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Overview of the Educator Evaluation Framework
Two Separate Ratings

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

**Student Impact Rating**
- High
- Moderate
- Low
Sources of Evidence

**Summative Performance Rating**

- Observations
- Artifacts
- Student/Staff Feedback
- Professional Practice Goals
- Student Learning Goals

**Evidence of Practice**

**Student Impact Rating**

**Evidence of Outcomes**

- Median Student Growth Percentiles (were applicable)
- Common Measures of Student Achievement, Growth, and Learning (DDMs)
Summative Performance Rating

**Three Categories of Evidence**
- Products of Practice
- Multiple Measures of Student Learning
- Other Evidence (e.g., student and staff feedback)

**Professional Judgment**
- Rubrics
- Assessment of: EDUCATOR GOAL ATTAINMENT
  - Ratings for: Standard I, Standard II, Standard III, Standard IV

**Gathering Evidence**

**Analyzing Evidence**

**Determining a Rating**

Professional Judgment + Minimum Thresholds → Summative Performance Rating
Student Impact Rating

Year 1
- Measure 1
  - High
  - Moderate
  - Low
- Measure 2
  - High
  - Moderate
  - Low

Year 2
- Measure 1
  - High
  - Moderate
  - Low
- Measure 2
  - High
  - Moderate
  - Low

Gathering Evidence
Analyzing Evidence
Determining a Rating

Professional Judgment
Student Impact Rating
The Educator Evaluation Framework

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

Rating of Impact on Student Learning

- Low
- Moderate
- High
Overview of Student Impact Rating
Student Impact Rating

Year 1
- Measure 1
  - High
  - Moderate
  - Low
- Measure 2
  - High
  - Moderate
  - Low

Year 2
- Measure 1
  - High
  - Moderate
  - Low
- Measure 2
  - High
  - Moderate
  - Low

Gathering Evidence → Analyzing Evidence → Determining a Rating

Profession Judgment → Student Impact Rating
Student Impact Rating

★ Evaluators assign a rating of “high,” “moderate,” or “low” based on trends (at least 2 years) and patterns (at least 2 measures)

★ Based on Common Measures

★ Student Growth Percentiles (SGPs)
★ District-Determined Measures (DDMs)
Definition of DDM

“Measures of student learning, growth, and achievement related to the Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks, Massachusetts Vocational Technical Education Frameworks, or other relevant frameworks, that are comparable across grade or subject level district-wide. These measures may include, but shall not be limited to: portfolios, approved commercial assessments and district-developed pre and post unit and course assessments, and capstone projects.”

- Student Measures
- Aligned to Frameworks
- Comparable Across District
- Expansive Definition of Acceptable Measures

603 CMR 35.02
Student Impact Rating
Implementation Status
Major Areas of Work

- Identification & Development
- Administration Protocols
- Setting Parameters
- Managing and Using Data

Districts are asked to report progress in each area based on the categories: No plan in place, plan in place, in progress, nearly completed, completed.
Major Areas of Work (Completed)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Identification of Measures</th>
<th>Administration Protocols</th>
<th>Parameters</th>
<th>Data Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ELA</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS/History</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science/Tech</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Languages/ ESL</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health/ PE</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVTE</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SISPs</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on 17 district responses as of May 22, 2015
# Major Areas of Work (No Plan)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Identification of Measures</th>
<th>Administration Protocols</th>
<th>Parameters</th>
<th>Data Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ELA</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS/History</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science/Tech</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Languages/ESL</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health/PE</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVTE</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SISPs</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on 17 district responses as of May 22, 2015
SRI Statewide Survey Results

🌟 Sample
- Completed February – March 2015
- 67 Schools from 20 districts
- 44 Principals 564 school staff

🌟 Challenges
- Readiness to implement
- Meaningful Development
- Buy-in
- Understanding the System
- Using Results
Readiness to Implement

* Districts are still preparing to administer DDMs
  
  - 40% of principals feel they prepared to administer DDMs or use systems to store DDM data
  - 70% of school staff believe the DDM(s) for their grade/subject are well-aligned to the content they are teaching
  - 64% of school staff feel they have sufficient understanding on how to administer the DDMs assigned to their grade/subject

(Percent agree or strongly agree)
Meaningful Development

*Educators need additional support to develop meaningful DDMs*

- DDMs identification and development has supported meaningful **conversations among educators about curriculum** (48% and 42%)
- DDMs identification and development has supported improved **assessment literacy** (40% and 31%)
- DDMs identification and development has been a meaningful experience for educators (38% and 22%)

(Percent agree or strongly agree for Principals & School Staff)
Buy-in

Perceptions about the value of DDMs are mixed.

- 41% of principals and 39% of school staff believe DDMs in general will help improve student learning, growth, and achievement.
- 49% of principals and 38% of school staff believe DDMs are a valuable component of a robust educator evaluation system.
- 55% of principals and 30% of school staff believe Including Student Impact Ratings in the evaluation system is fair.

(Percent agree or strongly agree)
Understanding the System

There is still a lack of understanding about how DDMs are used in the Educator Evaluation system

★ 74% of principals and 46% of school staff understand how DDMs will be used as part of the educator evaluation system

★ 55% of principals and 63% of school staff feel anxious about how Student Impact Ratings will affect their job security

(Percent agree or strongly agree for Principals & School Staff)
Using Results

*Districts are unsure how they will effectively use results from DDMs*

- 70% of principals and 50% of school staff understand how the information from their DDM(s) will inform their practice
- 66% of principals believe their DDMs will improve their knowledge about the progress of students in their school
- 57% of principals believe that data from their DDMs will help them make decisions about how to support students’ learning in their school

(Percent agree or strongly agree)
ESE Response

- Additional Time for districts that need it
- Options for districts to request alternative approaches to determining a Student Impact Rating
- Continued support
  - Highlighting effective district practices
  - Additional resources for Special Education educators
  - More example DDMs
Using Professional Development to support the Student Impact Rating
Critical Skills: Over Time

Early Implementation

- Assessment Literacy
- Using Results to inform Practice
- Formal Evaluation
- Content Alignment

Continued Improvement

- Assessment Literacy
- Using Results to inform Practice
- Formal Evaluation
- Content Alignment
Content Alignment: Goals

★ Curriculum Frameworks
★ Greater Understanding (e.g. Massachusetts Frameworks, Proposed Science Standards, or National Standards for World Languages)
★ Curriculum Development, Alignment, and Review.
★ Teaching Strategies

★ Determining Core Course Objectives
★ Identification of CCOs (e.g. Importance, New Shifts, Challenging for students, or District Priorities.)
★ Coherence across grade and content
Content Alignment: Examples

★ Curriculum Frameworks
  ★ Optional, after school study group, focused on understanding the concept of proficiency from the National World Languages Standards
  ★ Professional development workshop around using multiple text sources to support writing (a shift in Massachusetts Frameworks)

★ Determining Core Course Objectives
  ★ In Worcester, they hired a consult who trained educators in the identification and development of rubrics based on common assessment “verbs”.
Assessment Literacy: Goals

★ Understanding Basic Principles of Assessment
  ★ Concepts (Validity, Error, Bias)
  ★ Item traits (Difficulty, Cognitive Complexity, Discrimination)

★ Practical Strategies
  ★ Administration Protocols
  ★ Supports, Accommodations and Modifications for different groups of students
  ★ Reviewing Alignment with Content
Assessment Literacy: Examples

★ Understanding Basic Principles of Assessment
★ Guest speaker presents examples on the distinction between item difficulty and cognitive complexity
★ Workshop that helps educators apply important assessment concepts when they review currently used assessments.

★ Practical Strategies
★ Consultant shares practices of good assessment administration and works with a team to review their own administration protocols
★ Attend assessment review of existing accommodation practices at an educational collaborative
Using Results: Goals

★ Managing and Using Data
  ★ Improving methods of collecting and storing results
  ★ Easy access to data
  ★ Understanding different potential analyses

★ Connecting Results to Practice
  ★ Creating effective habits
  ★ Looking at change over time
Using Results: Examples

★ Managing and Using Data
  ★ Cross-site visits with neighboring districts to learn different approaches to storing and managing data
  ★ Training educators to use resource tools on managing data

★ Connecting Results to Practice
  ★ Consultant helps educators identify characteristics of students labeled as having demonstrated “low growth” and shares strategies to support these students
Formal Evaluation: Goals

- Understanding how DDMs are used in evaluation
  - Teachers’ central role in leading this work
  - How Summative Rating and Student Impact Rating are combined
- Priority on formative use
Formal Evaluation: Examples

- Understanding how DDMs are used in evaluation
  - District pays for travel for educators to attend an “office hours” presentation to deepen their understanding of the policy goals and requirements.
Resources:
http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeval/sir/guidance.html

★ Quick Reference Guides
★ **QRG: Student Impact Rating**
★ **QRG: District-Determined Measures**

★ Guidance Documents
★ **Implementation Briefs**
★ **Rating Educator Impact Guidance**

★ Additional Resources
★ **Model Contract Language**
★ **Example Assessments**
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