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Executive Summary

On May 27 and May 28, 2014, the Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (ESE) brought together public school districts, charter schools, associations, and union leaders from across the state for the Educator Evaluation Spring Convening.

The convening focused on four key areas: district-determined measures (DDMs), evaluator calibration, student and staff feedback, and professional development. Commissioner Mitchell Chester opened the convening, which was attended by 956 people over the two-day period.

The format for both days was the same; each day commenced with a plenary session, and participants had the opportunity to attend a lunch-and-learn session on the relationship between high-quality professional development and educator evaluation. Attendees participated in three break-out sessions:

- Using DDMs as a Lever for Change (Session A)
- Developing a Shared Understanding: Consistency, Conversations, and Calibration (Session B)
- Incorporating Student Feedback in Educator Evaluation (Session C)

Of the total participants, 300 completed the breakout session feedback forms for session A, 362 for session B, 332 for session C, 38 for the lunch-and-learn session, and 212 for the overall convening. When reviewing evaluation results, readers should consider the low response rate ranging from 22 percent to 38 percent.

Overall, the event was well received. More specifically, and with few exceptions, the majority of respondents:

- Agreed that all quality indicators were met.
- Agreed that all relevance and usefulness indicators were met.
- Reported that they would apply what they learned at the convening by sharing information with colleagues and improving the implementation of educator evaluation in their districts.
Potential opportunities to improve future work include:

- **Go deeper.** Respondents rated highly the usefulness of the sessions but often asked for more specific resources in the open-ended questions. Respondents were looking for concrete examples of implementation, models to follow, sample surveys, and other tools they could apply to their work rather than a conceptual overview.

- **Carve out time for interaction.** While most sessions received positive feedback on opportunities for interaction and having questions answered, comments on open-ended questions indicated that more dedicated opportunities for question-and-answer periods in breakout sessions would have been valuable.

- **Ensure space is suitable for interactive workshops.** On breakout session forms, one of the most common comments for improvement was that the space was loud or not conducive to the structure of the session.
Introduction

On May 27 and 28, 2014, the Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (ESE) brought together public school districts, educators, union leaders, and others across the state for professional development regarding emerging practices in the new Educator Evaluation Framework. The primary goals of the convening were to:

- Share best practices and actionable implementation tips and strategies.
- Recognize and celebrate successes.
- Provide a networking opportunity for educators across the state to learn from and connect with one another.

This report summarizes the overall findings of a brief postevent survey of the overall convening, as well as the postbreakout session feedback forms administered after each of the three breakout sessions. Respondents rated the quality, relevance, and utility of the overall event and breakout sessions. In addition, each breakout session survey asked questions related to the topics of needed resources, identifying priorities, and the utilization of the strategies presented in the session. For the overall convening, participants were asked about priorities for the 2014–15 school year, the usefulness of resources in varying formats, strategies for increasing evaluator capacity, and an open-ended question to collect qualitative feedback.
Evaluation Results

In total, 956 participants checked in at the convening. The program for the day included a plenary address and a lunch-and-learn session on the relationship between high-quality professional development and educator evaluation. Attendees also participated in three breakout sessions:

- Session A: Using DDMs as a Lever for Change
- Session B: Developing a Shared Understanding: Consistency, Conversations, and Calibration
- Session C: Incorporating Student Feedback in Educator Evaluation

Of the total participants, 300 completed the breakout session feedback forms for session A, 362 for session B, 332 for session C, 38 for the lunch-and-learn session, and 212 for the overall convening. When reviewing evaluation results, readers should consider the low response rates ranging from 22 percent to 38 percent. Throughout this report, percentages may not total 100 due to rounding and nonresponses to individual items.

The surveys for the overall convening and the breakout sessions asked participants to identify their current positions. Figure 1 shows the results of the overall convening responses over both days. The appendix provides responses broken out by day and individual breakout session attendance. In general, responses were similar across both days and breakout sessions. Approximately one quarter of respondents (26 percent) identified as a district administrator, and about one fifth of respondents (19 percent) identified as a school administrator. More than one quarter (28 percent) identified as a classroom educator, and 15 percent were a union/association leader. A detailed breakdown of positions by overall convening and breakout sessions, including written responses for other, can be found in the appendix.

Figure 1. Survey Respondents by Field of Employment (N = 212): Overall Convening
Overall Convening Evaluation Results

Quality

Respondents were asked to rate the quality of the overall convening based on four items:

1. The information presented was useful.
2. Overall, I was satisfied with the event/breakout session.
3. The event was well organized.
4. My questions and concerns were addressed.

As shown in Figure 2, the vast majority of respondents (80–97 percent) agreed that all quality indicators were met. Nearly all (94 percent–97 percent) of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that the event was well organized and that the information presented was useful. Slightly fewer, although still the majority of respondents (80 percent), agreed or strongly agreed that their questions and concerns were answered.

Figure 2. Quality of Overall Session (N = 209)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The information presented was useful.</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The event was well organized.</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My questions and concerns were addressed.</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, I was satisfied with the event.</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Relevance and Usefulness

The survey asked respondents to rate the relevance and usefulness of the overall convening based on three items:

1. I plan to use what I learned to improve educator evaluation implementation in my school or district.
2. I plan to share information from this convening with my colleagues.
3. Attending the event was a good use of my time.

As shown in Figure 3, the vast majority of respondents (91–99 percent) agreed that all relevance and usefulness indicators were met. Most notably, all but one percent of respondents said they plan to share information from the convening with colleagues. A slightly lesser proportion (93 percent) said they plan to use what was learned to improve educator evaluation implementation. More than nine out of ten respondents (91 percent) agreed or strongly agreed that attending the
overall event was a good use of time. Figure 3 provides a visual representation, and the appendix provides details on responses from individual days.

**Figure 3. Relevance and Usefulness of Overall Convening (N = 211)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I plan to use what I learned to improve educator evaluation implementation in my school or district.</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I plan to share information from this convening with my colleagues.</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attending the event was a good use of my time.</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Implementation Resources**

Respondents were asked to rate their likelihood of using ESE-provided resources to further their work by implementing new evaluation processes and tools. As shown in Figure 4, respondents said they are most likely to use **short and more general guidance documents or protocols containing high-level recommendations**. The second most likely to be utilized resource is **in-person trainings or meetings**, followed by **webinars**. A majority of respondents said they are only somewhat likely to very unlikely to utilize **recorded video presentations** (52 percent) and **longer guidance documents or protocols** (72 percent).

**Figure 4. How likely are you to access ESE resources in the following formats? (N = 171)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>Very likely</th>
<th>Likely</th>
<th>Somewhat likely</th>
<th>Unlikely</th>
<th>Very Unlikely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Short and more general guidance documents or protocols (less than five pages) that provide high-level recommendations for implementation</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-person trainings or meetings</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webinar</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recorded video presentation or training</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longer guidance documents or protocols (10+ pages) that provide more detailed recommendations for implementation</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Priorities

Respondents on the survey for the overall convening were asked to rank priorities in their school or district for education evaluation implementation in the 2014–15 school year. As detailed in Figure 5, the majority of respondents rated using DDMs in evaluation and calibration as priority 1 or priority 2. A smaller proportion (27 percent) ranked connecting education evaluation to implementation of the Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks as priority 1 or 2. Almost half of respondents (46 percent) ranked collecting student feedback as a low priority (4 or 5). Figure 5 summarizes responses across both days; the appendix contains responses broken out by day.

**Figure 5. Please rank the following priorities in your school/district for education evaluation implementation for the 2014–15 school year. Rank using 1–5, with 1 representing the highest priority. (N = 212)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Rank 1</th>
<th>Rank 2</th>
<th>Rank 3</th>
<th>Rank 4</th>
<th>Rank 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Using district-determined measures in evaluation</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calibration</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecting education evaluation to implementation of the Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linking education evaluation to implementation of professional development</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collecting student feedback</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evaluation Capacity

The overall convening survey asked participants to provide information regarding their district’s efforts to increase evaluator capacity. As shown in Figure 6, the majority of respondents reported that their district is using an online platform to manage evaluation (55 percent) and providing ongoing professional development opportunities for evaluators (49 percent). Respondents not implementing those strategies often indicated their district is planning or considering them. More than one quarter of respondents (28 percent) said their district is distributing evaluator responsibilities to other administrators. The least-utilized or -considered strategy was distributing evaluator responsibilities to teacher leaders with nearly half of respondents (46 percent) saying their district has not considered this strategy. Figure 6 summarizes responses across both days, and a detailed breakout of responses by day is included in the appendix.
Figure 6. In what ways is your district working to increase the capacity of evaluators? (N = 148)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Implementing</th>
<th>Planning</th>
<th>Considering</th>
<th>Has not considered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Using an online platform to manage the evaluation system</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing ongoing professional development opportunities for evaluators</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributing evaluator responsibilities to other administrators</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating a resource library for evaluators, including evaluation templates and exemplars</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributing evaluator responsibilities to teacher leaders</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Open-Ended Items

The overall convening survey concluded by asking respondents to share any additional feedback about the event. Across both days, 29 participants responded to this question. While several respondents were positive, many took the opportunity to give critical feedback that can be integrated into future convenings. Responses are summarized here with illustrative quotations.

- **Positive feedback (n = 8).**
  - “Thank you. This was well worth a day out of the district. I learned a great deal.”
  - “Such a rich presentation. I wish I had been here for both days. And I was not looking forward to coming at all. Great job.”
  - “Nice job! Hard to pack so much into one day. Appreciate info from other districts.”
  - “The evaluator calibration session was great because it allowed us to hear from four districts that have been in the trenches and had concrete feedback and suggestion. The sessions were interactive and just long enough before we moved to a new table.”

- **Suggestions for improvement (n = 16)**
  - “This felt more like a general overview. We needed specific info, not general strategies. Calibration session was best but too short.”
  - “Interested in learning what evaluation software school districts are using [and hearing] pros and cons from the different systems.”
  - “More focus on populations other than general education, language arts, and math would be appreciated. Especially students with severe special needs.”
• “I expected a bit more with DDMs [district-determined measures]. I was hoping to see actual examples and not just a summary of how people got there. As to the calibration workshop, I thought the information was somewhat useful, but the presentation format was difficult. Too many people.”

• “More soundproof rooms. Activity in Salon B very disruptive in Salon A.”

Breakout Session A: Using DDMs as a Lever for Change Results

This breakout session featured presentations from district leaders and staff from educational collaborations who are engaged in developing and implementing DDMs. Across both days (four sessions total), 300 respondents completed the postsession survey. Results are summarized here with detailed breakdowns by individual session included in the appendix.

Quality, Relevance, and Usefulness

Respondents were asked to rate the quality, relevance, and usefulness of the DDM breakout session based on six items:

1. Information was clearly presented.
2. Materials and activities were relevant to the topic of the session.
3. The activity in this session supported my planning for the 2014–15 school year.
4. My questions and concerns were addressed.
5. There were sufficient opportunities to interact with other participants.
6. The breakout session met my expectations.

Figure 7 summarizes responses to these six items across both days. A large majority of respondents (68 to 97 percent) agreed or strongly agreed with each of the quality, relevance, and usefulness statements. Most notably, 97 percent of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that information was clearly presented. More than four fifths of respondents (84 percent) agreed or strongly agreed that the activity in the DDM session supported planning for the 2014–15 school year. Almost one quarter of respondents (23 percent) disagreed or strongly disagreed that their questions and concerns were addressed in the session.
**Figure 7. Please rate your level of agreement or disagreement with the following statements (N = 300)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Materials and activities were relevant to the topic of the session.</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information was clearly presented.</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There were sufficient opportunities to interact with other participants.</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The activity in this session supported my planning for the 2014–15 school year.</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The breakout session met my expectations.</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My questions and concerns were addressed.</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Application**

Respondents were asked to rate their likelihood of applying what they learned in the session by sharing information with colleagues and using lessons learned to improve educator evaluation implementation. As shown in Figure 8, a majority of respondents indicated that they were *very likely* or *likely* to share information with colleagues (80 percent) and use it to improve educator evaluation implementation (71 percent). Almost one fifth of respondents said they are *somewhat likely* to apply what they learned (17 percent and 19 percent), and very few said they are *unlikely* or *very unlikely* to do so.

**Figure 8. After attending this session, how likely are you to… (N = 299)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Very likely</th>
<th>Likely</th>
<th>Somewhat likely</th>
<th>Unlikely</th>
<th>Very Unlikely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Share information from this session with your colleagues?</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use what you learned to improve educator evaluation implementation in your school or district?</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Readiness

Respondents rated their readiness to implement DDMs in the 2014–15 school year. As shown in Figure 9, a large majority of respondents stated they are ready to implement DDMs in *some* or *most* grades and/or subjects. About one tenth of respondents (9 percent) said they are not ready to implement DDMs in any grades and/or subjects.

**Figure 9. Thinking about the 2014–15 school year, which of the following best describes your district’s readiness to implement DDMs? (N = 276)**

- Ready to implement DDMs in *most* grades and/or subjects: 37%
- Ready to implement DDMs in *some* grades and/or subjects: 37%
- Ready to implement DDMs in all grades and/or subjects: 17%
- Not ready to implement DDMs in any grades and/or subjects: 9%

Additional Topics (N = 27)

The survey asked respondents to list additional topics related to DDM implementation for which they would like to see additional ESE resources. Across both days, 27 respondents provided an answer to this question. Their responses are summarized here.

- Additional examples of DDMs, including common language and developing DDMs for noncore subjects such as history, art, and physical education (n = 11)
- Conducting analysis of data from DDMs and applying findings (n = 7)
- Developing appropriate DDMs for nongeneral education teachers (n = 6)

Comments (N = 25)

The survey invited respondents to give any additional comments related to the session. Across both days, 25 respondents provided an answer to this question. Their responses are summarized here. Note that some of the responses to the open-ended comment question are similar to the responses to the additional topics question.

- Positive feedback regarding the presenter and content of the session (n = 9)
- Suggestions for improvement (n = 12)
  - Concrete examples of DDMs, implementation, and rating system (n = 5)
  - Improve space for hearing presenters (n = 2)
Breakout Session B: Developing a Shared Understanding: Consistency, Conversations, and Calibration Results

This breakout session featured presentations from district leaders sharing focus areas, strategies, and resources they used or created to support work on calibration. Across both days (four sessions total), 362 respondents completed the postsession survey. Results are summarized here with detailed breakdowns by individual session included in the appendix.

Quality, Relevance, and Usefulness

Respondents were asked to rate the quality, relevance, and usefulness of the DDM breakout session based on six items:

1. Information was clearly presented.
2. Materials and activities were relevant to the topic of the session.
3. The activity in this session supported my planning for the 2014–15 school year.
4. My questions and concerns were addressed.
5. There were sufficient opportunities to interact with other participants.
6. The breakout session met my expectations.

Figure 10 summarizes responses to these six items across both days. A large majority of respondents (87 to 96 percent) agreed or strongly agreed with each of the quality, relevance, and usefulness statements. Most notably, 96 percent of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that materials and activities were relevant to the topic of the session. More than nine tenths of respondents (92 percent) agreed or strongly agreed that the activity in the calibration session supported planning for the 2014–15 school year. The calibration session was the highest rated of all breakout sessions for quality, relevance, and usefulness measures.
Figure 10. Please rate your level of agreement or disagreement with the following statements (N = 359)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Materials and activities were relevant to the topic of the session.</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information was clearly presented.</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The activity in this session supported my planning for the 2014–15 school year.</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The breakout session met my expectations.</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There were sufficient opportunities to interact with other participants.</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My questions and concerns were addressed.</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Application

Respondents were asked to rate their likelihood of applying what they learned in the session by sharing information with colleagues and using lessons learned to improve educator evaluation implementation. The vast majority of respondents indicated that they were very likely or likely to share information with colleagues (87 percent) and use learnings to improve educator evaluation implementation (84 percent). Approximately one tenth of respondents said they are somewhat likely to apply what they learned (10 percent and 11 percent), and almost no respondents said they are unlikely or very unlikely to do so. Figure 11 summarizes all responses.

Figure 11. After attending this session, how likely are you to… (N = 358)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Likely Question</th>
<th>Very likely</th>
<th>Likely</th>
<th>Somewhat likely</th>
<th>Unlikely</th>
<th>Very Unlikely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Share information from this session with your colleagues?</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use what you learned to improve educator evaluation implementation in your school or district?</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Focus areas

The survey asked respondents to identify focus areas for improving evaluation consistency in the 2014–15 school year. As shown in Figure 12, the most commonly selected focus areas were providing feedback (61 percent) and observations (53 percent). More than one third of respondents (37 percent) identified evidence collection as an area of focus. For the nearly one tenth (9 percent) of respondents who selected other, two said all of the listed focus areas, five said calibration, and two said expectations.

Figure 12. Based on your team planning, what focus area(s) will you target in the 2014–15 school year to improve evaluation consistency? Select all that apply. \(N = 362\)

![Focus areas chart]

Additional Topics \(N = 29\)

The survey asked respondents to list additional topics related to calibration for which they would like to see additional ESE resources. Across both days, 29 respondents provided an answer to this question. Common responses are summarized here.

- Deeper guidance on calibration, including working models, dealing with subjectivity, and identifying indicators at the individual school and district level. \(n = 12\)
- Training and resources for evaluators, including giving difficult feedback and giving high quality feedback. \(n = 6\)
- Evidence collection, including the specifics of evidence collection, developing uniform observation expectations, the timeline for collecting evidence, and connecting evidence to ratings. \(n = 5\)

Comments \(N = 26\)

The survey invited respondents to give any additional comments related to the session. Across both days, 26 respondents provided an answer to this question. Their responses are summarized
here. Note that some of the responses to the open-ended comment question are similar to the responses to the additional topics question.

- Positive feedback regarding the format and content of the session \( (n = 16) \)
- Suggestions for improvement \( (n = 10) \)
  - Improve use of space to have enough room for workgroups and simultaneous presentations. \( (n = 9) \)
  - Have presenters provide resource information such as handouts or websites. \( (n = 1) \)

**Breakout Session C: Incorporating Student Feedback in Educator Evaluation Results**

This session introduced participants to the use of student surveys and included a review of the progress to date in ESE’s development of a model student feedback instrument. District presenters discussed the value of student feedback for an educator’s practice as well as their personal experiences using student feedback to improve instruction. Across both days (four sessions total), 332 respondents completed the postsession survey. Results are summarized here with detailed breakdowns by individual session included in the appendix.

**Quality, Relevance, and Usefulness**

Respondents were asked to rate the quality, relevance, and usefulness of the student feedback breakout session based on six items:

1. Information was clearly presented.
2. Materials and activities were relevant to the topic of the session.
3. The activity in this session supported my planning for the 2014–15 school year.
4. My questions and concerns were addressed.
5. There were sufficient opportunities to interact with other participants.
6. The breakout session met my expectations.

Figure 13 summarizes responses to these six items across both days. A majority of respondents (56 to 98 percent) agreed or strongly agreed with each of the quality, relevance, and usefulness statements. Most notably, 97 percent–98 percent of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that materials and activities were relevant to the topic of the session and that information was clearly presented. More than four in five respondents (82 percent) agreed or strongly agreed that the activity in the student feedback session supported planning for the 2014–15 school year. More than one third of respondents (36 percent) disagreed or strongly disagreed that there were sufficient opportunities to interact with other participants.
Figure 13. Please rate your level of agreement or disagreement with the following statements (N = 327)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Materials and activities were relevant to the topic of the session.</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information was clearly presented.</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The activity in this session supported my planning for the 2014–15 school year.</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My questions and concerns were addressed.</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The breakout session met my expectations.</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There were sufficient opportunities to interact with other participants.</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Application

Respondents were asked to rate their likelihood of applying what they learned in the session by sharing information with colleagues and using learnings to improve educator evaluation implementation. A majority of respondents indicated that they were very likely or likely to share information with colleagues (87 percent) and use learnings to improve educator evaluation implementation (84 percent). Approximately one tenth of respondents said they are somewhat likely to apply what they learned (10 percent and 11 percent). Almost no respondents said they are unlikely or very unlikely to do so. Figure 14 summarizes all responses.

Figure 14. After attending this session, how likely are you to… (N = 328)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Very likely</th>
<th>Likely</th>
<th>Somewhat likely</th>
<th>Unlikely</th>
<th>Very Unlikely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Share information from this session with your colleagues?</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use what you learned to improve educator evaluation implementation in your school or district?</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Incorporating Student Feedback

The survey asked respondents to identify at which point in the evaluation cycle they would incorporate student feedback. As shown in Figure 15, the most commonly selected points were self-assessment (66 percent) and goal setting and plan development (63 percent). One third of respondents (33 percent) selected formative assessment/evaluation, and about one in five selected educator plan implementation and/or summative evaluation (20 percent and 18 percent).

Figure 15. Following this session, at which point in the five-step cycle of evaluation do you plan to incorporate student feedback? Select all that apply. (N = 332)

Additional Topics (N = 29)

The survey asked respondents to list additional topics related to student feedback implementation for which they would like to see additional ESE resources. Across both days, 29 respondents provided an answer to this question. Their responses are summarized here.

- Information and training on collecting student feedback outside of a survey, particularly for young students (K–2), special education students, and English language learners. (n = 11)
- Implementation resources including budgeting, data analysis, and navigating implications for teacher contracts. (n = 8)
- Sample survey questions and methods for ensuring survey validity. (n = 5)

Comments (N = 22)

The survey invited respondents to give any additional comments related to the session. Across both days, 22 respondents provided an answer to this question. Their responses are summarized here. Note that some of the responses to the open-ended comment question are similar to the responses to the additional topics question.

- Positive feedback regarding the content of the session (n = 6)
- Suggestions for improvement (n = 10)
• More information on the specifics of implementation \((n = 6)\)
• Provide more opportunity for interaction, including a question and answer period. \((n = 3)\)

**Lunch and Learn Sessions Results**

During lunch, participants had an opportunity to attend a session addressing the relationship between high-quality professional development and educator evaluation. Similar to the breakout sessions, the lunch sessions contained the same content each day. The sessions were designed as a dialogue between participants and district administrators who are working on connecting the Massachusetts Standards for Professional Development to educator evaluation. Across both days, 38 respondents completed the post-lunch session survey. Results are summarized here with detailed breakdowns by individual session included in the appendix.

**Quality, Relevance, and Usefulness**

Respondents were asked to rate the quality, relevance, and usefulness of the lunch and learn sessions based on six items:

1. Information was clearly presented.
2. Materials and activities were relevant to the topic of the session.
3. The activity in this session supported my planning for the 2014–15 school year.
4. My questions and concerns were addressed.
5. There were sufficient opportunities to interact with other participants.
6. The breakout session met my expectations.

Figure 16 summarizes responses to these six items across both days. A majority of respondents (53 to 97 percent) agreed or strongly agreed with each of the quality, relevance, and usefulness statements except one. Most notably, 97 percent of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that materials and activities were relevant to the topic of the session. Almost nine out of 10 respondents (87 percent) agreed or strongly agreed that the activity in the lunch and learn sessions supported planning for the 2014–15 school year. Importantly, more than one third of respondents (34 percent and 37 percent) disagreed or strongly disagreed that there were sufficient opportunities for interaction and that their questions and concerns were addressed.
Figure 16. Please rate your level of agreement or disagreement with the following statements (N = 38)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Information was clearly presented.</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials and activities were relevant to the topic of the session.</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The activity in this session supported my planning for the 2014–15 school year.</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The breakout session met my expectations.</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My questions and concerns were addressed.</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There were sufficient opportunities to interact with other participants.</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Application

Respondents were asked to rate their likelihood of applying what they learned in the session by sharing information with colleagues and using learnings to improve educator evaluation implementation. Almost three quarters of respondents indicated that they were very likely or likely to share information with colleagues (71 percent), and more than four in five said they planned to use learnings to improve educator evaluation implementation (84 percent). A sizeable minority of respondents said they are somewhat likely to apply what they learned (13 percent and 24 percent); almost no respondents said they are unlikely or very unlikely to do so. Figure 17 summarizes all responses.

Figure 17. After attending this session, how likely are you to… (N = 38)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Very likely</th>
<th>Likely</th>
<th>Somewhat likely</th>
<th>Unlikely</th>
<th>Very Unlikely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Use what you learned to improve educator evaluation implementation in your school or district?</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share information from this session with your colleagues?</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Utilization of Massachusetts Standards for Professional Development

The survey asked respondents to identify whether their district is utilizing the Massachusetts Standards for Professional Development (MSPD) in educator evaluation. As shown in Figure 18, more than half of respondents (54 percent) said their district is implementing or planning to use MSPD in educator evaluation. Almost one quarter (22 percent) are considering it, and one quarter (25 percent) have not considered using MSPD in teacher evaluation.

Figure 18. Is your district using the Massachusetts Standards for Professional Development to support educator evaluation? (N = 28)

Additional Topics (N = 2)

The survey asked respondents to list additional topics related to connecting educator evaluation and professional development for which they would like to see additional ESE resources. Across both days, two respondents provided an answer to this question. One asked for the information to be shared on the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education professional development website, and the other made a positive comment about the session.

Comments (N = 6)

The survey invited respondents to give any additional comments related to the session. Across both days, six respondents provided an answer to this question. Four comments were positive about the content of the session. Two comments indicated that professional development in the respondents’ home districts is lacking and disjointed.
Conclusion

As this report demonstrated, the event was generally and broadly valuable to participants, and participants plan to apply what they learned at the convening to improve educator evaluation in their home schools and districts. Respondents most consistently rated the calibration breakout session highly and had the greatest proportion of improvement suggestions for the DDM session. As ESE moves forward supporting districts through the implementation of new educator evaluation methods, this report may be instructive for guiding the development of new materials and supports.