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# Overview

On June 28, 2011, the Massachusetts Board of Elementary and Secondary Education adopted new regulations to guide the evaluation of all educators serving in positions requiring a license. The educator evaluation regulations are designed to promote administrators’ and teachers’ professional growth and development, while placing improved student learning at the center of every educator’s work.

The Massachusetts Educator Evaluation Framework allows educators and evaluators to focus on the critical intersection of educator practice and educator impact on student learning through a holistic, multi-faceted, evidence-based process resulting in a Summative Performance Rating.

The **Summative Performance Rating** marks the culmination of an educator’s 5-step evaluation cycle, at which point an evaluator assesses an educator's practice against four Standards of Effective Teaching or Administrator Leadership Practice, as well as an educator's progress toward attainment of his/her professional practice and student learning goals.

This supplemental guidance document guides educators and evaluators in the determination of Summative Performance Ratings that meet the regulatory requirements. In addition to a review of the basic components of a Summative Evaluation, sample Summative Evaluations for different types of educators are included in [Appendix A](#_Appendix_A).

**Formative Evaluations**. Formative Evaluations take place at the end of Year 1 for educators on 2-year self-directed growth plans. Similar to the Summative Evaluation, districts must submit to DESE Formative Evaluation ratings on each of the four Standards and an overall performance rating; *however,* Formative Evaluation ratings default to the educator’s prior summative ratings, unless significant evidence demonstrates otherwise. [603 CMR 35.06(5)(b)](http://www.doe.mass.edu/lawsregs/603cmr35.html?section=06) This acknowledges the expertise of experienced, proficient educators and eases the evaluator burden of developing *new* ratings at the Formative Evaluation unless absolutely necessary.

# The Summative Evaluation

Evaluators are responsible for conducting a Summative Evaluation with each educator at the conclusion of an evaluation cycle. According to the regulations,

“[T]he evaluator determines an overall rating of educator performance based on the evaluator's professional judgment and an examination of evidence that demonstrates the educator's performance against Performance Standards and evidence of the attainment of the Educator Plan goals” ([603 CMR 35.06(6)](http://www.doe.mass.edu/lawsregs/603cmr35.html?section=06)).

In accordance with this description, a Summative Evaluation (Step 5 of the evaluation cycle) results in the following:

* A rating on each of the four performance Standards[[1]](#footnote-1)
* An assessment of overall goal attainment
* A Summative Performance Rating

**Figure 1: Components of a Summative Evaluation**
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### The Role of Professional Judgment

How does an evaluator know how to rate an educator on a specific Standard? How does one assess goal progress? How does this translate into an overall Summative Performance Rating?

There are no numbers or percentages that dictate ratings on Standards, the assessment of educator goal attainment, or the overall Summative Performance Rating for an individual educator. Rather than adopt a more mechanistic, one-size-fits all approach to supervision and evaluation, the Massachusetts evaluation framework encourages evaluators to look for trends and patterns in practice across multiple types of evidence and apply their professional judgment based on this evidence when evaluating practice.[[2]](#footnote-2) **The role of evidence *and* professional judgment in the determination of ratings on performance Standards and an overall Summative Performance Rating is paramount in this process**. Formulaic or numerical processes that calculate outcome ratings and preclude the application of professional judgment are inconsistent with the letter and the spirit of the evaluation framework.

The use of professional judgment based on multiple types of evidence promotes a more holistic and comprehensive analysis of practice, rather than over-reliance on one individual data point or rote calculation of practice based on predetermined formulas. This evidence includes products of practice, measures of student learning, and feedback from students and/or staff. Evaluators are also encouraged to take into account how educators respond to or apply additional supports and resources designed to promote student learning, as well as their own professional growth and development. Finally, professional judgment gives evaluators the flexibility to account for a wide variety of factors related to individual educator performance, such as: school-specific priorities that may drive practice in one Standard; an educator’s number of goals; experience level and/or leadership opportunities; and contextual variables that may impact the learning environment, such as unanticipated outside events or traumas.

That said, professional judgment does not equate to a “black box” from which evaluators can determine a performance rating. Evaluators must be well versed in the three categories of evidence when applying professional judgment to an educator’s practice.

## Three Categories of Evidence

Every educator’s Summative Evaluation must incorporate evidence from three distinct categories: (1) products of practice (artifacts and observations); (2) multiple measures of student learning; and (3) additional sources that provide relevant information on an educator’s practice related to one or more performance Standards.

**Products of Practice**

**Multiple Measures of Student Learning**

**Other Evidence (e.g. feedback)**

**THREE CATEGORIES OF EVIDENCE**

### Category 1: Products of Practice (Judgments Based on Artifacts & Observations)

The first category of evidence includes judgments based on products of practice, such as (1) artifacts related to educator practice, and (2) observations of practice. Both sources of evidence should yield information related to the educator’s practice within the four Standards and/or the educator’s goals.

Artifacts provided in support of educator practice could include anything from adapted curriculum units to lesson plans to parent/teacher communication logs. Artifacts should always be "products of an educator’s work that demonstrate knowledge and skills of the educator.” In other words, artifacts should be naturally occurring products related to the day-to-day work of instruction, and never be manufactured solely for evaluation purposes. Both educators and evaluators share responsibility in the collection of relevant artifacts.

Short, unannounced observations accompanied by timely, targeted feedback, as well as longer, announced observations with feedback also fall under this category of evidence. Supervisors are primarily responsible for this type of evidence, although peer observations may also be included.[[3]](#footnote-3)

**Observations.** According to Standard I, Indicator D (Evaluation) of the Administrator Rubric, an administrator should make “frequent, unannounced visits to classrooms” followed by “targeted and constructive feedback.” This type of observational practice underscores the value of collecting observational evidence several times throughout the year and using these opportunities to engage in regular, sustained dialogue. [603 CMR 35.04](http://www.doe.mass.edu/lawsregs/603cmr35.html?section=04)

### Category 2: Multiple Measures of Student Learning, Growth & Achievement

The second category of evidence—Measures of Student Learning, Growth, and Achievement— includes classroom assessments, common assessments comparable across grade or subject district-wide, and statewide growth measures where available.[[4]](#footnote-4) Educators and evaluators rely on this evidence to demonstrate impact on student learning in relation to anticipated student learning gains (as articulated in the Student Learning Indicator), as well as progress toward individual student learning goals. Therefore, multiple measures of student learning, growth, and achievement can and should go beyond common and statewide assessments to include performance assessments, capstone projects, interim and unit assessments, or even homework assignments or quizzes. It all depends on what the individual educator is seeking to measure related to his/her work with students. For example, a math teacher might include unit assessment trend data in her evidence portfolio to demonstrate student growth related to fractions, while a guidance counselor might incorporate attendance records and college application rates in his evaluation portfolio.

### Category 3: Other Evidence related to Standards of Practice (including Staff & Student Feedback)

The third category of evidence includes feedback from students and staff, as well as other sources of information such as evidence of fulfillment of professional responsibilities and evidence of family engagement. Like the other categories of evidence, there is no specific weight or point value assigned to student and staff feedback. Effective teaching and learning environments are the result of complex, collaborative, meaningful interactions between students and their educators and educators and their administrators; feedback is an opportunity for students and educators to share ideas about how to best improve instructional and leadership practices.

| ***Did you know?*** Research shows that combining observational feedback, student outcome data, and student feedback results is (a) a stronger predictor of teacher impact on student learning, (b) diagnostic feedback an educator can use to improve, and (c) a more reliable picture of educator effectiveness***.***[[5]](#footnote-5) |
| --- |

Student and staff feedback tools may include prompts about instructional practices, classroom conditions, and leadership strategies that (a) are aligned to the Standards of Effective Teaching and/or Administrative Leadership, and (b) provide actionable feedback to educators. DESE’s [Model Feedback Surveys](http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeval/feedback/) are high quality feedback tools well-aligned to the Standards. These surveys were developed, tested, and refined with almost 10,000 students and over 1,500 staff members. Standard, short, and mini forms are available for student surveys in grades 3-5 and 6-12, as well as staff surveys about school leadership practice. For more information on student and staff feedback, please see DESE’s [**Quick Reference Guide: Student & Staff Feedback**](http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeval/resources/QRG-Feedback.pdf).

# The Summative Performance Rating

## Organizing and Analyzing Evidence Using a Performance Rubric

Rubrics are critical components of the evaluation framework and are required for every educator.[[6]](#footnote-6) They play a key role at each step of the evaluation cycle by providing educators and evaluators with concrete descriptions of practice associated with each performance Standard.

In the DESE Model Rubrics, descriptions of practice associated with the [Standards and Indicators of Effective Teaching Practice](http://www.doe.mass.edu/lawsregs/603cmr35.html?section=03) and [Effective Administrative Leadership Practice](http://www.doe.mass.edu/lawsregs/603cmr35.html?section=04) are broken down into elements and distributed across four performance levels (Unsatisfactory, Needs Improvement, Proficient, and Exemplary). Each element describes a discrete behavior or related set of behaviors that educators and evaluators can prioritize for evidence-gathering, feedback, and eventually, evaluation. Rubrics therefore allow the evaluator to organize and analyze evidence for each individual educator based on concrete descriptions of practice. The result is a more accurate, transparent, and manageable evaluation process.

The use of rubrics to organize and analyze evidence also promotes a constructive dialogue through the development of common vocabulary related to effective practice between evaluators and educators, and about how to improve practice from one performance level to another. This should be an ongoing dialogue that should unfold throughout an educator’s evaluation cycle, starting with the identification of areas of practice that would benefit from growth or improvement (Step 1: Self-Assessment) and continuing through the establishment of goals and action steps that target these areas of practice (Step 2: Goal Setting & Educator Plan Development), the analysis of evidence and sharing of targeted feedback (Step 3: Implementation and Step 4: Formative Assessment/Evaluation), and the final assessment of practice in relation to performance described under each Standard at the culmination of an educator’s cycle (Step 5: Summative Evaluation).

## Standards-Level Ratings

After analyzing all evidence of practice collected by the evaluator and the educator, the evaluator determines a rating of Unsatisfactory, Needs Improvement, Proficient, or Exemplary, for each Standard. These ratings reflect evidence of professional practice, impact on student learning in relation to anticipated student learning gains, and may be informed by performance in specific priority areas as determined by the evaluator, educator, school, and/or district.

**Ratings for**:

STANDARD I

STANDARD II

STANDARD III

STANDARD IV

**Rubrics**

## Educator Goal Attainment

The Summative Performance Rating reflects not only an educator’s practice related to the Standards and Indicators of effective practice, but progress made toward an educator’s professional practice goal(s) and student learning goal(s).

**Assessment of**:

EDUCATOR GOAL ATTAINMENT

**Student Learning & Professional Practice**

Solidified at the beginning of an educator’s evaluation cycle, goals provide the framework for the educator plan, which should be comprised of concrete action steps, process benchmarks, and outcomes that are tied directly to goal attainment. Much of the evidence an educator and evaluator collects will document progress toward meeting these goals. Specifically, the evidence collected should demonstrate completion of action steps and the attainment of key benchmarks, such as targeted student performance outcomes or implementation and mastery of specific professional skills.

The job of the evaluator is to assess all of the evidence related to an educator’s goals and determine the extent to which the educator is progressing toward each goal (Step 4: Formative Assessment/Evaluation) and, ultimately, whether or not an educator meets each goal (Step 5: Summative Evaluation). As discussed, the Educator Plan plays a pivotal role in establishing clear benchmarks for goal attainment and should serve as a roadmap for determining goal progress. The evaluator makes a judgment of goal completion by comparing evidence to the key action steps and benchmarks outlined in the educator’s plan. Evaluators then assess progress on each individual goal, as well as overall goal progress. Figure 2provides one example of a goal attainment scale that an evaluator might use to rate individual goals and overall goal progress.

##### Figure 2: Model Rating Scale for Determining Educator Goal Progress

###

**Multiple Goals.** Every educator is required to have a minimum of two goals: a student learning goal and a professional practice goal. Overall goal attainment reflects progress across all goals. For example, if an educator *exceeds* his projected target on his student learning goal and makes *significant progress* on his professional practice goal, the evaluator may determine overall goal attainment as having *met goal*.

While evidence and professional judgment drive an evaluator’s assessment of an educator’s goal attainment, districts are encouraged to develop clear protocols evaluators can use in assessing goal progress as well as business rules for combining measures of goal attainment across multiple goals. This helps to ensure district-wide consistency in the assessment of goal progress.

Examples of how goal attainment informs the Summative Performance Rating are available in [Appendix A](#_Appendix_A), particularly Examples D ([Denise Johnson](#_Example_D:_Denise)) and F ([Ellen Darcy](#_Example_F:_Ellen)).

## Determining the Overall Summative Performance Rating

An educator’s ratings on each of the four Standards and an assessment of his/her overall goal attainment inform the educator’s overall Summative Performance Rating. The evaluator is responsible for determining the Summative Performance Rating based on these factors. However, the regulations put forth minimum threshold requirements for educators to earn an overall Summative Performance Rating of *Proficient* or *Exemplary*. These minimum performance expectations create a common understanding of performance thresholds to which all educators are held.

**MINIMUM THRESHOLDS FOR SUMMATIVE PERFORMANCE RATINGS**

To receive a Summative Performance Rating of *Proficient* or *Exemplary*, a teacher must be rated *Proficient* or *Exemplary* on **both** Standard I: Curriculum, Planning, and Assessment, and Standard II: Teaching all Students. Similarly, for an administrator to receive a Summative Performance Rating of *Proficient* or *Exemplary*, he/she must be rated *Proficient* or *Exemplary* on the Standard I: Instructional Leadership.[[7]](#footnote-7) (See Table 1 below.)

**Table 1: Performance Standards**

| PERFORMANCE STANDARDS |
| --- |
| School & District Administrators | **Teachers & Specialized Instructional Support Personnel**  |
| Instructional Leadership\*Management & OperationsFamily & Community EngagementProfessional Culture | Curriculum, Planning & Assessment\*Teaching All Students\*Family & Community EngagementProfessional Culture |
| \* Standards requiring *Proficient* rating or above to achieve overall Summative Performance Rating of *Proficient* or above |

Examples B ([Julia Martinez](#_Example_B:_Julia)) and E ([Robert Miller](#_Example_E:_Robert)) in [Appendix A](#_Appendix_A) illustrate how the minimum thresholds can impact a Summative Performance Rating.

Minimum Requirements for Earning Professional Teacher Status. To receive Professional Teacher Status, pursuant to G.L. ch. 71, § 41, a teacher must be rated *Proficient* or *Exemplary* on all four Standards of Effective Teaching Practice and for their overall Summative Performance Rating during their most recent summative evaluation. A principal considering making an employment decision that would lead to professional teacher status for any educator who has not met this minimum requirement must confer with the superintendent of schools by May 1. The principal's decision is subject to review and approval by the superintendent. [603 CMR 35.08(6)](http://www.doe.mass.edu/lawsregs/603cmr35.html?section=08).

See Example B (Julia Martinez) in Appendix A for a hypothetical evaluation of a non-PTS teacher.

**Figure 3: Determining a Summative Performance Rating**



Figure 3 illustrates the entire process by which an evaluator determines a Summative Performance Rating. Based on evidence from three distinct categories, the evaluator applies his/her professional judgment to (1) an evaluation of the educator’s practice within each of the four Standards, and (2) an assessment of the degree to which the educator met his/her student learning and professional practice goals.

The evaluator determines a rating for each of the four Standards and comes to an assessment of overall goal progress for a given educator. In conjunction with the appropriate minimum threshold requirements, the evaluator then uses professional judgment to determine an overall Summative Performance Rating of *Exemplary*, *Proficient, Needs Improvement* or *Unsatisfactory* and assigns the educator to the Educator Plan appropriate to that rating for the next evaluation cycle.

For examples of this process as applied to individual teachers, specialized instructional support providers, and administrators, please see [Appendix A](#_Appendix_A).

## The Importance of Evidence-Based Judgment and Transparency

The Summative Evaluation is the point at which an evaluator examines patterns of performance across multiple types of evidence collected throughout an entire evaluation cycle to determine a comprehensive rating. Rather than using formulas or percentages to determine ratings on individual Standards, the assessment of educator goal attainment, or the overall Summative Performance Rating for an individual educator, evaluators apply their professional judgment to evidence gathered over time and engage in an open dialogue with the educator about the status of his/her practice and progress. This evidence-based professional judgment combined with transparent dialogue about professional growth and development should lead to a summative evaluation that brings **no surprises** to the educator and results in ratings of practice that are informed and constructive, ensuring the entire evaluation cycle is both meaningful and actionable to each individual educator.

### Points of Consideration

With its emphasis on professional judgment, the Massachusetts model gives evaluators more flexibility in determining individual performance ratings than they would otherwise have under a system that imposes numerical weights or values to individual components of an evaluation. In contrast to formulaic systems that calculate ratings based on set values or percentages, this system allows evaluators to be responsive to local context or individual needs, emphasize trends and patterns of practice rather than rely on individual data points, and better target feedback and resources to individual educators. All of these factors contribute to a more holistic, comprehensive assessment of educator practice that is designed to promote an ongoing cycle of continuous improvement. This system also assumes at its heart that educators are professionals with critical knowledge, skills, and judgment necessary to make each and every evaluation meaningful and productive.

In order to ensure thoughtful, consistent implementation, districts will have to devote time and resources to supporting evaluators in their use of a performance rubric and pay special attention to calibrating evaluator judgments of practice across multiple measures of teacher effectiveness. It is also essential for districts to cultivate and promote a strong culture of transparency and communication around educator evaluation, educating both evaluators and educators in the processes, purposes and intent of the Massachusetts evaluation framework. For more information on evaluation training, including DESE calibration training resources, please see [Evaluator Calibration](http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeval/resources/calibration/).

# Appendix A

## Teacher/Specialized Instructional Support Personnel (SISP) Examples

### Example A: Michael Saunders (6th Grade Science Teacher with Professional Teacher Status)

| **Standard Ratings****Standard I:** Proficient**Standard II:** Proficient**Standard III:** Proficient**Standard IV:** Exemplary | **Goal Progress*** **Student Leaning Goal:** Exceeded
* **Professional Practice Goal:** Almost Met

**Assessment of Educator Goal Attainment:** Met Goals |
| --- | --- |

Michael Saunders, an experienced teacher, receives ratings of *Proficient* on Standards I-III and a rating of *Exemplary* on Standard IV. The evaluator was also able to determine that Mr. Saunders *exceeded* his student learning goal and *almost met* his professional practice goal, leading the evaluator to assess overall goal attainment as having “met” his goals. With *Proficient* ratings for both Standards I and II, Mr. Saunders meets the minimum threshold requirement to receive an Overall Standard Rating of *Proficient* or higher. Coupled with relatively strong performance on his two goals and an *Exemplary* rating for Standard IV, the evaluator gives Mr. Saunders an overall Summative Performance Rating of *Proficient* and places him on a self-directed growth plan for the next evaluation cycle.

**Summative Performance Rating:** Proficient **Educator Plan**: Self-Directed Growth Plan

### Example B: Julia Martinez (4th Grade Teacher *without* Professional Teacher Status)

| **Standard Ratings****Standard I:** Proficient**Standard II:** Needs Improvement**Standard III:** Proficient**Standard IV:** Proficient | **Goal Progress*** **Student Leaning Goal:** Met
* **Professional Practice Goal:** Met

**Assessment of Educator Goal Attainment:** Met Goals |
| --- | --- |

Julia Martinez is a 2nd year teacher with ratings of *Proficient* on Standards I, III and IV, and a rating of *Needs Improvement* on Standard II. Evidence indicated that Ms. Martinez met both her student learning and professional practice goals. Despite *Proficient* ratings for Standards I, III and IV, a rating of *Needs Improvement* in Standard II means that she does not meet the minimum threshold requirement to receive an Overall Standard Rating of *Proficient* or higher. Ms. Martinez receives a Summative Performance Rating of *Needs Improvement.* Her evaluator notes, however, her strong goal performance and feels confident that she will improve her practice in Standard II to *Proficient* by the end of her third year and be eligible to receive Professional Teacher Status. As a 2nd year, non-PTS teacher, Ms. Martinez will remain on a Developing Educator Plan for one more year.

**Summative Performance Rating:** Needs Improvement **Educator Plan**: Developing Educator Plan

### Example C: Elizabeth Allen (11th Grade American History Teacher with Professional Teacher Status)

| **Standard Ratings****Standard I:** Proficient**Standard II:** Proficient**Standard III:** Needs Improvement**Standard IV:** Needs Improvement | **Goal Progress*** **Student Leaning Goal:** Met
* **Professional Practice Goal:** Significant Progress

**Assessment of Educator Goal Attainment:** Significant Progress |
| --- | --- |

Elizabeth Allen, an experienced teacher, receives ratings of *Proficient* on Standards I and II and ratings of *Needs Improvement* on Standards III and IV. The evaluator also determined that Ms. Allen *met* her student learning goal and made *significant progress* toward her professional practice goal. This particular school was implementing a Wraparound Zone that year, and the majority of school staff, including Ms. Allen, had focused their professional practice goals on practice associated with Standard III: Family & Communication. Performance and goal attainment associated with this high-priority Standard was therefore prioritized in educator evaluations. Based on evidence of Ms. Allen’s practice related to Standard III, in addition to progress made toward her professional practice goal, the evaluator gives her an overall Summative Performance Rating of *Needs Improvement* and places Ms. Allen on a Directed Growth Plan for the next evaluation cycle. They agree that her professional practice goal during this subsequent evaluation cycle will focus specifically on establishing more effective two-way communications with parents of struggling students (Indicator II.C: Two-Way Communication).

**Summative Performance Rating:** Needs Improvement **Educator Plan**: Directed Growth Plan

### Example D: Denise Johnson (High School Guidance Counselor)

| **Standard Ratings****Standard I:** Proficient**Standard II:** Proficient**Standard III:** Needs Improvement**Standard IV:** Needs Improvement | **Goal Progress*** **Student Leaning Goal:** Exceeded
* **Professional Practice Goal:** Exceeded

**Assessment of Educator Goal Attainment:** Exceeded Goals |
| --- | --- |

Denise Johnson, a high school guidance counselor, also receives ratings of *Proficient* on Standards I and II and ratings of *Needs Improvement* on Standards III and IV. However in this case, Ms. Johnson *exceeded* her student learning goal and professional practice goal, both of which focused on expanding the provision of student services in a way that improved equity and access to historically underrepresented students (Standard II, Role-Specific Indicator E: Student Services[[8]](#footnote-8)). With *Proficient* ratings for both Standards I and II, she meets the minimum threshold requirement to receive an Overall Standard Rating of *Proficient* or higher. Coupled with such strong goal performance associated with a core component of her work, the evaluator gives Ms. Johnson an overall Summative Performance Rating of *Proficient* and places her on a Self-Directed Growth Plan for the next evaluation cycle.

**Summative Performance Rating:** Proficient **Educator Plan**: Self-Directed Growth Plan

## Administrator Examples

### Example E: Robert Miller (Experienced High School Principal)

| **Standard Ratings****Standard I:** Needs Improvement**Standard II:** Exemplary**Standard III:** Proficient**Standard IV:** Proficient | **Goal Progress*** **Student Leaning Goal:** Significant Progress
* **Professional Practice Goal:** Significant Progress

**Assessment of Educator Goal Attainment:** Significant Progress  |
| --- | --- |

Robert Miller, an experienced high school principal, receives a rating of *Needs Improvement* on Standard I, *Exemplary* on Standard II, and *Proficient* on Standards III and IV. Principal Miller came close but did not quite meet his two goals, however, including a professional practice goal that focused exclusively on aspects of practice associated with Standard I, Indicator C: Assessment. Without a rating of *Proficient* for Standard I, he does not meet the minimum threshold requirement needed to receive an Overall Standard Rating of *Proficient* or higher. Principal Miller receives an overall Summative Performance Rating of *Needs Improvement*, and his evaluator places him on a Directed Growth Plan that will focus on practice related to Standard I in the subsequent year.

**Summative Performance Rating:** Needs Improvement **Educator Plan**: Directed Growth Plan

### Example F: Ellen Darcy (School Business Administrator)

| **Standard Ratings****Standard I:** Proficient**Standard II:** Exemplary**Standard III:** Exemplary**Standard IV:** Exemplary | **Goal Progress*** **Student Leaning Goal (Team):** Exceeded
* **Professional Practice Goal:** Exceeded

**Assessment of Educator Goal Attainment:** Exceeded Goals |
| --- | --- |

Ellen Darcy, an experienced school business administrator, receives a rating of *Proficient* on Standard I and ratings of *Exemplary* on Standards II, III and IV. Ms. Darcy actually exceeded her two goals, including a goal to overhaul the district budget (Standard II, Indicator E) and a team-based student learning goal related to administering and tracking student performance through a new suite of literacy assessments. With a rating of *Proficient* on Standard I, Ms. Darcy meets the minimum threshold requirement needed to receive an Overall Standard Rating of *Proficient* or higher; given her *Exemplary* performance on the remaining three Standards in conjunction with her goal performance, her evaluator chooses to give her an overall Summative Performance Rating of *Exemplary*. This places Ms. Darcy on a self-directed growth plan in the subsequent year.

**Summative Performance Rating:** Exemplary **Educator Plan**: Self-Directed Growth Plan

1. See [603 CMR 35.03](http://www.doe.mass.edu/lawsregs/603cmr35.html?section=03)-[04](http://www.doe.mass.edu/lawsregs/603cmr35.html?section=04). [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. “…[T]he evaluator determines an overall rating of educator performance based on the evaluator's professional judgment and an examination of evidence that demonstrates the educator's performance against Performance Standards and evidence of the attainment of the Educator Plan goals[” (603 CMR 35.06(6)](http://www.doe.mass.edu/lawsregs/603cmr35.html?section=06); see also [ESE Model Teacher & Caseload Educator Contract, Section 14(b)](http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeval/model/PartIV_AppxC.pdf)); “The professional judgment of the primary evaluator shall determine the overall summative rating that the Educator receives” ([ESE Model Teacher & Caseload Educator Contract, Section 14(c)](http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeval/model/PartIV_AppxC.pdf)). [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. “Districts may develop and implement Peer Assistance and Review Programs (PAR) through the collective bargaining process” ([603 CMR 35.10](http://www.doe.mass.edu/lawsregs/603cmr35.html?section=10)). [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. “For educators responsible for direct instruction, multiple measures of student learning, growth, and achievement, which shall include: (1) Measures of student progress on classroom assessments that are aligned with the Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks or other relevant frameworks and are comparable within grades or subjects in a school; (2) Measures of student progress on learning goals set between the educator and evaluator for the school year; (3) Statewide growth measure(s) where available, including the MCAS Student Growth Percentile and the Massachusetts English Proficiency Assessment; and (4) Common assessments of student learning, growth, and achievement. For educators whose primary role is not as a classroom teacher, the appropriate measures of the educator's contribution to student learning, growth, and achievement set by the district.” [603 CMR 35.07](http://www.doe.mass.edu/lawsregs/603cmr35.html?section=07) [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation. 2012. [Asking Students about Teaching: Student Perception Surveys and Their Implementation](http://www.metproject.org/downloads/Asking_Students_Practitioner_Brief.pdf). Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation. 2012. [Gathering Feedback for Teaching: Combining High-Quality Observations with Student Surveys and Achievement Gains](http://www.metproject.org/downloads/MET_Gathering_Feedback_Practioner_Brief.pdf). Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation. 2012. [Asking Students about Teaching: Student Perception Surveys and Their Implementation](http://www.metproject.org/downloads/Asking_Students_Practitioner_Brief.pdf). [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. In rating educators on each performance Standard, evaluators must use a performance rubric provided by the Department in its Model System, or a comparably rigorous and comprehensive rubric developed by the district and reviewed by the Department. [603 CMR 35.08](http://www.doe.mass.edu/lawsregs/603cmr35.html?section=08). [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. As defined in [603 CMR 35.03](http://www.doe.mass.edu/lawsregs/603cmr35.html?section=03) and [603 CMR 35.04](http://www.doe.mass.edu/lawsregs/603cmr35.html?section=04). [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. Please see *MASCA Role-Specific Indicators to Supplement the ESE Model SISP Rubric*, available at <http://masca.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=363%253Arole-specific-indicators&catid=38%253Anews&Itemid=1>. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)