

Appendix F. Educator Evaluation System

September 2014

1) **PURPOSE OF EDUCATOR EVALUATION**

- A) This contract language is locally negotiated and based on M.G.L., c.71, § 38; M.G.L. c.150E; the Educator Evaluation regulations, 603 CMR 35.00 et seq. The Superintendent-Director of the Greater Lawrence Technical School is responsible for the implementation of 603 CMR 35.00. In the event of a conflict between this collective bargaining agreement and the governing laws and regulations, the laws and regulations will prevail.
- B) The regulatory purposes of evaluation are:
- a. To promote student learning, growth, and achievement by providing Educators with feedback for improvement, enhanced opportunities for professional growth, and clear structures for accountability, 603 CMR 35.01(2)(a);
 - b. To provide a record of facts and assessments for personnel decisions, 35.01(2)(b);
 - c. To ensure that every school committee has a system to enhance the professionalism and accountability of teachers and administrators that will enable them to assist all students to perform at high levels, 35.01(3); and to assure effective teaching and administrative leadership, 35.01(3).

2) **DEFINITIONS** Unless the context clearly requires otherwise, terms shall have the following meanings:

- A) **ADMINISTRATOR** shall mean any person employed in a School District in a position requiring a certificate or license as described in 603 CMR 7.09(1) through (5) or who has been approved as an administrator in the area of vocational education as provided in 603 CMR 4.00: *Vocational Technical Education* or who is employed in a comparable position in a collaborative, and who is not employed under an individual employment contract.
- B) **ARTIFACTS** shall mean products of an Educator's work that demonstrate the Educator's knowledge and skills with respect to specific performance standards.
- C) **BOARD** shall mean the Board of Elementary and Secondary Education or a person duly authorized by the Board.
- D) **CASELOAD EDUCATOR** shall mean Educators who teach or counsel individual or small groups of students through consultation with the regular classroom teacher, for example, school nurses, guidance counselors, speech and language pathologists, and some reading specialists and special education teachers.
- E) **CATEGORIES OF EVIDENCE** shall mean multiple measures of student learning, growth, and achievement, judgments based on observations and artifacts of professional practice, including unannounced observations of practice of any duration; and additional evidence relevant to one or more Standards of Effective Teaching Practice (603 CMR 35.03).
- F) **CLASSROOM TEACHER** shall mean Educators who teach preK-12 whole classes, and teachers of special subjects as such as art, music, library, and physical education. May also include special

education teachers and reading specialists who teach whole classes.

G) **DISTRICT-DETERMINED MEASURES** shall mean measures of student learning, growth and achievement related to the Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks, Massachusetts Vocational Technical Education Frameworks, or other relevant frameworks, that are comparable across grade or subject level district-wide. These measures may include, but shall not be limited to: portfolios, approved commercial assessments and district-developed pre and post unit and course assessments, and capstone projects.

H) **EDUCATOR(s)** shall mean all classroom teachers and caseload educators, unless otherwise noted.

I) **EDUCATOR PLAN** shall mean the growth or improvement actions identified as part of each Educator's evaluation. The type and duration of the plan shall be determined by the Evaluator. The Educator Plan shall include, but is not limited to, at least one goal related to the improvement of practice, one goal for the improvement of student learning, an action plan with benchmarks for goals established in the Plan, and the Evaluator's final assessment of the Educator's attainment of the goals. All elements of the Educator Plan are subject to the Evaluator's approval. There shall be four types of Educator Plans:

i) **DEVELOPING EDUCATOR PLAN** shall mean a plan, developed by the Educator and the Evaluator for no less than 90 school days and no more than one school year-Educator without Professional Teacher Status (PTS); or, at the discretion of an Evaluator, for an Educator with PTS in a new assignment.

ii) **SELF-DIRECTED GROWTH PLAN** shall mean a plan developed by the Educator for one or two school years for Educators with PTS who are rated *Proficient* or *Exemplary*.

iii) **DIRECTED GROWTH PLAN** shall mean a plan of at least 60 school days and no more than one school year for Educators with PTS, who are rated *Needs Improvement*, developed by the Educator and the Evaluator.

iv) **IMPROVEMENT PLAN** shall mean a plan of at least 45 school days and no more than one school year for Educators with PTS, who are rated *Unsatisfactory*, developed by the Evaluator with goals specific to improving the educator's unsatisfactory performance.

J) **ESE** shall mean the Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education.

K) **EVALUATION** shall mean the ongoing process of defining goals and identifying, gathering, and using information to improve professional performance (the "Formative Evaluation" and "Formative Assessment") and to assess total job effectiveness and make personnel decisions (the "Summative Evaluation").

L) **EVALUATION CYCLE** shall mean a five-component process that all Educators follow consisting of 1) Self-Assessment; 2) Goal-setting and Educator Plan development; 3) Implementation of the Plan; 4) Formative Assessment/Evaluation; and 5) Summative Evaluation.

- M) ***EVALUATOR:** Any person outside the bargaining unit who has been designated in writing by the Superintendent-Director as having responsibility for evaluations. All Primary Evaluators, and Supervising Evaluators (if any), must be licensed as Administrators by the Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) and must be full-time employees of the Greater Lawrence Technical School. Each Educator will have one Primary Evaluator at any one time responsible for determining performance ratings. The Superintendent-Director is responsible for ensuring that all Evaluators have training in the principles of supervision and evaluation. All Evaluators shall follow the Evidence Collection and Reporting requirements outlined in this agreement.
- i) **PRIMARY EVALUATOR** shall be the person who determines the Educator's performance ratings and evaluation. The Superintendent-Director shall identify the Primary Evaluator, normally the Principal, Vice-Principal, or Academy Supervisor at the Greater Lawrence Technical School. The Primary Evaluator shall assign Supervising Evaluators (if any), in a program/school building. The Primary Evaluator shall approve all Educator Plans; and approve all Formative/Summative Assessment/Evaluation reports and ratings for Educators after receiving recommendations from the Supervising Evaluator (if any). The Primary Evaluator shall review and approve any change in a rating from the preceding assessment/evaluation, either on a particular standard or overall. The Primary Evaluator shall review and approve, and may amend the final Summative Evaluation Report and Ratings. The Primary Evaluator may perform any or all duties ascribed to Supervising Evaluators below.
- ii) **SUPERVISING EVALUATOR** shall be the person responsible for supervising goal setting and plan development with the Educator; supervising the Educator's progress through Formative Assessment; evaluating the Educator's progress toward attaining goals in the Educator Plan; conducting classroom observations, collecting and analyzing other evidence allowed under state regulations; and providing feedback and support to the Educator. The Supervising Evaluator completes the Formative Assessment/Evaluation Report and, if applicable, recommends Formative Ratings to the Primary Evaluator. The Supervising Evaluator drafts the Summative Evaluation Report and recommends Summative Ratings to the Primary Evaluator. The Supervising Evaluator may be the Primary Evaluator or his/her designee.
- iii) **NOTIFICATION/CHANGE OF EVALUATOR(S):** The Educator shall be notified in writing of his/her Primary Evaluator, and Supervising Evaluator (if any) at the outset of each new evaluation cycle. The Evaluator(s) may be changed upon notification in writing to the Educator. At any time during the evaluation cycle, the Educator may send a written request to the Superintendent-Director for a different Primary Evaluator, or Supervising Evaluator. The Superintendent-Director may approve or deny such a request, which shall not be subject to the grievance and arbitration procedure, provided his/her decision is not arbitrary or capricious.
- iv) **TEACHING STAFF ASSIGNED TO MORE THAN ONE ACADEMY/PROGRAM:** Each Educator who is assigned to more than one Academy/Program will be evaluated by the appropriate administrator where the Educator is assigned most of the time. The Academy Supervisor of each Academy/Program in which the Educator serves must review and sign the evaluation, and may

add written comments. In cases where there is no predominate assignment, the Superintendent-Director will determine who the Primary Evaluator will be.

- N) **EXPERIENCED EDUCATOR** shall mean an Educator with Professional Teacher Status (PTS).
- O) **FAMILY** shall mean parents, legal guardians, or primary caregivers.
- P) **FORMATIVE ASSESSMENT** shall mean the process used to assess progress towards attaining goals set forth in Educator plans, performance on performance standards, or both. This process may take place at any time(s) during the cycle of evaluation, but typically takes place at mid-cycle.
- Q) **FORMATIVE EVALUATION** shall mean an evaluation conducted at the end of Year 1 for an Educator on a 2-year Self-Directed Growth plan which is used to arrive at a rating on progress towards attaining the goals set forth in the Educator Plan, performance on Standards, or both.
- R) **GOAL** shall mean a specific, actionable, and measurable area of improvement as set forth in an Educator's plan. A goal may pertain to any or all of the following: Educator practice in relation to Performance Standards, Educator practice in relation to indicators, or specified improvement in student learning, growth and achievement. Goals may be developed by individual Educators, by the Evaluator, or by teams, departments, or groups of Educators who have the same role.
- S) **MEASURABLE** shall mean that which can be classified or estimated in relation to a scale, rubric, or standards.
- T) **MULTIPLE MEASURES** shall include a combination of classroom, school and district assessments, student growth percentiles where available on state assessments.
- U) **OBSERVATION** shall mean a data gathering process that includes notes, claims, and judgments made during one or more classroom or worksite visits(s) of any duration by the Evaluator and may include examination of artifacts of practice, including student work. Classroom or worksite observations conducted pursuant to this article must result in feedback to the Educator. All classroom or worksite observations shall be conducted in person, however observations may be recorded using audio/video equipment provided that they are done openly with the knowledge and prior consent of the Educator. Observations recorded using audio/video equipment shall not replace in person observations, and will be used only as a support to aid the Educator in improving their professional practice. Normal supervisory responsibilities of department, building and district administrators will also cause administrators to drop in on classes and other activities in the worksite at various times as deemed necessary by the administrator. Carrying out these supervisory responsibilities, when they do not result in targeted and constructive written feedback to the Educator, are not observations as defined in this Article.
- V) **PARTIES** shall mean the parties to this agreement: the Greater Lawrence Regional Teachers Federation, Local 1707, AFT MA, AFL-CIO (hereinafter referred to as the *Federation*), and the Greater Lawrence Regional High School District Committee (hereinafter referred to as the *District*).

W) **PERFORMANCE RATING:** Describes the Educator's performance on each performance standard and overall. There shall be four performance ratings:

EXEMPLARY shall mean the Educator's performance consistently and significantly exceeds the requirements of a standard or overall.

PROFICIENT shall mean the Educator's performance fully and consistently meets the requirements of a standard or overall.

NEEDS IMPROVEMENT shall mean the Educator's performance on a standard or overall is below the requirements of a standard or overall, but is not considered to be *Unsatisfactory* at this time. Improvement is necessary and expected.

UNSATISFACTORY shall mean the Educator's performance on a standard or overall has not significantly improved following a rating of *Needs Improvement*, or the Educator's performance is consistently below the requirements of a standard or overall and is considered inadequate, or both.

X) **PERFORMANCE STANDARDS** shall mean performance standards locally developed pursuant to M.G.L. c. 71, § 38 and consistent with, and supplemental to 603 CMR 35.00.

Y) **PROFESSIONAL TEACHER STATUS (PTS)** shall mean the status granted to an Educator pursuant to M.G.L. c. 71, § 41.

Z) **RATING OF EDUCATOR IMPACT ON STUDENT LEARNING** shall mean a rating of *High, Moderate* or *Low* based on trends and patterns on state assessments and district-determined measures. The parties will negotiate the process for using state and district-determined measures to arrive at an Educator's rating of impact on student learning, growth and achievement, after ESE issues direction and guidance on this matter.

AA) **RATING OF OVERALL EDUCATOR PERFORMANCE** shall mean the Educator's overall performance rating is based on the Evaluator's professional judgment and examination of evidence of the Educator's performance against the four Performance Standards and the Educator's attainment of goals set forth in the Educator Plan, as follows:

- i) Standard 1: Curriculum, Planning and Assessment
- ii) Standard 2: Teaching All Students
- iii) Standard 3: Family and Community Engagement
- iv) Standard 4: Professional Culture
- v) Attainment of Professional Practice Goal(s)
- vi) Attainment of Student Learning Goal(s)

BB) **RUBRIC** shall mean a scoring tool that describes characteristics of practice or artifacts at different levels of performance. The rubrics for Standards and Indicators of Effective Teaching Practice are used to rate Educators on Performance Standards, these rubrics consists of:

- i) **STANDARDS:** Describes broad categories of professional practice, including those required in 603 CMR 35.03.
 - ii) **INDICATORS:** Describes aspects of each standard, including those required in 603 CMR 35.03.
 - iii) **ELEMENTS:** Defines the individual components under each indicator.
 - iv) **DESCRIPTORS:** Describes practice at four levels of performance for each element.
- CC) **SUMMATIVE EVALUATION** shall mean an evaluation used to arrive at a rating on each standard, an overall rating, and as a basis to make personnel decisions. The summative evaluation includes the Evaluator's judgments of the Educator's performance against Performance Standards and the Educator's attainment of goals set forth in the Educator's Plan.
- DD) **SUPERINTENDENT** shall mean the person employed by the school committee pursuant to M.G.L. c. 71 §59 and §59A. The Superintendent-Director is responsible for the implementation of 603 CMR 35.00.
- EE) **TEACHER** shall mean any person employed in a school district in a position requiring a certificate or license as described in 603 CMR 7.04(3) or who has been approved as an instructor in the area of vocational education as provided in 603 CMR 4.00: *Vocational Technical Education* or who is employed in a comparable position in a collaborative. Teachers may include, for example, classroom teachers, librarians, guidance counselors, or school nurses.
- FF) **TRENDS** shall be based on at least two (2) years of data.
- GG) **TRENDS IN STUDENT LEARNING** shall mean at least two (2) years of data from the district-determined measures and state assessments used in determining the Educator's rating on impact on student learning as *high, moderate or low*.

3) EVIDENCE USED IN EVALUATION

The following categories of evidence shall be used in evaluating each Educator:

- A) MULTIPLE MEASURES OF STUDENT LEARNING, GROWTH, AND ACHIEVEMENT, WHICH SHALL INCLUDE:
- i) 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;
 - ii) At least two district-determined measures of student learning related to the Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks or the Massachusetts Vocational Technical Education Frameworks or other relevant frameworks that are comparable across grades and/or subjects district-wide. These measures may include: portfolios, approved commercial assessments and district-developed pre and post unit and course assessments, and capstone projects. One such measure shall be the MCAS Student Growth Percentile (SGP) or Massachusetts English Proficiency Assessment gain scores, if applicable, in which case at least two years of data is required.

iii) Measures of student progress and/or achievement toward student learning goals set between the Educator and Evaluator for the school year or some other period of time established in the Educator Plan.

iv) 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. The measures set by the District should be based on the Educator's role and responsibility.

B) JUDGMENTS BASED ON OBSERVATIONS AND ARTIFACTS OF PRACTICE INCLUDING:

- i) Unannounced observations of practice of any duration.
- ii) Announced observation(s) for non-PTS Educators in their first year of practice in a school, Educators on Improvement Plans, and as determined by the Evaluator.
- iii) Examination of Educator work products.
- iv) Examination of student work samples.

C) EVIDENCE RELEVANT TO ONE OR MORE PERFORMANCE STANDARDS, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO:

- i) Evidence compiled and presented by the Educator, including:
 - a. Evidence of fulfillment of professional responsibilities and growth such as self-assessments, peer collaboration, professional development linked to goals in the Educator plans, contributions to the school community and professional culture;
 - b. Evidence of active outreach to and engagement with families;
- ii) Evidence of progress towards professional practice goal(s);
- iii) Evidence of progress toward student learning outcomes goal(s).
- iv) **Student and Staff Feedback--see #23-24, below; and**
- v) Any other relevant evidence from any source that the Evaluator shares with the Educator. Other relevant evidence could include information provided by other administrators such as the Superintendent-Director.

D) RECORD OF EVALUATION AND EVIDENCE COLLECTION

- i) **Record of Evaluation**
 - a. The parties agree that an effective evaluation process requires meaningful, ongoing, two-way communication. To facilitate this process, the parties agree that each Educator shall have a Record of Evaluation maintained as part of his/her Teacher files/personnel folder (and the equivalent in the *TeachPoint* System), pursuant to Article 26 –Personnel Practices. All evaluation documents contained in the Record of Evaluation shall remain confidential as personnel records for each member of the bargaining unit, and will not be considered a public record per the Privacy Exemption under the Massachusetts Public Records Law, M.G.L. c. 4, §7(26)(c). Each

Educator's Record of Evaluation shall consist of three (3) parts:

- All forms and documents used or contained in the evaluation process (or the equivalent in the *TeachPoint* System).
- Evaluator-supplied evidence.
- Educator-supplied evidence.

b. Standard forms shall include all relevant forms in Appendix G (or the equivalent in the *TeachPoint* System). The other components are described below.

ii) Role of the Record of Evaluation in Evaluation Reports

Formative or Summative Evaluation Reports shall rely on evidence previously entered into the Record of Evaluation according to the protocols below.

iii) Use of Evidence Log

Any Evaluator who collects evidence shall maintain an Evidence Log for each Educator under his/her supervision using the Evaluator Record of Evidence Form in Appendix G (or the equivalent in the *TeachPoint* System). The Log shall be used to document and preserve evidence that may be relied upon to determine ratings against standards and/or to assess progress toward goals. A Log entry may include attachments. Any time an Evaluator makes an entry into the Log, the Educator will receive a copy of the Log entry and any relevant attachments.

iv) Evidence Collection and Recordkeeping Protocols

Evaluators shall collect and record evidence from classroom observations and other sources of evidence allowed under state regulations according to the following protocols, however the parties agree that the characterization of evidence as "*Exemplary*", "*Proficient*", "*Needs Improvement*" or "*Unsatisfactory*" shall be optional for Educators on a Developing Plan as determined by the Evaluator. The characterization of evidence shall be mandatory for all Educators on a Directed Growth Plan, a Self-Directed Growth Plan, or an Improvement Plan.

v) Evaluator Supplied Evidence

a. Observation Process: Evidence collected from classroom observations shall be documented using the Observation Evidence Collection Tool in Appendix G (or the equivalent in the *TeachPoint* System), and recorded in the Evidence Log.

- (1) The Evaluator shall characterize an observation that generally demonstrates proficient or better practice on the Observation Evidence Collection Tool, and in the Evidence Log as either "*Proficient*" or "*Exemplary*". In these cases, the Evaluator shall have seven (7) school days to enter evidence and feedback from the observation on the Observation Evidence Collection Tool and in the Evidence Log, although the Educator may agree to extend this timeline to ten (10) school days. Feedback from "*Proficient*" or "*Exemplary*"

observations need only indicate one (1) of these descriptive statements but may include more detail.

- (2) In the case of an observation that raises questions or concerns, the Evaluator shall request an In-person Conference with the Educator within two (2) school days of the observation by sending the Educator a written or electronic note. Following this request, the Educator and Evaluator shall meet as soon as possible. The Evaluator shall not include any evidence or feedback from the observation on the Observation Evidence Collection Tool or in the Evidence Log until after the In-Person Conference is held. Following the meeting, the Evaluator shall have an additional two (2) school days to enter the evidence and/or feedback from the observation on the Observation Evidence Collection Tool and in the Evidence Log. If the meeting allays the Evaluator's concerns, he/she shall characterize the observation as either "*Proficient*" or "*Exemplary*" consistent with the above paragraph.
- (3) If the Evaluator still has concerns after meeting with the Educator, he/she shall characterize the observation as either "*Needs Improvement*" or "*Unsatisfactory*" on the *Observation Evidence Collection Tool* and in the *Evidence Log*, and the Evaluator shall clearly communicate his/her concerns to the Educator in writing. This feedback shall address:
 - The specific standard(s) and/or indicator(s) in question;
 - The supporting evidence for the Evaluator's concern(s);
 - Suggested actions for correcting the problem(s); and
 - The supports and resources available to the Educator.
- (4) Additionally, following a Log entry made by an Evaluator, the Educator may use the Educator Response Form in Appendix G (or the equivalent in the *TeachPoint* System) to submit comments and/or additional information he/she believes relevant to the Evaluator's understanding of the evidence. Any comments or information added by the Educator shall become part of the Educator's Record of Evaluation, and the Evaluator who collected and documented the evidence shall acknowledge receipt by writing the date received and by affixing his/her signature to the evidence collected. Dates and signatures shall be accomplished electronically using the *TeachPoint* System.

vi. Educator-Supplied Evidence

- a. Every Educator shall have the right to compile and present any evidence or information that relates to his/her performance against the standards and/or progress toward plan goals. The Educator may share any or all compiled evidence/information with his/her Evaluator(s) at any point in the evaluation cycle. Educator-Supplied Evidence will be documented using the Educator Collection of Evidence Form in Appendix G (or the equivalent in the *TeachPoint* System), and recorded in the Evidence Log. The Primary Evaluator shall acknowledge receipt of said contents by writing the date received and by affixing his/her signature to the evidence collected. The Educator shall be responsible for the scanning and uploading Educator-Supplied Evidence into *TeachPoint*. Dates and signatures shall be accomplished electronically using the *TeachPoint* System.

b. Additionally, following a Log entry made by an Evaluator, the Educator may use the Educator Response Form in Appendix G (or the equivalent in the *TeachPoint* System) to submit comments and/or additional information he/she believes relevant to the Evaluator's understanding of the evidence. Any comments or information added by the Educator shall become part of the Educator's Record of Evaluation, and the Evaluator who collected and documented the evidence shall acknowledge receipt by writing the date received and by affixing his/her signature to the evidence collected. Dates and signatures shall be accomplished electronically using the *TeachPoint* System.

vii. Other Sources of Evidence

a. Evidence collected from sources other than classroom observations or Educator-Supplied Evidence shall be documented using the Artifact Cover Page in Appendix G (or the equivalent in the *TeachPoint* System), and recorded in the Evidence Log. The Evaluator shall characterize entries on the Artifact Cover Page and in Evidence Log as either "*Exemplary*", "*Proficient*", "*Needs Improvement*" or "*Unsatisfactory*", with specific feedback accompanying each entry. Such evidence may be collected and documented at any time, provided the Evaluator holds an In-Person Conference with the Educator to share and discuss an entry which raises questions or concerns before it is formally entered into *TeachPoint*, thus giving the Educator an opportunity to address the evidence and dispel the concerns. The Evaluator and the Educator shall be responsible for the scanning and uploading evidence that they supply from Other Sources into *TeachPoint*.

b. Additionally, following a Log entry made by an Evaluator, the Educator may use the Educator Response Form in Appendix G (or the equivalent in the *TeachPoint* System) to submit comments and/or additional information he/she believes relevant to the Evaluator's understanding of the evidence. Any comments or information added by the Educator shall become part of the Educator's Record of Evaluation, and the Evaluator who collected and documented the evidence shall acknowledge receipt by writing the date received and by affixing his/her signature to the evidence collected. Dates and signatures shall be accomplished electronically using the *TeachPoint* System.

4) RUBRIC/FORMS

The rubrics are a scoring tool used for the Educator's self-assessment, the Formative Assessment, the Formative Evaluation and the Summative Evaluation. The parties agree to use the ESE Performance Rubrics, and forms included in this agreement (or the equivalent in the *TeachPoint* System) and attached hereto incorporated herein by reference as follows: Appendix G - Forms; Appendix H – ESE Model Rubric for Teachers; Appendix I – ESE Model Rubric for SISP, Appendix J - Setting SMART Goals, and Appendix K – District Determined Measures. The Teacher Rubric in Appendix H shall be used to evaluate an employee who works as a classroom teacher, a special education teacher, or a reading specialist. The SISP Rubric in Appendix I shall be used to evaluate an employee who works as a counselor, librarian, nurse, speech and language pathologist, physical therapist, or occupational therapist.

5) **EVALUATION CYCLE: TRAINING**

A) Prior to the implementation of the new evaluation process contained in this article, the District shall arrange training for all Educators, Principals, Academy Supervisors and other evaluators that outlines the components of the new evaluation process and provides an explanation of the evaluation cycle.

B) By November 1st of the first year of this agreement, all Educators shall complete a professional learning activity about self-assessment and goal-setting satisfactory to the Superintendent-Director or Principal. Any Educator hired after the November 1st date, and who has not previously completed such an activity, shall complete such a professional learning activity about self-assessment and goal-setting within three months of the date of hire.

C) The District through the Superintendent-Director shall determine the type and quality of training based on guidance provided by ESE. The parties agree that annual Evaluator Training shall be consistent for all Evaluators.

6. **EVALUATION CYCLE: ANNUAL ORIENTATION**

A) At the start of each school year, the Superintendent-Director, Principal or his/her designee shall conduct a meeting for Educators and Evaluators focused substantially on educator evaluation and the *TeachPoint* System. The Superintendent-Director, Principal or his/her designee shall:

- i) Provide an overview of the evaluation process, including goal setting and the educator plans.
- ii) Provide all Educators with directions for obtaining a copy of the forms (or the equivalent in the *TeachPoint* System) used by the District. These may be electronically provided.
- iii) Provide all Educators with training on how to use the *TeachPoint* System including but not limited to instruction on how to scan and upload evidence.
- iv) The faculty meeting may be digitally recorded to facilitate orientation of Educators hired after the beginning of the school year; and
- v) The parties agree that Evaluator Training shall be consistent for all Evaluators.

7. **EVALUATION CYCLE: SELF-ASSESSMENT**

A) Completing the Self-Assessment

- i) The evaluation cycle begins with the Educator completing and submitting to the Primary or Supervising Evaluator a self-assessment by October 1st or within four weeks of the start of their employment at the school. The Educator's self-assessment shall be completed using the Self-Assessment Form in Appendix G (or the equivalent in the *TeachPoint* System).
- ii) The self-assessment includes:

- a. An analysis of evidence of student learning, growth and achievement for students under the Educator's responsibility.
- b. An assessment of practice against each of the four Performance Standards of effective practice using the District's rubric.
- c. **Proposed goals to pursue:**
 - i. At least one goal directly related to improving the Educator's own professional practice.
 - ii. At least one goal directed related to improving student learning.

B) Proposing the Goals

- i) Educators must consider goals for grade-level, subject-area, department teams, or other groups of Educators who share responsibility for student learning and results, except as provided in (ii) below. Educators may meet with teams to consider establishing team goals. Evaluators may participate in such meetings.
- ii) For Educators in their first year of practice, the Evaluator or his/her designee will meet with each Educator by October 1st (or within four weeks of the Educator's first day of employment if the Educator begins employment after September 15th) to assist the Educator in completing the self-assessment and drafting the professional practice and student learning goals which must include induction and mentoring activities.
- iii) Unless the Evaluator indicates that an Educator in his/her second or third years of practice should continue to address induction and mentoring goals pursuant to 603 CMR 7.12, the Educator may address shared grade level or subject area team goals.
- iv) For Educators with PTS and ratings of *Proficient* or *Exemplary*, the goals may be team goals. In addition, these Educators may include individual professional practice goals that address enhancing skills that enable the Educator to share proficient practices with colleagues or develop leadership skills.
- v) For Educators with PTS and ratings of *Needs Improvement* or *Unsatisfactory*, the professional practice goal(s) must address specific standards and indicators identified for improvement. In addition, the goals may address shared grade level or subject area team goals.
- vi) An Educator's proposed and final goals shall be documented using the Goal Setting Form in Appendix G (or the equivalent in the *TeachPoint* System).

8. EVALUATION CYCLE: GOAL SETTING AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE EDUCATOR PLAN

A) Every Educator has an Educator Plan that includes, but is not limited to, one goal related to the improvement of practice; one goal for the improvement of student learning. The Plan also outlines actions the Educator must take to attain the goals established in the Plan and benchmarks to assess progress. Goals may be developed by individual Educators, by the Evaluator, or by teams, departments, or groups of Educators who have the similar roles and/or responsibilities. See Sections 15-19 for more

on Educator Plans.

B) To determine the goals to be included in the Educator Plan, the Evaluator reviews the goals the Educator has proposed in the Self-Assessment, using evidence of Educator performance and impact on student learning, growth and achievement based on the Educator's self-assessment and other sources that Evaluator shares with the Educator. The process for determining the Educator's impact on student learning, growth and achievement will be determined after ESE issues guidance on this matter. See #22, below.

C) Proposed goals shall be in the form of SMART Goals, and must align with program/school and District goals. Guidance for setting SMART Goals is attached hereto as part of Appendix J – Setting SMART Goals.

D) Educator Plan Development Meetings shall be conducted as follows:

i) Educators in the same school may meet with the Evaluator in teams and/or individually at the end of the previous evaluation cycle or by October 15th of the next academic year to develop their Educator Plan. Educators shall not be expected to meet during the summer hiatus.

ii) For those Educators new to the school, the meeting with the Evaluator to establish the Educator Plan must occur by October 15th or within six weeks of the start of their assignment in that school.

iii) The Evaluator shall meet individually with Educators with PTS and ratings of *Needs Improvement* or *Unsatisfactory* to develop professional practice goal(s) that must address specific standards and indicators identified for improvement. In addition, the goals may address shared grade level or subject matter goals.

E) The Evaluator completes the Educator Plan by November 1st. The Educator shall sign the Educator Plan within 5 school days of its receipt and may include a written response. The Educator's signature indicates that the Educator received the plan in a timely fashion. The signature does not indicate agreement or disagreement with its contents. The Evaluator retains final authority over the content of the Educator's Plan. All Educator Plans shall be documented using the Educator Plan Form in Appendix G (or the equivalent in the *TeachPoint* System).

**9. EVALUATION CYCLE: OBSERVATION OF PRACTICE AND EXAMINATION OF ARTIFACTS—
EDUCATORS WITHOUT PTS**

A) In the first year of practice or first year assigned to a school:

i) The Educator shall have at least one announced observation during the school year using the protocol described in section 11B, below.

ii) The Educator shall have at least four unannounced observations during the school year.

B) In their second and third years of practice or second and third years as a non-PTS Educator in the school:

i) The Educator shall have at least three unannounced observations during the school

year.

10. **EVALUATION CYCLE:** OBSERVATION OF PRACTICE AND EXAMINATION OF ARTIFACTS –
EDUCATORS WITH PTS

- A) The Educator whose overall rating is *Proficient* or *Exemplary* must have at least one unannounced observation during the evaluation cycle.
- B) The Educator whose overall rating is *Needs Improvement* must be observed according to the Directed Growth Plan during the period of Plan which must include at least two unannounced observations.
- C) The Educator whose overall rating is *Unsatisfactory* must be observed according to the Improvement Plan which must include both unannounced and announced observation. The number and frequency of the observations shall be determined by the Evaluator, but in no case, for improvement plans of one year, shall there be fewer than one announced and four unannounced observations. For Improvement Plans of six months or fewer, there must be no less than one announced and two unannounced observations.

11. **OBSERVATIONS:** The Evaluator's first observation of the Educator should take place by November 15th. Observations required by the Educator Plan should be completed by May 15th. The Evaluator may conduct additional observations after this date. The Evaluator is not required nor expected to review all the indicators in a rubric during an observation. All evidence from observations shall be collected and documented using the Observation Evidence Collection Tool in Appendix G (or the equivalent in the *TeachPoint* System), and recorded in the Evidence Log. The Evaluator shall document observations using the *TeachPoint* System, and shall be responsible for scanning and uploading evidence collected during observations into *TeachPoint*.

A) **Unannounced Observations**

- i) Unannounced observations may be in the form of partial or full- period classroom visitations, Instructional Rounds, Walkthroughs, Learning Walks, or any other means deemed useful by the Evaluator, Principal, Superintendent-Director or other administrator.
- ii) The Educator will be provided with at least brief written feedback from the Evaluator within 3-5 school days of the observation. The written feedback shall be delivered to the Educator in person, by email, using the *TeachPoint* System, placed in the Educator's mailbox or mailed to the Educator's home.
- iii) Any observation or series of observations resulting in one or more standards judged to be *Unsatisfactory* or *Needs Improvement* for the first time must be followed by at least one observation of at least 30 minutes in duration within 30 school days.

B) **Announced Observations**

- i) All non-PTS Educators in their first year in the school, PTS Educators on Improvement Plans and other educators at the discretion of the evaluator shall have at least one Announced Observation.

- a. The Evaluator shall select the date and time of the lesson or activity to be observed and discuss with the Educator any specific goal(s) for the observation.
- b. Within 5 school days of the scheduled observation, upon request of either the Evaluator or Educator, the Evaluator and Educator shall meet for a pre-observation conference. In lieu of a meeting, the Educator may inform the Evaluator in writing of the nature of the lesson, the student population served, and any other information that will assist the Evaluator to assess performance:
 - (1st) The Educator shall provide the Evaluator a draft of the lesson, student conference, IEP plan or activity. If the actual plan is different, the Educator will provide the Evaluator with a copy prior to the observation.
 - (2nd) The Educator will be notified as soon as possible if the Evaluator will not be able to attend the scheduled observation. The observation will be rescheduled with the Educator as soon as reasonably practical.
- c. Within 5 school days of the observation, the Evaluator and Educator shall meet for a post-observation conference. This timeframe may be extended due to unavailability on the part of either the Evaluator or the Educator, but shall be rescheduled within 24 hours if possible.
- d. The Evaluator shall provide the Educator with written feedback within 5 school days of the post-observation conference. For any standard where the Educator's practice was found to be *Unsatisfactory* or *Needs Improvement*, the feedback must:
 - (1st) Describe the basis for the Evaluator's judgment.
 - (2nd) Describe actions the Educator should take to improve his/her performance.
 - (3rd) Identify support and/or resources the Educator may use in his/her improvement.
 - (4th) State that the Educator is responsible for addressing the need for improvement.

12. EVALUATION CYCLE: FORMATIVE ASSESSMENT

A) A specific purpose for evaluation is to promote student learning, growth and achievement by providing Educators with feedback for improvement. Evaluators are expected to make frequent unannounced visits to classrooms. Evaluators are expected to give targeted constructive feedback to Educators based on their observations of practice, examination of artifacts, and analysis of multiple measures of student learning, growth and achievement in relation to the Standards and Indicators of Effective Teaching Practice.

B) Formative Assessment may be ongoing throughout the evaluation cycle but typically takes place mid-cycle when a Formative Assessment Report is completed. For an Educator on a two-year Self-Directed Growth Plan, the mid-cycle Formative Assessment Report is replaced by the Formative Evaluation Report at the end of year one. See section 13, below.

C) The Formative Assessment shall be documented using the Formative Assessment Report Form in Appendix G (or the equivalent in the *TeachPoint* System), and recorded in the Evidence Log. The Formative Assessment Report provides written feedback and ratings to the Educator about his/her progress towards attaining the goals set forth in the Educator Plan, performance on Performance Standards and overall, or both. Reports that give an overall rating of *Needs Improvement* or *Unsatisfactory* must rely on evidence previously entered into the Record of Evidence (and documented in the *TeachPoint* System) that the Primary or Supervising Evaluator has already discussed with the Educator at an In-Person Conference, and for which the Evaluator has provided specific feedback.

D) No less than two weeks before the due date for the Formative Assessment Report, which due date shall be established by the Evaluator with written notice to the Educator, the Educator shall provide to the Evaluator evidence of family outreach and engagement, fulfillment of professional responsibility and growth, and progress on attaining professional practice and student learning goals. The Educator may provide to the Evaluator additional evidence of the Educator's performances against the four Performance Standards. All Educator-Supplied Evidence will be documented using the Educator Collection of Evidence Form in Appendix G (or the equivalent in the *TeachPoint* System), and recorded in the Evidence Log.

E) Upon the request of either the Evaluator or the Educator, the Evaluator and the Educator will meet either before or after completion of the Formative Assessment Report.

F) The Evaluator shall complete the Formative Assessment Report and provide a copy to the Educator. All Formative Assessment Reports must be signed by the Evaluator and delivered face-to-face, by email, using the *TeachPoint* System, or to the Educator's school mailbox or home. Delivery and signatures shall be completed electronically using the *TeachPoint* System.

G) The Educator may reply in writing to the Formative Assessment Report within 5 school days of receiving the report using the Educator Response Form in Appendix G (or the equivalent in the *TeachPoint* System).

H) The Educator shall sign the Formative Assessment Report by within 5 school days of receiving the report. The signature indicates that the Educator received the Formative Assessment Report in a timely fashion. The signature does not indicate agreement or disagreement with its contents. Educator signatures shall be completed electronically using the *TeachPoint* System.

I) As a result of the Formative Assessment Report, the Evaluator may change the activities in the Educator Plan.

J) If the rating in the Formative Assessment Report differs from the last summative rating the Educator received, the Evaluator may place the Educator on a different Educator Plan, appropriate to the new rating. No Educator previously rated *Proficient* or *Exemplary* overall may have his/her overall rating lowered unless the Supervising or Primary Evaluator have first noted at least three (3) classroom observations in the Record of Evaluation during the current evaluation cycle that have raised concerns, and for which the Evaluator has provided specific feedback.

13. **EVALUATION CYCLE: FORMATIVE EVALUATION FOR TWO YEAR SELF-DIRECTED PLANS ONLY**

A) Educators on two year Self-Directed Growth Educator Plans receive a Formative Evaluation Report near the end of the first year of the two year cycle. The Educator's performance rating for that

year shall be assumed to be the same as the previous summative rating unless evidence demonstrates a significant change in performance in which case the rating on the performance standards may change, and the Evaluator may place the Educator on a different Educator plan, appropriate to the new rating. No Educator previously rated *Proficient* or *Exemplary* overall may have his/her overall rating lowered unless the Supervising or Primary Evaluator have first noted at least three (3) classroom observations in the Record of Evaluation during the current evaluation cycle that have raised concerns, and for which the Evaluator has provided specific feedback.

B) The Formative Evaluation shall be documented using the Formative Evaluation Report Form in Appendix G (or the equivalent in the *TeachPoint* System), and recorded in the Evidence Log. The Formative Evaluation Report provides written feedback and ratings to the Educator about his/her progress towards attaining the goals set forth in the Educator Plan, performance on each performance standard and overall, or both. Reports that give an overall rating of *Needs Improvement* or *Unsatisfactory* must rely on evidence previously entered into the Record of Evidence (and documented in the *TeachPoint* System) that the Primary or Supervising Evaluator has already discussed with the Educator at an In-Person Conference, and for which the Evaluator has provided specific feedback.

C) No less than two weeks before the due date for the Formative Evaluation Report, which due date shall be established by the Evaluator with written notice provided to the Educator, the Educator shall provide to the Evaluator evidence of family outreach and engagement, fulfillment of professional responsibility and growth, and progress on attaining professional practice and student learning goals. The Educator may also provide to the Evaluator additional evidence of the Educator's performance against the four Performance Standards. All Educator-Supplied Evidence will be documented using the Educator Collection of Evidence Form in Appendix G (or the equivalent in the *TeachPoint* System), and recorded in the Evidence Log.

D) The Evaluator shall complete the Formative Evaluation Report and provide a copy to the Educator. All Formative Evaluation Reports must be signed by the Evaluator and delivered face-to-face, by email, using the *TeachPoint* System, or to the Educator's school mailbox or home. Delivery and signatures for the Formative Evaluation Report shall be completed electronically using the *TeachPoint* System.

E) Upon the request of either the Evaluator or the Educator, the Evaluator and the Educator will meet either before or after completion of the Formative Evaluation Report.

F) The Educator may reply in writing to the Formative Evaluation Report within 5 school days of receiving the report using the Educator Response Form in Appendix G (or the equivalent in the *TeachPoint* System).

G) The Educator shall sign the Formative Evaluation Report by within 5 school days of receiving the report. The signature indicates that the Educator received the Formative Evaluation Report in a timely fashion. The signature does not indicate agreement or disagreement with its contents. Educator signatures shall be completed electronically using the *TeachPoint* System.

H) As a result of the Formative Evaluation Report, the Evaluator may change the activities in the Educator Plan.

I) If the rating in the Formative Evaluation Report differs from the last summative rating the Educator received, the Evaluator may place the Educator on a different Educator Plan, appropriate to the new rating.

14. **EVALUATION CYCLE: SUMMATIVE EVALUATION**

- A) The evaluation cycle concludes with a Summative Evaluation Report. The Summative Evaluation shall be documented using the Summative Evaluation Report Form in Appendix G (or the equivalent in the *TeachPoint* System), and recorded in the Evidence Log. For Educators on a one or two year Educator Plan, the Summative Evaluation Report must be written and provided to the Educator by May 15th.
- B) The Evaluator determines a rating on each standard and an overall rating based on the Evaluator's professional judgment, an examination of evidence against the Performance Standards and evidence of the attainment of the Educator Plan goals. No Educator previously rated *Proficient* or *Exemplary* overall may have his/her overall rating lowered unless the Supervising or Primary Evaluator have first noted at least three (3) classroom observations in the Record of Evaluation during the current evaluation cycle that have raised concerns and for which the Evaluator has provided specific feedback.
- C) The professional judgment of the Primary Evaluator shall determine the overall summative rating that the Educator receives.
- D) For an Educator whose overall performance rating is *Exemplary* or *Proficient* and whose impact on student learning is *Low*, the Evaluator's supervisor shall discuss and review the rating with the Evaluator and the supervisor shall confirm or revise the Educator's rating. In cases where the Superintendent-Director serves as the Primary Evaluator, the Superintendent-Director's decision on the rating shall not be subject to review.
- E) The Summative Evaluation rating must be based on evidence from multiple categories of evidence. MCAS Growth scores shall not be the sole basis for a summative evaluation rating. A Summative Evaluation Report that lowers an Educator's overall rating or rating on a particular standard from his/her previous overall rating or rating on a particular standard, or a report that gives an overall rating of *Needs Improvement* or *Unsatisfactory* must rely on evidence previously entered into the Record of Evidence (and documented in the *TeachPoint* System) that the Primary or Supervising Evaluator has already discussed with the Educator at an In-Person Conference, and for which the Evaluator has provided specific feedback.
- F) To be rated *Proficient* overall, the Educator shall, at a minimum, have been rated *Proficient* on the Curriculum, Planning and Assessment and the Teaching All Students Standards of Effective Teaching Practice.
- G) No less than four weeks before the due date for the Summative Evaluation Report, which due date shall be established by the Evaluator with written notice provided to the Educator, the Educator will provide to the Evaluator evidence of family outreach and engagement, fulfillment of professional responsibility and growth, and progress on attaining professional practice and student learning goals. The Educator may also provide to the Evaluator additional evidence of the Educator's performance against the four Performance Standards. All Educator-Supplied Evidence will be documented using the Educator Collection of Evidence Form in Appendix G (or the equivalent in the *TeachPoint* System), and recorded in the Evidence Log.
- H) The Summative Evaluation Report should recognize areas of strength as well as identify recommendations for professional growth.
- I) The Evaluator shall deliver a signed copy of the Summative Evaluation Report to the Educator face-to-face, by email, using the *TeachPoint* System, or to the Educator's school mailbox or home no later than May 15th. Delivery and signatures for the Summative Evaluation Report shall be completed

electronically using the *TeachPoint* System.

J) The Evaluator shall meet with the Educator rated *Needs Improvement* or *Unsatisfactory* to discuss the summative evaluation. The meeting shall occur by June 1st.

K) The Evaluator may meet with the Educator rated *Proficient* or *Exemplary* to discuss the summative evaluation, if either the Educator or the Evaluator requests such a meeting. The meeting shall occur by June 10th.

L) Upon mutual agreement, the Educator and the Evaluator may develop the Self-Directed Growth Plan for the following two years during the meeting on the Summative Evaluation Report.

M) The Educator shall sign the final Summative Evaluation Report by June 15th. The signature indicates that the Educator received the Summative Evaluation Report in a timely fashion. The signature does not indicate agreement or disagreement with its contents. Educator signatures shall be completed electronically using the *TeachPoint* System.

N) The Educator shall have the right to respond in writing to the summative evaluation using the Educator Response Form in Appendix G (or the equivalent in the *TeachPoint* System), which shall become part of the final Summative Evaluation Report.

O) A copy of signed final Summative Evaluation Reports shall be filed in the Educator's personnel file pursuant to Article 26 –Personnel Practices, (and maintained in the *TeachPoint* System).

15. **EDUCATOR PLANS: GENERAL**

A) Educator Plans shall be designed to provide Educators with feedback for improvement, professional growth, and leadership; and to ensure Educator effectiveness and overall system accountability. The Plan must be aligned to the standards and indicators and be consistent with District and school goals. All Educator Plans shall be documented using the Educator Plan Form in Appendix G (or the equivalent in the *TeachPoint* System). Delivery of Educator Plans and signatures acknowledging receipt shall be completed electronically using the *TeachPoint* System.

B) The Educator Plan shall include, but is not limited to:

- i) **At least one goal related to improvement of practice tied to one or more PerformanceStandards;**
- ii) At least one goal for the improvement the learning, growth and achievement of the students under the Educator's responsibility;
- iii) An outline of actions the Educator must take to attain the goals and benchmarks to assess progress. Actions must include specified professional development and learning activities that the Educator will participate in as a means of obtaining the goals, as well as other support that may be suggested by the Evaluator or provided by the school or District. Examples may include but are not limited to coursework, self-study, action research, curriculum development, study groups with peers, and implementing new programs.

C) 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.

16. EDUCATOR PLANS: DEVELOPING EDUCATOR PLAN

- A) The Developing Educator Plan is for all Educators without PTS, and, at the discretion of the Evaluator, Educators with PTS in new assignments. A Developing Educator Plan shall be no fewer than 90 school days and no more than one school year.
- B) The parties agree that, barring a pattern of performance of an egregious nature or where an Educator's continued employment impacts the safety of students, no Experienced Educator on a Developing Plan shall be dismissed or have his/her overall rating lowered to *Needs Improvement* or *Unsatisfactory* during the prescribed plan period.
- C) The Educator shall be evaluated at least annually.

17. EDUCATOR PLANS: SELF-DIRECTED GROWTH PLAN

- A) A Two-year Self-Directed Growth Plan is for those Educators with PTS who have an overall rating of *Proficient* or *Exemplary*, and after 2013-2014 whose Impact on Student Learning is *Moderate* or *High*. A Formative Evaluation Report is completed at the end of year 1 and a Summative Evaluation Report at the end of year 2.
- B) A One-year Self-Directed Growth Plan is for those Educators with PTS who have an overall rating of *Proficient* or *Exemplary*, and after 2013-2014 whose Impact on Student Learning is *Low*. In this case, the Evaluator and Educator shall analyze the discrepancy between the Summative Evaluation rating and the rating for Impact on Student Learning to seek to determine the cause(s) of the discrepancy. In the case where Educators with PTS have a rating of *Needs Improvement* and whose impact on student learning is *High*, the Evaluator and Educator shall analyze the discrepancy to determine the cause(s).
- C) The parties agree that, barring a pattern of performance of an egregious nature or where an Educator's continued employment impacts the safety of students, no Experienced Educator on a Self-Directed Growth Plan shall be dismissed or have his/her overall rating lowered to *Needs Improvement* or *Unsatisfactory* during the prescribed plan period.

18. EDUCATOR PLANS: DIRECTED GROWTH PLAN

- A) A Directed Growth Plan is for those Educators with PTS whose overall rating is *Needs Improvement*. A Directed Growth Plan shall be no fewer than 60 school days and no more than one school year.
- B) The goals in the Plan must address areas identified as needing improvement as determined by the Evaluator.
- C) The Evaluator shall complete a Summative Evaluation for the Educator at the end of the period determined by the Plan, but at least annually, and in no case later than June 10th.

D) For an Educator on a Directed Growth Plan whose overall performance rating is at least *Proficient*, the Evaluator will place the Educator on a Self-Directed Growth Plan for the next Evaluation Cycle.

E) For an Educator on a Directed Growth Plan whose overall performance rating is not at least *Proficient*, the Evaluator will rate the Educator as *Unsatisfactory* and will place the Educator on an Improvement Plan for the next Evaluation Cycle.

F) The parties agree that, barring a pattern of performance of an egregious nature or where an Educator's continued employment impacts the safety of students, no Experienced Educator on a Directed Growth Plan shall be dismissed or have his/her overall rating lowered to *Unsatisfactory* during the prescribed plan period.

19. **EDUCATOR PLANS: IMPROVEMENT PLAN**

A) An Improvement Plan is for those Educators with PTS whose overall rating is *Unsatisfactory*.

B) The parties agree that in order to provide students with the best instruction, it may be necessary from time to time to place an Educator whose practice has been rated as *Unsatisfactory* on an Improvement Plan of no fewer than 45 school days and no more than one school year. In the case of an Educator receiving a rating of *Unsatisfactory* near the close of one school year, the Improvement Plan may include activities that occur during the summer before the next school year begins. The District will provide for professional development and pay the cost of attendance at any professional development opportunities that occur over the summer.

C) The Evaluator must complete a Summative Evaluation for the Educator at the end of the period determined by the Evaluator for the Plan.

D) An Educator on an Improvement Plan shall be assigned a Supervising Evaluator (see definitions). The Supervising Evaluator is responsible for providing the Educator with guidance and assistance in accessing the resources and professional development outlined in the Improvement Plan. The Primary Evaluator may be the Supervising Evaluator.

E) The Improvement Plan shall define the problem(s) of practice identified through the observations and evaluation and detail the improvement goals to be met, the activities the Educator must take to improve, and the assistance to be provided to the Educator by the District.

F) The Improvement Plan process shall include:

i) Within ten school days of notification to the Educator that the Educator is being placed on an Improvement Plan, the Evaluator shall schedule a meeting with the Educator to discuss the Improvement Plan. The Evaluator will develop the Improvement Plan, which will include the provision of specific assistance to the Educator.

ii) The Educator may request that a representative of the Federation attend the meeting(s).

- iii) If the Educator consents, the Federation will be informed that an Educator has been placed on an Improvement Plan.
- G) The Improvement Plan shall:
- i) Define the improvement goals directly related to the performance standard(s) and/or student learning outcomes that must be improved;
 - ii) Describe the activities and work products the Educator must complete as a means of improving performance;
 - iii) Describe the assistance that the District will make available to the Educator;
 - iv) Articulate the measurable outcomes that will be accepted as evidence of improvement;
 - v) Detail the timeline for completion of each component of the Plan, including at a minimum a mid-cycle Formative Assessment Report of the relevant standard(s) and indicator(s);
 - vi) Identify the individuals assigned to assist the Educator which must include minimally the Supervising Evaluator; and,
 - vii) Include the signatures of the Educator and Supervising Evaluator.
- H) A copy of the signed Plan shall be provided to the Educator (and maintained in the *TeachPoint* System). The Educator's signature indicates that the Educator received the Improvement Plan in a timely fashion. The signature does not indicate agreement or disagreement with its contents. Delivery of an Improvement Plan and signatures acknowledging receipt shall be completed electronically using the *TeachPoint* System.
- I) The parties agree that, barring a pattern of performance of an egregious nature or where an Educator's continued employment impacts the safety of students, no Experienced Educator on an Improvement Plan shall be dismissed during the prescribed plan period.
- J) Decisions on the Educator's status at the conclusion of the Improvement Plan. All determinations below must be made no later than June 1. One of four decisions must be made at the conclusion of the Improvement Plan:
- i) If the Evaluator determines that the Educator has improved his/her practice to the level of *Proficient*, the Educator will be placed on a Self-Directed Growth Plan.
 - ii) In those cases where the Educator was placed on an Improvement Plan as a result of his/her Summative rating at the end of his/her Directed Growth Plan, if the Evaluator determines that the Educator is making substantial progress toward proficiency, the Evaluator shall place the Educator on a Directed Growth Plan.
 - iii) In those cases where the Educator was placed on an Improvement Plan as a result of his/her Summative rating at the end of his/her Directed Growth Plan, if the Evaluator determines that the Educator is not making substantial progress toward proficiency, the Evaluator shall recommend to the Superintendent-Director that the Educator be dismissed.
 - iv) If the Evaluator determines that the Educator's practice remains at the level of

Unsatisfactory, the Evaluator shall recommend to the Superintendent-Director that the Educator be dismissed.

20. TIMELINES: (DATES IN ITALICS ARE PROVIDED AS GUIDANCE)

| ACTIVITY: | COMPLETED BY: |
|--|----------------------|
| Superintendent-Director, Principal or his/her designee meets with Evaluators and Educators to explain evaluation process | <i>September 15</i> |
| Evaluator meets with first-year Educators to assist in self-assessment and goal setting process. Educator submits self-assessment and proposed goals | October 1 |
| Evaluator meets with Educators in teams or individually to establish Educator Plans (Educator Plan may be established at Summative Evaluation Report meeting in prior school year) | October 15 |
| Evaluator completes Educator Plans | November 1 |
| Evaluator should complete first observation of each Educator | November 15 |
| Educator submits evidence on parent outreach, professional growth, progress on goals (and any other part of the standards, if desired) * or four weeks before Formative Assessment Report date established by Evaluator | <i>January 5*</i> |
| Evaluator should complete mid-cycle Formative Assessment Reports for Educators on one-year Educator and Developing Plans | <i>February 1</i> |
| Evaluator holds Formative Assessment Meetings if requested by either Evaluator or Educator | <i>February 15</i> |
| Educator submits evidence on parent outreach, professional growth, progress on goals (and any other part of the standards, if desired) *or 4 weeks prior to Summative Evaluation Report date established by evaluator | <i>April 20*</i> |
| Evaluator completes Summative Evaluation Report | May 15 |
| Evaluator meets with Educators whose overall Summative Evaluation ratings are <i>Needs Improvement</i> or <i>Unsatisfactory</i> | June 1 |
| Evaluator meets with Educators whose ratings are <i>Proficient</i> or <i>Exemplary</i> at request of Evaluator or Educator | June 10 |
| Educator signs Summative Evaluation Report and adds response, if any within 5 school days of receipt | June 15 |

A) EDUCATORS WITH PTS ON TWO YEAR PLANS

| ACTIVITY: | COMPLETED BY: |
|---|--|
| Evaluator completes unannounced observation(s) | Any time during the 2- year evaluation cycle |
| Evaluator completes Formative Evaluation Report | <i>June 1 of Year 1</i> |
| Evaluator conducts Formative Evaluation Meeting, if any | <i>June 1 of Year 1</i> |
| Evaluator completes Summative Evaluation Report | May 15 of Year 2 |
| Evaluator conducts Summative Evaluation Meeting, if any | June 10 of Year 2 |
| Evaluator and Educator sign Summative Evaluation Report | June 15 of Year 2 |

B) The District and the Federation agree that the completion dates listed above are considered a guide. The District agrees to provide the Federation with a list of exact completion dates, consistent with the above guidelines at the beginning of each school year, and no later than September 15th.

C) EDUCATORS ON PLANS OF LESS THAN ONE YEAR

The timeline for Educators on Plans of less than one year will be established in the Educator Plan.

21. CAREER ADVANCEMENT

A) In order to attain Professional Teacher Status (PTS), the Educator should achieve ratings of *Proficient* or *Exemplary* on each Performance Standard and overall. A Principal considering making an employment decision that would lead to PTS for any Educator who has not been rated *Proficient* or *Exemplary* on each performance standard and overall on the most recent evaluation shall confer with the Superintendent-Director by May 1. The Principal's decision is subject to review and approval by the Superintendent-Director.

B) In order to qualify to apply for a teacher leader position, the Educator must have had a Summative Evaluation performance rating of *Proficient* or *Exemplary* for at least the previous two years.

C) Educators with PTS whose Summative Evaluation performance rating is *Exemplary* and, after 2013-14 whose Impact on Student Learning is rated *Moderate* or *High*, shall be recognized and rewarded with leadership roles, promotions, additional compensation, public commendation or other acknowledgement as determined by the District through collective bargaining where applicable.

22. RATING IMPACT ON STUDENT LEARNING GROWTH

A) BASIS OF THE EDUCATOR IMPACT ON STUDENT LEARNING

- i. The following student performance measures shall be used to in combination with professional judgment to determine an Educator's impact on student learning, growth, and achievement.
 - (a) Statewide growth measure(s):
 - (1st) Where available, statewide growth measures must be used each year as one (1) of the measures used to determine the Educator's Student Impact Rating.
 - (2nd) Statewide growth measures include the MCAS Student Growth Percentile, or its equivalent, and ACCESS for ELLs gain score.
 - (b) District-Determined Measures (DDMs) of student learning, growth, or achievement.

B) IDENTIFYING AND SELECTING DISTRICT-DETERMINED MEASURES

- i. A DDMs WORKING GROUP REPRESENTING TEACHERS AND ADMINISTRATORS SHALL BE ESTABLISHED TO IDENTIFY AND SELECT DDMs:
 - (a) The Working Group shall be co-chaired by the Federation President or his/her designee and the Superintendent-Director or his/her designee.
 - (b) The parties shall provide representation of Educators from a variety of grade levels and disciplines.
 - (c) At least half of the members of the Working Group shall be members of the bargaining unit chosen by the Federation President.
- ii. DDMs WORKING GROUP TASKS MAY INCLUDE:
 - (a) Surveying Educators and administrators in the district to create a list of assessments used in the district. The Working Group shall use the list to identify potential measures that may be adopted or adapted as DDMs. In addition, the Working Group may invite teams of Educators to identify or develop new measures that may be adopted or adapted as DDMs.
 - (b) Recruiting and identifying district Educators, including teachers of students with disabilities and English Language Learners (ELLs), as well as Educator teams to review the list of assessments for their specific content areas and to inform the identification and/or development of potential DDMs by making recommendations to the Working Group.
 - (c) Identifying the two measures of student learning, growth or achievement for each Educator according to subject and grade taught (e.g. Grade 3, Math; Grade 11 English).
 - (d) Collecting feedback from Educators and Evaluators regarding the quality (e.g.,

alignment to curriculum, utility) of the selected DDMs.

- (e) Where feedback suggests modifications to the selected DDMs or the selection of different DDMs is necessary, the Working Group shall convene a team of Educators with expertise in the content area to make recommendations to the Working Group.

iii. DDMS SELECTION CRITERIA

- (a) DDMS may consist of direct or indirect measures:
 - (1st) A direct measure assesses student growth in a specific content area or domain of social-emotional or behavioral learning over time.
 - (i) For all classroom educators, at least one measure in each year that will be used to determine the Educator Impact on Student Learning must be a direct measure.
 - (ii) Direct measures include measures such as: formative, interim and unit pre- and post-assessments in specific subjects, assessments of growth based on performances and/or portfolios of student work judged against common scoring rubrics, and mid-year and end-of-course examinations.
 - (2nd) Indirect measures do not measure student growth in a specific content area or domain of social-emotional or behavioral learning but do measure the consequences of that learning.
 - (i) Indirect measures include changes in: promotion and graduation rates, attendance and tardiness rates, rigorous course-taking pattern rates, college course matriculation and course remediation rates, discipline referral and other behavior rates, and other measures of student engagement and progress.
- (b) DDMS must be comparable across grade or subject level district-wide.
- (c) DDMS may be norm referenced or criterion referenced.
- (d) DDMS must include consistent, transparent scoring processes that establish clear parameters for what constitutes *high*, *moderate*, and *low* student growth.
- (e) DDMS must be aligned to the Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks or to the Massachusetts Vocational Technical Education Frameworks.

iv. PROCESS FOR SELECTING DDMS

- (a) The DDMS Working Group shall provide a written recommendation to the School Committee and to the Federation which identifies the list from which the two (2) DDMS for each Educator in the district shall be determined according to subject and grade taught (Grade 4 Reading, Grade 12 English).
- (b) The School Committee and the Federation shall ratify the Working Group's DDM list or they may negotiate modifications to it.

- (c) Educators must be informed of the two DDMs selected from the negotiated lists that will be used to determine their Educator Impact on Student Learning no later than the September 15th. The Evaluator's designation of a Educator's DDMs must be given to the Educator in writing. All Educators teaching the same subject and grade must be given the same DDMs.
- (d) The Superintendent-Director shall consult with the Federation President, and in accordance with this agreement shall arrange professional development for all Educators, Administrators and all other Evaluators that outlines the components of the Educator Impact on Student Learning and prepares Educators to administer DDMs.

C) DETERMINING EDUCATOR IMPACT ON STUDENT LEARNING FOR EACH DDM

- i. The Evaluator will meet with the Educator annually to discuss the Educator's students' growth scores on each DDM for that school year. For each DDM, the Evaluator will consult with the Educator and then will determine whether in general, the Educator's students demonstrated *high, moderate, or low* growth in comparison to the parameters the parties have set for *high, moderate, and low* growth for the specific DDM. The Evaluator will then apply professional judgment to the student outcome data to determine whether the Educator's impact on student learning was *high, moderate, or low*. The Evaluator's professional judgment must account for contextual factors including, but not limited to, the learning challenges presented by the students and the learning environment.
- ii. Educators shall have an opportunity to review and confirm the rosters of students whose scores will be used in the determination of their impact on student growth for each DDM.
 - (a) For full-year or fall semester courses, the DDM results from students who are not enrolled in the grade or course by October 1st or do not remain enrolled through the final date the DDM is administered shall not be used in the determination of an Educator's impact on student growth.
 - (b) For spring semester courses, the DDM results from students who are not enrolled in the grade or course by the end of the fourth week of the semester or do not remain enrolled through the final date the DDM is administered shall not be used in the determination of an Educator's impact on student growth.
 - (c) DDM results from students who are not present for instruction or education services for at least ninety percent (90%) of the allotted instructional or service time shall not be used in the determination of an Educator's impact on student growth.

D) DETERMINING EDUCATOR IMPACT ON STUDENT LEARNING

- i. The Evaluator shall use his/her professional judgment to determine whether an Educator is having a *high, moderate, or low* impact on student learning. The Evaluator will consider the designations of impact (*high, moderate, or low*) from two (2) measures (a statewide growth measure must be used as one measure, where available) in each of at least two (2) years and will apply professional judgment to those designations in order to establish trends and patterns in student learning, growth, and achievement, before determining the Educator's Impact on Student Learning. The Evaluator's professional judgment must account for

contextual factors including but not limited to the learning challenges presented by the students and the learning environment.

- (a) A rating of *high* indicates that the Educator's students demonstrated significantly higher than one (1) year's growth relative to academic peers in the grade or subject.
 - (b) A rating of *moderate* indicates that the Educator's students demonstrated one (1) year's growth relative to academic peers in the grade or subject.
 - (c) A rating of *low* indicates that the Educator's students demonstrated significantly lower than one (1) year's growth relative to academic peers in the grade or subject.
- ii. The Evaluator shall meet with the Educator rated low to discuss the Educator Impact on Student Learning. The Evaluator shall meet with the Educator rated *moderate* or *high* to discuss the Educator's Impact on Student Learning, if either the Educator or the Evaluator requests such a meeting.

E) INTERSECTION BETWEEN THE SUMMATIVE PERFORMANCE RATING AND THE EDUCATOR IMPACT ON STUDENT LEARNING:

- i. An Educator's Summative Performance Rating is a rating of Educator practice and remains independent from the Educator Impact on Student Learning, which is a rating of impact on student learning, growth, and achievement.
- ii. Educators with PTS whose overall Summative Performance Rating is *Exemplary* or *Proficient* and whose Educator Impact on Student Learning is *moderate* or *high* shall be placed on a two-year self-directed growth plan.
- iii. Educators with PTS whose overall Summative Performance Rating is *Exemplary* or *Proficient* and whose Educator Impact on Student Learning is *low* shall be placed on a one-year self-directed growth plan.
 - (a) The Educator and the Evaluator shall analyze the discrepancy between the Summative Performance Rating and Educator Impact on Student Learning to seek to determine the cause of the discrepancy.
 - (b) The Educator's Plan may include a goal related to examining elements of practice that may have contributed to *low* impact.
- iv. Evaluators and Educators shall use evidence of Educator performance and impact on student learning, growth, and achievement in the goal setting and Educator plan development processes, based on the Educator's self-assessment and other documented sources of evidence that the Evaluator has previously shared with the Educator.

F) THE PARTIES AGREE THAT A COPY OF ALL DISTRICT DETERMINED MEASURES (DDMs) AGREED TO BY THE PARTIES SHALL BE ATTACHED HERETO AND INCORPORATED HEREIN BY REFERENCE AS APPENDIX K.

G) THE PARTIES AGREE THAT THE TIMELINE FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF DDMs SHALL BE NEGOTIATED DURING THE 2014-2015 SCHOOL YEAR.

23. USING STUDENT FEEDBACK IN EDUCATOR EVALUATION

A) The parties recognize the critical role student feedback plays in the continuous professional development of Educators, and do agree upon the implementation of a student feedback survey for the purpose of informing the Self-Assessment and Goal Setting components of the Educator Evaluation process.

B) The parties agree that the District may engage an outside contractor to administer student feedback surveys on Educators. The District has partnered with Panorama Education (hereinafter "Panorama") to utilize their online platform and technical assistance for student feedback survey administration at the Greater Lawrence Technical School.

C) The Federation and the District agree to the following conditions with respect to the administration of the Survey of Student Feedback on Educators:

1. The District shall ensure that Panorama so engaged shall have in place adequate data security and privacy controls.
2. District-wide feedback collection shall occur annually, between May and June. The first year of student feedback collection shall occur near the end of the 2015-2016 school year in all grades at the GLTS. Feedback collected at this time shall be used to inform Self-Assessment and Goal Setting components of Educator Plans that commence in the fall of 2016.
3. The collection method for feedback from students in all grades at the GLTS shall be a confidential survey administered at the school level. Survey results, in the form of individualized Educator reports (hereinafter the "Student Survey Feedback Report"), will be provided only to the Educator. The parties agree that survey results in the form of aggregate data shall also be available to Educators and the GLTS Administration.
4. The collection method for feedback from students shall be subject to ongoing discussion between the parties through the Evaluation Oversight Committee (EOC) during the 2016-2017 school year, with a final determination being made no later than April 15, 2017, in order to allow for feedback collection prior to the close of the 2016-2017 school year.
5. Educator's may upload as an artifact the Student Survey Feedback Report as one of multiple sources of data to inform their Self-Assessment and Goal Setting on their respective Educator Plan. Data from the Student Survey Feedback Report may not be used as evidence toward a rating on any Standard, or Overall.

6. The parties agree that the EOC shall:

a. Determine the final survey instrument and content for student surveys in all grades for the 2015-2016 school year found in the *Survey of Student Feedback (Greater Lawrence Technical School)* attached hereto and incorporated herein by reference as Exhibit A, no later than April 15, 2016.

(URL): https://admin.panoramaed.com/greaterlawrence/survey/demo_templates/3112

b. Identify which students will provide feedback to which Educators, no later than April 30, 2016.

c. Finalize the selection of a survey instrument for student feedback on Educators in all grades no later than April 15, 2017.

d. Determine accessibility requirements of student feedback collection methods for students with disabilities, whose first language is not English, or who may experience other barriers to providing feedback to their teachers (ongoing).

e. Develop the necessary technical training for Educators and students in preparing for implementation of the Survey of Student Feedback on Educators at the GLTS.

7. Educators who are on less-than-one-year Plans already in progress in the fall subsequent to implementation of the Survey of Student Feedback on Educators may review the Student Survey Feedback Report during the current Plan, but need not apply the feedback to Self-Assessment or Goal Setting until the next Educator Plan commences.

25. USING STAFF FEEDBACK IN EDUCATOR EVALUATION

ESE will provide model contract language, direction and guidance on using staff feedback in Administrator Evaluation. Upon receiving this model contract language, direction and guidance, the parties agree to bargain with respect to this matter.

26. TRANSITION FROM EXISTING EVALUATION SYSTEM

A) The parties agree to maintain the consistent list of evaluating faculty. At the start of each school year the District shall provide the Federation with this list which shall contain the name of each Educator, the type plan each Educator is on, and the start and projected end date of each Educator's plan.

B) The parties shall agree on a process for identifying the Educator Plan that each Educator will be placed on during the Educator's first year being evaluated under the new procedures, providing that Educators who have received ratings of *Unsatisfactory* or its equivalent in the prior year will be placed on Self-Directed Growth or Improvement Plans at the sole discretion of the Superintendent-Director.

C) The parties agree that to address the workload issue of Evaluators, during the first evaluation cycle under this Agreement in every school or department, the names of the Educators who are being placed on Self-directed Growth Plans shall be literally or figuratively "put into a hat." The first fifty

(50) percent drawn shall be on a 1-year Self-directed Growth Plan and the second fifty (50) percent shall be on a 2-year Plan.

D) The existing evaluation system will remain in effect until the provisions set forth in this Article are implemented. The relevant timeframe for adopting and implementing new systems is set forth in 603 CMR 35.11(1).

27. GENERAL PROVISIONS

A) Only Educators who are licensed may serve as Primary Evaluators of Educators.

B) Evaluators shall not make negative comments about the Educator's performance, or comments of a negative evaluative nature, in the presence of students, parents or other staff, except in the unusual circumstance where the Evaluator concludes that s/he must immediately and directly intervene. Nothing in this paragraph is intended to limit an administrator's ability to investigate a complaint, or secure assistance to support an Educator.

C) The Superintendent-Director shall insure that Evaluators have training in supervision and evaluation, including the regulations and standards and indicators of effective teaching practice promulgated by ESE (35.03), and the evaluation Standards and Procedures established in this Agreement. The parties agree that Evaluator Training shall be consistent for all Evaluators.

D) Should there be a serious disagreement between the Educator and the Evaluator regarding an overall summative performance rating of *Unsatisfactory*, the Educator may meet with the Evaluator's supervisor to discuss the disagreement. Should the Educator request such a meeting, the Evaluator's supervisor must meet with the Educator. The Evaluator may attend any such meeting at the discretion of the Superintendent-Director.

E) While the parties agree that Educators may be evaluated on all elements in the rubrics, the parties also agree starting with the 2014-2015 school year the District shall limit the number of focus elements from the rubrics to seven (7) elements, and the District shall make the Federation aware of these focus elements prior to the start of the school year.

F) Violations of this article are subject to the grievance and arbitration procedures, however, in a situation where the process has resulted in a fair and thorough evaluation but the Evaluator has missed deadlines that do not impact the fairness of the evaluation, that type of misstep should not undo an otherwise fair and thorough evaluation process.

Appendix G. Educator Evaluation System Forms

September 2014

The District agrees to implement all forms found in Appendix G using the TeachPoint software, and will submit a request for enhancement to TeachPoint, no later than September 15, 2014, to incorporate and integrate these forms for use at GLTS. Upon successful integration of these forms by TeachPoint the District shall perform evaluations using said forms.

Evaluation Tracking Sheet

Educator—Name/Title: _____

Primary Evaluator—Name/Title: _____

Supervising Evaluator, if any—Name/Title/Role in evaluation: _____

School(s): _____

Educator Plan: Self-Directed Growth Plan Directed Growth Plan
 Developing Educator Plan Improvement Plan

Plan Duration: 2-Year One-Year Less than a year _____

| Evaluation Step | Date(s) | Educator Initials | Evaluator (s) Initials |
|--|---------|-------------------|------------------------|
| Self-Assessment received by evaluator | | | |
| Educator Plan development completed | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Formative Assessment conference, if any ¹ <input type="checkbox"/> Formative Evaluation conference, if any ² | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Formative Assessment Report completed <input type="checkbox"/> Formative Evaluation Report completed ³ | | | |
| Educator response, if any, received by evaluator ⁴ | | | |
| Summative Evaluation conference, if any | | | |
| Summative Evaluation Report completed | | | |
| Educator response, if any, received by evaluator | | | |

¹ As per the Massachusetts Model System for Educator Evaluation Contract Language, evaluation conferences are required for ratings of Needs Improvement and Unsatisfactory but conferences may be requested by either the educator or evaluator for any Educator Plan. The conference may occur before or after the Report is completed; the sequence in the above table does not denote required chronological order.

² Formative Evaluation only occurs at the end of the first year of a **two-year Self-Directed Growth Plan**.

³ The educator's formative evaluation rating at the end of the first year of the two-year cycle shall be the same as the previous summative rating unless evidence demonstrates a significant change in performance. In such a case, the rating on the formative evaluation may change. Assigning ratings is optional during Formative Assessment.

⁴ An educator may provide written comments to the evaluator at any time using the Educator Response Form but 603 CMR 35.06 ensures that educators have an opportunity to respond to the Formative Assessment, Formative Evaluation, and Summative Evaluation in writing.

Self-Assessment Form

Educator—Name/Title: _____

Primary Evaluator—Name/Title: _____

Supervising Evaluator, if any—Name/Title/Role in evaluation: _____

School(s): _____

Part 1: Analysis of Student Learning, Growth, and Achievement
Briefly summarize areas of strength and high-priority concerns for students under your responsibility for the upcoming school year. Cite evidence such as results from available assessments. This form should be individually submitted by educator, but Part 1 can also be used by individuals and/or teams who jointly review and analyze student data.

603:CMR 35.06 (2)(a)1

Team, if applicable: _____

List Team Members below:

| | |
|--|--|
| | |
| | |
| | |

Self-Assessment Form

Educator—Name/Title: _____

Part 2: Assessment of Practice Against Performance Standards
Citing your district's performance rubric, briefly summarize areas of strength and high-priority areas for growth. Areas may target specific Standards, Indicators, or Elements, or span multiple Indicators or Elements within or across Standards. The form should be individually submitted by educator, but Part 2 can also be used by teams in preparation for proposing team goals.
 603 CMR 35.06 (2)(a)2

Team, if applicable: _____

List Team Members below:

| | |
|--|--|
| | |
| | |
| | |

Signature of Educator _____ Date _____

Signature of Evaluator _____ Date _____

*** The evaluator's signature indicates that he or she has received a copy of the self-assessment form and the goal setting form with proposed goals. It does not denote approval of the goals.**

Goal Setting Form

Educator—Name/Title: _____

Primary Evaluator—Name/Title: _____

Supervising Evaluator, if any—Name/Title/Role in evaluation: _____

School(s): _____

Check all that apply¹: Proposed Goals Final Goals Date: _____

A minimum of one student learning goal and one professional practice goal are required. Team goals must be considered per 603 CMR 35.06(3)(b). Attach pages as needed for additional goals or revisions made to proposed goals during the development of the Educator Plan.

| <p align="center">Student Learning SMART Goal <i>Check whether goal is individual or team; write team name if applicable.</i></p> | <p align="center">Professional Practice SMART Goal <i>Check whether goal is individual or team; write team name if applicable.</i></p> |
|--|---|
| <p><input type="checkbox"/> Individual <input type="checkbox"/> Team: _____</p> <hr/> | <p><input type="checkbox"/> Individual <input type="checkbox"/> Team: _____</p> <hr/> |

SMART: S=Specific and Strategic; M=Measurable; A=Action Oriented;
R=Rigorous, Realistic, and Results-Focused; T=Timed and Tracked

¹ If proposed goals change during Plan Development, edits may be recorded directly on original sheet or revised goal may be recorded on a new sheet. If proposed goals are approved as written, a separate sheet is not required.

Educator Plan Form

Educator—Name/Title: _____

Primary Evaluator—Name/Title: _____

Supervising Evaluator, if any—Name/Title/Role in evaluation: _____

School(s): _____

Educator Plan: Self-Directed Growth Plan Directed Growth Plan
 Developing Educator Plan Improvement Plan*

Plan Duration: 2-Year One-Year Less than a year _____

Start Date: _____ End Date: _____

Goal Setting Form with final goals is attached to the Educator Plan.

Some activities may apply to the pursuit of multiple goals or types of goals (student learning or professional practice). Attach additional pages as necessary.

| Student Learning Goal(s): Planned Activities <i>Describe actions the educator will take to attain the student learning goal(s). Activities may apply to individual and/or team. Attach additional pages as needed.</i> | | |
|---|--|-----------------------|
| Action | Supports/Resources from School/District ¹ | Timeline or Frequency |
| | | |

*Additional detail may be attached if needed

Educator Plan Form

Educator—Name/Title: _____

| Professional Practice Goal(s): Planned Activities <i>Describe actions the educator will take to attain the professional practice goal(s). Activities may apply to individual and/or team. Attach additional pages as needed.</i> | | |
|---|--|-----------------------|
| Action | Supports/Resources from School/District ¹ | Timeline or Frequency |
| | | |

This Educator Plan is “designed to provide educators with feedback for improvement, professional growth, and leadership,” is “aligned to statewide Standards and Indicators in 603 CMR 35.00 and local Performance Standards,” and “is consistent with district and school goals.” (see 603 CMR 35.06 (3)(d) and 603 CMR 35.06(3)(f).)

Signature of Evaluator _____ Date _____

Signature of Educator _____ Date _____

* As the evaluator retains final authority over goals to be included in an educator’s plan (see 603 CMR 35.06(3)(c)), the signature of the educator indicates that he or she has received the Goal Setting Form with the “Final Goal” box checked, indicating the evaluator’s approval of the goals. The educator’s signature does not necessarily denote agreement with the goals. Regardless of agreement with the final goals, signature indicates recognition that “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.” (see 603 CMR 35.06(4))

¹ Must identify means for educator to receive feedback for improvement per 603 CMR 35.06(3)(d)

GREATER LAWRENCE TECHNICAL SCHOOL
Evaluator Record of Evidence Form



Educator—Name/Title: _____

Primary Evaluator—Name/Title: _____

Supervising Evaluator, if any—Name/Title/Role in evaluation: _____

School(s): _____

Academic Year: _____ Educator Plan and Duration: _____

| Standards and Indicators for Effective Teaching Practice: Rubric Outline as per 603 CMR 35.03 The evaluator should track collection to ensure that sufficient evidence has been gathered. | | | |
|--|---|--|---|
| I. Curriculum, Planning, & Assessment | II. Teaching All Students | III. Family & Community Engagement | IV. Professional Culture |
| <input type="checkbox"/> I-A. Curriculum and Planning <input type="checkbox"/> I-B. Assessment <input type="checkbox"/> I-C. Analysis | <input type="checkbox"/> II-A. Instruction <input type="checkbox"/> II-B. Learning Environment <input type="checkbox"/> II-C. Cultural Proficiency <input type="checkbox"/> II-D. Expectations | <input type="checkbox"/> III-A. Engagement <input type="checkbox"/> III-B. Collaboration <input type="checkbox"/> III-C. Communication | <input type="checkbox"/> IV-A. Reflection <input type="checkbox"/> IV-B. Professional Growth <input type="checkbox"/> IV-C. Collaboration <input type="checkbox"/> IV-D. Decision-making <input type="checkbox"/> IV-E. Shared Responsibility <input type="checkbox"/> IV-F. Professional Responsibilities |

* The Rubric Outline is intended to be used for citing Standards and Indicators. Evaluators should review the full rubric for analysis of evidence and determination of ratings.

GREATER LAWRENCE TECHNICAL SCHOOL
Evaluator Record of Evidence Form



Educator: _____ Evaluator: _____

| Date <i>(Record date of collection, duration if applicable)</i> | Source of Evidence* <i>(e.g., parent conference, observation)</i> | Standard(s)/ Indicator(s) <i>Note Standard(s) and Indicator(s) to which evidence is tied</i> | Analysis of Evidence <i>Record notes "based on observations and artifacts of professional practice, including unannounced observations of practice of any duration" or other forms of evidence to support determining ratings on Standards as per 603 CMR 35.07</i> | Feedback Provided <i>Briefly record feedback given to educator (e.g., strengths recognized, suggestions for improvement)</i> |
|---|---|--|---|--|
| EX: 11/8/11 | EX: unit plans, benchmark data | EX: I-B | EX: unit plans were appropriately modified after analysis of benchmark data to better reflect student performance at mid-point of semester | EX: recognized strong adjustment to practice, suggested teacher collaborate with team on backward curriculum mapping |

*note if classroom observations are announced or unannounced

Educator Collection of Evidence Form

Educator—Name/Title: _____

Primary Evaluator—Name/Title: _____

Supervising Evaluator, if any—Name/Title/Role in evaluation: _____

School(s): _____

Evidence pertains to (check all that apply)¹:

- Fulfillment of professional responsibilities and growth
- Evidence of outreach to and ongoing engagement with families
- Progress toward attaining student learning goal(s)
- Progress toward attaining professional practice goal(s)
- Other: _____

| Summary of Evidence <i>Summarize the evidence compiled to be presented to evaluator with a brief analysis. Attach additional pages as needed.</i> |
|--|
| |

Signature of Educator _____ Date _____

Signature of Evaluator _____ Date _____

Attachment(s) included

¹ Per 603 CMR 35.07(1)(c)1, "Evidence compiled and presented by the educator includ[es]: 1. Evidence of fulfillment of professional responsibilities and growth, such as: self-assessments; peer collaboration; professional development linked to goals and or educator plans; contributions to the school community and professional culture; 2. Evidence of active outreach to and ongoing engagement with families." However, educator collection of evidence is not limited to these areas.

Formative Assessment Report Form

Educator—Name/Title: _____

Primary Evaluator—Name/Title: _____

Supervising Evaluator, if any—Name/Title/Role in evaluation: _____

School(s): _____

Assessing¹:

Progress toward attaining goals

Performance on Standards

Both

Progress Toward Student Learning Goal(s)

Describe current level of progress and feedback for improvement. Attach additional pages as needed.

Empty space for describing progress toward student learning goals.

Progress Toward Professional Practice Goal(s)

Describe current level of progress. Attach additional pages as needed.

Empty space for describing progress toward professional practice goals.

¹ As per [603 CMR 35.02](#) and [603 CMR 35.06\(5\)](#), formative assessment shall mean the process used to assess progress towards attaining goals set forth in educator plans, performance on performance standards, or both.

Educator—Name/Title: _____

| Performance on Each Standard <i>Describe performance and feedback for improvement. Attach additional pages as needed.</i> |
|---|
| I: Curriculum, Planning, & Assessment |
| II: Teaching All Students |
| III: Family & Community Engagement |
| IV: Professional Culture |

The educator shall have the opportunity to respond in writing to the formative assessment as per 603 CMR 35.06(5)(c) on the Educator Response Form.

Signature of Evaluator _____ Date Completed: _____

Signature of Educator* _____ Date Received: _____

* Signature of the educator indicates acknowledgement of this report; it does not necessarily denote agreement with the contents of the report. Educators have the opportunity to respond to this report in writing and may use the Educator Report Form.

Formative Evaluation Report Form

* For educators on two-year Self-Directed Growth Plans at the end of Year One of the cycle

Educator—Name/Title: _____

Primary Evaluator—Name/Title: _____

Supervising Evaluator, if any—Name/Title/Role in evaluation: _____

School(s): _____

Assessing¹:

Progress toward attaining goals

Performance on Standards

Both

| Progress Toward Student Learning Goal(s) | | | | |
|---|--|---|------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| <i>Attach additional pages as needed.</i> | | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Did not Meet | <input type="checkbox"/> Some Progress | <input type="checkbox"/> Significant Progress | <input type="checkbox"/> Met | <input type="checkbox"/> Exceeded |
| <u>Rationale, evidence, and feedback for improvement:</u> | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Progress Toward Professional Practice Goal(s) | | | | |
| <i>Attach additional pages as needed.</i> | | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Did not Meet | <input type="checkbox"/> Some Progress | <input type="checkbox"/> Significant Progress | <input type="checkbox"/> Met | <input type="checkbox"/> Exceeded |
| <u>Rationale, evidence, and feedback for improvement:</u> | | | | |
| | | | | |

¹ As per 603 CMR 35.02 and 603 CMR 35.06(5), formative evaluation shall mean the process used to assess progress towards attaining goals set forth in educator plans, performance on performance standards, or both.

Formative Evaluation Report Form

Educator—Name/Title: _____

- Evaluator is assigning same ratings as prior Summative Evaluation; no comments needed
- Evaluator is assigning ratings that differ from prior Summative Evaluation; comments are required

| Rating on Each Standard | |
|---|---|
| I: Curriculum, Planning, & Assessment | <input type="checkbox"/> Unsatisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Needs Improvement <input type="checkbox"/> Proficient <input type="checkbox"/> Exemplary |
| <u>Rationale, evidence, and feedback for improvement:</u> <div style="height: 100px;"></div> | |
| II: Teaching All Students | <input type="checkbox"/> Unsatisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Needs Improvement <input type="checkbox"/> Proficient <input type="checkbox"/> Exemplary |
| <u>Rationale, evidence, and feedback for improvement:</u> <div style="height: 100px;"></div> | |
| III: Family/Community Engagement | <input type="checkbox"/> Unsatisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Needs Improvement <input type="checkbox"/> Proficient <input type="checkbox"/> Exemplary |
| <u>Rationale, evidence, and feedback for improvement:</u> <div style="height: 100px;"></div> | |
| IV: Professional Culture | <input type="checkbox"/> Unsatisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Needs Improvement <input type="checkbox"/> Proficient <input type="checkbox"/> Exemplary |
| <u>Rationale, evidence, and feedback for improvement:</u> <div style="height: 100px;"></div> | |

Summative Evaluation Report Form

Educator—Name/Title: _____

Primary Evaluator—Name/Title: _____

Supervising Evaluator, if any—Name/Title/Role in evaluation: _____

School(s): _____

Current Plan: Self-Directed Growth Plan Directed Growth Plan
 Developing Educator Plan Improvement Plan

Progress Toward Student Learning Goal(s)
Attach additional pages as needed.

Did not meet Some progress Significant Progress Met Exceeded

Rationale, evidence, and feedback for improvement:

Progress Toward Professional Practice Goal(s)
Attach additional pages as needed.

Did not meet Some progress Significant Progress Met Exceeded

Rationale, evidence, and feedback for improvement:

Summative Evaluation Report Form

Educator—Name/Title: _____

| Overall Performance Rating | | | |
|--|---|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Unsatisfactory | <input type="checkbox"/> Needs Improvement | <input type="checkbox"/> Proficient | <input type="checkbox"/> Exemplary |
| Educator Impact on Student Learning | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> High | <input type="checkbox"/> Moderate | <input type="checkbox"/> Low | |
| <p><u>Rationale, evidence, and feedback for improvement:</u></p> | | | |
| Plan Moving Forward | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Self-Directed Growth Plan | <input type="checkbox"/> Directed Growth Plan | <input type="checkbox"/> Improvement Plan | <input type="checkbox"/> Developing Educator Plan |

The educator shall have the opportunity to respond in writing to the summative evaluation as per 603 CMR 35.06(6) on the Educator Response Form.

Signature of Evaluator _____ Date Completed: _____

Signature of Educator* _____ Date Received: _____

* Signature of the educator indicates acknowledgement of this report; it does not necessarily denote agreement with the contents of the report. Educators have the opportunity to respond to this report in writing and may use the Educator Report Form.

Educator Response Form

Educator—Name/Title: _____

Primary Evaluator—Name/Title: _____

Supervising Evaluator, if any—Name/Title/Role in evaluation: _____

School(s): _____

Response to: (check all that apply)

- Educator Plan, including goals and activities
- Evaluator collection and/or analysis of evidence
- Formative Assessment or Evaluation Report
- Summative Evaluation Report
- Other: _____

| Educator Response <i>Attach additional pages as needed</i> | |
|--|--|
| | |

Signature of Educator _____ Date _____

Signature of Evaluator _____ Date _____

Attachment(s) included

Observation Evidence Collection Tool

Educator—Name/Title:

Evaluator—Name/Title:

School(s):

Educator Plan: Self-Directed Growth Plan Directed Growth Plan
 Developing Educator Plan Improvement Plan*

Plan Duration: Two-Year One-Year Less than a year _____

Observation Number: Observation Date: Observation Time/Duration:

Observation Location (e.g., classroom, grade-level meeting, etc.):

Intended Observation Focus: higher-order thinking (school focus on rigor)

| Observation Evidence <i>What did the educator and students say and do?</i> | Aligned Indicator |
|--|-------------------|
| | |
| Feedback to the Educator | |
| | |

Observation Evidence pertains to (check any that apply):

Progress toward attaining student learning goal(s) Progress toward attaining professional practice goal(s)

| Standards and Indicators for Effective Teaching Practice: Rubric Outline | | | |
|--|---|---|--|
| I. Curriculum, Planning, & Assessment | II. Teaching All Students | III. Family & Community Engagement | IV. Professional Culture |
| I-A. Curriculum and Planning I-B. Assessment I-C. Analysis | II-A. Instruction II-B. Learning Environment II-C. Cultural Proficiency II-D. Expectations | III-A. Engagement III-B. Collaboration III-C. Communication | IV-A. Reflection IV-B. Professional Growth IV-C. Collaboration IV-D. Decision-making IV-E. Shared Responsibility IV-F. Prof. Responsibilities |

Characterization of Evidence: Exemplary Proficient Needs Improvement Unsatisfactory

Artifact Cover Page

Educator—Name/Title:

Evaluator—Name/Title:

School(s):

Educator Plan: Self-Directed Growth Plan Directed Growth Plan
 Developing Educator Plan Improvement Plan*

Plan Duration: Two-Year One-Year Less than a year _____

Artifact Title/Name:

Submission Date:

| Artifact Evidence <i>What aspects of educator performance does this artifact illustrate?</i> | Aligned Indicator |
|--|--------------------------|
| | |

Star evidence statements that show progress toward attaining student learning goal(s) or professional practice goal(s).

| Standards and Indicators for Effective Teaching Practice: Rubric Outline | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| I. Curriculum, Planning, & Assessment | II. Teaching All Students | III. Family & Community Engagement | IV. Professional Culture |
| I-A. Curriculum and Planning I-B. Assessment I-C. Analysis | II-A. Instruction II-B. Learning Environment II-C. Cultural Proficiency II-D. Expectations | III-A. Engagement III-B. Collaboration III-C. Communication | IV-A. Reflection IV-B. Professional Growth IV-C. Collaboration IV-D. Decision-making IV-E. Shared Responsibility IV-F. Professional Responsibilities |

Characterization of Evidence: Exemplary Proficient Needs Improvement Unsatisfactory

Appendix H. ESE Model Rubric for Teachers

January 2012

Guide to Teacher Rubric

Rubrics – defined in the regulations as “scoring tool[s] that describe characteristics of practice or artifacts at different levels of performance” (603 CMR 35.02) – are a critical component of the Massachusetts educator evaluation framework and are required for every educator. Rubrics are designed to help educators and evaluators (1) develop a consistent, shared understanding of what proficient performance looks like in practice, (2) develop a common terminology and structure to organize evidence, and (3) make informed professional judgments about formative and summative performance ratings on each Standard and overall. This appendix contains the ESE Model Teacher Rubric.

Structure of the Teacher Rubric

Standards: Standards are the broad categories of knowledge, skills, and performance of effective practice detailed in the regulations. There are four Standards for teachers: *Curriculum, Planning, and Assessment*; *Teaching All Students*; *Family and Community Engagement*; and *Professional Culture*.

Indicators: Indicators, also detailed in the regulations, describe specific knowledge, skills, and performance for each Standard. For example, there are three indicators in Standard I of the teacher rubric: *Curriculum and Planning*; *Assessment*; and *Analysis*.

Elements: The elements are more specific descriptions of actions and behaviors related to each Indicator. The elements further break down the Indicators into more specific aspects of educator practice and provide an opportunity for evaluators to offer detailed feedback that serves as a roadmap for improvement.

Descriptors: Performance descriptors are observable and measurable statements of educator actions and behaviors aligned to each element and serve as the basis for identifying the level of teaching or administrative performance in one of four categories: *Unsatisfactory*, *Needs Improvement*, *Proficient*, or *Exemplary*.

Use of the Teacher Rubric

This rubric describes teaching practice. It is intended to be used throughout the 5 step evaluation cycle for all teachers, including teachers of whole classrooms, small groups, individual students, or any combination of the above. The rubric is designed to be applicable to general education teachers from pre-K through Advanced Placement, as well as teachers with specialized classes or knowledge, including teachers of English Language Learners, and special education teachers; districts may also choose to use this rubric for educators in other roles such as specialists.

The responsibilities of teachers to whom this rubric will be applied may vary. ESE encourages educators and evaluators to use the rubric strategically by discussing and agreeing upon certain indicators and Elements that should be high priorities according to that educator’s role and responsibilities as well as his/her professional practice and student learning needs. There are a variety of ways to emphasize these components throughout the evaluation cycle. For example, high priority indicators and/or elements can be analyzed in greater depth during self-assessment, targeted during goal setting, a focus for more comprehensive evidence collection, or all of the above. However, the expectation is that by the end of the evaluation cycle, educators and evaluators have gathered and shared a reasonable amount of evidence on every indicator to support a rating for each Standard.

Guide to Teacher Rubric

| Standard I: Curriculum, Planning, and Assessment | Standard II: Teaching All Students | Standard III: Family and Community Engagement | Standard IV: Professional Culture |
|---|---|--|---|
| <p>A. Curriculum and Planning Indicator</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Subject Matter Knowledge 2. Child and Adolescent Development 3. Rigorous Standards-Based Unit Design 4. Well-Structured Lessons <p>B. Assessment Indicator</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Variety of Assessment Methods 2. Adjustments to Practice <p>C. Analysis Indicator</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Analysis and Conclusions 2. Sharing Conclusions With Colleagues 3. Sharing Conclusions With Students | <p>A. Instruction Indicator</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Quality of Effort and Work 2. Student Engagement 3. Meeting Diverse Needs <p>B. Learning Environment Indicator</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Safe Learning Environment 2. Collaborative Learning Environment 3. Student Motivation <p>C. Cultural Proficiency Indicator</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Respects Differences 2. Maintains Respectful Environment <p>D. Expectations Indicator</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Clear Expectations 2. High Expectations 3. Access to Knowledge | <p>A. Engagement Indicator</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Parent/Family Engagement <p>B. Collaboration Indicator</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Learning Expectations 2. Curriculum Support <p>C. Communication Indicator</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Two-Way Communication 2. Culturally Proficient Communication | <p>A. Reflection Indicator</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Reflective Practice 2. Goal Setting <p>B. Professional Growth Indicator</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Professional Learning and Growth <p>C. Collaboration Indicator</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Professional Collaboration <p>D. Decision-Making Indicator</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Decision-making <p>E. Shared Responsibility Indicator</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Shared Responsibility <p>F. Professional Responsibilities Indicator</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Judgment 2. Reliability and Responsibility |

How to reference parts of the rubric:

Guide to Teacher Rubric

Indicator terminology: under the “Teaching All Students” Standard (1), the “Instruction Indicator” (A) can be referred to as Indicator II-A

Element terminology: under the Instruction Indicator (A), the Student Engagement Element (2) can be referred to as Element II-A-2

Standard I: Curriculum, Planning, and Assessment. *The teacher promotes the learning and growth of all students by providing high-quality and coherent instruction, designing and administering authentic and meaningful student assessments, analyzing student performance and growth data, using this data to improve instruction, providing students with constructive feedback on an ongoing basis, and continuously refining learning objectives.*

| Indicator I-A. Curriculum and Planning: Knows the subject matter well, has a good grasp of child development and how students learn, and designs effective and rigorous standards-based units of instruction consisting of well-structured lessons with measurable outcomes. | | | | |
|---|---|--|---|--|
| I-A. Elements | Unsatisfactory | Needs Improvement | Proficient | Exemplary |
| I-A-1. Subject Matter Knowledge | Demonstrates limited knowledge of the subject matter and/or its pedagogy; relies heavily on textbooks or resources for development of the factual content. Rarely engages students in learning experiences focused on complex knowledge or skills in the subject. | Demonstrates factual knowledge of subject matter and the pedagogy it requires by sometimes engaging students in learning experiences around complex knowledge and skills in the subject. | Demonstrates sound knowledge and understanding of the subject matter and the pedagogy it requires by consistently engaging students in learning experiences that enable them to acquire complex knowledge and skills in the subject. | Demonstrates expertise in subject matter and the pedagogy it requires by engaging all students in learning experiences that enable them to synthesize complex knowledge and skills in the subject. Is able to model this element. |
| I-A-2. Child and Adolescent Development | Demonstrates little or no knowledge of developmental differences in how students learn. Typically develops one learning experience for all students that does not enable most students to meet the intended outcomes. | Demonstrates knowledge of developmental levels of students this age but does not identify developmental levels and ways of learning among the students in the class and/or develops learning experiences that enable some, but not all, students to move toward meeting intended outcomes. | Demonstrates knowledge of the developmental levels of students in the classroom and the different ways these students learn by providing differentiated learning experiences that enable all students to progress toward meeting intended outcomes. | Demonstrates expert knowledge of the developmental levels of the teacher’s own students and students in this grade or subject more generally and uses this knowledge to differentiate and expand learning experiences that enable all students to make significant progress toward meeting stated outcomes. Is able to model this element. |

Note: At the Exemplary level, an educator’s level of expertise is such that he or she is able to model this element through training, teaching, coaching, assisting, and/or demonstrating. In this rubric, this level of expertise is denoted by “is able to model.”

Guide to Teacher Rubric

| I-A. Elements | Unsatisfactory | Needs Improvement | Proficient | Exemplary |
|---|--|--|---|---|
| I-A-3. Rigorous Standards-Based Unit Design | Plans individual lessons rather than units of instruction, or designs units of instruction that are not aligned with state standards/ local curricula, lack measurable outcomes, and/or include tasks that mostly rely on lower level thinking skills. | Designs units of instruction that address some knowledge and skills defined in state standards/local curricula, but some student outcomes are poorly defined and/or tasks rarely require higher-order thinking skills. | Designs units of instruction with measurable outcomes and challenging tasks requiring higher-order thinking skills that enable students to learn the knowledge and skills defined in state standards/local curricula. | Designs integrated units of instruction with measurable, accessible outcomes and challenging tasks requiring higher-order thinking skills that enable students to learn and apply the knowledge and skills defined in state standards/local curricula. Is able to model this element. |
| I-A-4. Well-Structured Lessons | 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. | Develops lessons with only some elements of appropriate student engagement strategies, pacing, sequence, activities, materials, resources, and grouping. | Develops well-structured lessons with challenging, measurable objectives and appropriate student engagement strategies, pacing, sequence, activities, materials, resources, technologies, and grouping. | 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. |

Note: At the Exemplary level, an educator's level of expertise is such that he or she is able to model this element through training, teaching, coaching, assisting, and/or demonstrating. In this rubric, this level of expertise is denoted by "is able to model."

Guide to Teacher Rubric

| Indicator I-B. Assessment: Uses a variety of informal and formal methods of assessments to measure student learning, growth, and understanding to develop differentiated and enhanced learning experiences and improve future instruction. | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|--|
| I-B. Elements | Unsatisfactory | Needs Improvement | Proficient | Exemplary |
| I-B-1. Variety of Assessment Methods | Administers only the assessments required by the school and/or measures only point-in-time student achievement. | May administer some informal and/or formal assessments to measure student learning but rarely measures student progress toward achieving state/local standards. | Designs and administers a variety of informal and formal methods and assessments, including common interim assessments, to measure each student's learning, growth, and progress toward achieving state/local standards. | Uses an integrated, comprehensive system of informal and formal assessments, including common interim assessments, to measure student learning, growth, and progress toward achieving state/local standards. Is able to model this element. |
| I-B-2. Adjustment to Practice | Makes few adjustments to practice based on formal and informal assessments. | May organize and analyze some assessment results but only occasionally adjusts practice or modifies future instruction based on the findings. | Organizes and analyzes results from a variety of assessments to determine progress toward intended outcomes and uses these findings to adjust practice and identify and/or implement appropriate differentiated interventions and enhancements for students. | Organizes and analyzes results from a comprehensive system of assessments to determine progress toward intended outcomes and frequently uses these findings to adjust practice and identify and/or implement appropriate differentiated interventions and enhancements for individuals and groups of students and appropriate modifications of lessons and units. Is able to model this element. |

Note: At the *Exemplary* level, an educator's level of expertise is such that he or she is able to model this element through training, teaching, coaching, assisting, and/or demonstrating. In this rubric, this level of expertise is denoted by "is able to model."

Guide to Teacher Rubric

| Indicator I-C: Analysis: Analyzes data from assessments, draws conclusions, and shares them appropriately. | | | | |
|---|---|--|---|--|
| I-C Elements | Unsatisfactory | Needs Improvement | Proficient | Exemplary |
| I-C-1. Analysis and Conclusions | Does not draw conclusions from student data beyond completing minimal requirements such as grading for report cards. | Draws conclusions from a limited analysis of student data to inform student grading and promotion decisions. | Individually and with colleagues, draws appropriate conclusions from a thorough analysis of a wide range of assessment data to improve student learning. | Individually and with colleagues, draws appropriate, actionable conclusions from a thorough analysis of a wide range of short- and long-term instructional decisions. Is able to model this element. |
| I-C-2. Sharing Conclusions With Colleagues | Rarely shares with colleagues conclusions about student progress and/or rarely seeks feedback. | Only occasionally shares with colleagues conclusions about student progress and/or only occasionally seeks feedback from them about practices that will support improved student learning. | Regularly shares with appropriate colleagues (e.g., general education, special education, and English learner staff) conclusions about student progress and seeks feedback from them about instructional or assessment practices that will support improved student learning. | Establishes and implements a schedule and plan for regularly sharing with all appropriate colleagues conclusions and insights about student progress. Seeks and applies feedback from them about practices that will support improved student learning. Is able to model this element. |
| I-C-3. Sharing Conclusions With Students | Provides little or no feedback on student performance except through grades or report of task completion, or provides inappropriate feedback that does not support students to improve their performance. | Provides some feedback about performance beyond grades but rarely shares strategies for students to improve their performance toward objectives. | Based on assessment results, provides descriptive feedback and engages students and families in constructive conversation that focuses on how students can improve their performance. | Establishes early, constructive feedback loops with students and families that create a dialogue about performance, progress, and improvement. Is able to model this element. |

Note: At the *Exemplary* level, an educator's level of expertise is such that he or she is able to model this element through training, teaching, coaching, assisting, and/or demonstrating. In this rubric, this level of expertise is denoted by "is able to model."

Guide to Teacher Rubric

Standard II: Teaching All Students. *The teacher promotes the learning and growth of all students through instructional practices that establish high expectations, create a safe and effective classroom environment, and demonstrate cultural proficiency.*

| Indicator II-A. Instruction: Uses instructional practices that reflect high expectations regarding content and quality of effort and work; engage all students; and are personalized to accommodate diverse learning styles, needs, interests, and levels of readiness. | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|
| II-A. Elements | Unsatisfactory | Needs Improvement | Proficient | Exemplary |
| II-A-1. Quality of Effort and Work | Establishes no or low expectations around quality of work and effort and/or offers few supports for students to produce quality work or effort. | May state high expectations for quality and effort, but provides few exemplars and rubrics, limited guided practice, and/or few other supports to help students know what is expected of them; may establish inappropriately low expectations for quality and effort. | Consistently defines high expectations for the quality of student work and the perseverance and effort required to produce it; often provides exemplars, rubrics, and guided practice. | Consistently defines high expectations for quality work and effort and effectively supports students to set high expectations for each other to persevere and produce high-quality work. Is able to model this element. |
| II-A-2. Student Engagement | Uses instructional practices that leave most students uninvolved and/or passive participants. | Uses instructional practices that motivate and engage some students but leave others uninvolved and/or passive participants. | Consistently uses instructional practices that are likely to motivate and engage most students during the lesson. | Consistently uses instructional practices that typically motivate and engage most students both during the lesson and during independent work and home work. Is able to model this element. |
| II-A-3. Meeting Diverse Needs | Uses limited and/or inappropriate practices to accommodate differences. | May use some appropriate practices to accommodate differences, but fails to address an adequate range of differences. | Uses appropriate practices, including tiered instruction and scaffolds, to accommodate differences in learning styles, needs, interests, and levels of readiness, including those of students with disabilities and English learners. | Uses a varied repertoire of practices to create structured opportunities for each student to meet or exceed state standards/local curriculum and behavioral expectations. Is able to model this element. |

Note: At the Exemplary level, an educator's level of expertise is such that he or she is able to model this element through training, teaching, coaching, assisting, and/or demonstrating. In this rubric, this level of expertise is denoted by "is able to model."

Guide to Teacher Rubric

| Indicator II-B. Learning Environment: Creates and maintains a safe and collaborative learning environment that motivates students to take academic risks, challenge themselves, and claim ownership of their learning. | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|---|
| II-B. Elements | Unsatisfactory | Needs Improvement | Proficient | Exemplary |
| II-B-1. Safe Learning Environment | Maintains a physical environment that is unsafe or does not support student learning. Uses inappropriate or ineffective rituals, routines, and/or responses to reinforce positive behavior or respond to behaviors that interfere with students' learning. | May create and maintain a safe physical environment but inconsistently maintains rituals, routines, and responses needed to prevent and/or stop behaviors that interfere with all students' learning. | Uses rituals, routines, and appropriate responses that create and maintain a safe physical and intellectual environment where students take academic risks and most behaviors that interfere with learning are prevented. | Uses rituals, routines, and proactive responses that create and maintain a safe physical and intellectual environment where students take academic risks and play an active role—individually and collectively—in preventing behaviors that interfere with learning. Is able to model this element. |
| II-B-2. Collaborative Learning Environment | Makes little effort to teach interpersonal, group, and communication skills or facilitate student work in groups, or such attempts are ineffective. | Teaches some interpersonal, group, and communication skills and provides some opportunities for students to work in groups. | Develops students' interpersonal, group, and communication skills and provides opportunities for students to learn in groups with diverse peers. | Teaches and reinforces interpersonal, group, and communication skills so that students seek out their peers as resources. Is able to model this practice. |
| II-B-3. Student Motivation | Directs all learning experiences, providing few, if any, opportunities for students to take academic risks or challenge themselves to learn. | Creates some learning experiences that guide students to identify needs, ask for support, and challenge themselves to take academic risks. | Consistently creates learning experiences that guide students to identify their strengths, interests, and needs; ask for support when appropriate; take academic risks; and challenge themselves to learn. | Consistently supports students to identify strengths, interests, and needs; ask for support, take risks; challenge themselves; set learning goals; and monitor their own progress. Models these skills for colleagues. |

Note: At the *Exemplary* level, an educator's level of expertise is such that he or she is able to model this element through training, teaching, coaching, assisting, and/or demonstrating. In this rubric, this level of expertise is denoted by "is able to model."

Guide to Teacher Rubric

| Indicator II-C. Cultural Proficiency: Actively creates and maintains an environment in which students' diverse backgrounds, identities, strengths, and challenges are respected. | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|---|
| II-C. Elements | Unsatisfactory | Needs Improvement | Proficient | Exemplary |
| II-C-1. Respects Differences | Establishes an environment in which students demonstrate limited respect for individual differences. | Establishes an environment in which students generally demonstrate respect for individual differences | Consistently uses strategies and practices that are likely to enable students to demonstrate respect for and affirm their own and others' differences related to background, identity, language, strengths, and challenges. | Establishes an environment in which students respect and affirm their own and others' differences and are supported to share and explore differences and similarities related to background, identity, language, strengths, and challenges. Is able to model this practice. |
| II-C-2. Maintains Respectful Environment | Minimizes or ignores conflicts and/or responds in inappropriate ways. | Anticipates and responds appropriately to some conflicts or misunderstandings but ignores and/or minimizes others. | Anticipates and responds appropriately to conflicts or misunderstandings arising from differences in backgrounds, languages, and identities. | Anticipates and responds appropriately to conflicts or misunderstandings arising from differences in backgrounds, languages, and identities in ways that lead students to be able to do the same independently. Is able to model this practice. |

Note: At the *Exemplary* level, an educator's level of expertise is such that he or she is able to model this element through training, teaching, coaching, assisting, and/or demonstrating. In this rubric, this level of expertise is denoted by "is able to model."

Guide to Teacher Rubric

| Indicator II-D. Expectations: Plans and implements lessons that set clear and high expectations and also make knowledge accessible for all students. | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|--|
| II-D. Elements | Unsatisfactory | Needs Improvement | Proficient | Exemplary |
| II-D-1. Clear Expectations | Does not make specific academic and behavior expectations clear to students. | May announce and post classroom academic and behavior rules and consequences, but inconsistently or ineffectively enforces them. | Clearly communicates and consistently enforces specific standards for student work, effort, and behavior. | Clearly communicates and consistently enforces specific standards for student work, effort, and behavior so that most students are able to describe them and take ownership of meeting them. Is able to model this element. |
| II-D-2. High Expectations | Gives up on some students or communicates that some cannot master challenging material. | May tell students that the subject or assignment is challenging and that they need to work hard but does little to counteract student misconceptions about innate ability. | Effectively models and reinforces ways that students can master challenging material through effective effort, rather than having to depend on innate ability. | Effectively models and reinforces ways that students can consistently master challenging material through effective effort. Successfully challenges students' misconceptions about innate ability. Is able to model this element. |
| II-D-3. Access to Knowledge | Rarely adapts instruction, materials, and assessments to make challenging material accessible to all students. | Occasionally adapts instruction, materials, and assessments to make challenging material accessible to all students. | Consistently adapts instruction, materials, and assessments to make challenging material accessible to all students, including English learners and students with disabilities. | Individually and with colleagues, consistently adapts instruction, materials, and assessments to make challenging material accessible to all students, including English learners and students with disabilities. Is able to model this element. |

Note: At the *Exemplary* level, an educator's level of expertise is such that he or she is able to model this element through training, teaching, coaching, assisting, and/or demonstrating. In this rubric, this level of expertise is denoted by "I" is able to model."

Guide to Teacher Rubric

Standard III: Family and Community Engagement. *The teacher promotes the learning and growth of all students through effective partnerships with families, caregivers, community members, and organizations.*

| Indicator III-A. Engagement: Welcomes and encourages every family to become active participants in the classroom and school community. | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|--|
| III-A. Elements | Unsatisfactory | Needs Improvement | Proficient | Exemplary |
| III-A-1. Parent/Family Engagement | Does not welcome families to become participants in the classroom and school community or actively discourages their participation. | Makes limited attempts to involve families in school and/or classroom activities, meetings, and planning. | Uses a variety of strategies to support every family to participate actively and appropriately in the classroom and school community. | Successfully engages most families and sustains their active and appropriate participation in the classroom and school community. Is able to model this element. |

| Indicator III-B. Collaboration: Collaborates with families to create and implement strategies for supporting student learning and development both at home and at school. | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|---|
| III-B. Elements | Unsatisfactory | Needs Improvement | Proficient | Exemplary |
| III-B-1. Learning Expectations | Does not inform parents about learning or behavior expectations. | Sends home only a list of classroom rules and the learning outline or syllabus for the year. | Consistently provides parents with clear, user-friendly expectations for student learning and behavior. | Successfully conveys to most parents student learning and behavior expectations. Is able to model this element. |
| III-B-2. Curriculum Support | Rarely, if ever, communicates with parents on ways to support children at home or at school. | Sends home occasional suggestions on how parents can support children at home or at school. | Regularly updates parents on curriculum throughout the year and suggests strategies for supporting learning at school and home, including appropriate adaptation for students with disabilities or limited English proficiency. | Successfully prompts most families to use one or more of the strategies suggested for supporting learning at school and home and seeks out evidence of their impact. Is able to model this element. |

Note: At the *Exemplary* level, an educator's level of expertise is such that he or she is able to model this element through training, teaching, coaching, assisting, and/or demonstrating. In this rubric, this level of expertise is denoted by "is able to model."

Guide to Teacher Rubric

| Indicator III-C. Communication: Engages in regular, two-way, and culturally proficient communication with families about student learning and performance. | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|--|
| III-C. Elements | Unsatisfactory | Needs Improvement | Proficient | Exemplary |
| III-C-1. Two-Way Communication | Rarely communicates with families except through report cards; rarely solicits or responds promptly and carefully to communications from families. | Relies primarily on newsletters and other one-way media and usually responds promptly to communications from families. | Regularly uses two-way communication with families about student performance and learning and responds promptly and carefully to communications from families. | Regularly uses a two-way system that supports frequent, proactive, and personalized communication with families about student performance and learning. Is able to model this element. |
| III-C-2. Culturally Proficient Communication | Makes few attempts to respond to different family cultural norms and/or responds inappropriately or disrespectfully. | May communicate respectfully and make efforts to take into account different families' home language, culture, and values, but does so inconsistently or does not demonstrate understanding and sensitivity to the differences. | Always communicates respectfully with families and demonstrates understanding of families' home language, culture, and values. | Always communicates respectfully with families and demonstrates understanding and appreciation of different families' home language, culture, and values. Is able to model this element. |

Note: At the *Exemplary* level, an educator's level of expertise is such that he or she is able to model this element through training, teaching, coaching, assisting, and/or demonstrating. In this rubric, this level of expertise is denoted by "is able to model."

Guide to Teacher Rubric

Standard IV: Professional Culture. *The teacher promotes the learning and growth of all students through ethical, culturally proficient, skilled, and collaborative practice.*

| Indicator IV-A. Reflection: Demonstrates the capacity to reflect on and improve the educator's own practice, using informal means as well as meetings with teams and work groups to gather information, analyze data, examine issues, set meaningful goals, and develop new approaches in order to improve teaching and learning. | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|---|
| IV-A. Elements | Unsatisfactory | Needs Improvement | Proficient | Exemplary |
| IV-A-1. Reflective Practice | Demonstrates limited reflection on practice and/or use of insights gained to improve practice. | May reflect on the effectiveness of lessons/ units and interactions with students but not with colleagues and/or rarely uses insights to improve practice. | Regularly reflects on the effectiveness of lessons, units, and interactions with students, both individually and with colleagues, and uses insights gained to improve practice and student learning. | Regularly reflects on the effectiveness of lessons, units, and interactions with students, both individually and with colleagues; and uses and shares with colleagues, insights gained to improve practice and student learning. Is able to model this element. |
| IV-A-2. Goal Setting | Generally, participates passively in the goal-setting process and/or proposes goals that are vague or easy to reach. | Proposes goals that are sometimes vague or easy to achieve and/or bases goals on a limited self-assessment and analysis of student learning data. | Proposes challenging, measurable professional practice, team, and student learning goals that are based on thorough self-assessment and analysis of student learning data. | Individually and with colleagues builds capacity to propose and monitor challenging, measurable goals based on thorough self-assessment and analysis of student learning data. Is able to model this element. |

Note: At the *Exemplary* level, an educator's level of expertise is such that he or she is able to model this element through training, teaching, coaching, assisting, and/or demonstrating. In this rubric, this level of expertise is denoted by "Is able to model."

Guide to Teacher Rubric

| Indicator IV-B. Professional Growth: Actively pursues professional development and learning opportunities to improve quality of practice or build the expertise and experience to assume different instructional and leadership roles. | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|
| IV-B. Elements | Unsatisfactory | Needs Improvement | Proficient | Exemplary |
| IV-B-1. Professional Learning and Growth | Participates in few, if any, professional development and learning opportunities to improve practice and/or applies little new learning to practice. | Participates only in required professional development activities and/or inconsistently or inappropriately applies new learning to improve practice. | Consistently seeks out and applies, when appropriate, ideas for improving practice from supervisors, colleagues, professional development activities, and other resources to gain expertise and/or assume different instruction and leadership responsibilities. | Consistently seeks out professional development and learning opportunities that improve practice and build expertise of self and other educators in instruction and leadership. Is able to model this element. |

| Indicator IV-C. Collaboration: Collaborates effectively with colleagues on a wide range of tasks. | | | | |
|--|---|--|---|--|
| IV-C. Elements | Unsatisfactory | Needs Improvement | Proficient | Exemplary |
| IV-C-1. Professional Collaboration | Rarely and/or ineffectively collaborates with colleagues; conversations often lack focus on improving student learning. | Does not consistently collaborate with colleagues in ways that support productive team effort. | Consistently and effectively collaborates with colleagues in such work as developing standards-based units, examining student work, analyzing student performance, and planning appropriate intervention. | Supports colleagues to collaborate in areas such as developing standards-based units, examining student work, analyzing student performance, and planning appropriate intervention. Is able to model this element. |

Note: At the *Exemplary* level, an educator's level of expertise is such that he or she is able to model this element through training, teaching, coaching, assisting, and/or demonstrating. In this rubric, this level of expertise is denoted by "is able to model."

Guide to Teacher Rubric

Indicator IV-D. Decision-Making: Becomes involved in schoolwide decision making, and takes an active role in school improvement planning.

| IV-D. Elements | Unsatisfactory | Needs Improvement | Proficient | Exemplary |
|-------------------------|--|---|--|---|
| IV-D-1. Decision-Making | Participates in planning and decision making at the school, department, and/or grade level only when asked and rarely contributes relevant ideas or expertise. | May participate in planning and decision making at the school, department, and/or grade level but rarely contributes relevant ideas or expertise. | Consistently contributes relevant ideas and expertise to planning and decision making at the school, department, and/or grade level. | In planning and decision-making at the school, department, and/or grade level, consistently contributes ideas and expertise that are critical to school improvement efforts. Is able to model this element. |

Indicator IV-E. Shared Responsibility: Shares responsibility for the performance of all students within the school.

| IV-E. Elements | Unsatisfactory | Needs Improvement | Proficient | Exemplary |
|-------------------------------|--|--|---|--|
| IV-E-1. Shared Responsibility | Rarely reinforces schoolwide behavior and learning expectations for all students and/or makes a limited contribution to their learning by rarely sharing responsibility for meeting their needs. | Within and beyond the classroom, inconsistently reinforces schoolwide behavior and learning expectations for all students, and/or makes a limited contribution to their learning by inconsistently sharing responsibility for meeting their needs. | Within and beyond the classroom, consistently reinforces schoolwide behavior and learning expectations for all students, and contributes to their learning by sharing their responsibility for meeting their needs. | Individually and with colleagues develops strategies and actions that contribute to the learning and productive behavior of all students at the school. Is able to model this element. |

Note: At the Exemplary level, an educator's level of expertise is such that he or she is able to model this element through training, teaching, coaching, assisting, and/or demonstrating. In this rubric, this level of expertise is denoted by "is able to model."

Guide to Teacher Rubric

| Indicator IV-F. Professional Responsibilities: Is ethical and reliable, and meets routine responsibilities consistently. | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|--|
| IV-F. Elements | Unsatisfactory | Needs Improvement | Proficient | Exemplary |
| IV-F-1. Judgment | Demonstrates poor judgment and/or discloses confidential student information inappropriately. | Sometimes demonstrates questionable judgment and/or inadvertently shares confidential information. | Demonstrates sound judgment reflecting integrity, honesty, fairness, and trustworthiness and protects student confidentiality appropriately. | Demonstrates sound judgment and acts appropriately to protect student confidentiality, rights and safety. Is able to model this element. |
| IV-F-2. Reliability & Responsibility | Frequently misses or is late to assignments, makes errors in records, and/or misses paperwork deadlines; frequently late or absent. | Occasionally misses or is late to assignments, completes work late, and/or makes errors in records. | Consistently fulfills professional responsibilities; is consistently punctual and reliable with paperwork, duties, and assignments; and is rarely late or absent from school. | Consistently fulfills all professional responsibilities to high standards. Is able to model this element. |

Note: At the *Exemplary* level, an educator's level of expertise is such that he or she is able to model this element through training, teaching, coaching, assisting, and/or demonstrating. In this rubric, this level of expertise is denoted by "is able to model."

Appendix I. ESE Model Rubric for Specialized Instructional Support Personnel (SISP)

March 2012

Rubrics – defined in the regulations as “scoring tool[s] that describe characteristics of practice or artifacts at different levels of performance” ([603 CMR 35.02](#)) – are a critical component of the Massachusetts educator evaluation framework and are required for every educator. Rubrics are designed to help educators and evaluators (1) develop a consistent, shared understanding of what proficient performance looks like in practice, (2) develop a common terminology and structure to organize evidence, and (3) make informed professional judgments about formative and summative performance ratings on each Standard and overall. This appendix contains the ESE Model “SISP” Rubric.

Structure of the Specialized Instructional Support Personnel (SISP) Rubric

Standards: Standards are the broad categories of knowledge, skills, and performance of effective practice detailed in the regulations. There are four Standards for teachers: *Curriculum, Planning, and Assessment*; *Teaching All Students*; *Family and Community Engagement*; and *Professional Culture*.

Indicators: Indicators, also detailed in the regulations, describe specific knowledge, skills, and performance for each Standard. For example, there are three indicators in Standard 1 of the SISP rubric: *Curriculum and Planning*; *Assessment*; and *Analysis*.

Elements: The elements are more specific descriptions of actions and behaviors related to each Indicator. The elements further break down the Indicators into more specific aspects of educator practice and provide an opportunity for evaluators to offer detailed feedback that serves as a roadmap for improvement.

Descriptors: Performance descriptors are observable and measurable statements of educator actions and behaviors aligned to each element and serve as the basis for identifying the level of teaching or administrative performance in one of four categories: *Unsatisfactory*, *Needs Improvement*, *Proficient*, or *Exemplary*.

Use of the Specialized Instructional Support Personnel (SISP) Rubric

This rubric describes practice that is common across educators in professional support roles such as school counselors, school psychologists, school nurses, and others defined in the recognition clause of the appropriate collective bargaining agreement. It is intended to be used throughout the 5 step evaluation cycle for educators who provide direct services such as education, therapy, counseling, assessment, and diagnosis to a caseload of students, as well as educators who may provide indirect support to students through consultation to and collaboration with teachers, administrators, and other colleagues.

The roles and responsibilities of educators to whom this rubric will be applied will vary. ESE encourages educators and evaluators to use the rubric strategically by discussing and agreeing upon certain Indicators and Elements that should be high priorities according to that educator's role and responsibilities as well as his/her professional practice and student learning needs. There are a variety of ways to emphasize these components throughout the evaluation cycle. For example, high priority indicators and/or elements can be analyzed in greater depth during self-assessment, targeted during goal setting, a focus for more comprehensive evidence collection, or all of the above. However, the expectation is that by the end of the evaluation cycle, educators and evaluators have gathered and shared a reasonable amount of evidence on every Indicator to support a rating for each Standard.



Specialized Instructional Support Personnel (SISP) Rubric At-A-Glance

| Standard I: Curriculum, Planning, and Assessment | Standard II: Teaching All Students | Standard III: Family and Community Engagement | Standard IV: Professional Culture |
|---|--|--|---|
| <p>A. Curriculum and Planning Indicator</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Professional Knowledge Child and Adolescent Development Plan Development Well-Structured Lessons <p>B. Assessment Indicator</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Variety of Assessment Methods Adjustments to Practice <p>C. Analysis Indicator</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Analysis and Conclusions Sharing Conclusions With Colleagues Sharing Conclusions With Students and Families | <p>A. Instruction Indicator</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Quality of Effort and Work Student Engagement Meeting Diverse Needs <p>B. Learning Environment Indicator</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Safe Learning Environment Collaborative Learning Environment Student Motivation <p>C. Cultural Proficiency Indicator</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Respects Differences Maintains Respectful Environment <p>D. Expectations Indicator</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Clear Expectations High Expectations Access to Knowledge | <p>A. Engagement Indicator</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Parent/Family Engagement <p>B. Collaboration Indicator</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Learning Expectations Student Support <p>C. Communication Indicator</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Two-Way Communication Culturally Proficient Communication | <p>A. Reflection Indicator</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Reflective Practice Goal Setting <p>B. Professional Growth Indicator</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Professional Learning and Growth <p>C. Collaboration Indicator</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Professional Collaboration Consultation <p>D. Decision-Making Indicator</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Decision-making <p>E. Shared Responsibility Indicator</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Shared Responsibility <p>F. Professional Responsibilities Indicator</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Judgment Reliability and Responsibility |

Note: The SISP rubric is designed to have close alignment with the teacher rubric to emphasize commonalities across educators. Please see Appendix E addressing "Role-Specific Indicators" for additional guidance and samples of how to strategically supplement this rubric to further differentiate by role. How to reference parts of the rubric: Indicator terminology: under the "Teaching All Students" Standard (II), the "Instruction Indicator" (A) can be referred to as Indicator II-A. Element terminology: under the Instruction Indicator (A), the Student Engagement Element (2) can be referred to as Element II-A-2.

Guide to Specialized Instructional Support Personnel (SISP) Rubric

Standard 1: Curriculum, Planning, and Assessment. *promotes the learning and growth of all students by providing high-quality and coherent instruction, designing and administering authentic and meaningful student assessments, analyzing student performance and growth data, using this data to improve instruction, providing students with constructive feedback on an ongoing basis, and continuously refining learning objectives.*

| Indicator I-A. Curriculum and Planning: Has strong knowledge specific to subject matter and/or professional responsibility, has a good grasp of child development and how students learn, and designs effective and rigorous plans for support consisting of well-structured lessons with measurable outcomes. | | | | |
|--|---|--|---|--|
| I-A. Elements | Unsatisfactory | Needs Improvement | Proficient | Exemplary |
| I-A-1. Professional Knowledge | Demonstrates limited professional knowledge; relies heavily on outdated practices as opposed to current practices supported by research. Rarely engages students in academic, behavioral, and social/emotional learning experiences through the use of educational and/or clinical practices. | Demonstrates factual knowledge of the professional content and delivery and sometimes applies it to engage students in academic, behavioral, and social/emotional learning experiences through the use of educational and/or clinical practices. | Demonstrates sound knowledge and understanding of professional content and delivery by consistently engaging students in academic, behavioral, and social/emotional learning experiences through the use of educational and/or clinical practices that enable students to acquire knowledge and skills. | Demonstrates mastery of professional content and its delivery by engaging all students in academic, behavioral, and social/emotional learning experiences, through the use of educational and/or clinical practices, that enable students to synthesize knowledge and skills. Is able to model this element. |
| I-A-2. Child and Adolescent Development | Demonstrates little or no knowledge of child and adolescent development; typically develops one learning experience, and/or type of support or assistance for all students that does not adequately address intended outcomes. | Demonstrates general knowledge of child and adolescent development but does not apply this knowledge when providing differentiated learning experiences, support, and/or assistance that would enable all students—as opposed to just some—to move toward meeting intended outcomes. | Demonstrates knowledge of students' developmental levels and the different ways these students learn or behave by providing differentiated learning experiences, support, and/or assistance that enable all students to progress toward meeting intended outcomes. | Demonstrates expert knowledge of the developmental levels of individual students and students in the grade or subject more generally and uses this knowledge to differentiate and expand learning experiences, supports, and/or types of assistance, enabling all students to make significant progress toward meeting stated outcomes. Is able to model this element. |

Note: At the *Exemplary* level, an educator's level of expertise is such that he or she is able to model this element through training, teaching, coaching, assisting, and/or demonstrating. In this rubric, this level of expertise is denoted by "is able to model."

Guide to Specialized Instructional Support Personnel (SISP) Rubric

| I-A. Elements | Unsatisfactory | Needs Improvement | Proficient | Exemplary |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|---|--|
| 1-A-3 Plan Development ¹ | Develops or contributes to the development of plans that are not timely and/or not tailored to the needs of individual students; or, plans do not include appropriate supports or measurable outcomes that would enable students to meet the goals and objectives of the plan. | Develops or contributes to the timely development of plans that respond to some but not all relevant individual student needs, and/or plans that lack sufficient measurable outcomes or supports that enable students to meet all goals and objectives of the plan. | Develops or contributes to the timely development of well-structured plans with measurable outcomes that respond to all relevant individual student needs, and include supports that enable students to meet the goals or objectives of the plan. | Develops or contributes to the timely development of comprehensive, well-structured plans with measurable outcomes that respond to all relevant individual student needs, are coordinated with other plans relevant to those students, and include supports that enable students to meet all goals or objectives of the plan. Is able to model this element. |
| I-A-4. Well-Structured Lessons | Develops lessons (which may include individual and group activities or sessions) with inappropriate student engagement strategies, pacing, sequence, activities, materials, and/or grouping. | Develops lessons (which may include individual and group activities or sessions) with only some elements of appropriate student engagement strategies, pacing, sequence, activities, materials, resources, and grouping. | Develops well-structured lessons (which may include individual and group activities or sessions) with challenging, measurable objectives and appropriate student engagement strategies, pacing, sequence, activities, materials, and grouping. | Develops well-structured and highly engaging lessons (which may include individual and group activities and sessions) with challenging, measurable objectives and appropriate student engagement strategies, pacing, sequence, activities, materials, and grouping to attend to every student's needs. Is able to model this element. |

Note: At the *Exemplary* level, an educator's level of expertise is such that he or she is able to model this element through training, teaching, coaching, assisting, and/or demonstrating. In this rubric, this level of expertise is denoted by "Is able to model."

¹ "Plan" is used throughout this document to refer to a variety of plans, including but not limited to: lesson plans, unit plans, Individualized Education Programs (IEPs), Individualized Health Care Plans (IHCPs), Career Plans, and 504 Plans. The type of plan that an educator is responsible for depends on the educator being evaluated; both the educator and evaluator should understand and agree upon the definition relevant to the educator's role.

Guide to Specialized Instructional Support Personnel (SISP) Rubric

| Indicator I-B. Assessment: Uses a variety of informal and formal methods of assessments to measure student learning, growth, and understanding to develop differentiated and enhanced learning experiences and improve future instruction. | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|--|
| I-B. Elements | Unsatisfactory | Needs Improvement | Proficient | Exemplary |
| I-B-1. Variety of Assessment Methods | Administers assessments and/or collects only the data required by the school and/or measures only point-in-time student achievement or development. | May design and administer assessments and/or collect some data to measure student learning, growth, or development, but uses a limited range of methods. | Designs and administers assessments and/or collects data to measure student learning, growth, and/or development through a variety of methods, including informal and formal assessments and common interim assessments where applicable. | Uses an integrated, comprehensive assessment system, including informal and formal assessment methods and common interim assessments where applicable, to measure student learning, growth, and development. Is able to model this element. |
| I-B-2. Adjustment to Practice | Makes few adjustments to practice by identifying and/or implementing appropriate differentiated interventions, supports, and programs based on formal and informal assessments. | May organize and analyze some assessment results but only occasionally adjusts practice and identifies and/or implements appropriate differentiated interventions, supports, and programs for students. | Organizes and analyzes results from a variety of assessments to determine progress toward intended outcomes and uses these findings to adjust practice and identify and/or implement appropriate differentiated interventions, supports, and programs for students. | Organizes and analyzes results from a comprehensive system of assessments to determine progress toward intended outcomes and frequently uses these findings to adjust practice and identify and/or implement appropriate differentiated interventions, supports, or programs for individuals and groups of students and appropriate modifications of plans. Is able to model this element. |

Note: At the *Exemplary* level, an educator's level of expertise is such that he or she is able to model this element through training, teaching, coaching, assisting, and/or demonstrating. In this rubric, this level of expertise is denoted by "is able to model."

Guide to Specialized Instructional Support Personnel (SISP) Rubric

| Indicator I-C. Analysis: Analyzes data from assessments, draws conclusions, and shares them appropriately. | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|--|
| I-C. Elements | Unsatisfactory | Needs Improvement | Proficient | Exemplary |
| I-C-1. Analysis and Conclusions | Does not analyze data and/or draw conclusions from data beyond completing minimal requirements. | Draws conclusions from a limited analysis of data to inform student learning, growth, and development. | Individually and with colleagues, draws appropriate conclusions about programs, plans, and practices from a thorough analysis of a wide range of data to improve student learning, growth, and development. | Individually and with colleagues, draws appropriate, actionable conclusions about programs, plans, and practices from a thorough analysis of a wide range of data that improve short- and long-term planning decisions. Is able to model this element. |
| I-C-2. Sharing Conclusions With Colleagues | Rarely shares with colleagues conclusions about student progress and/or rarely seeks feedback from them about practices that will support improved student learning and/or development. | Only occasionally shares with colleagues conclusions about student progress and/or seeks feedback from them about practices that will support improved student learning and/or development. | Regularly shares with appropriate colleagues (e.g., classroom teachers, administrators, and professional support personnel) conclusions about student progress and seeks feedback from them about practices that will support improved student learning and/or development. | Establishes and implements a schedule and plan for regularly sharing with all appropriate colleagues (e.g., classroom teachers, administrators, and professional support personnel) conclusions and insights about student progress. Seeks and applies feedback from them about practices that will support improved student learning and/or development. Is able to model this element. |
| I-C-3. Sharing Conclusions With Students and Families | Provides little or no feedback on student growth or progress except through minimally required reporting or provides inappropriate feedback that does not support students to grow and improve. | Provides some feedback about student growth or progress beyond required reports but rarely shares strategies for students to grow and improve. | Based on assessment results and/or other data, provides descriptive feedback and engages students and families in constructive conversation that focuses on student growth and improvement. | Establishes early, constructive feedback loops with students and families that create a dialogue about student growth, progress, and improvement. Is able to model this element. |

Note: At the *Exemplary* level, an educator's level of expertise is such that he or she is able to model this element through training, teaching, coaching, assisting, and/or demonstrating. In this rubric, this level of expertise is denoted by "is able to model."

Guide to Specialized Instructional Support Personnel (SISP) Rubric

Standard II: Teaching All Students. Promotes the learning and growth of all students through instructional practices that establish high expectations, create a safe and effective classroom environment, and demonstrate cultural proficiency.

| Indicator II-A. Instruction: Uses instructional and clinical practices that reflect high expectations regarding content and quality of effort and work; engage all students; and are personalized to accommodate diverse learning styles, needs, interests, and levels of readiness. | | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|---|--|
| II-A. Elements | Unsatisfactory | Needs Improvement | Proficient | Exemplary | |
| II-A-1. Quality of Effort and Work | Establishes no or low expectations for student work and behavior and/or offers few supports to help students know what is expected of them. | May state high expectations for student work and behavior, but provides few exemplars and rubrics, or limited guided practice, and/or few other supports to help students know what is expected of them. | Consistently defines high expectations for student work and behavior, and the perseverance and effort required to produce it; often provides exemplars, rubrics, or guided practice, and/or models appropriate behaviors. | Consistently defines high expectations for student work and behavior and effectively supports students to set high expectations for each other to persevere and produce high-quality work. Is able to model this element. | |
| II-A-2. Student Engagement | Uses instructional and/or clinical practices that leave most students uninvolved and/or passive. | Uses instructional and/or clinical practices that motivate and engage some students but leave others uninvolved and/or passive. | Consistently uses instructional and clinical practices that are likely to motivate and engage most students during the lesson, activity, or session. | Consistently uses instructional and clinical practices that typically motivate and engage most students during the lesson, activity, or session, and during independent work. Is able to model this element. | |
| II-A-3. Meeting Diverse Needs | Uses limited and/or inappropriate practices and/or supports to accommodate differences. | May use some appropriate practices and/or supports to accommodate differences, but fails to address an adequate range of differences. | Uses appropriate practices, including tiered instruction, scaffolds, and other supports, to accommodate differences in learning styles, needs, interests, and levels of readiness, including those of students with disabilities and English learners. | Uses a varied repertoire of practices and/or supports to create structured opportunities for each student to meet or exceed expectations for growth and development. Is able to model this element. | |

Note: At the *Exemplary* level, an educator's level of expertise is such that he or she is able to model this element through training, teaching, coaching, assisting, and/or demonstrating. In this rubric, this level of expertise is denoted by "is able to model."

Guide to Specialized Instructional Support Personnel (SISP) Rubric

| Indicator II-B. Learning Environment: Creates and maintains a safe and collaborative learning environment that motivates students to take academic risks, challenge themselves, and claim ownership of their learning. | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|---|
| II-B. Elements | Unsatisfactory | Needs Improvement | Proficient | Exemplary |
| II-B-1. Safe Learning Environment | Maintains a physical environment that is unsafe or does not support student learning. Uses inappropriate or ineffective rituals, routines, and/or responses to reinforce positive behavior or respond to behaviors that interfere with students' learning. | May create and maintain a safe physical environment but inconsistently maintains rituals, routines, and responses needed to prevent and/or stop behaviors that interfere with all students' learning. | Uses rituals, routines, and appropriate responses that create and maintain a safe physical and intellectual environment where students take academic risks and most behaviors that interfere with learning are prevented. | Uses rituals, routines, and proactive responses that create and maintain a safe physical and intellectual environment where students take academic risks and play an active role—individually and collectively—in preventing behaviors that interfere with learning. Is able to model this element. |
| II-B-2. Collaborative Learning Environment | Makes little effort to teach interpersonal, group, and communication skills or facilitate student work in groups, or such attempts are ineffective. | Teaches some interpersonal, group, and communication skills and provides some opportunities for students to work in groups. | Develops students' interpersonal, group, and communication skills and provides opportunities for students to learn in groups with diverse peers. | Teaches and reinforces interpersonal, group, and communication skills so that students seek out their peers as resources. Is able to model this practice. |
| II-B-2. Student Motivation | Directs all learning experiences, providing few, if any, opportunities for students to take risks or challenge themselves. | Creates some learning experiences that guide students to identify needs, ask for support, and challenge themselves to take risks. | Consistently creates learning experiences that guide students to identify their strengths, interests, and needs; ask for support when appropriate; take risks; and challenge themselves to succeed. | Consistently supports students to identify their strengths, interests, and needs; ask for support; take risks; challenge themselves; set learning goals; and monitor their own progress. Is able to model this element. |

Note: At the *Exemplary* level, an educator's level of expertise is such that he or she is able to model this element through training, teaching, coaching, assisting, and/or demonstrating. In this rubric, this level of expertise is denoted by "Is able to model."

Guide to Specialized Instructional Support Personnel (SISP) Rubric

| Indicator II-C. Cultural Proficiency: Actively creates and maintains an environment in which students' diverse backgrounds, identities, strengths, and challenges are respected. | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|--|
| II-C. Elements | Unsatisfactory | Needs Improvement | Proficient | Exemplary |
| II-C-1. Respects Differences | Establishes an environment in which students demonstrate limited respect for individual differences. | Establishes an environment in which students generally demonstrate respect for individual differences. | Consistently uses strategies and practices that are likely to enable students to demonstrate respect for and affirm their own and others' differences related to background, identity, language, strengths, and challenges. | Establishes an environment in which students respect and affirm their own and others' differences and are supported to share and explore differences and similarities related to background, identity, language, strengths, and challenges. Is able to model this element. |
| II-C-2. Maintains Respectful Environment | Minimizes or ignores conflicts and/or responds in inappropriate ways. | Anticipates and responds appropriately to some conflicts or misunderstandings but ignores and/or minimizes others. | Anticipates and responds appropriately to conflicts or misunderstandings arising from differences in backgrounds, languages, and identities. | Anticipates and responds appropriately to conflicts or misunderstandings arising from differences in backgrounds, languages, and identities in ways that lead students to be able to do the same independently. Is able to model this element. |

Note: At the *Exemplary* level, an educator's level of expertise is such that he or she is able to model this element through training, teaching, coaching, assisting, and/or demonstrating. In this rubric, this level of expertise is denoted by "is able to model."

Guide to Specialized Instructional Support Personnel (SISP) Rubric

| Indicator II-D. Expectations: Plans and implements lessons and/or supports that set clear and high expectations and also make knowledge, information, and/or supports accessible for all students. | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|--|
| II-D. Elements | Unsatisfactory | Needs Improvement | Proficient | Exemplary |
| II-D-1. Clear Expectations | Does not make specific standards for student work, effort, interactions, and behavior clear to students. | May communicate specific standards for student work, effort, interactions, and behavior, but inconsistently or ineffectively enforces them. | Clearly communicates and consistently enforces specific standards for student work, effort, and behavior. | Clearly communicates and consistently enforces specific standards for student work, effort, interactions, and behavior so that most students are able to describe them and take ownership of meeting them. Is able to model this element. |
| II-D-2. High Expectations | Gives up on some students or communicates that some cannot accomplish challenging goals. | May tell students that a goal is challenging and that they need to work hard but does not model ways students can accomplish the goal through effective effort. | Effectively models and reinforces ways that students can set and accomplish challenging goals through effective effort, rather than having to depend on innate ability. | Effectively models and reinforces ways that students can consistently accomplish challenging goals through effective effort. Successfully challenges students' misconceptions about innate ability. Is able to model this element. |
| II-D-3. Access to Knowledge | Rarely adapts instruction, services, plans, communication, and/or assessments to make curriculum/supports accessible to all students for whom the educator has responsibility. | Occasionally adapts instruction, services, plans, communication, and/or assessments to make curriculum/supports accessible to all students for whom the educator has responsibility. | Consistently adapts instruction, services, plans, communication, and/or assessments to make curriculum/supports accessible to all students for whom the educator has responsibility, including English learners and students with disabilities. | Individually and with colleagues, consistently adapts instruction, services, plans, communication, and/or assessments to make curriculum/supports accessible to all students for whom the educator has responsibility, including English learners and students with disabilities. Is able to model this element. |

Note: At the *Exemplary* level, an educator's level of expertise is such that he or she is able to model this element through training, teaching, coaching, assisting, and/or demonstrating. In this rubric, this level of expertise is denoted by "is able to model."

Guide to Specialized Instructional Support Personnel (SISP) Rubric

Standard III: Family and Community Engagement. *Promotes the learning and growth of all students through effective partnerships with families, caregivers, community members, and organizations.*

| Indicator III-A. Engagement: Welcomes and encourages every family to become active participants in the classroom and school community. | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|--|
| III-A. Elements | Unsatisfactory | Needs Improvement | Proficient | Exemplary |
| III-A-1. Parent/Family Engagement | Does not welcome families to become participants in the classroom and school community or actively discourages their participation. | Makes limited attempts to involve families in school and/or classroom activities, meetings, and planning. | Uses a variety of strategies to support families to participate actively and appropriately in the classroom and school community. | Successfully engages most families and sustains their active and appropriate participation in the classroom and school community. Is able to model this element. |

| Indicator III-B. Collaboration: Collaborates with families to create and implement strategies for supporting student learning and development both at home and at school. | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|---|
| III-B. Elements | Unsatisfactory | Needs Improvement | Proficient | Exemplary |
| III-B-1. Learning Expectations | Does not inform parents about learning, behavior, and/or wellness expectations. | Sends home only a list of rules/expectations and an outline of the student learning, behavior, or wellness plan for the year. | Consistently provides parents with clear, user-friendly expectations for student learning, behavior, and/or wellness. | Successfully conveys to most parents clear, user-friendly student learning, behavior, and wellness expectations. Is able to model this element. |
| III-B-2. Student Support | Rarely, if ever, communicates with parents on ways to support learning and development at home or at school. | Sends home occasional suggestions on how parents can support learning and development at home or at school. | Regularly communicates with parents to create, share, and/or identify strategies for supporting learning and development at school and home. | Regularly communicates with parents to share and/or identify strategies for supporting learning and development at school and home, successfully encourages most families to use at least one of these strategies, and seeks out evidence of their impact. Is able to model this element. |

Note: At the Exemplary level, an educator's level of expertise is such that he or she is able to model this element through training, teaching, coaching, assisting, and/or demonstrating. In this rubric, this level of expertise is denoted by "is able to model."

Guide to Specialized Instructional Support Personnel (SISP) Rubric

| Indicator III-C. Communication: Engages in regular, two-way, and culturally proficient communication with families about student learning, behavior and wellness. | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|---|
| III-C. Elements | Unsatisfactory | Needs Improvement | Proficient | Exemplary |
| III-C-1. Two-Way Communication | Rarely communicates with families except through required reports; rarely solicits or responds promptly to communications from families. | Relies primarily on sharing general information and announcements with families through one-way media and usually responds promptly to communications from families. | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Regularly uses two-way communication with families about student learning, behavior, and wellness; responds promptly and carefully to communications from families. | Regularly uses a two-way system that supports frequent, proactive, and personalized communication with families about individual student learning, behavior, and wellness. Is able to model this element. |
| III-C-2. Culturally Proficient Communication | Makes few attempts to respond to different family cultural norms and/or responds inappropriately or disrespectfully. | May communicate respectfully and make efforts to take into account different families' home language, culture, and values, but does so inconsistently or does not demonstrate understanding and sensitivity to the differences. | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Always communicates respectfully with families and demonstrates understanding of and sensitivity to different families' home language, culture, and values. | Always communicates respectfully with families and demonstrates understanding and appreciation of different families' home language, culture, and values. Is able to model this element. |

Note: At the *Exemplary* level, an educator's level of expertise is such that he or she is able to model this element through training, teaching, coaching, assisting, and/or demonstrating. In this rubric, this level of expertise is denoted by "is able to model."

Guide to Specialized Instructional Support Personnel (SISP) Rubric

Standard IV: Professional Culture. *Promotes the learning and growth of all students through ethical, culturally proficient, skilled, and collaborative practice.*

| Indicator IV-A. Reflection: Demonstrates the capacity to reflect on and improve the educator's own practice, using informal means as well as meetings with teams and work groups to gather information, analyze data, examine issues, set meaningful goals, and develop new approaches in order to improve teaching and learning. | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|---|
| IV-A. Elements | Unsatisfactory | Needs Improvement | Proficient | Exemplary |
| IV-A-1. Reflective Practice | Demonstrates limited reflection on practice and/or use of insights gained to improve practice. | May reflect on the effectiveness of instruction, supports, and interactions with students but not with colleagues and/or rarely uses insights gained to improve practice. | 3. Regularly reflects on the effectiveness of instruction, supports, and interactions with students, both individually and with colleagues, and uses insights gained to improve practice and student outcomes. | Regularly reflects on the effectiveness of instruction, supports, and interactions with students, both individually and with colleagues; and uses and shares with colleagues insights gained to improve practice and student outcomes. Is able to model this element. |
| IV-A-2. Goal Setting | Participates passively in the goal-setting process and/or proposes goals that are vague or easy to reach. | Proposes one goal that is vague or easy to achieve and/or bases goals on a limited self-assessment and analysis of student data. | 4. Proposes challenging, measurable professional practice, team, and student learning goals that are based on thorough self-assessment and analysis of student data. | Individually and with colleagues builds capacity to propose and monitor challenging, measurable goals based on thorough self-assessment and analysis of student data. Is able to model this element. |

Note: At the *Exemplary* level, an educator's level of expertise is such that he or she is able to model this element through training, teaching, coaching, assisting, and/or demonstrating. In this rubric, this level of expertise is denoted by "is able to model."

Guide to Specialized Instructional Support Personnel (SISP) Rubric

| Indicator IV-B. Professional Growth: Actively pursues professional development and learning opportunities to improve quality of practice or build the expertise and experience to assume different instructional and leadership roles. | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|---|
| IV-B. Elements | Unsatisfactory | Needs Improvement | Proficient | Exemplary |
| IV-B-1. Professional Learning and Growth | Participates in few, if any, professional development and learning opportunities to improve practice and/or applies little new learning to practice. | Participates only in required professional development and learning activities and/or inconsistently or inappropriately applies new learning to improve practice. | 5. Consistently seeks out and applies, when appropriate, ideas for improving practice from supervisors, colleagues, professional development activities, and other resources to gain expertise and/or assume different instruction and leadership responsibilities. | Consistently seeks out professional development and learning opportunities that improve practice and build expertise of self and other educators in instruction, academic support, and leadership. Is able to model this element. |

Note: At the *Exemplary* level, an educator's level of expertise is such that he or she is able to model this element through training, teaching, coaching, assisting, and/or demonstrating. In this rubric, this level of expertise is denoted by "Is able to model."

| Indicator IV-C. Collaboration: Collaborates effectively with colleagues on a wide range of tasks. | | | | |
|--|---|--|---|---|
| IV-C. Elements | Unsatisfactory | Needs Improvement | Proficient | Exemplary |
| IV-C-1. Professional Collaboration | Rarely and/or ineffectively collaborates with colleagues; conversations often lack focus on student performance and/or development. | Does not consistently collaborate with colleagues in ways that support productive team effort. | 6. Consistently and effectively collaborates with colleagues through shared planning and/or informal conversation in such work as: analyzing student performance and development and planning appropriate interventions at the classroom or school level. | Facilitates effective collaboration among colleagues through shared planning and/or informal conversation in such work as analyzing student performance and development and planning appropriate, comprehensive interventions at the classroom and school level. Is able to model this element. |

Guide to Specialized Instructional Support Personnel (SISP) Rubric

| IV-C. Elements | Unsatisfactory | Needs Improvement | Proficient | Exemplary |
|-------------------------|---|---|--|---|
| IV-C-2. Consultation | Regularly provides inappropriate advice; does not provide advice and expertise to general education teachers or other colleagues unless prompted to do so; and/or fails to offer advice when appropriate. | Provides advice and expertise to support general education teachers and other colleagues to create appropriate and effective academic, behavioral, and social/emotional learning experiences for only some students for whom responsibility is shared, or sometimes provides advice that is inappropriate or poorly customized. | 7. Regularly provides appropriate advice and expertise that is customized to support general education teachers and other colleagues to create appropriate and effective academic, behavioral, and social/emotional learning experiences for students for whom responsibility is shared. | Utilizes a variety of means to regularly provide advice and expertise that is customized to support general education teachers and other colleagues to successfully create appropriate and effective academic, behavioral, and social/emotional learning experiences for students. Is able to model this element. |

Note: At the *Exemplary* level, an educator's level of expertise is such that he or she is able to model this element through training, teaching, coaching, assisting, and/or demonstrating. In this rubric, this level of expertise is denoted by "is able to model."

Guide to Specialized Instructional Support Personnel (SISP) Rubric

| Indicator IV-D. Decision-Making: Becomes involved in schoolwide decision making, and takes an active role in school improvement planning. | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|---|
| IV-D. Elements | Unsatisfactory | Needs Improvement | Proficient | Exemplary |
| IV-D-1. Decision-Making | Participates in planning and decision making at the school, department, and/or grade level only when asked and rarely contributes relevant ideas or expertise. | May participate in planning and decision making at the school, department, and/or grade level but rarely contributes relevant ideas or expertise. | 8. Consistently contributes relevant ideas and expertise to planning and decision making at the school, department, and/or grade level. | In planning and decision-making at the school, department, and/or grade level, consistently contributes ideas and expertise that are critical to school improvement efforts. Is able to model this element. |

| Indicator IV-E. Shared Responsibility: Shares responsibility for the performance of all students within the school. | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|---|
| IV-E. Elements | Unsatisfactory | Needs Improvement | Proficient | Exemplary |
| IV-E-1. Shared Responsibility | Rarely reinforces schoolwide behavior and learning expectations for all students and/or makes a limited contribution to their learning by rarely sharing responsibility for meeting their needs. | Within and beyond the classroom, inconsistently reinforces schoolwide behavior and learning expectations for all students, and/or makes a limited contribution to their learning by inconsistently sharing responsibility for meeting their needs. | 9. Within and beyond the classroom, consistently reinforces school-wide behavior and learning expectations for all students, and contributes to their learning by sharing responsibility for meeting their needs. | Individually and with colleagues, develops strategies and actions that contribute to the learning and productive behavior of all students at the school. Is able to model this element. |

Note: At the *Exemplary* level, an educator's level of expertise is such that he or she is able to model this element through training, teaching, coaching, assisting, and/or demonstrating. In this rubric, this level of expertise is denoted by "is able to model."

Guide to Specialized Instructional Support Personnel (SISP) Rubric

| Indicator IV-F. Professional Responsibilities: Is ethical and reliable, and meets routine responsibilities consistently. | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|--|
| IV-F. Elements | Unsatisfactory | Needs Improvement | Proficient | Exemplary |
| IV-F-1. Judgment | Demonstrates poor judgment and/or discloses confidential student information inappropriately. | Sometimes demonstrates questionable judgment and/or inadvertently shares confidential information. | Demonstrates sound judgment reflecting integrity, honesty, fairness, and trustworthiness and protects student confidentiality appropriately. | Demonstrates sound judgment and acts appropriately to protect student confidentiality, rights and safety. Is able to model this element. |
| IV-F-2. Reliability & Responsibility | Frequently misses or is late to assignments, makes errors in records, and/or misses paperwork deadlines; frequently late or absent. | Occasionally misses or is late to assignments, completes work late, and/or makes errors in records. | Consistently fulfills professional responsibilities; is consistently punctual and reliable with paperwork, duties, and assignments; and is rarely late or absent from school. | Consistently fulfills all professional responsibilities to high standards. Is able to model this element. |

Note: At the *Exemplary* level, an educator's level of expertise is such that he or she is able to model this element through training, teaching, coaching, assisting, and/or demonstrating. In this rubric, this level of expertise is denoted by "is able to model."

Appendix J. Setting SMART Goals

March 2012

Appendix J: Setting SMART Goals¹

Good goals help educators, schools, and districts improve. That is why the educator evaluation regulations require educators to develop goals that are specific, actionable, and measurable. They require, too, that goals be accompanied by action plans with benchmarks to assess progress.

This “SMART” Goal framework is a useful tool that individuals and teams can use to craft effective goals and action plans:

| | | |
|----------|---|---|
| S | = | S pecific and S trategic |
| M | = | M easurable |
| A | = | A ction Oriented |
| R | = | R igorous, R ealistic, and R esults-Focused (the 3 Rs) |
| T | = | T imed and T racked |

Goals with an action plan and benchmarks that have these characteristics are “SMART.”

A practical example some of us have experienced in our personal lives can make clear how this SMART goal framework can help turn hopes into actions that have results.

First, an example of not being “SMART” with goals: *I will lose weight and get in condition.*

Getting SMARTer: *Between March 15 and Memorial Day, I will lose 10 pounds and be able to run 1 mile nonstop.*

The **hope** is now a **goal**, that meets most of the SMART Framework criteria:

| | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|----------------------------------|
| It's S pecific and Strategic | = | 10 pounds, 1 mile |
| It's M easurable | = | pounds, miles |
| It's A ction-oriented | = | lose, run |
| It's got the 3 Rs | = | weight loss and running distance |
| It's T imed | = | 10 weeks |

SMART enough: To make the goal really “SMART,” though, we need to add an action plan and benchmarks. They make sure the goal meets that final criteria, “Tracked.” They also strengthen the other criteria, especially when the benchmarks include “process” benchmarks for tracking progress on the key actions and “outcome” benchmarks that track early evidence of change and/or progress toward the ultimate goal.

Key Actions

¹ The SMART goal concept was introduced by G.T. Doran, A. Miller and J. Cunningham in *There's a S.M.A.R.T. way to write management's goals and objectives*, *Management Review* 70 (11), AMA Forum, pp. 35-36. *What Makes a Goal “SMART”?* also draws from the work of Ed Costa, Superintendent of Schools in Lenox; John D'Auria, Teachers 21; and Mike Gilbert, Northeast Field Director for MASC.

Setting SMART Goals

- Reduce my daily calorie intake to fewer than 1,200 calories for each of 10 weeks.
- Walk 15 minutes per day; increase my time by 5 minutes per week for the next 4 weeks.
- Starting in week 5, run and walk in intervals for 30 minutes, increasing the proportion of time spent running instead of walking until I can run a mile, non-stop, by the end of week 10.

Benchmarks:

- For process, maintaining a daily record of calorie intake and exercise
- For outcome, biweekly weight loss and running distance targets (e.g., After 2 wks: 2 lbs/0 miles; 4 wks: 4 lbs/0 miles; 6 wks: 6lbs/.2 mi; 8 wks: 8 lbs/.4 miles)

S = Specific and Strategic

Goals need to be straightforward and clearly written, with sufficient specificity to determine whether or not they have been achieved. A goal is strategic when it serves an important purpose of the school or district as a whole and addresses something that is likely to have a big impact on our overall vision.

M = Measurable

If we can't measure it, we can't manage it. What measures of quantity, quality, and/or impact will we use to determine that we've achieved the goal? And how will we measure progress along the way? Progress toward achieving the goal is typically measured through "benchmarks." Some benchmarks focus on the process: are we doing what we said we were going to do? Other benchmarks focus on the outcome: are we seeing early signs of progress toward the results?

A = Action Oriented

Goals have active, not passive verbs. And the action steps attached to them tell us "who" is doing "what." Without clarity about what we're actually going to do to achieve the goal, a goal is only a hope with little chance of being achieved. Making clear the key actions required to achieve a goal helps everyone see how their part of the work is connected—to other parts of the work and to a larger purpose. Knowing that helps people stay focused and energized, rather than fragmented and uncertain.

R = Rigorous, Realistic, and Results-Focused (the 3 Rs)

A goal is not an activity: a goal makes clear what will be different as a result of achieving the goal. A goal needs to describe a realistic, yet ambitious result. It needs to stretch the educator, team, school, or district toward improvement but not be out of reach. The focus and effort required to achieve a rigorous but realistic goal should be challenging but not exhausting. Goals set too high will discourage us, whereas goals set too low will leave us feeling "empty" when it is accomplished and won't serve our students well.

T = Timed

A goal needs to have a deadline. Deadlines help all of us take action. For a goal to be accomplished, definite times need to be established when key actions will be completed and benchmarks achieved. Tracking the progress we're making on our action steps (process benchmarks) is essential: if we fall behind on doing something we said we were going to do, we'll need to accelerate the pace on something else. But tracking progress on process outcomes isn't enough. Our outcome benchmarks help us know whether we're on track to achieve our goal and/or whether we've reached our goal. Benchmarks give us a way to see our progress and celebrate it. They also give us information we need to make mid-course corrections.

Appendix K. District Determined Measures

September 2014

The list of District Determined Measures (DDMs) to be used at Greater Lawrence Technical High School shall be negotiated by the parties during the 2014-2015 school year. The list of DDMs shall be added to Appendix K of the parties collective bargaining agreement.