

## Wareham Public Schools Educator Evaluation System

This document contains the procedures for implementing the educator evaluation system in the Wareham Public Schools written in collaboration between the District and the Wareham Education Association. Following the procedures contained herein is essential toward maintaining the confidence and integrity of this system, and ensuring its outcomes remain applicable, useful, valid, and contractual.

The system is composed of **ratings** based on **evidence** collected through two means -- evaluation of **artifacts** and **observations**. Most of these observations will be unannounced (commonly called **walkthroughs**), though in some circumstances observations may be pre-scheduled. According to Massachusetts's regulations, educators must be rated in four categories:

- I. Curriculum, Planning, and Assessment**
- II. Teaching All Students**
- III. Family and Community Engagement**
- IV. Professional Culture.**

Evaluators are reminded to base ratings on the rubrics that are part of this system, and are advised to carefully consider relevant terms such as “most of” or “majority”. One or two exceptions to best practices observed over a school year or series of observations do not render an educator ineligible for a proficient or exemplary rating. Also to be noted is that rubrics address the actions and choices of educators, not children. There is no place for attempting to evaluate an educator based on the actions of students assigned to him/her; the intent is to evaluate the decision-making and array of options the educator applies.

A **rating** of an educator must be based on repeated **evidence** in support. Educators must receive a rating in each of the four standards by the end of their plan, based on the cumulative evidence and artifacts. In order to support a rating, evidence drawn from at least three observations and/or artifacts must be present. Only that which was observed by the evaluator is eligible for inclusion. Furthermore, any educator who was rated in any standard as “needs improvement” or “unsatisfactory” must be based have received at least seven unannounced observations.

Only that evidence collected through the normal procedures of the school building, or mentioned in feedback to the educator, can be used as the basis for a rating. Impressions from standing in the hallway, or gathered as an evaluator is performing duties not related to the evaluation process, are not eligible as evidence. Any evidence not included in feedback to educators is ineligible.

Much of the evidence, particularly on Standards I. & II. come from unannounced observations, often called walkthroughs. A walkthrough with a duration of ten or more minutes must result in feedback supplied to an educator through the “Short Form” within three school days. Note that this form is not intended to replace all other methods of communication; emails or short notes are still welcome means of aiding educators in improving their craft.

The form should not be signed when first shared, to allow for discussion and a fair summation of what was observed in the classroom. It is recommended that the evaluator print this form as written in preparation for further discussion. When the educator has received notice that a new form has been inputted s/he has three school days on which to offer comment or ask questions. Forms should not be signed while that discussion is ongoing. At the conclusion of any discussion based on a form, or at the conclusion of this period, the evaluator and educator should sign the Walkthrough Form. If the educator is not receiving automatic notice that a form has been uploaded on TeachPoint, s/he should be notified that this has been done; otherwise this timeline should be extended.

Educators on Directed Plans, Improvement Plans, and Developing Educator Plans, will have at least one announced observation. The conference before and after the scheduled observations should be based on the evaluation form.

Further grounds for ratings can be gleaned from the use of **artifacts**, any evidence of practice collected by the evaluator or provided by the Educator. There is no requirement of any sort for a minimum / maximum number of artifacts, and no such requirement shall be created. Educators are encouraged to use artifacts to offer proof that standards are being met, either in response to negative feedback, or to “fill in” any evaluation areas. This will be particularly applicable after the formative evaluation report. Artifacts can be submitted in paper form or uploaded.

Much of this system is reliant on deadlines. Absent communication from administration, the deadlines contained in the Unit A contract should be seen as applicable. Should any deadline fall on a day when the schools are not open, forms from either party would be due the next school day.

**Definitions of each Evaluation Plan Designation:**

- (1) Developing Educator Plan: Non Professional Status teachers
- (2) Self-Directed Growth Plan:
- (3) Directed Growth Plan:
- (4) Improvement Plan:

There are different evaluative needs for each subsequent plan:

**Developing Educator:**

An educator in a substantially different position or in his/her first three years in the Wareham Public Schools shall be formally evaluated at least annually.

**Self-Directed Growth Plan:**

1). A two-year Self-Directed Growth Plan is for professional status educators who have an overall rating of proficient or exemplary. A formative evaluation report is provided at the end of year one and summative evaluative report, at the end of year two.

**Directed Growth Plan:**

- 1). PTS teachers that have a previous overall rating in needs improvement are placed on this plan.
- 2). The goal of the plan must address areas identified as needing improvement as determined by the evaluator.
- 3). 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 no later than June 1.
- 4). When the evaluator determines that the performance is proficient or exemplary the Educator is transitioned to a Self-Directed Growth Plan for the next evaluation cycle.
- 5). For an Educator that does not rate overall proficient or exemplary, the Educator is placed on an Improvement Plan for the next evaluation cycle.
- 6) Educators are entitled to support and resources in order to meet the goals of a directed growth plan. Any disagreement about what constitutes “appropriate” is resolved in negotiations between the Association and District.

**Improvement Plans:**

- 1). An Improvement Plan is for those Educators rated as overall unsatisfactory.
- 2). This plan, keeping in mind what is in the best interest of children, can be no fewer than 45 [per new contract] calendar days and no more than one school year.
- 3). A Summative evaluation report must be complete by the end of the determined period of time.
- 4). The Improvement Plan shall define the problem(s) of practices identified through the observations and evaluations.
- 5). The Educator may request that a representative from the Wareham Educators Association attend meeting(s).
- 6). If the Educator consents, the Wareham Educators Association will be informed that an Educator has been placed on an Improvement Plan.

**The Improvement Plan Shall:**

- 1). Define improvement goals directly related to performance standards, indicators and elements.
- 2). Describe the activities and work the Educator should complete as a means to improve performance.
- 3). Describe the assistance the district will provide.
- 4). Articulate measurable outcomes that will be accepted as evidence toward improvement.
- 5). Detail the timeline for completion of the plan
- 6). Identify the individuals assigned to assist the Educator.
- 7). Include the signatures of the Educator and Evaluator.

**Decision on the Educators Status at the Conclusion of the Improvement:**

All determinations below must be made no later than June 1. 1 of 3 alternatives must be chosen and decisions must be made at the conclusion of an Improvement Plan.

- a. If the Evaluator determines that the Educator has improved practice to the level of proficiency required and the Educator is placed on a Self-Directed Growth Plan.
- b. If the Evaluator determines that the Educator is making substantial progress toward proficiency, the Evaluator shall place the Educator on a Directed Growth Plan.
- c. If the Evaluator determines that the Educator is not making substantial progress toward proficiency, or the Educator's practice remains at a level of unsatisfactory, the Evaluator shall recommend to the Superintendent that the Educator be dismissed.