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# Overview of the Training Workshop Series

Training Workshop Series Purpose and Goals

This series of five training sessions, an Orientation to the new evaluation framework followed by four 1-hour workshops, is designed to prepare educators without evaluator responsibilities to implement the new Massachusetts educator evaluation system through the following intended outcomes:

* Introduce educators to the key components of the new evaluation framework.
* Support educators in developing a common understanding of the new educator evaluation framework and the opportunities for professional growth and development using the Massachusetts Model System.
* Provide participants with opportunities to engage in the first three steps of the 5-Step Evaluation Cycle

The training sessions will accomplish these goals through the use of detailed facilitator guides and participant handouts that connect to Model System resources. All materials are available online at <http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeval/training/teachers/>.

Audience

The audience for each session includes school-level educators without evaluator responsibilities, such as classroom teachers and specialized instructional support personnel.

Timing and Structure

Each session is one hour in length. The Orientation session introduces participants to the key components of the Massachusetts educator evaluation framework. The subsequent workshops provide participants with the opportunity to unpack performance rubrics, conduct a self-assessment, develop S.M.A.R.T. goals, and strategically identify sources of evidence, with each workshop structured to result in concrete deliverables associated with each educator’s evaluation. Homework assignments help participants extend and apply their learning to the next workshop. ESE designed each session to be delivered by a school administrator or teacher leader during common planning time or comparable in-school collaborative meeting period.

List of Training Sessions

**Orientation.** The Orientation describes the most important aspects of the evaluation framework. The Orientation includes topics such as the purpose of the evaluation framework, the two ratings everyone will receive, the 5-Step evaluation cycle, and key characteristics of the evaluation rubric.

**Workshop 1: Rubric Review.** The first workshop introduces the basic structure and terminology of the performance rubrics and gives participants an opportunity to examine the rubric components.

**Workshop 2: Self-Assessment.** The second workshop engages participants in Step 1 of the 5-Step Cycle—self-assessment. Participants will learn about the key characteristics of a high quality self-assessment and have an opportunity to complete their own self-assessments.

**Workshop 3: S.M.A.R.T. Goals.** The third workshop engages participants in Step 2 of the 5-Step Cycle cycle—the development of student learning goals and professional practice goals that are S.M.A.R.T. with clear benchmarks for success.

**Workshop 4: Gathering Evidence.** The fourth workshop introduces participants to the three types of evidence required in an evaluation, and provides tips and strategies for determining high quality artifacts of practice and measures of student learning. Participants will identify sources of evidence related to practice outlined in their educator plans to demonstrate performance.

# Preparing for 1-Hour Orientation

## Overview

This 1-hour Orientation is designed to provide an overview of the new educator evaluation framework, including the two ratings everyone will receive, the new performance standards and rubrics, the four educator plans, as well as the 5-Step Cycle of evaluation.

## Context

Participants will have varying levels of knowledge about the new educator evaluation system. The content of this Orientation describes the key regulatory requirements for educator evaluation, as well as the opportunity of a new educator evaluation system: to make educator evaluation more useful in improving practice and more connected to student learning.

## Intended Outcomes

At the end of this session:

* Participants will have a clear understanding of the new educator evaluation framework, including:
* The two ratings
* New performance standards
* Four educator plans
* The 5-Step Cycle of Evaluation
* Participants will identify concrete “next steps” related to:
* Additional training available to teachers and staff on educator evaluation
* School-specific implementation plans

## Agenda

1. Welcome
2. Orientation to the Evaluation Framework
   1. Context
   2. The Evaluation Framework’s Two Ratings
      1. Summative Performance Rating
      2. Student Impact Rating
   3. The 5-Step Evaluation Cycle
3. Check for Understanding
4. Next Steps
5. Q&A
6. Exit Ticket

## Equipment and Materials

* Equipment: Laptop computer with copy of Orientation PowerPoint, projector

## Regulatory Requirements

603 CMR 35.00 describes the revised Massachusetts state regulations around educator evaluation. The following are key highlights from the regulations:

* The evaluation cycle shall include self-assessment addressing Performance Standards established through collective bargaining or included in individual employment contracts.
* The evaluation cycle shall include goal setting and development of an Educator Plan.
* The evaluation cycle shall include implementation of the Educator Plan. It is the educator's responsibility to attain the goals in the plan and to participate in any trainings and professional development provided through the state, district, or other providers in accordance with the Educator Plan.
* The evaluation cycle shall include a formative assessment or a formative evaluation.
* The evaluation cycle shall include a summative evaluation, in which the 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. The educator shall have the opportunity to respond in writing to the summative evaluation.

(603 CMR 35.06)

Additional detail about the regulatory requirements for each step of the 5-Step Cycle of evaluation can be found at <http://www.doe.mass.edu/lawsregs/603cmr35.html> and in Part II of the ESE Model System, the *School-Level Planning and Implementation Guide*.

## Model System Resources

Model System resources can be found on ESE’s website at <http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeval/model/>.

Specific resources that are useful to review before facilitating this training module include:

*Part II: School-Level Planning and Implementation Guide*

* [Overview of the Educator Evaluation Framework](http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeval/model/PartII.pdf#page=9) (pp. 5–6)
* [Priorities for Implementing the Framework](http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeval/model/PartII.pdf#page=11) (pp. 7–8)

*Part III: Guide to Rubrics and Model Rubrics for Superintendent, Administrator, and Teacher*

* [Structure of the Model Rubrics](http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeval/model/PartIII.pdf#page=9) (p. 6)
* [Rubrics At-a-Glance](http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeval/model/PartIII.pdf#page=10) (p. 7)
* [Standards and Indicators of Effective Teaching Practice: Rubric](http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeval/model/PartIII_AppxC.pdf#page=4) (pp. C-2–C-15)

# Facilitator Guide

## I. Welcome (5 minutes)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Title slide   * **Facilitator Note:** This presentation was a collaborative effort designed by the Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (ESE) and a group of Massachusetts teachers. It synthesizes many existing ESE documents with the audience of teachers and staff in mind. Participants and facilitators are welcome to visit the ESE website ([www.doe.mass.edu/edeval/](http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeval/)) to learn more about the evaluation framework. | Slide 1 |
| This slide lays out the five training sessions for teachers and staff.  *Explain:*  This Orientation is the first of a five-part training series for all educators without evaluator responsibilities. The four 1-hour workshops that follow this Orientation will take participants through interactive activities associated with key aspects of the 5-Step Cycle of evaluation, including a review of the performance standards and rubrics, how to conduct a self-assessment, and how to set S.M.A.R.T. goals, and how to collect evidence.  This five hour training program is designed to introduce participants to the new evaluation framework. Additional training materials and supports are available on the Educator Evaluation website at [www.doe.mass.edu/edeval/training](http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeval/training). | Slide 2 |
| Agenda slide   * **Facilitator Note:** Briefly review agenda. * **Facilitator Note:** It is recommended to deliver the presentation either a) without taking questions during the presentation, but allowing significant time for questions after the presentation, or b) by stopping to take questions at strategic times during the presentation, and also allowing for questions at the end of the presentation. | Slide 3 |
| This slide describes the information participants should understand by the end of the orientation.   * **Facilitator Note:** Briefly review intended outcomes. | Slide 4 |

## 

## II. Orientation to the Evaluation Framework (35 minutes)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| The next two slides explain the importance of effective educators and the scope of the evaluation framework.  *Explain:*  “Research has shown that the single most influential school-based factor affecting student achievement is teacher quality (Hanushek, Kain, and Rivkin, 1998; Goldhaber, 2002).  “Effective leaders create the conditions that enable powerful teaching and learning to occur. Therefore, the most important thing that schools and policymakers can do is to ensure that every student has a highly accomplished teacher in a school with an effective leader.  “The new educator evaluation framework is a critical component of the state’s ongoing efforts to improve educator effectiveness by supporting all educators-- from teachers to principals to superintendents--throughout their career.” | Slide 5 |
| *Explain:*  “This evaluation system is designed to provide educators with opportunities and supports to engage in continuous improvement. Educators play an active role throughout the process, from reflecting on their own performance, to setting goals, to shaping plans to improve practice. Throughout this process, they receive timely, relevant feedback and guidance from evaluators.  “Educators participating in the new evaluation framework include all educators in positions that require a license from the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education. This includes all teachers, administrators, and superintendents, as well as specialized instructional support personnel, such as guidance counselors, school nurses, school psychologists.” | Slide 6 |
| Section Break slide | Slide 7 |
| *Explain:*  “Let’s begin with the end. As a result of this new evaluation framework, everyone will eventually earn two ratings: a Summative Performance Rating (shown here on the left) of either Exemplary, Proficient, Needs Improvement or Unsatisfactory; and an Impact Rating on Student Performance (shown here on the right) of either high, moderate or low.  “One critical point about these ratings sets Massachusetts apart from many other states: these ratings are separate – one does not change the other. Your impact rating on student performance will neither raise nor lower your Summative Performance Rating. Another important aspect to consider is the timeframe for the Student Impact Rating, which will not be determined for individual educators until the 2015-16 school year. We’ll examine the rationale behind this timeline in a few minutes. | Slide 8 |
| *Explain:*  “Let’s start with the Summative Performance Rating. This rating reflects an assessment of an educator’s professional practice, as well as progress the educator makes toward his or her goals. All educators, including evaluators, will receive a Summative Rating of Exemplary, Proficient, Needs Improvement, or Unsatisfactory.  “There are three types of evidence that inform the Summative Rating. The first includes multiple measures of student learning, growth and achievement. This type of evidence is used to gauge progress on an educator’s student learning goal and can include everything from student work to benchmark assessments to portfolios. The second type of evidence includes products of educator practice. This includes artifacts, such as lesson plans, as well as observations conducted throughout the year.  “The third category of evidence includes student and staff feedback. Teachers must collect feedback from students about their practice, and administrators must collect feedback from teachers about their leadership practice. Feedback can be collected through surveys, or by other means, like exit slips, narrative writing exercises, or end-of-unit feedback forms.” | Slide 9 |
| *Explain:*  “As part of the new evaluation framework, everyone uses a rigorous, comprehensive performance rubric to assess practice.  “This rubric includes four Standards of effective practice, each of which is broken down into concrete Indicators that further define what each Standard includes.” | Slide 10 |
| *Explain:*  “The four Standards take shape and find meaning in a performance rubric. Here you can see a map of the Teacher Rubric. The four Standards for teacher practice are listed across the top row. Each Standard is then broken down into three to six Indicators.  “For example, Standard I: Curriculum, Planning & Assessment has three corresponding Indicators: Curriculum & Planning, Assessment and Analysis. Both the Standards and Indicators are defined specifically in the regulations and represent the aspects of practice on which each educator will be evaluated.  “Educators will receive a rating on each of the four Standards, and those ratings will inform their overall Summative Rating. With that in mind, I’d like to draw your attention to the two Standards with asterisks.  “These two Standards are considered the **most important** components of effective educator practice. In fact, a teacher must be rated Proficient on these Standards in order to receive an overall Summative Rating of Proficient.  “For example, if a teacher were to be rated Proficient on Standards 1, 3 and 4, yet rated Needs Improvement on Standard 2, Teaching all Students, the highest overall Summative Rating they could receive would be Needs Improvement until they improved their performance in Standard 2.  “Workshop #1 will provide much more time to review your performance rubric in depth.” | Slide 11 |
| *Explain:*  “As just mentioned, everyone receives a rating on each of the four Standards, as well as an overall Summative Performance Rating. These ratings are based on a four-point scale: Unsatisfactory, Needs Improvement, Proficient, and Exemplary.  “This four-point scale represents a significant shift from prior evaluation systems that utilized 3- or even 2-point scales when evaluating teachers and administrators.”  “Not only does a 2- or 3-point scale lack transparency, it fails to provide anyone—whether we’re talking about teachers, principals, or superintendents—with the critical information and feedback needed to learn and grow in their profession.” | Slide 12 |
| * **Facilitator Note:** This slide can be customized by replacing the sample element in the left-hand column (ex. Well-Structured Lessons) with either (1) an element that your school/district is particularly focused on, and/or (2) an element from your own adapted or revised rubric. The Model Rubric can be found at <http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeval/model/>   *Explain:*  “The Department of Elementary & Secondary Education has developed a [model rubric](http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeval/model/PartIII_AppxC.pdf) for teachers. The Model Rubric includes elements under each Indicator, which are then built out into performance descriptors attached to each of the four performance levels.  “The descriptors, as you see here, are measurable statements of actions and behaviors aligned to each element of practice. These help you and your supervisor identify your level of performance within each Standard, which helps shape your goals and ultimately, your Summative Performance Rating.” | Slide 13 |
| *Explain:*  “In sum, ratings on the Standards of practice, as articulated through a performance rubric, plus an assessment of progress toward educator goals over the course of an evaluation cycle, lead to the Summative Performance Rating.”   * **Facilitator Note:** Pause to answer any questions and/or allow a minute or two for participants to jot down notes or questions. | |
| *Explain:*  “Now let’s look at what the Summative Performance Rating means for an educator.  “The Summative Rating determines the type of plan an educator will be on.  “As you see here, educators that are rated Proficient or Exemplary—the top two rows of this matrix—will be on Self-Directed Growth Plans, giving them autonomy over what their goals will focus on throughout the evaluation cycle.  “If an educator is rated Needs Improvement, they will be on a Directed Growth Plan, which simply means that their goals should focus on the area in need of improvement.  “Educators that receive a Summative Rating of Unsatisfactory are on Improvement Plans, which require more intensive support.  “Finally, you can see at the bottom of this matrix is something called a Developing Educator Plan. This plan is designed to support and develop new teachers and administrators during the first three years on the job.  “Now that we’ve seen where these plans come from, let’s take a deeper look at each one.” | Slide 14 |
| *Explain:*  “The four plans are designed to accommodate an educator’s experience level as well as their ratings on the last evaluation cycle. These plans differ in two ways: their duration—a plan could be as long as two school years or as short as 30 days—and the degree of autonomy allotted to the educator. The intent is to provide each educator with the opportunity to improve their practice in a manner that meets their specific needs.  “As we just discussed, Developing Educator Plans are for educators that are new to a specific role. This includes non-tenured teachers in the first three years of the profession, as well as administrators in the first three years in a district. This plan can be one school year or less in duration.  “The next three plans are for experienced educators. The Self-Directed Growth Plan is for educators who were rated Proficient or Exemplary on their last evaluation and can be one *or* two years in length.  “A Directed Growth Plan is for educators rated Needs Improvementon their last evaluation and can be one school year or less in duration. The purpose of a Directed Growth Plan is to focus on that particular area in which they need to improve so they can achieve an overall rating of Proficient once more and move back into a Self-Directed Plan. An educator can only remain on a Directed Growth Plan for one cycle. If they do not receive a rating of Proficient or higher at the conclusion of that cycle, they would transition to an Improvement Plan.  “Finally, educators rated Unsatisfactory are placed on an Improvement Plan, which can be anywhere from 30 calendar days in length up to one school year. For Improvement Plans, evaluators stipulate the educator’s professional practice and student learning goals and identify the appropriate action steps and professional development required to address those goals.” | Slide 15 |
| * **Facilitator Note:** *This is an optional slide.* It provides an alternative visual representation of the four types of educator plans and the information associated with each. | Slide 16 |
| *Explain:*  “We’ve now discussed the Summative Performance Rating and its role in determining an educator’s plan throughout the evaluation cycle.  “Let’s shift gears and discuss the second rating everyone will receive—the Impact Rating on Student Performance.  “Every educator is going to receive a rating of impact on student learning, growth and achievement of high, moderate or low. The regulations require that the Impact Rating be based on trends and patterns in student learning.  “What do we mean by trends and patterns? Trends are results based on at least two years of data, and patterns are defined as consistent results from multiple measures. Bottom line: you will need at least two years of data from multiple sources to inform your Impact Rating.  “Data can come from a variety of sources. State-wide growth measures, such as MCAS student growth percentiles, must be taken into account when applicable, but as many of you know, only a fraction of educators work with students who take these tests.  “Therefore, other measures of student learning will inform the Impact Rating, including district-determined measures that are comparable across grade levels and subject areas.  “We will talk more about these in a moment. First, let’s look at how the Impact Rating works.” | Slide 17 |
| *Explain:*  “You’ve seen how the Summative Rating determines which of the four plans an experienced educator will follow. We’ve now added in the Impact Rating to this matrix. Your Impact Rating remains completely separate from your Summative Rating and does not change the Summative Rating. What it does do is determine the length of the plan and the nature of your goals.  “For educators whose Impact Rating is low, the Educator Plan shall be no more than one school year in length and shall include one or more goals related to student learning developed on the basis of an analysis of the educator's professional practice.  “For example, if you are a tenured teacher with a Summative Rating of Proficient or Exemplary and an Impact Rating of moderate or high, you will be on a 2-year Self-Directed Growth Plan. If your Impact Rating is low, your plan will be one year in length, with one or more of your goals focusing on an area of student learning that stands out as in need of additional attention. This outcome is specifically designed to allow you and your supervisor to focus on that discrepancy between Proficient or Exemplary practice and low student growth, driving home the principle that student learning remains the focus of educator practice.  “For educators on Directed Growth or Improvement Plans, which are already one school year or less in duration, an Impact Rating of low, in conjunction with an analysis of their professional practice needs, simply helps to determine the focus of their goals.  “In sum, the Impact Rating and the student results on district or state measures that inform it are explicitly designed to prompt focused self-assessment, collaborative inquiry, conversation, and action, resulting in targeted professional growth or development plans and goals that lead to improvement.  “The Impact Rating is a signaling device for further investigation, not a dispositive judgment on performance.” | Slide 18 |
| *Explain:*  “As defined, an Impact Rating requires student data from multiple measures across at least two years. Two years of collecting data means that Student Impact Ratings will not be submitted until the end of the 2015-16 school year for most educators.  “For information on developing district-wide measures of student learning, growth and achievement for use in determining Impact Ratings, ESE has published *Part VII of the Model System: Rating Educator Impact on Student Learning Using District-Determined Measures* on its website, as well as various Implementation Briefs on effective development and use of DDMs.”   * **Facilitator Note:** Pause and answer any questions, or provide time for participants to jot down notes and questions about the material just covered. | Slide 19 |
| Section Break slide.  *Explain:*  “We’ve covered the two ratings every educator receives under the new evaluation framework and what it means to be on one of the four educator plans.  “We’ve also reviewed the four standards and performance rubrics that define practice for every educator in the Commonwealth.  “Let’s now take a look at the next key component of the new framework: the 5-Step Cycle of Evaluation.” | Slide 20 |
| * **Facilitator Note:** The next several slides aim to provide a general overview of the 5 steps in the evaluation cycle. They do not aim to include every detail about each step – those details will be provided in the upcoming workshops. | |
| *Explain:*  “This is the 5-Step Evaluation Cycle that drives every educator’s plan.  “Each step of the cycle was developed in direct response to former evaluation practices in many schools and districts, where evaluation was seen as ‘something done **to** the educator,’ disconnected from student and educator learning.  “The 5-Step Cycle is designed to ensure that you are an active participant throughout your own evaluation and are driving the very process forward. Each step is designed to capitalize on collaboration and promote continuous learning.  “We’re going to go through each step over the next few minutes.” | Slide 21 |
| *Explain:*  “The cycle begins with the educator in the driver’s seat, engaging in a self-assessment.  “Many people think that this part is easy--something to overlook, perhaps, and just jump to goal setting. I would argue that this is *the driving force* of the entire evaluation cycle—a critical opportunity for you to take ownership of your own evaluation rather than experience it as something being done “to” you.  “The extent to which you engage in a thoughtful, comprehensive, targeted self-assessment will drive the entire process that meets your needs and helps you to excel.  “The purpose of the self-assessment is two-fold: it actively engages you in launching your own evaluation, and it prepares you to propose rigorous, targeted goals.  “The self-assessment process has three parts: analyzing student learning needs, identifying professional practice needs related to the four Standards of practice, and thinking about goals related to these two areas.” | Slide 22 |
| *Explain:*  “After completing the self-assessment, you move to Step 2: Analysis, Goal Setting and Plan Development. At this point, everyone sets at least two goals. Of the two goals, one must be a student learning goal related to the achievement or growth of students for whom you are responsible. The other goal must be a professional practice goal that is aligned with the Standards and Indicators in the rubric. The nature of both goals should come directly from your self-assessment, as well as what was learned in prior evaluation cycles.  “Educators must also consider team goals. Team goals are common goals you may set with a grade level or subject-area team and can be a very effective way for groups of similarly situated educators to work together on common objectives, whether they’re related to a new initiative like the implementation of the revised Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks, or targeted to a school-wide goal, such as decreasing the achievement gap or better supporting English Language Learners.  “Team goals can be extremely effective in moving schools and districts forward toward meeting shared improvement goals and objectives.  “Evaluators and educators work together to finalize goals. Part of the evaluator’s role is to ensure that the necessary supports and resources are available to the educator. To that end, the evaluator must sign-off on the goals that will inform the educator plan.” | Slide 23 |
| *Explain:*  “The last component of Step 2 is the development of the Educator Plan. Developing the Educator Plan is a much simpler process when the goals are clear and S.M.A.R.T.: Specific and strategic, measurable, action-oriented, rigorous, realistic and results-focused, timed and tracked.  “When done well, S.M.A.R.T. goals lead directly to the development of an educator plan with **key action steps** and **benchmarks**. Key action steps should be tightly linked to realistic attainment of the goals, and benchmarks should be identified to track progress and results.” | Slide 24 |
| *Explain:*  “Step 3: Implementation of the Plan is the heart of the 5-Step Cycle, during which time everyone completes the action steps outlined in their plan. As you begin gathering evidence around your practice with specific focus on your goals, your supervisor conducts frequent observations and engages in ongoing dialogue with you around practice and student learning.  “You may have questions or concerns about what is meant by ‘evidence.’ The new framework purposefully identifies several types of evidence that inform an evaluation in order to ensure that a comprehensive picture of practice for each educator is taken into account. Evidence includes student learning data, various artifacts, observational evidence, and student feedback. Evidence should relate directly to your goals or focused aspects of practice and prompt feedback and dialogue about instruction.  “You still might be concerned about collecting and maintaining evidence, not knowing if it’s the right evidence or the best evidence. You might be worried about dealing with reams of paper. The prospect of gathering evidence might feel overwhelming. It doesn’t have to be. So how do you make sure that this process is constructive and beneficial without letting it get overwhelming?” | Slide 25 |
| *Explain:*  “The collection of evidence is an opportunity to select a sample of high-quality artifacts and other data that fairly represents performance and impact. It is not intended to be a record of everything you’ve done in a year. It’s important that there be sufficient evidence associated with each Standard such that an evaluator can make an informed judgment related to practice under that Standard. That said, the preponderance of evidence should focus on your goals, high priority Indicators, and any critical school priorities not addressed by your professional practice and student learning goals.  “Evidence should never be manufactured or created for the sake of evaluation, but rather reflect a sample of your day-to-day work. School leaders can also identify common artifacts for which all educators are responsible—artifacts that represent evidence of school-wide goals or objectives when relevant. There is no set number of artifacts required to be submitted, and, in fact, the number of artifacts to collect will vary by educator depending on their goals and the action steps in their plan. Whether you identify 8, 10, or even 12 artifacts, the key is to ensure a balanced representation of performance.” | Slide 26 |
| *Explain:*  “Remember how observations used to be all that was required in an evaluation? The new evaluation framework represents a big shift away from that model. Now, observations represent one of several sources for evidence, and they play an important formative role in promoting professional growth and development. Through the use of short, frequent observations, rather than one or two formal observations, evaluators have the opportunity to provide targeted, ongoing feedback to educators and maintain a dialogue around teaching and learning. Research shows that this type of targeted, ongoing feedback about instruction has the most potential to support and improve practice.  “The regulations define Proficient practice with regard to evaluation as including ‘frequent, unannounced visits to classrooms’ followed by ‘targeted and constructive feedback to teachers.’ This underscores the importance of moving beyond the typical announced observation to an approach that is more sustained, targeted and constructive. The ESE Model System recommends frequent, brief unannounced observations for all educators, while maintaining at least one announced observation for new teachers or educators who are struggling.  “Remember, the purpose of shorter, more frequent observations is to foster more opportunities to engage in focused, informed conversation around instruction, and to ensure that a comprehensive picture of practice is available to evaluators.” | Slide 27 |
| *Explain:*  “Step 4 is the formative assessment/evaluation and takes place midway through your evaluation cycle.  “For educators on a plan that is one year or less in length, the formative assessment serves as a critical ‘check-in’ regarding progress on goals and/or performance standards.  “For educators on a two-year plan, Step 4 is called a formative *evaluation* and takes place at the end of the first school year. In addition to checking progress on goals, the formative evaluation in two-year plans results in ratings on each of the four Standards as well as an overall Summative Rating. However, these ratings are assumed to be the same as the previous Summative Rating unless evidence demonstrates a significant change in performance.” | Slide 28 |
| *Explain:*  “Finally, at the end of the cycle, everyone has a Summative Evaluation. The Summative Evaluation is the point at which the evaluator looks at all of the evidence together—the artifacts, observation notes, and measures of student learning related to the educator’s goals—and develops ratings based on this comprehensive picture of practice.  “Every educator earns a rating on each of the four Standards, as well as an overall Summative Rating that takes into account progress on his/her goals.” | Slide 29 |
| *Explain:*  “This visual captures the 5-Step Cycle for teachers in linear form, rather than a circular form. The linear graphic provides a different way to look at this process, with the five steps of the cycle spread out across the top of the page and the components of each step listed below.  “You’ll see in this 1-year cycle, everyone conducts their self-assessment in September and moves through Step 2: Goal Setting and Plan Development by the end of October.  “The formative assessment takes place in the middle of the year, usually in January or February, so the evaluator can touch base with the educator and check in on progress toward their goals.  “The cycle concludes in May or June with the Summative Evaluation.” | Slide 30 |
| *Explain:*  “For educators on a 2-year plan, the two main differences are the length of Step 3: Implementation of the Plan, which extends over a period of two school years, and the timing of Step 4: the formative evaluation, which takes place at the end of the first year in June.  “For 2-year cycles, Step 4 is called a formative evaluation, rather than a formative assessment, because the evaluator actually rates an educator’s performance on each Standard and provides an overall Summative Performance Rating. (*Remember, this formative evaluation rating is presumed to be the same as the prior ratings unless there is evidence of a significant change in performance. That means that for the vast majority of educators on 2-year plans, the formative evaluation at the end of year 1 still acts as a mid-cycle check-in focused on progress on goals.)”* | Slide 31 |
| *Explain*:  “Together, this 5-Step Cycle drives continuous learning for all educators. At the conclusion of each cycle, all of the conversations, analyses, and experiences that inform the Summative Evaluation provide the foundation for the next self-assessment, creating a continuous cycle of improvement that will improve teaching *and* learning throughout the school.” | Slide 32 |
| * **Facilitator Note**: This is a customizable slide intended to explain who the key evaluators at your school are, and who they will be evaluating. The graphic organizer above is a sample that you can modify as needed. | Slide 33 |

## 

## III. Check for Understanding (5 minutes)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| * **Facilitator Note**: This is an optional slide intended to give participants an opportunity to check their understanding. You may wish to give participants a moment to answer these questions individually before reviewing them together. In addition, you may adapt this slide to highlight the particular aspects of the evaluation frameworks you wish to emphasize.   *Answers*:  1) T  2) T (Summative Performance Rating)  4) F (All educators will receive a Summative Performance Rating at the end of their 5-Step Evaluation Cycle, which can vary in duration depending on the type of Plan the educator is on.)  5) T | Slide 34 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| IV. Next Steps (5 minutes) | |
| *Explain*:  “The next training session is Workshop #1: Rubric Review. In this workshop, teachers will review the basic components of the evaluation rubric, and then complete an interactive activity to deepen their understanding of that rubric. The lesson will include opportunities for teachers to ask questions and dive deeper into the full rubric.”   * **Facilitator Note:** Confirm date, time and location of Workshop 1: Rubric Review. | Slide 35 |
| * **Facilitator Note**: This is a customizable slide available to school leaders who wish to provide teachers and staff with a preview of next steps and upcoming dates related to the evaluation cycle. | Slide 36 |

## V. Q&A (5 minutes)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Q&A Slide | Slide 37 |

## VI. Exit Ticket (5 minutes)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Exit Ticket slide   * **Facilitator Note:** This is intended as an opportunity for participants to provide feedback regarding the quality of the presentation, as well as a chance for them to ask additional questions and provide comments about the evaluation system. It is important that administrators read, reflect, and act upon the feedback as they prepare for the upcoming workshops. * **Facilitator Note:** Enter your email address on this final slide, so participants know where to send questions. | Slide 38 |