The Massachusetts Framework for Educator Evaluation: An Orientation for Teachers and Staff

October 2014 (updated)
Training Workshops for Teachers and Staff

★ **Orientation**: Overview of Educator Evaluation Framework

★ Workshop 1: Rubric Review

★ Workshop 2: Self-Assessment

★ Workshop 3: Goal Setting

★ Workshop 4: Gathering Evidence
Agenda

★ Orientation to the Evaluation Framework
  o Context
  o The Evaluation Framework’s Two Ratings
    – Summative Performance Rating
    – Student Impact Rating
  o The 5-Step Evaluation Cycle

★ Check for Understanding

★ Q&A
Intended Outcomes

★ Participants will understand the new educator evaluation framework, including:

- The evaluation framework’s two ratings
- The new performance standards and aligned rubrics
- The 5-Step Cycle of Evaluation
Effective teachers and leaders matter

- No other school-based factor has as great an influence on student achievement as an effective teacher.
- Effective leaders create the conditions that enable powerful teaching and learning to occur.

**Therefore**, ensuring that every child is taught by effective teachers and attends a school that is led by an effective leader is key to preparing all students for success after high school.
The evaluation framework helps schools and districts support teachers and leaders by:

- Encouraging them to reflect upon and take an active role in improving their teaching/leadership practices
- Providing them with timely, relevant feedback and guidance

Every educator in an ESE-licensed position will be evaluated
The Evaluation Framework’s Two Ratings
Two Ratings

Every educator will eventually receive two ratings:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summative Performance Rating</th>
<th>Impact Rating on Student Performance*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional practice</td>
<td>Student growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exemplary</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proficient</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs Improvement</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Result:
- Determines the type of Educator Plan
- Determines the length of Educator Plan

*Districts will not begin issuing Impact Ratings until the 2015-2016 school year.
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)
Performance Rubrics

* All districts evaluate educators using a rigorous and comprehensive performance rubric aligned to the Standards and Indicators.
# Standards & Indicators

<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>A. Curriculum &amp; Planning</td>
<td>A. Instruction</td>
<td>A. Engagement</td>
<td>A. Reflection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Assessment</td>
<td>B. Learning Environment</td>
<td>B. Collaboration</td>
<td>B. Professional Growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Analysis</td>
<td>C. Cultural Proficiency</td>
<td>C. Communication</td>
<td>C. Collaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D. Expectations</td>
<td>D. Decision-Making</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>E. Shared Responsibility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F. Professional Responsibilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Standards requiring proficient rating or above to achieve overall rating of proficient or above
A 4-Point Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Needs Improvement</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Exemplary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education
# Model Rubric Excerpt

## Well-Structured Lessons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Needs Improvement</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Exemplary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Develops lessons with inappropriate student engagement strategies, pacing, sequence, activities, materials, resources, and/or grouping for the intended outcome or for the students in the class.</td>
<td>Develops lessons with only some elements of appropriate student engagement strategies, pacing, sequence, activities, materials, resources, and grouping.</td>
<td><strong>Develops well-structured lessons with challenging, measurable objectives and appropriate student engagement strategies, pacing, sequence, activities, materials, resources, technologies, and grouping.</strong></td>
<td>Develops well-structured and highly engaging lessons with challenging, measurable objectives and appropriate student engagement strategies, pacing, sequence, activities, materials, resources, technologies, and grouping to attend to every student’s needs. Is able to model this element.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Determining 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*
4 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
## 5-Step Evaluation Cycle - Timeframe

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Educator</th>
<th>Name of Plan</th>
<th>Length of Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Educator in 1st 3 Years of Teaching</td>
<td>Developing Educator Plan</td>
<td>Up to 1 School Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educator with 3+ Years of Teaching and Most Recent Rating was Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Improvement Plan</td>
<td>30 Days to 1 School Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educator with 3+ Years of Teaching and Most Recent Rating was Needs Improvement</td>
<td>Directed Growth Plan</td>
<td>Up to 1 Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educator with 3+ Years of Teaching and Most Recent Rating was Proficient or Exemplary</td>
<td>Self-Directed Growth Plan</td>
<td>1 or 2 Years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Student Impact Rating

Rating reflects:

★ At least 2 years of data from which *trends* and *patterns* can be identified

Evidence must include:

★ State-wide growth measures, where available (e.g. MCAS student growth percentiles)

★ District-determined measures comparable across the district for all educators in the same grade or content area

*Districts will not begin issuing Impact Ratings until the 2015-2016 school year.*
Determining 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></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rating of Impact on Student Learning

- Low
- Moderate
- High
Student Impact Rating

★ 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 2015-16 school year.

*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

- Self-Assessment
- Analysis, Goal Setting & Plan Development
- Implementation of the Plan
- Formative Assessment / Evaluation
- Summative Evaluation

- 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:
  - Student data, and
  - Performance rubric

★ 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
Step 2: Analysis, Goal Setting and Plan Development

- The educator plan is based on S.M.A.R.T. goals.

**Goals**

- **S** Specific and Strategic
- **M** Measurable
- **A** Action Oriented
- **R** Rigorous, Realistic, and Results Focused
- **T** Timed and Tracked

**Educator Plans**

**Key Action Steps**

**Benchmarks**
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 (including student feedback)

★ 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)
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 new educators or educators who are struggling.
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**
- Educators self-assess and propose goals

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

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

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

**Summative Evaluation**
- 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

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

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

### 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
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 determines 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 announced. Multiple brief, unannounced observations with feedback Gather Artifacts from each Category of Evidence

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

Progress on Each Standard
Based on Rubrics and supported by artifacts:

Rating on Each Standard
Based on Rubrics and supported by artifacts

Summative Overall Rating

Professional Practice
Assess practice against Performance Standards. Create at least one goal. Must consider team or department goals

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 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
Every educator is an active participant in the evaluation process

**Step 1:** Every educator uses a rubric and data about student learning

**Step 2:** Every educator proposes at least 1 professional practice goal and 1 student learning goal. Team goals must be considered

**Step 3:** Educators and their evaluator collect evidence and assesses progress.

**Step 4:** Every educator has a mid-cycle review

**Step 5:** Every educator earns one of four ratings of performance

Collaboration and Continuous Learning are the focus
# Evaluators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluators</th>
<th>Teachers/ Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Jones (Department Head)</td>
<td>Foreign Languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Thompson (Teacher Leader)</td>
<td>Math &amp; Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Johnson (Curriculum Specialist)</td>
<td>English &amp; History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Grant (Principal)</td>
<td>Special Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Long (Assistant Principal)</td>
<td>Specialists and Nurses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Check for Understanding

1. The new evaluation framework requires regular evaluations of all educators, including teachers, staff, and administrators.

2. All educators will be evaluated on a 4 point scale.

3. All educators will have a summative evaluation at the end of each year.

4. The 5 steps of the evaluation cycle are self-assessment, goal setting/plan development, plan implementation, formative assessment/evaluation, and summative evaluation.
Training Workshops for Teachers and Staff

- **Orientation:** Overview of Educator Evaluation Framework
- **Workshop 1:** Rubric Review
- **Workshop 2:** Self-Assessment
- **Workshop 3:** Goal Setting
Orientation to the Evaluation Framework

★ Our Next Steps:
Exit Ticket

For more information:
EducatorEvaluation@doe.mass.edu

Facilitator Email:
[INSERT EMAIL]