

RATING

TYPE AND LENGTH OF EDUCATOR PLAN FOR EXPERIENCED EDUCATORS^A

EVIDENCE SUCH AS THAT LISTED BELOW:

PRACTICE

- Self-assessment
- Unannounced observations*
- Announced observations
- Educator work products*
- Team, grade, school meetings
- School, district committees
- Professional development participation and products

STUDENT LEARNING

- Student learning goals determined by educator & evaluator*
- Student work samples
- District, school, classroom based assessments
- Student portfolios, projects, performance tasks

ENGAGEMENT

- Self-Assessment*
- School-home communications
- School-community communications
- Student surveys (2013)*
- Staff surveys (2013)*
- Family engagement
- Professional development

* Required by regulations

MUST BE USED TO JUDGE EDUCATOR'S PRACTICE

- Professional Practice Goal
- Standard 1: Curriculum, Planning and Assessment OR Instructional Leadership
- Standard 2: Teaching All Students OR Management & Operations
- Standard 3: Family and Community Engagement
- Standard 4: Professional Culture
- Student Learning Goal

RESULTING IN FORMATIVE & SUMMATIVE PERFORMANCE RATINGS

Developing Educator Plan

- Educators without PTS or administrators in first 3 years
- PTS educators in a substantially new position
- One-year plan
- Same elements as the experienced educator plans

A All educators will have an **Educator Plan**, the type and length determined by the overall summative rating and trends/patterns in student learning outcomes. All Educator Plans must have a professional practice goal and a student learning goal.

B At least 2-year trends using **multiple measures of student learning outcomes** will be rated as High, Moderate, or Low. Guidance from DESE related to this element of the evaluation framework is expected in July 2012. Implementation by Sept. 2013.

Exemplary

ONE YEAR SELF-DIRECTED PLAN

- Goals set by educator with evaluator input; one must address low outcomes.
- Summative evaluation at year end.

Proficient

TWO-YEAR SELF-DIRECTED PLAN

- Goals set by educator with evaluator approval.
- Plan activities are primarily implemented with colleagues, which could include peer observation if negotiated.
- Formative evaluation at end of Year 1.
- Summative evaluation at end of Year 2.

Needs Improvement

DIRECTED PLAN – UP TO ONE YEAR

- Goals determined by evaluator with educator input, but must address areas of low performance and/or low outcomes.
- Plan activities designed by evaluator with educator input, but must focus on improving identified areas of underperformance related to the four standards, student learning outcomes, or both.
- Formative assessment at least mid cycle.
- Summative evaluation at end of Plan. If sufficient progress is made, educator is rated Proficient. If progress is insufficient, educator is rated Unsatisfactory.

Unsatisfactory

UP TO 12-MONTH IMPROVEMENT PLAN

- Goals determined by the evaluator with educator input and must address areas of low performance and/or low outcomes.
- Plan activities designed by evaluator with educator input and must focus on improving identified areas of underperformance related to the standards, student learning outcomes, or both.
- Formative assessment at least mid cycle through the plan.
- Summative evaluation at end of Plan. If sufficient progress, educator returns to regular evaluation cycle. Educator may be dismissed/demoted with insufficient progress on improvement goals.

LOW

MODERATE

HIGH

TRENDS OF MULTIPLE MEASURES OF STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES.^B

MULTIPLE MEASURES MUST INCLUDE AT LEAST

- District-determined pre/post assessment comparable across grades and subjects – may be district-developed or district-adopted.
- MCAS Student Growth Percentile, and MEPA gain scores if applicable.

IMPLEMENTATION TIMELINE

- For 2011-12:** All 34 Level 4 schools and identified "early adopter" districts
- For 2012-13:** All *Race to the Top* districts
- For 2013-14:** All other districts



center for education policy and practice

www.massteacher.org/cepp

working for great public schools

