

DRAFT

May 29, 2014

Memorandum of Agreement

Pursuant to the provisions of Chapter 150E of the General Laws of Massachusetts, this Memorandum of Agreement is made and entered into by the School Committee of the Town of Wellesley (“the Committee”) and the Wellesley Teachers’ Association (the “Association” or “WTA”).

The Committee and the Association hereby agree that the Educator evaluation system for Unit A members of the Wellesley Teachers’ Association (attached hereto as Exhibit A) shall be implemented at the beginning of the 2014-2015 school year and shall replace the existing evaluation system set forth in Article 20 and Appendix G in the Unit A collective bargaining agreement between the Committee and the Association.

For the Wellesley Public Schools:

For the Wellesley Teachers’ Association:

Dr. David Lussier
Superintendent of Schools

Date: _____

Jonathan Simon
President

Date: _____

KC Kato
Chair, Wellesley School Committee

Date: _____

Introduction

During the 2012-2013 school year, 49 teachers and administrators volunteered to participate in an Educator evaluation pilot using a modified version of the Kim Marshall evaluation system. At the conclusion of the pilot, a survey was administered to teachers and administrators. A Design Team comprised of teachers and administrators analyzed the results of the survey and in June 2013 made a recommendation to the Superintendent to implement an Educator evaluation system for the second pilot year in 2013-2014.

Purpose of Educator Evaluation

The parties agree that the primary purposes of evaluation are:

- i) To promote student learning, growth, and achievement by providing Educators with feedback for improvement, enhanced opportunities for professional growth, and clear structures for accountability;
- ii) **To maintain effective teaching and administrative leadership;**
- iii) To ensure that the 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;
- iv) **To provide a record of facts and assessments for personnel decisions.**

Definitions

- A) **Artifacts of Professional Practice:** Products of an Educator's work and student work samples that demonstrate the Educator's knowledge and skills with respect to specific Performance Standards.
- B) **Caseload Educator:** Educators who teach or counsel individual or small groups of students through consultation with the regular classroom teacher. For example guidance counselors, speech and language pathologists, occupational and physical therapists, psychologists, literacy specialists, and content coaches.
- C) **Categories of Evidence:** 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 (but see U., below); and additional evidence relevant to one or more Standards of Effective Teaching Practice.
- D) **Classroom Teacher:** Educators who teach PK-12 whole classes, and teachers of special subjects such as art, music, library, and physical education. May also include special education teachers and reading specialists who teach whole classes.

- E) **District-Determined Measures (DDMs):** Measures of student learning, growth and achievement related to the Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks or other relevant frameworks that are locally bargained and comparable across grade or subject level district-wide. These measures may include, but shall not be limited to the following: portfolios, approved commercial assessments, district-developed pre and post unit and course assessments, and capstone projects.
- i. **Direct measures:** A direct measure assesses student growth in a specific content area or domain of social-emotional or behavioral learning over time. Direct measures shall include, but are not limited to, criterion referenced or, where applicable, norm referenced measures, including but not limited to: 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.
 - ii. **Indirect measures:** 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.
- F) **Educator(s):** Inclusive term that applies to all classroom teachers and caseload Educators, unless otherwise noted.
- G) **Educator Plan:** The growth or improvement actions identified as part of each Educator’s evaluation. The Educator’s career stage, overall performance rating, and the rating on the impact of student learning, growth and achievement determine the type of plan. There shall be four types of Educator Plans:
- i) **Developing Educator Plan** shall mean a plan developed by the Educator and the Evaluator for one school year or less for an Educator without Professional Teacher Status (PTS); or at the discretion of an Evaluator, for an Educator with PTS in a new assignment (see definition, below).
 - 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.
 - (a) For Educators whose impact on student learning is either moderate or high, the Educator Plan shall be two years.
 - (b) For Educators whose impact on student learning is low, the Educator Plan shall be for one year. The Plan shall include a goal related to examining elements of practice that may be contributing to low impact.
 - iii) **Directed Growth Plan** shall mean a plan developed by the Educator and Evaluator of one school year or less for Educators with PTS who are rated Needs Improvement.

- iv) **Improvement Plan** shall mean a plan developed by the Evaluator of at least 30 school days and no more than one school year for Educators with PTS who are rated Unsatisfactory with goals specific to improving the Educator's unsatisfactory performance.
- H) **ESE**: The Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education
- I) **Evaluation**: The ongoing process of defining goals and identifying, gathering, and using information as part of a process to improve professional performance (Formative Assessment) and to assess total job effectiveness and make personnel decisions (Summative Evaluation).
- J) **Evaluator**: Any person designated by the Superintendent who has primary or contributing responsibility for observation and evaluation. The Superintendent is responsible for ensuring that all Evaluators have training in the principles of supervision and evaluation. Each Educator shall have one primary Evaluator at any one time responsible for determining performance ratings.
 - i) **Primary Evaluator**: This person determines the Educator's performance ratings and evaluation. The Primary Evaluator is the person responsible for developing the Educator Plan, supervising the Educator's progress through formative assessments, and evaluating the Educator's progress toward attaining the Educator Plan goals.
 - ii) **Contributing Evaluator**: This person shall conduct one (1) observation for teachers who are in their first year in the Wellesley Public Schools, and provide them with needed additional support. In certain circumstances, a contributing Evaluator may be called upon as a resource for other teachers during their evaluation process. For example, at the Middle School, a Department Head may serve as the Primary Evaluator, while the Principal may serve as the Contributing Evaluator.
 - iii) **Assignment of Primary and Contributing Evaluators**: Educators shall be assigned a primary and, when applicable, a contributing Evaluator. The parties may agree to assign a different Primary and/or Contributing Evaluator to an Educator.
 - iv) **Notification**: The Educator shall be notified in writing of his or her Primary Evaluator and, when applicable, Contributing Evaluator at the outset of each new evaluation cycle.
- K) **Evaluation Cycle**: 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.
- L) **Experienced Educator**: An Educator with Professional Teacher Status (PTS).
- M) **Family**: Includes students' parents, legal guardians, foster parents, or primary caregivers.

- N) **Formative Assessment:** The process used to assess progress towards attaining goals set forth in an Educator Plan, performance on standards or both. This process may take place at any time during the cycle of evaluation, but typically takes place at mid-cycle. See also, Mid-Cycle Assessment.
- O) **Formative Evaluation:** 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 goals set forth in the Educator Plan, performance on Standards and indicators of Effective Teaching Practice, or both.
- P) **Goal:** A specific, actionable, and measurable area of improvement as set forth in the 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 having the same role.
- Q) **Measurable:** That which can be classified or estimated in relation to a scale, rubric, or standards.
- R) **Mid-Cycle Assessment:** See Formative Assessment
- S) **Multiple Measures of Student Learning:** Measures must include a combination of classroom, school and district assessments, student growth percentiles on state assessments, and student Massachusetts English Proficiency Assessment (MEPA) scores.
- T) **New Assignment:** An Educator with PTS shall be considered in a new assignment when teaching under a different license.
- U) **Observation:** A time during a teacher's normal classroom day when an Evaluator is present while the teacher conducts a class or exercises his or her professional duties. An observation is an opportunity to gather information on performance relative to the criteria identified in the Professional teaching Standards. This data gathering process includes notes and judgments made during the classroom or worksite visit, and may include examination of artifacts of practice including student work. Observations may be announced or unannounced. Classroom or worksite observations conducted pursuant to this article must result in constructive feedback to the Educator.
- i) **Announced Observation:** An observation that lasts for a period of time in order to observe a lesson or including transitions between lessons. Feedback for announced observations is provided through formal pre-observation and post-observation conferences.
- (a) **Pre-Observation Conference:** A conference between an Evaluator and an Educator that may be used to obtain background information in advance of a particular Announced Observation or to receive information about a particular classroom activity that he or she will observe, including the goals

for the lesson. This conference may be used by the Educator and Evaluator to collaboratively clarify, refine, and/or elaborate the activities and the goals they are meant to achieve.

(b) **Post-Observation Conference:** A conference between an Evaluator and Educator following an announced observation. The Educator and Evaluator shall review the goals of the lesson, the outcomes; discuss what the Evaluator observed, and what students were learning.

ii) **Unannounced Observation:** An observation by the Evaluator of approximately 10 minutes. Targeted and constructive feedback for an unannounced observation shall take the form of a conversation between the Educator and Evaluator, after which the Educator will complete the self-reflection form, the Evaluator will complete the response form, and sign off on the observation cycle. The entire observation cycle should take place within three (3) business days. The timeframe may be extended due to the unavailability of the Educator or Evaluator and rescheduled within a reasonable period of time.

(a) Normal supervisory responsibilities of department, building and district administrators will 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 feedback to the Educator, are not observations as defined in this article.

(b) If the Evaluator is actively engaged in note-taking while in the classroom, the visit to the classroom shall be considered an observation pursuant to the definition and the Educator can expect targeted and constructive feedback as described above.

V) **Parties:** the parties to this agreement are the Wellesley Teachers Association and the School Committee of the Town of Wellesley.

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

1) **Exemplary:** The Educator's performance consistently and significantly exceeds the requirements of a standard or overall. The rating of Exemplary on a standard indicates that practice significantly exceeds Proficient and could serve as a model of practice on that standard district-wide.

2) **Proficient:** the Educator's performance fully and consistently meets the requirements of a standard or overall. Proficient practice is understood to be fully satisfactory.

3) **Needs Improvement:** 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.

- 4) **Unsatisfactory:** 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:** Locally developed standards and indicators pursuant to M.G.L. c. 71, s 38 and consistent with, and supplemental to 603 CMR 35.00. The parties may agree to limit standards and indicators to those set forth in 603 CMR 35.03.
- Y) **Professional Teacher Status:** The standard granted to an Educator pursuant to M.G.L. c.71, s 41.
- Z) **Rating of Educator Impact on Student Learning:** 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.
- AA) **Rating of Overall Educator Performance:** 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:** 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 consist of:
1. Standards: Describe broad categories of professional practice, including those required in 603 CMR 35.03.
 2. Indicators: Describe aspects of each standard, including those required in 603 CMR 35.03;
 3. Elements: Defines the individual components under each indicator;
 4. Descriptors: Describes practice at four levels of performance for each element.
- CC) **Specialized Instructional Support Personnel:** Educators who perform a wide range of activities in schools, including a broad array of prevention and intervention services that promote effective teaching and learning. SISP collaborate with teachers and other school staff to ensure that students receive high quality instruction that is responsive to their diverse academic, social, emotional and mental health needs.

- DD) **Summative Evaluation:** 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.
- EE) **Superintendent:** The person employed by the school committee pursuant to M.G.L. c. 71, s59 and s59A. The Superintendent is responsible for the implementation of 603 CMR 35.00.
- FF) **Teacher:** An Educator employed in a position requiring a certificate or license as described in 603 CMR 7.04(3) (a, b, and d) and in the area of vocational education as provided in 603 CMR 4.00. Teachers may include, for example, classroom teachers, librarians, guidance counselors, or speech pathologists.
- GG) **Trends in student learning:** At least three years of data from the locally bargained district determined measures (DDMs) and state assessments used in determining an Educator’s rating for impact on student learning.
- HH) **Working Group** – A Working Group shall be composed of an equal number of members chosen by the Association and by the superintendent (or designee). The working group shall be chaired by the Association president (or designee) and a person designated by the superintendent. The responsibilities of the Working Group are detailed below.

Process

The parties agree to “adapt” the Massachusetts Model System for Educator Evaluation and implement the new system in the following ways:

1. General Provisions
 - a. Should there be a serious disagreement between the Educator and Evaluator regarding an overall summative evaluation 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.

2. The parties agree to establish a **working group** which shall review the evaluation processes and procedures. This group shall also review and provide guidance on DDMs and ISL definitions annually.
3. Training
 - a. The Association and Superintendent will work together to provide training for the Working Group.
 - b. The Superintendent shall insure that Evaluators have training in supervision and evaluation, including the regulations and standards and indicators of effective teaching practice promulgated by DESE, and the evaluation standards and procedures established in this Agreement.
 - c. The district will provide training on the Educator evaluation model, 11 hours for Evaluators and 4 hours for Educators.
 - d. All Evaluators, including principals, assistant principals, department heads, and K-12 Directors will receive training from a DESE approved vendor. The trained Evaluators will then provide teachers with 4 hours of training on the Educator evaluation model.
 - e. All Evaluators, including principals, assistant principals, department heads, and K-12 Directors will participate in additional professional development to help support their growth as Evaluators with an emphasis on goal setting and the use of rubrics, and will pilot streamlined approaches to evidence collection during the 2014-2015 school year.
 - f. The district will provide teachers with additional professional development on the Educator evaluation system during the December 1, 2014 Inservice Day.
 - g. The district will publish its training schedule which will include the Timeline for Educator Evaluation and Academic Council Calendar through the Superintendent's Bulletin and district website.
4. Educator Evaluation Data Collection
 - a. The district will use a web-based analytic tool, to collect Educator evaluation data for each Educator.
5. Using Student Feedback in Educator Evaluation
 - a. The parties agree to bargain with respect to this matter once DESE has finalized this process and provided guidance to school districts.
6. Using Staff Feedback in Educator Evaluation
 - a. The parties agree to bargain with respect to this matter once the DESE has finalized this process and provided guidance to school districts.
7. Transition from Existing Evaluation System

- a. The parties agree that 50% or more of the Educators in the district will be evaluated during the 2014-2015 school year under the guidelines set forth in this Agreement.
- b. Educators who are on cycle for the 2014-2015 school year include all teachers who have not yet attained professional teacher status; teachers evaluated in the 2013-2014 school year with an overall rating of “Satisfactory with Concerns” and all staff who were on Year 4 (Professional Development) under the previous evaluation system.
- c. Educators who are not on cycle during the 2014-2015 school year will participate in professional development and begin working on student learning goals and professional practice goals in anticipation of being placed on cycle during the 2015-2016 school year.
- d. An Educator will not be rated on his or her Impact on Student Learning (ISL) until the Educator, together with his or her Evaluators, have piloted at least two DDMs for two academic years and the Educator and Evaluator have established valid criteria for assessing ISL.

DATA SOURCES

In order to insure a comprehensive understanding of the teacher’s work, the supervisor will use a variety of data sources. The supervisor’s analysis of such data will be communicated to the teacher in writing, including using the .

1. Visitations – the supervisor will observe the teacher during his or her classes or during the providing of services, as appropriate.
2. Student Work or Written Teacher Work – The supervisor will review other aspects of classroom instruction which may include written teacher work; student tests; student work; lesson/unit plans; handouts and assignment sheets, unit evaluations written by the teacher, and, after consultation with the teacher, records of student grades.
3. Interactions with Others- The supervisor will review information about the teacher’s interactions with students, parents, colleagues, administrators, and, where appropriate, members of the community. No information will be included in an evaluation unless substantiated and based on the supervisor’s own observations, documentation, and/or reasonable investigation conducted with the knowledge of the teacher.
4. Activities- The supervisor will review the teacher’s professional development and participation in faculty activities within the school. A record of school activities may be noted in the evaluation reports.

5. Data provided by the teacher- At the discretion of the teacher, he/she may provide supervisors with additional non-classroom information that can be documented to be included in the end-of-year evaluation report.
6. Structured Conferences- The supervisor may meet with the teacher to share, gather, and/or analyze information and ideas about the teacher’s professional work, particularly when the indicators of effective teaching are not readily observable during classroom instruction.
7. At least two measures of student learning growth - One such measure shall be the MCAS Student Growth Percentile (SGP) or Massachusetts English Proficiency Assessment gain scores, if applicable, but such assessment shall not be the sole basis for an evaluation rating.

RUBRICS

1. Classroom Teachers: Teachers shall use a rubric that blends the Massachusetts Model Rubric’s framework language with descriptive language from Dr. Kim Marshall’s rubric. The Wellesley Educator Evaluation Design Team chose the Marshall language during the first Pilot Year of the new Evaluation System. This “hybrid rubric” will help to ground teachers in observable practices and to guide post-observation discussions and reflections while providing clarity when communicating with other districts and with the Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education about standards, indicators, elements, and performance.
2. “Specialized Instructional Support Personnel” (SISP): Unless otherwise specified in this document, SISPs will use the appropriate model SISP rubric from the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education.
3. Caseload educators: Unless otherwise specified in this document, Caseload Educators will use the model SISP rubric from the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education.
4. Nurses will use the “School Nurses Adaptation” of the model SISP rubric.

EVALUATION CYCLE

The parties agree to utilize a 5-Step Evaluation Cycle that includes Self-Assessment, Analysis/ Goal Setting/Plan Development, Implementation of Plan, Formative Assessment/Evaluation, and Summative Assessment.

1. **Training:** The district shall provide training for all Educators and Evaluators that does the following.
 - a. Outlines the components of the new evaluation process
 - b. Explains the evaluation cycle
 - c. Instructs how to draft goals and Educator plans
 - d. Teaches how to use the web-based analytic tool
 - e. Instructs how to collect, report and utilize data from DDMs.

The Working Group will make recommendations regarding the most effective means of providing this training.

2. **Self-Assessment:** By the first Friday after the first Monday in September, an Educator will complete a self-assessment using the appropriate rubric and the Self-Assessment Form (Appendix D).
3. **Educator Goal Setting and Plan Development:** By November 1, an Educator and Evaluator will use the appropriate rubric to set a minimum of one Professional Practice Goal and one Student Learning Goal in order to develop an Educator Growth Plan. Goals should align with school, department, or district goals. The Educator and Evaluator should also develop a set of actions the Educator will take in pursuit of their Student Learning Goal(s) and Professional Practice Goal(s). It is expected that the Educator Goal Setting and Plan Development process addresses the analysis of student learning, growth and achievement of the students under the Educator's responsibility. Educators shall record their goals and proposed actions on the Educator Goal-Setting and Plan Development form (Appendix E).
4. **Observations:**
 - a. Evaluators will conduct a minimum of six (6) observations of each Educator being evaluated. Observations should last approximately 10 minutes. At least two observations will take place before December 1.
 - b. Within two (2) school days after each observation, the Educator and Evaluator will engage in a conversation that focuses on what students were learning and doing, which standards in the rubric the lesson corresponded with, how the Educator is progressing towards goals set forth in the Educator's Plan and next steps for growth.
 - c. Within two (2) school days of the post-observation conversation, the Educator will complete the Post Observation Form to document the conversation.
 - d. Within two (2) school days of the Educator completing the Post Observation Form, the Evaluator will review the comments from the Educator. The Evaluator must acknowledge his/her review on the form. The Evaluator may also provide additional comments and recommendations for growth using the Post Observation Form (Appendix F). If the Evaluator makes additional comments, he or she must notify the Educator via email.
 - e. An Educator may respond separately in writing to an Evaluator's comments in the Post Observation form. An Educator should make such response within five (5) school days of being notified of the additional comments.
 - f. *In order to promote candor in the Post Observation Dialogues, access to a Post Observation Form shall be limited to the Primary Evaluator, except in the case where a Contributing Evaluator conducted the observation. In the case where a Contributing Evaluator conducted the observation, that Evaluator may only view the Post Observation Forms created by the Educator*

and the Contributing Evaluator.

5. Formative Assessment

a. MID-CYCLE REPORT:

- i. For **all Non-PTS staff and for PTS staff** whose performance rating is Needs Improvement or Unsatisfactory, and who are not demonstrating growth towards goals, the Evaluator will provide a mid-year report using the Mid-Cycle Progress Form by January 15. (Appendix G). The Educator may respond in writing to the Formative Assessment within five (5) days of receiving the Formative Assessment.
- ii. For **PTS staff** on a Directed Growth Plan or a 1-year Self-directed Growth Plan, the Evaluator will provide a mid-year report using the Mid-Cycle Progress Form by January 15 (Appendix G). The Educator may respond in writing to the Formative Assessment within five (5) days of receiving the Formative Assessment.
- iii. For all PTS staff on a 2-year Self-Directed Growth Plan, the Evaluator will provide a Mid-cycle Progress Report to the Educator by June 1.

6. Summative Assessment

- a. **SUMMATIVE EVALUATION REPORT:** All participating staff will receive an end-of cycle report using the Summative Evaluation Report. The Summative Evaluation Report will include progress toward student learning goals, progress toward professional practice goals, and a rating on each standard (Appendix I). The professional judgment of the primary Evaluator shall determine the overall summative rating that the Educator receives.
- b. Educators rated “Proficient” or “Exemplary” in Standards 1 and 2 may be eligible for a summative rating of “Proficient”. Educators rated “Needs Improvement” or “Unsatisfactory” will receive an overall summative rating of “Needs Improvement” or “Unsatisfactory”. The Summative Evaluation Report shall recognize areas of strength as well as identify recommendations for professional growth.
- c. For an Educator on a Developing Educator Plan, a Directed Growth Plan or an Improvement Plan, the Evaluator shall deliver the Summative Evaluation by May 1.
- d. For an Educator on a Self-Directed Growth Plan, the Evaluator shall deliver the Summative Evaluation Report by June 15.

- e. The Educator shall sign the Summative Evaluation Report within two (2) school days of delivery and shall have the right to respond in writing within five (5) days of delivery. 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.
- f. A copy of the signed Summative Evaluation Report shall be placed in the Educator's personnel file.

7. Impact of Summative Rating on Educator Plans

- a. For an Educator with professional status whose overall performance rating is exemplary or proficient and whose impact on student learning is moderate or high, the Educator shall follow a two year Self-Directed Growth Plan.
- b. For an Educator with professional status whose overall performance rating is exemplary or proficient and whose impact on student learning is low, the Educator shall follow a one-year Directed Growth Plan.
- c. For an Educator with professional status whose overall performance is unsatisfactory, that Educator shall follow an Improvement Plan

8. 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 for a realistic time period sufficient to achieve the goals outlined in the Improvement Plan, but no less than thirty (30) school days and no more than one year.
- c. Within ten (10) school days after the decision to place an Educator on an Improvement Plan, the Educator, Evaluator, and a representative from the Wellesley teachers' Association will meet to discuss the development of an Improvement Plan.
- d. 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.
- e. 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 Primary Evaluator;
 - vii. Include the signatures of the Educator and Primary Evaluator.
- f. A copy of the signed Plan shall be provided to the Educator and the Association. 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.
 - g. In the event that the Educator and the Evaluator do not mutually agree on the Plan, it will be referred to the Superintendent or designee. The Superintendent or designee and the President of the Association or designee shall meet within ten (10) school days to attempt to resolve the disagreement. In the event they are unable to resolve the disagreement, the Superintendent or designee shall resolve the disagreement, and his decision will be final.
 - h. The Evaluator must complete a Summative Evaluation for the Educator at the end of the period determined by the Evaluator for the Plan.
 - i. Decision on the Educator's status at the conclusion of the Improvement Plan
 - i. All determinations must be made no later than May 1. One of three decisions must be made at the conclusion of the Improvement Plan:
 - 1. If the Evaluator determines that the Educator has improved his or her practice to the level of proficiency, the Educator will be placed on a Self-Directed Growth Plan.
 - 2. In those cases where the Educator was placed on an Improvement Plan as a result of his or her Summative Rating at the end of his or her Directed or Self-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.
 - 3. In those cases where the Educator was placed on an Improvement Plan as a result of his or her Summative Rating at the end of his or 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 that the Educator be dismissed.

4. If the Evaluator determines that the Educator's practice remains at the level of Unsatisfactory, the Evaluator shall recommend to the Superintendent that the Educator be dismissed.

Rating of Educator Impact on Student Learning (ISL)

1. Basis of the Impact on Student Learning Rating
 - a. The following student performance measures will be the basis for determining an Educator's impact on student learning, growth, and achievement.
 - i. Statewide growth measure(s): Where available, statewide growth measures must be selected each year as one of the measures used to determine the Educator's ISL.
 - ii. District-Determined Measures (DDMs) of student learning, growth, or achievement.
2. Identifying and Selecting District-Determined Measures
 - a. The Working Group representing teachers and administrators shall review and approve DDMs.
 - b. The Working Group shall be co-chaired by the president of the bargaining unit or his/her designee and the Superintendent or his/her designee.
 - c. The parties shall endeavor to provide, to the extent practicable, representation of Educators from a variety of grade levels and disciplines.
 - d. The Working Group shall be composed of an equal number of members chosen by the Association (or designee) and by the superintendent (or designee).
 - e. Working Group shall :
 - i. Review and approve assessments and other measures recommended by Educators and administrators from across the district for adoption as DDMs.
 - ii. Request additional information about an assessment or other measure recommended for adoption as a DDM.
 - iii. Make recommendations to an Administrator or Educator for the modification of an assessment or other measure to make the measure more suitable as a DDM. At the request of an Administrator or Educator who proposed the DDM, the Working Group will meet with that Administrator or Educator to discuss the DDM.
 - f. Evaluators shall:
 - i. Submit at least two (2) measures of student learning, growth, or achievement for each Educator based on recommendations from Educators with expertise in the content area. The same measures can be used for multiple Educators, especially if the measures have been developed by a

- PLC or similar collaborative work group.
- ii. Integrate feedback from and respond to requests for additional information from the Working Group.
 - iii. Collect feedback from Educators regarding the effectiveness of the selected DDMs.
 - iv. Work with Educators with expertise in the content area to make modifications to or propose alternative DDMs as necessary.
- g. DDM Selection Criteria**
- i. DDMs must meet the definition of direct or indirect measures as defined above.
 - 1. For all classroom Educators, at least one measure in each year that will be used to determine an Educator's ISL must be a direct measure.
 - 2. Other measures may be direct or indirect.
 - ii. DDMs must be comparable across grade, course level or subject level district-wide, as appropriate.
 - iii. DDMs must include consistent, transparent scoring processes that establish clear parameters for what constitutes high, moderate, and low student growth.
 - iv. DDMs must be aligned to the Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks, Massachusetts Vocational Technical Education Frameworks, or other relevant Frameworks, when possible.
- h. Process for Selecting DDMs**
- i. The DDMs Working Group shall provide a written recommendation to the school committee and local association by (DATE) which identifies at least two (2) DDMs for each educator. Any DDMs on the recommendation list not piloted in 2014-15 shall be piloted in 2015-16. After three (3) years of data for a DDM, the DDM, in combination with professional judgment, can be used to determine each Educator's ISL Rating.
 - ii. The school committee and the local association shall ratify the DDM list or shall negotiate modifications. Ratification will proceed after agreement by the respective parties. In the event agreement is not reached by the school committee and the local association within a reasonable period of time, either party may file a petition for arbitration under G.L. c. 71, sec. 38.

iii. Educators must be informed of the DDMs that will be used to determine their Student Impact Ratings no later than the first Friday after the first Monday in September.

iv. To ensure the effective implementation of DDMs, the superintendent (or designee), with input from the Working Group and the Professional Development Committee, shall arrange professional development for all Educators, principals, and other Evaluators that includes the following:

- 1.** Overview and selection process
- 2.** Implementation plan
- 3.** Administration and evaluating
- 4.** Impact on Student Learning Rating
- 5.** Student roster attribution

i. Process for Reviewing DDMs

i. Annually [we need a time frame], Evaluators and Educators will submit to the Working Group a brief update on the DDMs being used. This update shall include an assessment of the effectiveness of the DDM and any requested modifications. The update may be submitted jointly or separately by the Evaluator and Educator.

ii. During the year, as needed, an Evaluator and/or Educator may request feedback from the Working Group on a DDM. Substantial modification to a DDM or replacement of a DDM must follow the ratification procedures in h., above.

3. Defining ISL Ratings

i. In order to create a valid definition of high, moderate and low student growth, the district will pilot DDMs for a period of three years and gather data on those DDMs.

ii. In April of the third year of the pilot, Administrators and Educators will use this data to recommend definitions of high, moderate and low student growth to the Working Group for the specific DDMs.

iii. The Working Group shall:

- 1.** Review the definitions of high, moderate and low growth.
- 2.** Request additional information about a definition as necessary
- 3.** Make recommendations to an Administrator or Educator for the modification of a definition. At the request of an Administrator or Educator who proposed the definitions, the Working Group will meet with that Administrator or Educator to discuss the DDM.

- iv. The DDMs Working Group shall provide a written recommendation to the school committee and local association by May 15 for the definitions of high, moderate and low student growth.
- v. The school committee and the local association shall ratify the definitions or shall negotiate modifications. Ratification will proceed after agreement by the respective parties. In the event agreement is not reached by the school committee and the local association within a reasonable period of time, either party may file a petition for arbitration under G.L. c. 71, sec. 38.

4. Determining Educator ISL for Each DDM

- i. The Evaluator will meet with the Educator annually to conduct a collaborative conversation about the Educator's student outcomes on the DDMs administered in the previous year. For each DDM, the Evaluator and the Educator will exercise their professional judgment in discussing how the outcomes in student assessments are affected by contextual factors including, but not limited to, the learning challenges presented by the students and the learning environment. Based on their discussions, they will determine together whether, in general, the Educator's students achieved high, moderate or low growth in comparison to the growth expectations for the specific DDM. Based on this conversation, as part of the continuous learning cycle for the Educator, the Evaluator may recommend that the Educator continue using current instructional approaches, materials and/or pacing, or suggest modifications or changes to them. Educators shall have an opportunity to review and confirm the roster of students whose outcomes will be used in the determination of their ISL for each DDM.
 - 1. 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.
 - 2. 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.
 - 3. DDM results from students who are not present for instruction or education services for at least 90 percent of the allotted

instructional or service time shall not be used in the determination of an Educator's impact on student growth.

- ii. Following the conversation outlined in 4.i., above, The Evaluator shall use his/her professional judgment to determine whether an Educator meets the definitions for having a high, moderate, or low impact on student learning. The Evaluator will consider the determinations of student growth that resulted from the annual conversations held pursuant to section i.,i. above (high, moderate, or low) from at least two measure relative to at least three years of data and will apply professional judgment to those determinations in order to designate the Educator's ISL. The Evaluator's professional judgment must account for contextual factors including, but not limited to, learning challenges presented by the students and the environment.
- iii. Before making a final determination that an Educators' ISL rating is low, the Evaluator shall refer the matter to the Working Group for review. The Working Group shall then make recommendations regarding that Educator's ISL Rating for consideration by the Evaluator.
- iv. The Evaluator shall meet with the Educator rated low to discuss the ISL Rating. The Evaluator may meet with the Educator rated moderate or high to discuss the ISL Rating, if either the Educator or the Evaluator requests such a meeting.

5. Intersection between the Summative Performance Rating and the ISL Rating

- a. An Educator's Summative Performance Rating is a rating of Educator practice and remains independent from the Educator's ISL Rating, which is a rating of impact on student learning, growth, and achievement.
 - i. Rating of Overall Educator Performance: 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.
 - ii. Results from DDMs and the ISL Rating are used to inform the Educator's Self-Assessment, to develop a professional practice goal or student learning goal and the resulting Educator Plan.
 - iii. DDM results shall not be used, in whole or in part, in an Educator's Summative Evaluation to lower the Educator's performance rating on one of the four professional standards or on the overall performance rating.

- iv. Neither the Educator’s professional practice goal nor the student learning goal shall be expressed in numerical terms or in terms of any test score or growth score.
- b. Educators with PTS whose Summative Performance Rating is exemplary and whose ISL Rating is moderate or high shall be placed on a two-year self-directed growth plan and may be recognized in a manner that has been collectively bargained between the Association and the Committee.
- c. Educators with PTS whose Summative Performance Rating is proficient and whose ISL Rating is moderate or high shall be placed on a two-year self-directed growth plan and may be recognized in a manner that has been collectively bargained between the Association and the Committee.
- d. Educators with PTS whose Summative Performance Rating is exemplary and whose ISL Rating is low shall be placed on a one-year self-directed growth plan.
 - i. In such cases, the Evaluator’s supervisor shall discuss and review the ISL Rating with the Evaluator and the supervisor shall confirm or revise the Educator’s ISL Rating. In cases where the superintendent serves as the Evaluator, the superintendent’s decision on the rating shall not be subject to review.
 - ii. The Educator and the Evaluator shall analyze the discrepancy between the Summative Performance Rating and Student Impact Rating to seek to determine the cause of the discrepancy.
 - iii. The Educator Plan may include a goal related to examining elements of practice that may be contributing to low impact.
- e. Evaluators 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 sources that the Evaluator shares with the Educator.

APPENDICES

- Appendix - A Wellesley Hybrid Teacher Rubric
- Appendix - B DESE Model Rubric for Instructional Support Personnel
- Appendix - C DESE Model Rubric for Administrators
- Appendix - D Educator Self-Assessment Form
- Appendix - E Educator Plan and Goal Setting Form
- Appendix - F Post Observation Documentation Form
- Appendix - G Mid-cycle Report
- Appendix - H Summative Evaluation Report

Appendix - I Improvement Plan

Appendix - J Nurse Rubric

Appendix - K Professional Development Plan for the Wellesley Supervision and
Evaluation System

Appendix - L Evaluation Cycle Timeline