign SWDs to a higher proportion of paraprofessionals instead of licensed teachers?
* For students who received low scores on the MCAS, what proportion of their school day do they now spend on each subject? How does this compare to students who scored higher on the MCAS?

In addition to creating new data reports, the RADAR project is also convening a select group of districts to pilot the resources and strengthen linkages between strategies, planning and resource use. Lessons learned from this effort can then be applied statewide. Over the 2016–17 and 2017–18 school years, nine pilot districts will use RADAR to analyze their resource allocation decisions and identify opportunities for strengthening strategic plans. The goal of the project is for participants to generate multi-year resource plans based on their findings, and to develop related communications strategies to advocate for any proposed changes. ESE will integrate lessons from the pilot districts’ experiences into further refinement and statewide expansion of RADAR tools. The participating districts also served as a second pilot group to provide feedback on the SLE Report.

Beyond the inclusion of the SLE Report, RADAR has clear connections to equity issues. Supporting materials for RADAR users identify a few entry points that districts might use when determining how best to leverage RADAR; one of these is equity. For example, a district where the highest poverty school has the lowest academic performance may use the SLE Report to investigate whether that school’s students have had lower rates of access to highly rated educators, and may also use RADAR tools to determine whether average class sizes at the school vary from the district average. Districts can also use RADAR data to inform their plans for addressing gaps identified by the SLE Report, such as determining how and where to deploy resources.

## Ongoing Goals and Metrics for Key Strategies

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Educator Preparation** | **Metrics** |
| **SY**  **2016**–**17** | Implement the Candidate Assessment of Performance (CAP) in all teacher prep programs throughout the state | CAP data submissions by educator preparation programs (EPPs)  Stakeholder surveys  Case study data from external researcher |
| **SY**  **2017**–**18** | After one full year of statewide implementation, support EPPs in continuous improvement, establishing rigorous standards for performance, and providing high quality feedback to teacher candidates through CAP | Proportion of EPPs conducting calibration training with supervisors  Proportion of EPPs using the CAP dashboard  Case study data and other analyses from external researcher |
| **SY**  **2016**–**17** | Support the development and implementation of high quality district/EPP partnerships to promote stronger teacher pipelines | Completion of strategic planning by 8 partnerships  Development of resources to support partnership work |
| **SY**  **2017**–**18** | Same as activity described above | Implementation of proposed models by 8 partnerships |
| **2017** | Develop new educator preparation Edwin reports for EPPs and districts |  |
| **Staff involved:** | Educator Preparation team; external research contract for Educator Preparation Profiles | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Educator Evaluation** | **Metrics** |
| **SY**  **2016**–**17** | Share equity plan strategies with stakeholders  Model Rubric Validation: which indicators and elements are most predictive | Conduct two in-person or virtual convenings for districts and other stakeholders (fall and spring)  Plan established |
| **SY**  **2016**–**17** | Support implementation of online calibration resources | Overall number of users, user feedback, greater differentiation in educator evaluation ratings |
| **SY**  **2016**–**17** | Disseminate interactive planning guide for distributed leadership | User satisfaction, reduced evaluator workload |
| **SY**  **2017**–**18** | Communicate the importance of educator evaluation data in ensuring equitable access to the field and the general public | Press coverage of educator evaluation shifts to focus on the equitable assignment of students to teachers |
| **SY**  **2017**–**18** | Overall monitoring of school/district equity strategy implementation | Embed and establish protocols in Title II, Part A subgrantee monitoring |
| **Staff involved:** | Center for Instructional Support | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Student Learning Experience (SLE) Report** | **Metrics** |
| **Spring 2017** | Launch SLE Report statewide |  |
| **Spring 2017** | Communicate with districts on using SLE, including tutorial video | Proportion of districts correctly using and interpreting SLE data in their first district equity plan submission |
| **Spring & Summer 2017** | Districts use SLE to inform district equity plans | Proportion of districts submitting approvable district equity plans, where applicable |
| **Fall 2017 & Winter 2018** | Develop additional enhancements to report based on Department and district feedback | Implementation of enhanced report |
| **Staff involved:** | Center for Instructional Support; Education Data Services; Executive Office of Education Information Technology; Equity Professional Learning Network and RADAR pilot districts; Office of Digital Learning | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Educator Effectiveness Guidebook**  **for Inclusive Practice** | **Metrics** |
| **SY**  **2016**–**17** | Develop and execute dissemination, engagement, and implementation strategy, informed by field test  Focus Academy offers course on Guidebook | Increase in full-inclusion placements  Implementation of course |
| **SY**  **2016**–**17** | Disseminate Guidebook and Equity Playbook to principals via Ambassadors program | 1,000 completed principal surveys |
| **SY**  **2016**–**17** | Provide professional development to 400 administrators and 1200 educators in Foundations for Inclusive Practice | Vendor reports of course completers |
| **SY**  **2016**–**17** | Provide technical assistance to schools identified as “Focus Schools” due to poor outcomes for students with disabilities in the Inclusive Schools Project | Approx. 25 participating schools focusing on closing achievement gaps for students with disabilities |
| **SY**  **2016**–**17** | Establish a common language and shared vision of positive social and emotional competencies for all students through participation in CASEL’s Collaborating States Initiative | Inclusion of social emotional learning competencies in high profile policy documents (e.g. revised curriculum frameworks) |
| **Staff involved:** | Center for Instructional Support; Special Education Policy and Planning; Office of Tiered System of Supports | |

# Appendix A. Stakeholder engagement and communications

Since submitting the 2015 Equity Plan, the Department has led or participated in efforts to share components of the plan, both within ESE and with external stakeholders. The discussions, meetings and presentations facilitated two-way communication: both the dissemination of equity plan strategies and implementation, and useful feedback from ESE colleagues and from the field.

Stakeholders expressed strong interest in learning more about the Student Learning Experience (SLE) Report and the activities of the Educational Equity Professional Learning Network (PLN). This interest also came from other State Education Agencies, as many have not implemented pilot districts for equity strategies, and to our knowledge none have a data tool like the SLE Report. The equity team was enthusiastic about opportunities to share on these topics, given that the complexities of the SLE Report are easier to understand through a person-to-person discussion, and that a major purpose of the PLN is to disseminate its practices and lessons learned.

After passage of the Every Student Succeeds Act, with its requirements regarding district-level equity data and plans, the equity team’s stakeholder engagement took on an additional purpose and significance: the team used engagement opportunities to preview district-level equity work and the supports that ESE intends to provide, and to learn how ESE offices and external organizations can also support districts in their equity work.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Date** | **Office/group** | **Mode of communication** | **Content** | **Objective** |
| 11/10/2015 | Office of Licensure | Presentation | Overview of equity work & how it overlaps with licensure | Inform licensure team of how their work aligns with equity initiatives |
| 11/20/2015 | Educator Preparation | Meeting | Overlap of Educator Preparation & equity work | Increase Ed Prep team's awareness of Equity Plan, and equity team's understanding of Ed Prep initiatives involved in the Equity Plan |
| 12/8/2015 | Office of District and School Turnaround (ODST) & District and School Assistance Centers (DSAC) | Presentation & discussion | Overview of Equity Plan, including SLE Report; focus on Educational Equity PLN | Prepare ODST and DSAC members to support their districts in pursuing equity strategies, particularly districts participating in the PLN |
| 12/17/2016 | ODST & DSAC | Presentation; Statewide System of Support staff meeting | Guidebook tools | Presentation on how to use Guidebook tools with member districts |
| 2/19/2016 | DSAC data team | Presentation & discussion | Overview of SLE report and how districts can use it | Inform data team about SLE report, so they can assist districts in using the report, if needed |
| 3/30/2016 | Greater Boston DSAC | Presentation & discussion | Overview of Equity Plan, including SLE report and ESSA equity requirements for districts | Prepare DSAC team members to support their districts in equity work and gain team's input on how ESE can support districts |
| 4/11/2016 | Economic Disadvantage working group | Presentation, discussion and brainstorming | Overview of Equity Plan, focusing on upcoming district-level equity plans and how ESE offices can support districts | Identify existing tools/resources from ESE offices that can support districts in developing local equity strategies |

**CALENDAR OF STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT AND COMMUNICATION ACTIVITIES: INTERNAL STAKEHOLDERS**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 9/28/2016 | Department-wide | Roundtable presentation | Overview of Equity Plan, Guidebook and Ambassadors | Inform diverse offices of equity work and how it connects to their own work, now and in the future |
| 11/15/2016 | Office of English Language Acquisition and Academic Achievement (OELAAA) | Presentation & discussion | Overview of SLE report and how it is applicable to ELs | Inform OELAAA of equity work and how it connects to their own work |
| 3/3/2017 | Department-wide staff who expressed interest in the SLE report | Presentation | Detailed view of SLE report and how districts can use it | Inform staff from diverse offices and gather ideas of how districts can use the report |

**CALENDAR OF STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT AND COMMUNICATION ACTIVITIES: EXTERNAL STAKEHOLDERS**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Date** | **Stakeholder group** | **Mode of communication** | **Content** | **Objective** |
| 9/10/2015 | Press; general audience | US Education Department press call | Commissioner & teacher provided overview of MA Equity Plan | Provide national audience with overview of MA Equity Plan approaches |
| 10/19/2015 | Educators (newsletter recipients) | Educator Effectiveness newsletter | Overview & focus on Educational Equity PLN | Provide perspective of equity data and strategies that is relevant to a variety of educators |
| 11/4/2015 | Teach Plus Fellows working group on equity | In-person | Contents of Equity Plan and its approval | Update the Teach Plus Fellows, as this group gave input during development of the plan |
| 12/22/2015 | Educator preparation programs (EPPs) | One-pager attached to email | Overview of Ed Prep components of Equity Plan, and Educational Equity PLN members seeking Ed Prep partners | Inform and connect with potential partners for Springfield Empowerment Zone/Lawrence Public Schools/UP Network |
| 1/11-1/12 2016 | EdTrust Equity Network Meeting (TX) | Presentation; Q&A | Presentation on activities of PLN and role of data | Share with other states about the Educational Equity PLN, particularly around using data |
| 1/19/2016 | Equitable Access Support Network (EASN) working group | Webinar | Equity PLN | Share with other states overall structure of PLN and lessons learned (challenges and successes) |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Date** | **Stakeholder group** | **Mode of communication** | **Content** | **Objective** |
| 2/23/2016 | District leaders | Webinar | District-EPP partnerships | Ed Prep team shares strategies and resources for district leaders seeking to leverage partnerships with EPPs, including for equity initiatives |
| 2/24/2016 | Assabet Valley Collaborative: Leadership for Inclusive Practice | Presentation | Overview of Equity Plan and of district-level work in PLN districts | Share promising practices from PLN member district |
| 3/22/2016 | New Special Education Directors Leadership Institute | Presentation | Guidebook tools | Present on using Guidebook tools with schools |
| 4/13/2016 | Boston Public Schools | Technical assistance | Guidebook tools | Provide technical assistance on using Guidebook tools with Boston schools |
| 4/28/2016 | Massachusetts Organization of Educational Collaboratives | Technical assistance | Guidebook tools | Provide technical assistance on using Guidebook tools with member districts |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Date** | **Stakeholder group** | **Mode of communication** | **Content** | **Objective** |
| 5/16/2016 - 5/17/2016 | Diverse school and district leaders | Presentation at Educator Effectiveness Spring Convening | SLE Report and other data tools that districts can use to inform equity strategies | Communicate to schools and districts about the Every Student Succeeds Act requirement on district-level equity data and strategies, and about new and existing ESE data tools to identify equity gaps |
| 5/19/2016 | Bi-County Collaborative | Technical Assistance | Guidebook tools | Provide technical assistance on using Guidebook tools with member districts |
| 6/2/2016 | District and state leaders from neighboring states | Presentation at Teaching Conditions Matter workshop (CT) | Randolph Public Schools PLN team members presented on their district’s equity strategy | Share with other states and districts Randolph's approaches to addressing disproportionate disciplinary practices |
| 6/14/2016 | Special Education Effectiveness Group | Train-the-trainers workshop | Guidebook tools | Prepare educators to train others on Guidebook tools |
| 6/28/2016 | Principals and other educators statewide | [Massachusetts Playbook: Equitable Access to Excellent Educators](http://www.doe.mass.edu/educators/equitableaccess/Playbook.pdf) | Description of, and links to, ESE resources that can help principals and other educators address equity gaps identified in MA Equity Plan | A team of "Ambassadors" met with principals statewide to discuss local challenges and how educators can leverage resources in the Playbook |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Date** | **Office/group** | **Mode of communication** | **Content** | **Objective** |
| 7/29/2016 | EASN working group of state education agencies | Webinar | SLE Report: development and how districts use it | Share with other states about how districts have used, and can use, a report, particularly to inform their work with districts on local equity plans |
| 9/23/2016 | RADAR pilot districts | Presentation and practice session | SLE Report | Present on uses of SLE Report and how it connects to other resource allocation data tools |
| 1/23/2017 | Racial Imbalance Advisory Council | Discussion | Read and discuss key portions of Equity Update | Receive feedback on communications and stakeholder accessibility |
| 2/17/2017 | School district representatives | Report testing session | User test of SLE report | Receive feedback on utility and accessibility of enhanced SLE report |
| 3/16/2017 | Representatives of educator professional organizations | Presentation & discussion | Overview of equity work and SLE report | Receive feedback on SLE report and communications with the field |

# Appendix B: Educational Equity Professional Learning Network (PLN) Resources

* [Evaluator Calibration: Best Practices for Inclusion Toolkit](http://www.doe.mass.edu/educators/equitableaccess/Toolkit.docx)
  + Based on Everett and Milton’s PLN work
  + Approaches for districts aiming to improve evaluator calibration and support inclusive practices for general education classrooms
* [Cultural Proficiency: A Strategy to Address Equity Gaps in Students’ Achievement and Learning Experiences](http://www.doe.mass.edu/educators/equitableaccess/CulturalProficiency.docx)
  + Based on Boston, Milton and Taunton’s PLN work
  + Lessons, resources and guiding questions for districts pursuing cultural proficiency initiatives
* [Build Deeper Relationships with Educator Preparation Programs](http://www.doe.mass.edu/educators/equitableaccess/Partnerships.docx)
  + Based on Lawrence’s PLN work
  + Guidance for districts seeking more productive relationships with educator preparation programs
  + Also, see the [Leveraging Partnerships Webinar](https://youtu.be/_ss_jbeHPXE) and corresponding [PowerPoint presentation](http://www.doe.mass.edu/educators/equitableaccess/LeveragingPartnerships.pptx) to learn how to strategically leverage partnerships with educator preparation programs to strengthen your employment pipeline

# Appendix C: 2015–16 Statewide Educator Evaluation Data

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **# of educators** | **# of educators evaluated** | **% of educators evaluated** | **Summative Rating** | | | |
| **Exemplary** | **Proficient** | **Needs Improvement** | **Unsatisfactory** |
| **All teachers & administrators** | 87,380 | 80,756 | 92.4% | 11.5% | 84.2% | 3.9% | 0.4% |
| **All administrators** | 6,651 | 5,565 | 83.7% | 16.4% | 80.2% | 3.2% | 0.1% |
| **All teachers** | 71,986 | 67,572 | 93.9% | 10.7% | 84.7% | 4.1% | 0.4% |
| **Teachers without Professional Teacher Status** | 17,185 | 15,758 | 91.7% | 4.3% | 84.4% | 10.6% | 0.8% |
| **Teachers with Professional Teacher Status** | 53,237 | 50,297 | 94.5% | 12.5% | 85.3% | 1.9% | 0.3% |
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