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DRAFT FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES
Priorities of the Evaluation Framework

✓ Place Student Learning at the Center
✓ Promote Growth and Development
✓ Recognize Excellence
✓ Set a High Bar for Tenure
✓ Shorten Timelines for Improvement
A Work in Progress

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

- At present, the priorities of the Framework have not been fully achieved in most districts.
- The Student Impact Rating emphasizes student learning and outcomes.
Most districts have identified/developed DDMs.*
Mixed opinions about whether DDMs are essential to ed eval.
Many districts are still in the early stages of setting parameters for high, moderate, and low growth.
The starting line has moved several times:

2013-14
Original regulatory timeline

2014-15
Timeline shift #1: Commissioner establishes 2013-14 as a pilot year

2015-16
Timeline shift #2: Commissioner establishes extension request process

*claims throughout this presentation are supported by M.A.S.S. member survey results and the evaluation study underway led by SRI International
ESE: Goal Oriented and Open to New Ideas

★ The Framework is solid.
★ We believe evaluating educator impact using patterns and trends based on DDMs and SGPs will prove to be robust and meaningful for educators and evaluators.

★ The concerns are real.
★ We take feedback about the culture shifts necessary to accomplish this work seriously.

★ We are committed to the goal, but open to new approaches.
★ Along with colleagues such as the M.A.S.S. officers, we have reflected on our core principles for evaluating educator impact on student learning and recognize there may well be multiple pathways to the same desired goal.
Core Principles for Evaluating Educator Impact

1. Evaluating an educator’s impact on student learning must be at the center of the educator evaluation process.

2. Districts must be able to provide educators with a rating based on their impact on students, which must also be reported to ESE.

3. Judgments about educator impact must be based on multiple, high quality measures. SGPs from statewide assessments must be used as one measure, where available.

4. As a form of checks and balances, evaluation systems must be able to juxtapose educator practice with impact on student learning.

5. Evaluation systems must respect the professional judgment of evaluators and educators.
A Proposal

★ Current process remains intact – patterns and trends using DDMs and SGPs

★ ESE is exploring ways districts may submit requests to ESE to pursue alternative pathways for incorporating educator impact into educator evaluation.

★ Approved pathways must adhere to ESE’s Core Principles.

★ NOTE: To the extent that this proposal would require changing the regulations, final implementation would be pending Board approval
Pathways for Evaluating Educator Impact

Core Principles

- Common Measures
- Student Learning Goals
- Evidence from Multiple Measures

More time

Two student learning goals

Aligned to 5-step cycle

Creation of 5th Standard

Common Assessments:
- Combat isolation.
- Foster informed conversations about student learning.
- Capitalize on educator expertise.
Pathway 1: Common Measures

- Student Impact Ratings determined using professional judgment based on patterns and trends (current process).
- **More time:** Districts may delay reporting of Student Impact Ratings for all educators until 2016-17.
Pathway 1: Common Measures

★ Why it works:
★ Retains integrity of current framework – no need to re-educate educators and evaluators.
★ Provides more time for districts that need it.
★ Addresses concerns about new measures by providing time to try them out before determining high, moderate, or low impact.

★ Considerations:
★ Will pushing back the timeline energize or frustrate educators?
Pathway 2: Student Learning Goals

★ Student Impact Ratings determined using professional judgment based on progress toward attainment of two student learning goals.

★ Retain Comparability: One student learning goal must be aligned to school/district priorities and be measured using common assessments, where possible (may be a group goal).

★ Promote Educator Autonomy: The other goal may be tailored to the individual educator and her/his students.
Pathway 2: Student Learning Goals

★ Why it works:
★ Capitalizes on existing educator “buy-in” and understanding of student learning goals.
★ Reduces workload by requiring only one common measure per educator.
★ Honors educator autonomy.

★ Considerations:
★ How can MA avoid the pitfall seen in other states where goals prove to be far less rigorous than common assessments? What structures will districts put in place to ensure comparable rigor?
Pathway 3: Evidence from Measures

★ A 5th **Standard**, “Impact on Student Learning” is created.

★ The Summative Performance Rating is based on Standards I-V.

★ **5-Step Cycle Alignment:** Evidence of educator impact on student learning is collected through the cycle alongside evidence related to the existing Standards.

★ At least one **common assessment** must be used as evidence to inform a rating on Standard 5.
Pathway 3: Evidence from Measures

Why it works:

- Streamlines the evaluation process through alignment to the 5-step cycle.
- Jettisons anxiety connected to the Student Impact Rating.
- Provides evaluators latitude for arriving at ratings of educator impact, while still holding them accountable.

Considerations:

- How will districts effectively communicate this shift to educators?
- Will evaluators feel empowered to identify low impact?
Questions?

REMINDER: To the extent that this proposal would require changing the regulations, final implementation would be pending Board approval.