1-Hour Overview: The Massachusetts Framework for Educator Evaluation

September 2012
Welcome

Please sit with members from your school or district team
ESE Training Modules for Evaluators

✿ 1-Hour Overview

✿ Module 2: Unpacking the Rubric

✿ Module 3: Self-Assessment

✿ Module 4: S.M.A.R.T. Goals & Educator Plan Development

✿ Module 5: Gathering Evidence

✿ Module 6: Observations and Feedback
Agenda

★ Key Components of the new Educator Evaluation Framework

- Summative Performance Rating
  - Performance Standards & Rubrics
- Student Impact Rating
- 5-Step Cycle

★ Next Steps
Intended Outcomes

★ Participants will have a clear understanding of the new educator evaluation framework, including:
  - The two ratings
  - New performance standards
  - The 5-Step Cycle of Evaluation

★ Participants will identify concrete “next steps” related to:
  - Training school staff on educator evaluation
  - Implementation at your school or district
Collaborative Development of the Educator Evaluation Framework

Race to the Top (August 2010)
(with district and local union agreement)

Task Force Report (March 2011)
(wide representation from the field, Listening Tour)

New Regulations (June 2011)
(500+ public comments)

Building Effective Educators

Model System (January 2012)
(collaboration with Level 4 schools, Early Adopter districts, unions and state associations)
Priorities of the new evaluation framework

- **Place Student Learning at the Center** – Student learning is central to the evaluation and development of educators

- **Promote Growth and Development** – Provide all educators with feedback and opportunities that support continuous growth and improvement through collaboration

- **Recognize Excellence** – Encourage districts to recognize and reward excellence in teaching and leadership

- **Set a High Bar for Tenure** – Entrants to the teaching force must demonstrate Proficient performance on all standards within three years to earn Professional Teacher Status

- **Shorten Timelines for Improvement** – Educators who are not rated Proficient face accelerated timelines for improvement

We want to ensure that each student in the Commonwealth is taught by an effective educator, in schools and districts led by effective leaders.
Key Components of the New Evaluation Framework
Key Components of the New Evaluation Framework

★ Summative Performance Rating
  - New Performance Standards & Indicators
  - Four Plans

★ Impact Rating on Student Performance

★ 5-Step Cycle
Everyone earns two ratings

Summative Performance Rating

Exemplary
Proficient
Needs Improvement
Unsatisfactory

Impact Rating on Student Performance

High
Moderate
Low

*Most districts will not begin issuing Impact Ratings before the 2014-2015 school year.
Summative Performance Rating
Summative Performance Rating

Rating reflects:
- Performance based on Standards and Indicators of Effective Practice
- Progress toward educator goals

Evidence includes:
1. Multiple measures of student learning, growth and achievement
2. Judgments based on observations and artifacts of professional practice
3. Additional evidence relevant to Standards (student/staff feedback)
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4 Performance Levels

- Exemplary
- Proficient
- Needs Improvement
- Unsatisfactory
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4 Performance Levels

Exemplary

Proficient

Needs Improvement

Unsatisfactory

Performance consistently and significantly exceeds the requirements of a standard or overall

Performance fully and consistently meets the requirements of a standard or overall

Summative Performance Rating
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# 4 Standards of Effective Practice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School &amp; District Administrators</th>
<th>Teachers &amp; Specialized Instructional Support Personnel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Leadership*</td>
<td>Curriculum, Planning &amp; Assessment*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management &amp; Operations</td>
<td>Teaching All Students*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family &amp; Community Engagement</td>
<td>Family &amp; Community Engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Culture</td>
<td>Professional Culture</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Standards requiring Proficient rating or above to achieve overall Summative Rating of Proficient or above*
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# Standards and Indicators of Effective Teaching Practice

## I. Curriculum, Planning, & Assessment
- **A. Curriculum and Planning**
- **B. Assessment**
- **C. Analysis**
  - A. Instruction
  - B. Learning Environment
  - C. Cultural Proficiency
  - D. Expectations

## II. Teaching All Students
- **A. Instruction**
- **B. Learning Environment**
- **C. Cultural Proficiency**

## III. Family & Community Engagement
- **A. Engagement**
- **B. Collaboration**
- **C. Communication**

## IV. Professional Culture
- **A. Reflection**
- **B. Professional Growth**
- **C. Collaboration**
- **D. Decision-making**
- **E. Shared Responsibility**
- **F. Professional Responsibilities**
# Standards and Indicators of Effective Teaching Practice
(with ESE Model Rubric elements)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I. Curriculum, Planning, &amp; Assessment</th>
<th>II. Teaching All Students</th>
<th>III. Family &amp; Community Engagement</th>
<th>IV. Professional Culture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. Curriculum and Planning</strong></td>
<td><strong>A. Instruction</strong></td>
<td><strong>A. Engagement</strong></td>
<td><strong>A. Reflection</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Child and Adolescent Development</td>
<td>2. Student Engagement</td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Goal Setting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Rigorous Standards-Based Unit Design</td>
<td>3. Meeting Diverse Needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Well-Structured Lessons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B. Assessment</strong></td>
<td><strong>B. Learning Environment</strong></td>
<td><strong>B. Collaboration</strong></td>
<td><strong>B. Professional Growth</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Adjustments to Practice</td>
<td>2. Collaborative Learning Environment</td>
<td>2. Curriculum Support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C. Analysis</strong></td>
<td><strong>C. Cultural Proficiency</strong></td>
<td><strong>C. Communication</strong></td>
<td><strong>C. Collaboration</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Sharing Conclusions with Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D. Expectations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>D. Decision-making</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. High Expectations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Access to Knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E. Engagement</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>E. Shared Responsibility</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F. Professional Culture</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Shared Responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. Instruction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B. Learning Environment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C. Cultural Proficiency</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D. Expectations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E. Engagement</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F. Professional Culture</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Standards and Indicators of Effective Teaching Practice (with ESE Model Rubric elements)

II. Teaching All Students

A. Instruction
   1. Quality and Effort of Work
   2. Student Engagement
   3. Meeting Diverse Needs

B. Learning Environment
   1. Safe Learning Environment
   2. Collaborative Learning Environment
   3. Student Motivation

C. Cultural Proficiency
   1. Respects Differences
   2. Maintains Respectful Environment

D. Expectations
   1. Clear Expectations
   2. High Expectations
   3. Access to Knowledge

* For more information on rubrics, see Part III: Guide to Rubrics and Model Rubrics
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## Four Model System Rubrics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role-Specific Rubric</th>
<th>Summative Performance Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent Rubric (District-Level Administrators)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal Rubric (School-Level Administrators)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Teacher Rubric</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialized Instructional Support Personnel Rubric</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Similarities across rubrics underscore common responsibilities and understandings.
- Role-Specific Indicators can supplement rubrics to provide differentiation by role.
Four Standards of Practice  --  Educator Goals

Summative Performance Rating

Exemplary – Proficient – Needs Improvement -- Unsatisfactory
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Summative Rating Determines Your Educator Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summative Rating</th>
<th>1-yr Self-Directed Growth Plan</th>
<th>2-yr Self-Directed Growth Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exemplary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proficient</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs Improvement</td>
<td>Directed Growth Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Improvement Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Developing Educator Plan: for new teachers & administrators
Four Types of Educator Plans

★ Developing Educator Plan
For educators without Professional Teaching Status, administrators in the first three years in a district, or at the discretion of an evaluator for an educator in a new assignment; one school year or less in length

★ Self-Directed Growth Plan
For experienced educators rated Proficient or Exemplary on their last evaluation; these plans can be one or two school years in length

★ Directed Growth Plan
For educators rated Needs Improvement on their last evaluation; up to one school year in length

★ Improvement Plan
For educators rated Unsatisfactory on their last evaluation; min. of 30 calendar days, up to one school year in length
Student Impact Rating
Student Impact Rating

Rating reflects:

- At least 2 years of data from which *trends and patterns* can be identified
- Multiple measures of student learning, growth & achievement

Evidence must include:

- State-wide growth measures, where available (e.g. MCAS student growth percentiles, ACCESS scores)
- District-determined measures comparable across the district for all educators in the same grade or content area

*Most districts will not begin issuing Impact Ratings before the 2014-2015 school year.*
### Student Impact Rating Determines Plan Duration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summative Rating</th>
<th>1-yr Self-Directed Growth Plan</th>
<th>2-yr Self-Directed Growth Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exemplary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proficient</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs Improvement</td>
<td>Directed Growth Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Improvement Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Rating of Impact on Student Learning

- **Low**
- **Moderate**
- **High**

**Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education**
The Student Impact Rating must be based on at least 2 years of data across multiple measures, and therefore is unlikely to be issued until the following years:

- Level 4 districts: 2014-2015 school year
- All other districts: 2015-2016 school year

Districts will begin identifying and piloting district-determined measures* in 2013

* For more information on district-determined measures, see Part VII: Rating Educator Impact on Student Learning Using District-Determined Measures of Student Learning
The 5-Step Evaluation Cycle

A Step-by-Step Review
5 Step Evaluation Cycle

- Every educator is an active participant in their own evaluation
- Process promotes collaboration and continuous learning
Step 1: Self-Assessment

★ Educators self-assess their performance using:
  o Student data, and
  o Performance rubric
    - Based on the Standards and Indicators of Effective Teaching Practice and/or Administrative Leadership

★ Educators propose goals related to their professional practice and student learning needs
Step 2: Analysis, Goal Setting and Plan Development

★ Educators set S.M.A.R.T. goals:
  o Student learning goal
  o Professional practice goal
    (Aligned to the Standards and Indicators of Effective Practice)

★ Educators are required to consider **team goals**

★ Evaluators have final authority over goals
A “S.M.A.R.T.er GOAL”

A Goal Statement
+ Key Actions
+ Benchmarks (Process & Outcome)

= Educator Plan
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Step 3: Implementation of the Plan

- Educator completes the planned action steps of his/her plan
- Educator and evaluator collect evidence of practice and goal progress, including:
  - Multiple measures of student learning
  - Observations and artifacts
  - Additional evidence related to performance standards
- Evaluator provides feedback
Strategic Evidence Collection

★ Prioritize based on goals and focus areas

★ Quality not quantity

★ Artifacts should be “naturally occurring” sources of evidence (e.g. lesson plans)

★ Consider common artifacts for which all educators are responsible
Observations

- The regulations define Proficient practice with regard to evaluation as including “frequent unannounced visits to classrooms” followed by “targeted and constructive feedback to teachers” (604 CMR 35.04, “Standards and Indicators of Effective Administrative Leadership Practice)

- The Model System recommends short, frequent unannounced observations for all educators, as well as at least one announced observation for non-PTS and struggling educators.
Step 4: Formative Assessment/Evaluation

- Occurs mid-way through the 5-Step Cycle
  - Typically Jan/Feb for educators on a 1-year plan (formative assessment)
  - Typically May/June for educators on a 2-year plan (formative evaluation)

- Educator and Evaluator review evidence and assess progress on educator’s goals
Step 5: Summative Evaluation

Evaluator determines an overall summative rating of performance based on:

- Comprehensive picture of practice captured through multiple sources of evidence

Summative Performance Rating reflects:

- Ratings on each of the four Standards
- Progress toward goals
Educator Evaluation: Annual Cycle
Struggling Educators and Educators without Professional Teacher Status

**Self Assessment**
- September
  - Educators self-assess and propose goals

**Plan Development, Analysis, and Goal-Setting**
- Sept - Oct
  - Educator Plan is determined that includes Goals and Actions

**Implementation of the Plan & Collection of Evidence**
- Oct - May
  - Educators implement the Plan; both Educator and Evaluator gather evidence

**Formative Assessment**
- Jan - Feb
  - Evaluator assess/evaluates Educator progress; mid-cycle or on-going

**Summative Evaluation**
- May - June
  - Evaluator determines rating on each Standard and Overall Rating

**Student Learning**
- Analyze data of current students
- Create at least one goal. Must consider team or department goals

**Goals**
- Educator proposes; Evaluator approves

**Observations**
- At least one announced + Multiple brief, unannounced observations with feedback

**Actions and Alignment**
- Actions Educator must take to attain goals that are aligned with statewide standards and indicators, e.g., PD, coursework

**Gather Artifacts from each Category of Evidence**
- Products of Practice
- Multiple Measures of Student Learning
- Other Evidence

**Progress on Each Standard**
- Based on Rubrics and supported by artifacts
- Exemplary
- Proficient
- Needs Improvement
- Unsatisfactory

**Rating on Each Standard**
- Based on Rubrics and supported by artifacts

**Summative Overall Rating**
- Exemplary
- Proficient
- Needs Improvement
- Unsatisfactory

Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education
Educator Evaluation: Two-Year Cycle
Proficient and Exemplary Educators with Professional Teacher Status

Self Assessment
Sept, Yr 1
Teacher self-assesses and proposes goals

Educator Plan Development & Goal-Setting
Sept – Oct, Yr 1
Teacher and Principal determine Educator Plan that includes Goals and Actions

Implementation of the Plan & Collection of Evidence
Oct, Yr 1 – May, Yr 2
Teacher implements the Plan; Both teacher and Principal gather evidence

Formative Evaluation
May – June, Year 1
Principal evaluates performance and progress at end of Yr1; Same rating as before unless "significant change"

Summative Evaluation
May – June, Year 2
Principal determines teacher's rating on each Standard and Overall Rating

Student Learning
Analyze data of current students. Create at least one goal. Consider team or department goals

Goals
Teacher proposes; Principal approves

Observations
At least one unannounced. Multiple brief, unannounced observations with feedback

Progress on Goals
(Individual and/or Team/Dept. Goals)

Progress on Each Standard
Based on Rubrics and supported by artifacts:
- Exemplary
- Proficient
- Needs Improvement
- Unsatisfactory

Rating on Each Standard
Based on Rubrics and supported by artifacts

Summative Overall Rating
- Exemplary
- Proficient
- Needs Improvement
- Unsatisfactory

Actions and Alignment
As determined by Principal: Actions teacher must take to attain goals that are aligned with statewide standards and indicators

Gather Artifacts from each Category of Evidence
- Products of Practice
- Multiple Measures of Student Learning
- Other Evidence

Progress on Goals
(Individual and/or Team/Dept. Goals)
Every educator is an active participant in the evaluation process. Every educator uses a rubric and data about student learning. Every educator proposes at least 1 professional practice goal and 1 student learning goal. Team goals must be considered. Every educator earns one of four ratings of performance. Every educator has a mid-cycle review. Educators and their evaluator collect evidence and assesses progress. Collaboration and Continuous Learning are the focus.
Next Steps – Team Time

★ Confirm educator evaluation training schedule for school staff
  o Training Modules for Evaluators
  o Training Workshops for Teachers
  http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeval/implementation/

★ What does your school or district need to focus on?
Priorities of the new evaluation framework

✓ **Place Student Learning at the Center** – Multiple measures of student performance informing student learning goals and the Student Impact Rating

✓ **Promote Growth and Development** – Common, rigorous Standards and Indicators of effective practice, educator-driven 5-Step Cycle, continuous opportunities for feedback and collaboration

✓ **Recognize Excellence** – Through Summative and Impact Ratings, recognition of truly “Exemplary” educators who serve as models for others

✓ **Set a High Bar for Tenure** – “Proficiency” required in all four Standards of Effective Practice in order to receive professional teaching status

✓ **Shorten Timelines for Improvement** – Shorter Educator Plans for struggling educators focus resources and shorten timelines for improvement

We want to ensure that each student in the Commonwealth is taught by an effective educator in schools and districts led by effective leaders.
ESE Training Modules for Evaluators

★ 1-Hour Overview

★ **Module 2: Unpacking the Rubric**

★ Module 3: Self-Assessment

★ Module 4: S.M.A.R.T. Goals & Educator Plan Development

★ Module 5: Gathering Evidence

★ Module 6: Observations and Feedback
Feedback and Questions

Please take a moment to complete the feedback form being handed out. We appreciate your feedback!

Questions?

- About this training:
  E-mail [FACILITATOR/VENDOR EMAIL HERE]
- About educator evaluation more generally:
  E-mail EducatorEvaluation@doe.mass.edu

Additional information is available at:
- www.doe.mass.edu/edeval/