

## Databases on State Teacher and Principal Evaluation Policies (STEP Database and SPEP Database)—Comprehensive Comparison

For a list of state references shown in brackets (e.g., [RI-2], [DC-5]), please click the title of the state desired.

Note to user: If the answer to a question is listed as "**Not specified**," the researcher was unable to locate sufficient information to provide an accurate answer.

| Component 1: Evaluation System Goals   |  |  |
|--|--|--|
| System Goals   | <a href="#">Massachusetts</a>  | <a href="#">New Jersey</a>   |
| <p><b>A. According to the state, what are the goals and purposes of the evaluation system?</b></p> | <p>The overall goals for the new regulations articulated by the department include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• "Promote growth and development of leaders and teachers,</li> <li>• Place student learning at the center, using multiple measures of student learning, growth and achievement,</li> <li>• Recognize excellence in teaching and leading,</li> <li>• Set a high bar for professional teaching status, and</li> <li>• Shorten timelines for improvement."</li> </ul> <p>[MA-11, p. 80]</p> <p>The purposes of the evaluation system, as specified under state law and regulations, are to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Promote student learning, growth, and achievement</li> <li>• Provide educators with "feedback for improvement, enhanced opportunities for professional growth, and clear structures for accountability"</li> <li>• Provide "a record of facts and assessments for personnel decisions"</li> </ul> <p>[MA-5, sec. 35.01(2)]</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Establish a universal vision of highly effective teaching practice based on a common language and clear expectations.</li> <li>• Implement teacher practice measures that yield accurate and differentiated levels of performance.</li> <li>• Provide teachers with timely, actionable, and data-driven feedback.</li> <li>• Provide teachers with targeted professional development opportunities aligned to assessment and feedback to support their growth.</li> <li>• Use multiple measures of performance data to inform personnel decisions.</li> <li>• Increase student achievement for all students by ensuring that every student has access to a highly effective teacher.</li> </ul> <p>[NJ-18, p. 5]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Raise student achievement.</li> <li>• Provide specific feedback to educators.</li> <li>• Inform the provision of aligned professional development.</li> <li>• Inform personnel decisions.</li> </ul> <p>[NJ-4, sec. 2(a)]</p> |

|   |   |  |
|---|---|--|
| <p><b>B. Are the goals aligned with the state strategic plan or other teacher reform initiatives?</b></p> | <p>Yes. The goals are aligned with the state's overall education effectiveness goals, the state's Race to the Top initiatives, and the state's ESEA flexibility request [MA-3, p. 10; MA-11, pp. 79–82].</p>  | <p>Yes, the proposed system goals align with governor's reform agenda. One of the goals is to improve teacher and leader effectiveness with data-supported evaluations. Through an executive order, the governor created a task force to recommend an evaluation framework [NJ-13]. Excellent Educators for New Jersey is the initiative to pilot the new teacher evaluation system [NJ-10].</p> |
| <p><b>C. Are the goals and standards aligned with teacher preparation and certification programs?</b></p> | <p>Overhaul and alignment of preparation program approval, leadership license standards, and the development of teacher-leadership standards is underway as per the state's Race to the Top initiatives [MA-3, pp. 105, 128].</p> <p>In future years, certification requirements for teachers will likewise be reviewed to ensure their alignment with the goals and standards for evaluation and to foster an aligned policy framework for educator effectiveness [MA-3, pp. 39–40].</p> | <p>Not specified</p>   |
| <p><b>Standards</b></p>   | <p><a href="#"><u>Massachusetts</u></a></p>   | <p><a href="#"><u>New Jersey</u></a></p>   |
| <p><b>A. What are the state's teaching standards?</b></p>   | <p>Standards and Indicators of Effective Teaching Practice [MA-5, sec. 35.03]</p>   | <p>New Jersey Professional Standards for Teachers and Leaders [NJ-6]</p>   |
| <p><b>B. When were the standards last revised?</b></p>  | <p>June 28, 2011 [MA-5, sec. 35.03]</p>   | <p>July 2004 [NJ-6, p. 1]</p>  |
| <p><b>C. Are they aligned with InTASC standards?</b></p>  | <p>Not directly</p>   | <p>Yes [New Jersey Department of Education, personal communication]</p>  |
| <p><b>D. Are they aligned with principal evaluation standards?</b></p>                                    | <p>Yes [MA-5, sec. 35.04]</p>   | <p>No, New Jersey currently uses the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) standards that were developed in 1996. New Jersey plans to adopt the updated ISLLC's Educational Leadership Policy Standards from</p>  |

|   |  |  |
|---|--|--|
|   |  | 2008 [NJ-5, p. 27; NY-19, p. 82].  |
| <p><b>E. What areas do the standards cover?</b></p> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Curriculum, planning, and assessment</li> <li>2. Teaching all students</li> <li>3. Family and community engagement</li> <li>4. Professional culture</li> </ol> <p>[MA-5, sec. 35.03]</p> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Subject-matter knowledge</li> <li>2. Human growth and development</li> <li>3. Diverse learners</li> <li>4. Instructional planning and strategies</li> <li>5. Assessment</li> <li>6. Learning environment</li> <li>7. Special needs</li> <li>8. Communication</li> <li>9. Collaboration and partnerships</li> <li>10. Professional development</li> </ol> <p>[NJ-6, pp. 9–18]</p> |

## Component 2: Stakeholder Investment and Communication Plan

| Stakeholders, Roles, and Feedback  | <u>Massachusetts</u>   | <u>New Jersey</u>   |
|--|--|---|
| <p><b>A. Did the state mandate (or recommend) which stakeholders are or were involved in creating the evaluation system?</b></p> | <p>In May 2010, the state board of education in Massachusetts mandated the creation of a Task Force on the Evaluation of Teachers and Administrators to review and recommend revisions to existing regulations on teacher evaluation [MA-12, p. 30].</p> | <p>Yes, mandated stakeholder involvement in the new teacher evaluation system through the Educator Effectiveness Task Force, a committee composed of teachers, school leaders, state legislators, and representatives from the New Jersey School Boards Association, the Garden State Coalition of Schools, the New Jersey Association of School Administrators, the New Jersey Principals and Supervisors Association, the New Jersey Education Association, and the American Federation of Teachers. Another committee, the Education Pilot Advisory Committee, was established to advise New Jersey's Department of Education on the implementation of the pilot. The committee is composed of teachers, principals, superintendents, administrators, parents, and the higher education community.</p> <p>Each pilot district also convenes its own district evaluation pilot advisory committee to discuss challenges and provide feedback to the state on the program and its implementation. Each district evaluation pilot advisory committee has named members to also serve on the state Evaluation Pilot Advisory Committee to ensure district concerns are reaching the state. The district evaluation pilot advisory committees must include representation from the following groups: teachers from each school level (e.g., elementary, middle, high school) composing at least one quarter of committee membership, central office administrators overseeing the teacher evaluation process, the superintendent,</p> |

|  |   |   |
|--|---|---|
|  |   | <p>administrators conducting evaluations, a special education administrator, a parent, and the local school board. In addition, the committee must include a data coordinator who is responsible for managing all data components of the district evaluation system. At the discretion of the superintendent, membership may also be extended to representatives of other groups such as counselors, child study team members, instructional coaches, new teacher mentors, and students. One member of the advisory committee is identified as the program liaison to the New Jersey Department of Education [ NJ-7, sec. D, pp. 22–24; NJ-8; NJ-9; NJ-13; NJ-18, p. 15; NJ-19, p. 15].</p> |
| <p><b>A1. If yes, what roles did stakeholder groups play—advisory or authoritative?</b></p>  | <p>Advisory [MA-12, p. 30]</p> <p>In addition, the state created a Leadership Steering Committee for Educator Evaluation to monitor implementation of the new teacher evaluation system [MA-17, p. 14].</p>   | <p>Advisory [NJ-5, p. 10; NJ-7, sec. D, pp. 22–23]</p>  |
| <p><b>B. Did the state mandate (or recommend) how constituent feedback was integrated into the redesign effort? (methods and response)</b></p> | <p>The task force submitted its recommendations to the board of education in March 2011. A modified version of these recommendations with added specificity on the use of student performance data was included in the draft regulations submitted by the Commissioner of Elementary and Secondary Education in April 2011. The regulations then were made available for public comment for two months. During the public comment period, the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education received over 500 comments and held six regional forums that included over 700 teachers, administrators, and other stakeholders. The feedback was vetted by department staff and much of it was incorporated into the final recommendations submitted to the board of education in June 2011 [MA-1, pp. 2–3; MA-2;</p> | <p>Yes, recommends that all LEAs must include feedback from teachers and any stakeholder group deemed appropriate based on based on performance goals [NJ-16, p. 82].</p>   |

|   |  |   |
|---|--|---|
|   | MA-16].  |   |
| <p><b>C. Whose feedback was solicited? (pilot participants, teachers, etc.)</b></p> | <p>The Task Force on the Evaluation of Teachers and Administrators included 40 people from the leadership of statewide organizations of teachers, principals, superintendents, school committees, parent organizations, experts in evaluation and measurement, classroom practitioners, business representatives, and a student representative [MA-12, pp. 2, 8]. The public comment period enabled all stakeholder groups, educators, and interested citizens to contribute feedback [MA-1, p. 2].</p> <p>The state also seeks ongoing feedback from teachers, administrators, and stakeholders through feedback from information sessions and professional development opportunities and stakeholder comments on updated draft documents posted to the Massachusetts Department of Education website [MA-11, p. 83].</p> | <p>The Education Pilot Advisory Committee was established to advise and provide feedback on the implementation of the pilot to the New Jersey State Department of Education. The committee is composed of teachers, principals, superintendents, administrators, parents, and the higher education community. Each pilot district convenes its own district evaluation pilot advisory committee to discuss challenges and provide feedback to the state on the program and its implementation. Each district evaluation pilot advisory committee has nominated members to also serve on the state Education Pilot Advisory Committee to ensure district concerns are reaching the state. The district evaluation pilot advisory committees must include representation from the following groups: teachers from each school level (e.g., elementary, middle, high school) composing at least one quarter of committee membership, central office administrators overseeing the teacher evaluation process, the superintendent, administrators conducting evaluations, a special education administrator, a parent, and the local school board. In addition, the committee must include a data coordinator who is responsible for managing all data components of the district evaluation system. At the discretion of the superintendent, membership may also be extended to representatives of other groups such as counselors, child study team members, instructional coaches, new teacher mentors and students. One member of the advisory committee is identified as the program liaison to the New Jersey Department of Education [NJ-8; NJ-9; NJ-18, p. 15; NJ-19, p. 15].</p> |
| <p><b>Communication Plan</b></p>  | <p><u><a href="#">Massachusetts</a></u></p>  | <p><u><a href="#">New Jersey</a></u></p>  |

|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
| <p><b>A. Did the state develop a communication plan to keep the broader school community informed?</b></p> | <p>The state does not have a publicly available communication plan. The state uses multiple communication mechanisms developed and recommended by the task force, including webinars, regional and stakeholder meetings, a dedicated website, a frequently asked questions document, and periodic updates on implementation ("Commissioner's Updates"). The state also communicates with stakeholders through meetings of the professional organizations of superintendents, principals, and other educators to communicate with their stakeholder groups [MA-7; MA-11, p. 85; Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, personal communication]. The state used Race to the Top funds to appoint an implementation specialist who is overseeing the communication strategy [MA-4, p. 32; MA-13, pp. 4–5].</p>   | <p>Yes, the state created a model communication plan for districts participating in the pilot. This model includes suggested components and timelines [NJ-11].</p> |
| <p><b>A1. If yes, what kind of information was communicated and to which audiences?</b></p>                | <p>The Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education shared information and invited feedback on the proposed regulations via regional forums and numerous stakeholder group presentations. For implementation, a comprehensive training and outreach strategy was developed involving both face-to-face and Web-based opportunities for feedback. A dedicated webpage with a link to the department's home page provides the public and the field with access to pertinent updates, documents, and information. A dedicated e-mail address provides opportunities for public feedback and questions as implementation proceeds. Other updates on implementation are sent out to district leaders, as needed. The department is developing a model system that districts can choose to adopt or adapt (or develop their own systems that conform to the regulations). Extensive outreach and training materials are being planned to support the model</p> | <p>The model communication plan audiences include teachers, principals, school boards, central offices, students, and parents [NJ-11, pp. 2–3].</p>                |

|  |   |   |
|--|---|---|
|  | system [MA-7].  |   |
| <p><b>A2. If yes, what modes of communication were used?</b></p>                               | <p>The state maintains a webpage with regular updates [MA-7; MA-10] and has produced a slide show detailing the model evaluation system [MA-8], a "frequently asked questions" document [MA-6], and a two-page overview document [MA-9]. Presentations are regularly made to stakeholder groups and educators, and additional webinars and regional outreach are planned to coincide with the release of the model system of educator evaluation called for in the regulations [MA-7]. These are supplemented by department press releases and press briefings on the new regulations [Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, personal communication].</p> | <p>The model communication plan recommends that districts use e-mails and district events such as faculty/board meetings and surveys and create a website [NJ-11, pp. 2–3].</p>             |
| <p><b>A3. If yes, what was the basic timeline for communicating aspects of the reform?</b></p> | <p>From 2010 forward, the goals of the new evaluation framework have been a consistent part of the commissioner's and department's messaging. Specific communication plans are tied to implementation and roll out of the model system that the department is preparing. Since this is a primary RTTT initiative, communication strategies receive high-level stakeholder review by a formal statewide RTTT stakeholder advisory committee, as well [Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, personal communication].</p>   | <p>By September 30, 2011, each district must complete their website and create a district evaluation pilot advisory committee. The remaining timelines are not specified [NJ-11, p. 1].</p> |

| <b>Component 3: Selecting Measures</b>  |   |   |
|---|---|---|
| <b>Student Growth Measures (Tested Subjects/Grades)</b>   | <b><u>Massachusetts</u></b>   | <b><u>New Jersey</u></b>  |
| <b>A. Does the state mandate (or recommend) that student growth measures be included?</b>   | Yes, the state requires "multiple measures of student learning, growth, and achievement" [MA-5, sec. 35.07(1)(a)] and mandates that "at least two state or district-wide measures of student learning gains" must be included [MA-5, sec. 35.09(2)(a)].   | Yes, mandates [NJ-1, sec. 6A:32-4.4; NJ-4, secs. 3 and 18(b)(2); NJ-5, p. 20; NJ-7, sec. D, pp. 16–17]  |
| <b>A1. If yes, what model of measurement does the state require? (value-added model, percentile model, gain scores, covariate-adjusted, layered)</b>                          | The state requires multiple measures of student learning, growth, and achievement, one of which should be "state-wide growth measure(s) where available, including the MCAS Student Growth Percentile and the Massachusetts English Proficiency Assessment (MEAP)" [MA-5, sec. 35.07(1)(a)(3)]. | Percentile model [NJ-7, sec. D, p. 18; NJ-12, pp. 28–29]  |
| <b>B. Does the state mandate (or recommend) an inclusion/exclusion criterion that will determine which teachers will have the growth model included in their final score?</b> | Yes [MA-5, sec. 35.07(1)(a)(2)]   | No; but the state plans to implement an inclusion/exclusion criterion as outlined by the task force and included in the state's ESEA waiver proposal. In 2011–12, teachers in reading and mathematics in Grades 4–8 in pilot districts will have student growth measures included in their summative ratings. Districts must identify an alternative measure of performance based on student achievement, such as student learning objectives, for teachers in nontested grades and subjects [NJ-5, p. 22; NJ-16, pp. 79–80]. |
| <b>B1. If yes, what is the criterion for inclusion/exclusion?</b>   | Yes, only teachers with students who have statewide assessment data on MCAS or MEPA tests over a two-year period will be eligible for the student growth percentile model [MA-5, sec. 35.07(1)(a)(2)].  | Not applicable  |
| <b>Student Growth Measures (Nontested Subjects/Grades)</b>  | <b><u>Massachusetts</u></b>   | <b><u>New Jersey</u></b>  |

|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
| <b>A. Does the state mandate (or recommend) that student growth measures be included?</b>      | Yes, mandates [MA-5, secs. 35.07(1)(a), 35.09(2)(a)].  | Yes, mandates [NJ-1, sec. 6A:32-4.4; NJ-4, sec. 3 and 18(b)(3-4); NJ-7, sec. D, pp. 16–17; NJ-16, p. 79]   |
| <b>A1. If yes, does the state mandate (or recommend) alternative growth measures?</b>          | Yes, mandates [MA-5, sec.35.07(1)(a)(1)–(5)].  | Yes, recommends [NJ-4, sec. 3; NJ-16, pp. 79–80]   |
| <b>A1a. If yes, are the alternative measures state, district, or locally created measures?</b> | State and district measures will be used in assessing educator impact on student learning, growth, and achievement. The results of locally created measures may be used in setting goals and as evidence of educator performance against standards and goal attainment. [MA-5, sec. 35.07(1)(a)(1)–(5), sec. 35.09(2)(a)(2)].  | The task force recommends that for teachers of nontested grades and subjects, districts identify or develop alternative measures of performance. These measures do not need to be derived from standardized test scores and could be based on other measures, such as student learning objectives. The New Jersey State Department of Education will provide guidance on the selection and use of these measures [NJ-16, pp. 79–80]. |
| <b>B. Do the alternative measures rely on any of the following?</b>                            | Districts determine which nonstate measures should be used to assess a teacher's impact on student learning [MA-5, sec. 35.07; MA-8, p. 16, but the measures must be "comparable across schools, grades, and subject matter district-wide" [MA-5, sec. 35.09(2)(a)(2)]. The Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education is required to provide districts with additional guidance in developing measures of student learning by July 2012 [MA-5, sec. 35.11(4)(b)]. | Yes, interim and benchmark assessments [NJ-18, pp. 54–62].   |
| <b>B1. Classroom-based assessments</b>   | Yes [MA-5, sec. 35.07(1)(a)(1)]  | No   |
| <b>B2. Interim or benchmark assessments</b>  | Not specified  | Yes [NJ-18, pp. 54–62]   |
| <b>B3. Curriculum-based assessments</b>  | Not specified  | No   |
| <b>C. Do the alternative measures include any of the following?</b>                            | Districts determine which nonstate measures should be used to assess a teacher's impact on student learning [MA-5, sec. 35.07; MA-8, p. 16]; however, the measures must be "comparable   | Yes, portfolios, pre- and post-tests, and SLOs [NJ-18, pp. 54–62].   |

|   |   |  |
|---|---|--|
|   | across schools, grades, and subject matter district-wide" [MA-5, sec. 35.09(2)(a)(2)]. The Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education is required to provide districts with additional guidance in developing measures of student learning by July 2012 [MA-5, sec. 35.11(4)(b)].                         |  |
| <b>C1. The four P's: projects, portfolios, performances, products</b>             | Yes, if selected by the district [MA-8, p. 16].   | Yes [NJ-4, sec. 3; NJ-18, pp. 54–62]   |
| <b>C2. Pre- and posttests</b>   | Yes, if selected by the district [MA-5, sec. 35.02 (definition of district-determined measures)].   | Yes [NJ-18, pp. 54–62]   |
| <b>C3. Teacher-developed item banks and assessments</b>                           | Yes, if selected by the district [MA-5, sec. 35.02 (definition of district-determined measures)].   | Not specified  |
| <b>C4. Student learning objectives (SLOs)</b>                                     | Yes [MA-5, sec. 35.07(1)(a)(2)]   | Yes [NJ-16, pp. 79–80; NJ-18, pp. 54–62]   |
| <b>Measures of Teacher Performance (Observation)</b>                              | <a href="#"><u>Massachusetts</u></a>  | <a href="#"><u>New Jersey</u></a>  |
| <b>A. Are any observation instruments mandated (or recommended) by the state?</b> | Observations, including unannounced observation, is required; however, no specific instrument is identified [MA-5, sec. 35.07(1)(b)]. The Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education is developing rubrics for a variety of educator roles as part of the state's model evaluation system [MA-10; MA-15]. | Yes, recommends a number of instruments. The state has developed a list of instruments from which districts may choose. In addition, the state has developed specific criteria and procedures that instruments must meet for the pilot project [NJ-7, sec. D, pp. 25–26; NJ-18, pp. 47, 51]. |
| <b>A1. If yes, what is/are the observation instrument(s)?</b>                     | The Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education is developing rubrics for a variety of educator roles as part of the state's model evaluation system [MA-10; MA-15].   | Not specified  |
| <b>B. Has the instrument been piloted?</b>  | Not specified; however, the draft teacher effectiveness rubrics are being piloted during 2011–12 in 34 Level 4 schools, Chelsea High School, and 11 districts and 4 collaboratives who  | Districts will pilot their choice of instrument in 2012–13 [NJ-18, pp. 47, 51].  |

|  |  |   |
|--|--|---|
|  | volunteered to serve as “early adopter” districts [MA-10; MA-15].  |   |
| <b>C. What are the labels attached to the levels of performance on the observation rubric? (proficient, distinguished, etc.)</b>         | Not yet publicly released; however, draft versions suggest exemplary, proficient, needs improvement, and unsatisfactory [MA-10; MA-13; MA-15].   | Not applicable  |
| <b>D. Are these labels aligned with the system-level performance levels?</b>   | Yes [MA-5, sec. 35.08(1)(a)–(d)]   | Not applicable  |
| <b>E. How is a final rating determined for the various domains measured by the observation rubric?</b>                                   | The evaluator determines an overall rating of educator performance based on the evaluator's professional judgment and an examination of evidence that demonstrates the educator's performance against Performance Standards and evidence of attainment of the Educator Plan goals [MA-5, sec. 35.06(7)]. | Not applicable  |
| <b>Details for Observation Methods</b>   | <b><u>Massachusetts</u></b>  | <b><u>New Jersey</u></b>  |
| <b>A. Does the state mandate (or recommend) the frequency and format of observation differentiated by status or years of experience?</b> | To some extent, as part of general requirements for formative and summative evaluation [MA-5, sec. 35.06]. The evaluation cycle must include unannounced observations of classroom practice [MA-5, sec. 35.07(1)(b)].  | Yes, mandates [NJ-1, sec. 6A:32-4.4–4.5; NJ-3, 18A:27-3.1; NJ-15; NJ-18, p. 23; NJ-16, p. 79]   |
| <b>A1. If no, what are the state's requirements for frequency of observation for all teachers?</b>                                       | Not applicable   | Not applicable  |
| <b>A2. If yes, briefly describe the state's requirements for different groups of teachers.</b>   | Teachers without professional teacher status or in a new assignment shall be evaluated annually at a minimum [MA-5, sec. 35.06(8)]. For experienced teachers, their frequency of evaluation depends on their previous performance ranking and student learning impact rating.                            | The state mandates that all teachers be evaluated annually and that teachers rated as ineffective or partially effective in their previous summative evaluation receive a midyear evaluation as well [NJ-4, sec. 13(b–c)]. Nontenured teachers are formally observed at least three times a year and not less than once a semester. The number of required observations |

- Proficient or exemplary with moderate or high impact rating: summative evaluation every two years with a formative evaluation at the end of the first year of their Educator Plan
- Proficient or exemplary with low impact rating: summative evaluation at the end of a one-year Educator Plan
- Needs improvement: summative evaluation at the end of a one-year Educator Plan
- Unsatisfactory: placed on an improvement plan (length determined by evaluator) and given summative evaluation at the end of the plan

[MA-5, sec. 35.06(7)(a)–(c)]

may be reduced after one year of teaching [NJ-3, 18A:27-3.1]. Tenured teachers are formally observed at least annually [NJ-1, sec. 6A:32-4.5].

The state recommends that all nontenured teachers be formally observed three times a year and tenured teachers be formally observed twice a year [NJ-15; NJ-16, p. 79]. The state recommends that at least two informal observations be conducted annually [NJ-14].

For pilot districts in 2012–13, nontenured teachers of "core content areas" (Math, Language Arts, Science, and Social Studies teachers in Grades K–5) must be observed a minimum of five times over the school year. Nontenured teachers of "non-core content areas" must be observed a minimum of three times over the school year. Tenured teachers of "core content areas" must be observed a minimum of four times over the school year. Tenured teachers of "non-core content areas" must be observed a minimum of two times over the school year. The state also stipulates the number of observations that must have pre- and postconferences, the number of unannounced observations, observations conducted by an external evaluator, minimum durations of observations, and which observations must be double scored [NJ-18, pp. 23–24].

**B. Does the state mandate (or recommend) how many evaluators are used?**

Not specified

Although not mandated, the state requires participants in the 2012–13 pilot program to have double scoring for at least one observation for teachers of "core content areas" (Math,

|   |   |  |
|---|---|--|
|   |   | <p>Language Arts, Science, and Social Studies teachers in Grades K–5) and recommends double scoring for all teachers. One double-scored evaluation may count as two observations for "core content area" teachers. In addition, the state requires the use of both external and internal evaluators [NJ-18, pp. 23–24].</p>  |
| <p><b>B1. If yes, who evaluates? (principals, teams, peers, etc.)</b></p> | <p>Not specified; however, the state's regulation explicitly allows LEAs to set up Peer Assistance and Review (PAR) programs through local collective bargaining processes [MA-5, sec. 35.10(1)].</p> | <p>The state mandates that someone with an administrative, principal, or supervisor's license evaluate [NJ-1, sec. 6A:32-4.4–4.5; NJ-4, sec. 3].</p> <p>The task force recommends that formal observations be conducted by supervisors, such as principals or assistant principals. Informal observations, however, could be conducted by individuals designated by the principal, such as another teacher, coaches, or a mentor [NJ-14]. The state recommends that least one formal observation be conducted by an evaluator who does not work in the same school as the teacher [NJ-16, p. 79].</p> <p>For the 2012–13 pilot districts, all observations are considered formal [NJ-18, p. 23]. Observations may be conducted by appropriately certified supervisory staff, and/or those having shown proof of mastery or certification using the teaching practice evaluation instrument and who do not work in the same school as the teacher [New Jersey Department of Education, personal communication].</p> |
| <p><b>C. Does the state mandate (or</b></p>                               | <p>The state requires that the evaluation cycle begin</p>   | <p>Yes, mandates that each observation will be</p>   |

|   |   |  |
|---|---|--|
| <p><b>recommend) that opportunities be provided for teacher reflection on the results of the observation? (like pre- and postobservation conferences)</b></p> | <p>with self-assessment [MA-5, sec. 35.06(2)]. The state requires that a formative evaluation take place midcycle in which the educator and evaluator review progress towards goals and performance against standards [MA-5, sec. 35.06(5)(a); MA-8, p. 8].</p> | <p>followed by a conference between the observer or supervisor and the teacher [NJ-1, sec. 6A:32-4.4–4.5; NJ-4, sec. 3 and 18(b)(7)].</p> <p>The task force recommends that, in addition to a postconference, formal observations include a preconference. The task force also recommends that a copy of each teacher's observation results be placed in that teacher's file, including recommendations and praise [NJ-14].</p>  |
| <p><b>Additional Measures of Teacher Performance</b></p>  | <p><u><a href="#">Massachusetts</a></u></p>   | <p><u><a href="#">New Jersey</a></u></p>   |
| <p><b>A. Does the state mandate (or recommend) measures other than observation?</b></p>   | <p>Yes, mandates [MA-5, sec. 35.07].</p>  | <p>Yes, recommends [NJ-5, p. 17; NJ-7, sec. D, p. 25].</p> <p>For pilot districts (2011–12 and 2012–13), another measure of practice, other than observation, must be included [NJ-18, p. 24].</p>   |
| <p><b>A1. If yes, what are the additional measures?</b></p>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Artifact review</li> <li>• Self-assessments</li> <li>• Evaluator's professional judgment</li> <li>• Eventually (2013–14) student, staff, and possibly parent feedback</li> </ul> <p>[MA-5, sec. 35.07]</p>             | <p>The task force recommends that an additional measure of teacher practice be determined by LEAs, which could include a review of a teacher portfolio or student or parent surveys [NJ-5, p. 17; NJ-7, sec. D, p. 25; NJ-16, p. 79]. LEAs participating in the 2012–13 pilot must include one of these measures or a similar measure as an additional measure of teacher practice and submit a rationale for its selection to the New Jersey Department of Education. The New Jersey Department of Education may require LEAs to choose a different measure if it does not adequately meet professional standards [NJ-18, p. 24].</p> |
| <p><b>B. How are the alternative measures</b></p>   | <p>The state indicates that evaluators should use</p>   | <p>Incorporated into the final summative score as</p>  |

|  |   |   |
|--|---|---|
| <b>incorporated into the evaluation?</b>   | their professional judgment to incorporate all sources of evidence in determining final ratings for the teacher on each standard included in the teacher effectiveness rubric [MA-5, sec. 35.07(2) (a)–(b); MA-8, p. 15]. | part of the Teacher Practice component along with observation [NJ-5, p. 17; NJ-18, p. 18; NJ-16, p. 75].  |
| <b>B1. Included in a rubric with an observation</b>  | Yes [MA-8, p. 15]   | Not applicable  |
| <b>B2. Included in a rubric, but separate from any observation</b>                             | Not applicable  | Not applicable  |
| <b>B3. Not included in a rubric, but calculated or incorporated into final summative score</b> | Not applicable  | Yes, the task force recommends that LEAs determine the weight of the alternative measures, which can be between 5 and 50 percent of the total score for teacher practice [NJ-5, p. 12; NJ-16, p. 75]. For pilot districts in 2012–13, the alternate measures are included in the Teacher Practice component along with observation and compose 5–10 percent of a teacher's summative rating [NJ-18, p. 18]. |

| Component 4: System Structure  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
| Regulatory Framework   | <a href="#">Massachusetts</a>  | <a href="#">New Jersey</a>   |
| <b>A. Does the state mandate (or recommend) the use of multiple measures?</b>  | Yes, mandates [MA-5, sec. 35.07].  | Yes, mandates [NJ-4, sec. 3 and 18(b)(4)]  |
| <b>A1. If yes, does the state mandate (or recommend) different weights for various measures?</b>   | No   | Yes, recommends a range of weights for each measure. The task force recommends that the total evaluation score be divided evenly between student achievement and teacher practice, each domain accounting for 50 percent of the total score [NJ-5, p. 12; NJ-16, p. 75].<br><br>For the 2012–13 pilot program, student achievement and teaching practice each compose 50 percent of a teacher's summative rating for teachers of tested grades and subjects (Language Arts and Math, Grades 4–8). For teachers of nontested grades and subjects, student achievement may compose 15–50 percent and teaching practice may compose 50–85 percent of a teacher's summative rating [NJ-18, p. 18]. |
| <b>A2. If no, does the state provide an alternative method for combining the data from different measures? (comparison matrix, etc.)</b> | Not specified; however, the state indicates that evaluators should use their professional judgment to incorporate all sources of evidence in determining final ratings for the teacher on each standard included in the teacher effectiveness rubric [MA-5, sec. 35.07(2)(a)–(b); MA-8, pp. 15-16]. The state does mandate that a teacher must be rated as "proficient" or higher on the Planning, Curriculum, and Assessment and the Teaching All Students standards in order to receive a "Proficient" rating overall [MA-5, sec. 35.08(4)]. | Not applicable   |

|  |  |   |
|--|--|---|
|  | <p>The state does provide a matrix for combining the final summative score with the student learning impact ratings; however, the matrix does not generate a final composite score. Instead, it determines which type of Educator Plan a teacher will be assigned to based on their scores on the two ratings and whether educators rated exemplary with moderate or high growth will be eligible for new responsibilities, reward, or commendation [MA-8, p. 12].</p>   |   |
| <p><b>B. Does the state mandate (or recommend) a continuous cycle of teacher goal setting and professional development as part of the evaluation system?</b></p> | <p>Yes [MA-8, pp. 7, 8]</p>  | <p>Yes, mandates [NJ-1, secs. 6A:32-4.4 and 4.5; NJ-4, secs. 3 and 16]</p>  |
| <p><b>B1. If yes, briefly describe the goal-setting cycle and any links to professional development.</b></p>   | <p>Teachers complete a self-assessment to use with their evaluators in creating a development plan ("Educator Plan") that identifies specific goals (both team and individual) related to both practice and student learning. The teacher implements the steps outlined in the plan, which identifies needed professional development and support. Formative evaluation and summative evaluation processes are used to assess progress and contribute to a teacher's final performance evaluation rating [MA-5, sec. 35.06 (3)–(5); MA-8, p. 8].</p> | <p>The state mandates that all teachers have an individual professional development plan tied to evaluation results. The professional development plan identifies individual, district, and school goals and professional development activities, and is intended to foster professional growth and focus on areas of improvement, particularly on improving student learning. The plan also includes timelines for implementation, responsibilities for implementation, and supports to be provided [NJ-1, secs. 6A:32-4.4 and 4.5; NJ-4, secs. 3 and 16].</p> <p>The state also mandates that mentoring be provided to new teachers [NJ-4, sec. 15; NJ-7, sec. D, pp. 33–35]. For the 2012–13 pilot program, the state requires LEAs to identify how they will support professional development, including professional learning communities and coaching [NJ-18, p. 26].</p> |

| Weights of Measures   | <u>Massachusetts</u>  | <u>New Jersey</u>  |
|---|-----------------------|--|
| <p><b>A. If multiple measures, how much weight is given to student growth measures?</b></p> | <p>Not applicable</p> | <p>The task force recommends that 35–45 percent of the summative score be composed of student achievement measures. The student achievement domain includes three possible measures: 70–90 percent of the student achievement score may be based on student growth, 10 percent may be based on a schoolwide performance measure, and up to 20 percent may be based on another district-chosen performance measure. The teacher practice domain includes at least two measures: 50–95 percent of the teacher practice score based on classroom observations and 5–50 percent based on other measures of practice [NJ-5, p. 12; NJ-15; NJ-16, p. 75].</p> <p>For 2012–13 pilots, the state differentiates between teachers of tested subjects and grades (Language Arts and Math, Grades 4–8) and teachers of nontested subjects and grades. Student achievement must compose 50 percent of the summative score, but LEAs may choose how to weight each measure. For teachers of tested grades and subjects, student growth (measured through New Jersey State Assessments) composes 35–45 percent of the summative score, schoolwide performance measures compose 5–10 percent of the summative score, and up to 10 percent of the summative score may consist of other optional performance measures. For teachers of nontested grades and subjects, student achievement must compose 15–50 percent of the summative score. Student assessments or performance-based measures, including any optional measures, compose 10–45 percent of the summative score, and schoolwide</p> |

|   |                       |   |
|---|-----------------------|---|
|   |                       | <p>performance measures compose 5–10 percent of the summative score [NJ-18, p. 18].</p>   |
| <p><b>B. How much weight is given to classroom observation?</b></p> | <p>Not applicable</p> | <p>The task force recommends that 25 to 47.5 percent of the summative score be composed of classroom observations . The teacher practice domain includes at least two measures: 50 to 95 percent of the teacher practice score may be based on classroom observations and 5 to 50 percent may be based on other measures of practice [NJ-5, p. 12; NJ-15; NJ-16, p. 75]</p> <p>For 2012–13 pilots, , the state differentiates between teachers of tested subjects and grades (Language Arts and Math, Grades 4–8) and teachers of nontested subjects and grades. Teacher practice must compose 50 percent of the summative score, but LEAs may choose how to weight each measure. For teachers of tested grades and subjects, teacher observation composes 40–45 percent of the summative score and other measures of practice compose 5–10 percent of the summative score. For teachers of nontested grades and subjects, teacher observation composes 45–80 percent of the summative score and other measures of practice compose 5–10 percent of the summative score [NJ-18, p. 18].</p> |
| <p><b>B1. If yes, how much weight was given to other areas?</b></p> | <p>Not applicable</p> | <p>Of the summative score, 5 percent for a schoolwide measure of student achievement, up to 10 percent for an additional performance measure of student achievement, and 2.5–25 percent for additional measures of teacher practice, such as portfolios or student surveys [NJ-15]</p>  |

|   |   |  |
|---|---|--|
|   |   | For the 2012–13 pilot program, schoolwide measures of student achievement compose 5–10 percent of the summative score, additional performance measures of student achievement compose up to 10 percent of the summative score, and other measures of performance (which may include portfolios or surveys) compose 5–10 percent of the summative score [NJ-18, p. 18]. |
| <b>C. Are the weights stable or do they fluctuate with teaching discipline and context?</b> | Not applicable  | Not yet determined—the weights may be stable for all teachers within each LEA, but the weights are likely to vary between LEAs [NJ-5, pp. 12–13; NJ-16, p. 75]. The weights may vary for teachers of tested and nontested grades, as they will for the 2012–13 pilot program [NJ-18, p. 18].   |
| <b>D. If applicable, what is the anticipated date for rolling out the system statewide?</b> | Race to the Top districts (approximately 66 percent of school districts in the state) will begin implementing the new evaluation system in fall 2012. The remaining districts will begin implementation in fall 2013, since all LEAs must adopt or implement evaluations systems consistent with state regulations by the 2013–14 school year [MA-5, sec. 35.11(1)(c); MA-11, p. 83]. | 2013–14 [NJ-14; NJ-16, p. 73]  |
| <b>Levels and Domains</b>   | <u><a href="#">Massachusetts</a></u>  | <u><a href="#">New Jersey</a></u>  |
| <b>A. Does the state mandate (or recommend) the number of proficiency levels?</b>           | Yes, mandates four levels for standards of teacher practice and three levels for impact on student learning [MA-5, sec. 35.08(1)(a)–(d), sec. 35.09(3)].  | Yes, mandates four levels [NJ-4, sec. 18(b)(1); NJ-7, sec. D, p. 24].  |
| <b>B. What are the labels attached to the levels? (basic, proficient, etc.)</b>             | Teachers earn two ratings. For the four standards focused on teacher practice and a teacher's goal attainment, teachers receive an overall summative rating attached to one of the four labels: exemplary, proficient, needs  | Highly effective, effective, partially effective, and ineffective [NJ-4, sec. 18(b)(1); NJ-5, p. 75; NJ-7, sec. D, p. 24; NJ-15].  |

|   |   |  |
|---|---|--|
|   | <p>improvement, and unsatisfactory [MA-5, sec. 35.08(1)(a)–(d)]. For the rating on an educator's impact on student learning, teachers are given a rating of low, medium, or high [MA-5, sec. 35.09 (3)]; however, this rating cannot be applied until measures for student learning have been identified and data is available for two years [MA-5, sec. 35.11(4)(c)].</p>  |  |
| <p><b>C. Are the levels attached to a career ladder? (novice, apprentice, leader, master, etc.)</b></p> | <p>Educators rated at proficient or above are eligible for additional roles, responsibilities, and compensation, as determined by the district and through collective bargaining, where applicable [MA-5, sec. 35.06(7)(c)]. Exemplary educators with moderate or high growth must be acknowledged or rewarded by the district with leadership roles, compensation, or public commendation [MA-5, sec. 35.08(7)]. To receive professional teacher status (tenure), educators must be rated proficient on all standards and overall [MA-5, sec. 35.08(6)].</p> | <p>Not yet determined—in its Race to the Top application, the state outlined plans to establish a career ladder. Teachers who earn a highly effective rating for three consecutive years will be eligible for promotion to Master Teacher status, but the state has not confirmed these plans [NJ-7, sec. D, p. 36].</p> |
| <p><b>D. What domains are covered by the evaluation system?</b></p>                                     | <p>The model system includes four standards of practice (Curriculum, Planning, and Assessment; Teaching All Students; Family and Community Engagement; Professional Culture). A separate rating assesses a teacher's impact on student learning [MA-8, pp. 10–12].</p>  | <p>1. Student Achievement<br/>2. Teacher Practice</p> <p>[NJ-5, p. 12; NJ-16, p. 75]</p>   |
| <p><b>E. Do the domains align with the state's teacher standards?</b></p>                               | <p>Yes [MA-5, sec. 35.03; MA-8, p. 10]</p>  | <p>Not directly, but the observation instruments must be aligned to the InTASC standards [NJ-18, p. 42].</p>   |

| Component 5: Evaluators   |  |   |
|---|--|---|
| Personnel   | <a href="#">Massachusetts</a>  | <a href="#">New Jersey</a>  |
| <b>A. Does the state provide the trained personnel who will use the rubrics or other sources of documentation?</b>  | No, but district superintendents are responsible for ensuring that all evaluators be trained appropriately [MA-1, sec. 35.11(7)]. The state is supporting district implementation through workshops, training videos, webinars, and approved providers who will support district implementation [MA-10].   | No, but the state will provide training to district-level evaluators in the 2012–13 school year [NJ-16, p. 205].  |
| <b>A1. If yes, to whom and what kind of training does the state provide for using data? (interpreting value-added scores, tracking progress, monitoring data)</b> | See above; the state also has placed data coaches in its regionally located district support and assistance centers to assist districts and educators [Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, personal communication].  | The state will provide training in the model framework, if chosen, and the student growth percentile [NJ-16, p. 205].   |
| <b>B. Does the state select evaluators, and if yes, what are the eligibility criteria?</b>  | No. District superintendents are "responsible for ensuring that all evaluators have training in the principals of supervision and evaluation" [MA-5, sec. 35.11(7)]. The state is, however, investing a large portion of its RTTT grant to support high-quality district implementation via workshops, training videos, webinars, and approved providers who will support district implementation [MA-10]. | Yes, the task force recommends that supervisors, such as principals and assistant principals, serve as evaluators [NJ-14].<br><br>For the 2012–13 pilot program, observations must also be scored by a certified external evaluator who does not work in the school of the teacher being evaluated [NJ-18, p. 23].                          |
| Training and Guidelines   | <a href="#">Massachusetts</a>  | <a href="#">New Jersey</a>  |
| <b>A. Does the state provide oversight to ensure that evaluators use the instrument with fidelity?</b>  | No. District superintendents are "responsible for ensuring that all evaluators have training in the principals of supervision and evaluation" [MA-5, sec. 35.11(7)]. However, the state is investing a large portion of its RTTT grant to support high-quality district implementation via workshops, training videos, webinars, and approved providers who will support district implementation [MA-10].  | Only during the initial implementation phase. The New Jersey Office of Education offered training for evaluators in pilot sites through their county offices and plans to implement training for all LEAs by 2012–13. LEAs are responsible for providing time to train evaluators on their observation protocols [NJ-7, sec. D, pp. 28–29]. |

|  |  |   |
|--|--|---|
|  |  | <p>For the 2012–13 pilot program, pilot districts will be required to submit data to the New Jersey Department of Education for analysis to ensure fair and consistent use of the teaching practice instruments [NJ-18, p. 20].</p> <p>For the 2012–13 pilot program, pilot districts will be required to submit data to the New Jersey Department of Education for analysis to ensure fair and consistent use of the teaching practice instruments [NJ-19, p. 20].</p> |
| <p><b>B. Has the state created mechanisms to retrain evaluators who are not implementing the system with fidelity?</b></p> | <p>Evaluators are evaluated, in part, on the quality of their evaluations, as per the new regulations [Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, personal communication].</p>                                | <p>No, LEAs are responsible for developing a process to ensure evaluators are accurate and implementing the system with fidelity for both the pilot programs and the full-scale evaluation system [NJ-14].</p>  |
| <p><b>C. Does the state provide examples and guidance in determining levels of proficiency and approval?</b></p>           | <p>The model system will contain rubrics for assessing educator practice for a range of educator profiles [MA-15].</p>   | <p>Not specified</p>  |
| <p><b>D. Does the state provide guidance or resources in maintaining a steady pool of trained evaluators?</b></p>          | <p>The state is investing a large portion of its RTTT grant to support high-quality district implementation via workshops, training videos, webinars, and approved providers who will support district implementation [MA-10].</p> | <p>For the 2012–13 pilot program, evaluators must show proof of mastery and achieve certification of the observation instrument [NJ-18, p. 20].</p>   |

| Component 6: Data Integrity   |  |   |
|---|--|---|
| Data Infrastructure and Validation  | <a href="#">Massachusetts</a>  | <a href="#">New Jersey</a>  |
| <b>A. Has the state provided, or has it plans to provide, a data infrastructure to link teachers to individual student data using unique identifiers?</b> | Yes, through the Education Personnel Information Management System (EPIMS), established in 2007 [MA-3, p. 58; MA-4, p. 71; Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, personal communication].  | New Jersey has a data infrastructure that uses unique identifiers for both students and teachers [NJ-7, sec. C, pp. 2, 5]. The state will have the ability to link individual teacher and student data by fall 2012 [NJ-5, p. 22; NJ-7, sec. C, pp. 5–7]. |
| <b>B. What data validation processes are in place? (teachers reviewing student lists, administrators monitoring input, software for auto validation)</b>  | The state will analyze all evaluation results and identify any irregularities, such as an unusual number of high or low evaluation ratings in one school [MA-4, p. 105].   | Yes, LEAs can download student identification numbers through NJ SMART's online portal and make any corrections and update any student data. The state also audits the information yearly to maintain overall data quality [NJ-7, sec. C, pp. 2–4].       |
| <b>C. How does the state ensure teacher/student confidentiality?</b>  | The state uses unique identifiers for both teachers and individual students to protect sensitive personal information in the data [MA-4, pp. 70–71].<br><br>In addition, any data that is created in connection with educator evaluation shall be considered confidential personnel information and is not subject to disclosure under the public records law [MA-5, sec. 35.07(1)(c)(2)–(3)]. | Not specified   |
| <b>D. Is there a system through which teachers and administrators can correct errors?</b>   | Roster verification will be one of the issues addressed in the guidance on district-determined measures the state will be publishing on or before July 2012. All RTTT districts have committed to incorporating SIF-compliant systems, which will ease the burden of roster verification on districts and educators and help ensure data quality [MA-3, p. 74].                                | Not specified   |
| Reporting   | <a href="#">Massachusetts</a>  | <a href="#">New Jersey</a>  |
| <b>A. Is teacher evaluation data able to be</b>   | The state will collect and analyze educator  | Yes, the state will publish aggregate evaluation  |

|  |   |   |
|--|---|---|
| <p><b>aggregated or disaggregated to depict results at various levels?</b></p>                             | <p>evaluation ratings annually under the new framework. These results will be made available to district review teams and will become a central component in the analysis of patterns in the distribution of ineffective, effective, and highly effective educators at the local, regional, and state levels. The analysis will identify any irregularities (e.g., high numbers of either ineffective or highly effective teachers in one school), and results will be used to prompt evaluation audits [MA-3, p. 101].</p> | <p>results at the state, LEA, and school level, and by school poverty quartile at the state and LEA level [NJ-16, p. 8].</p>  |
| <p><b>B. Do administrators and teachers have access to evaluation data?</b></p>                            | <p>The state is redesigning the Teacher Effectiveness and Quality Improvement Plan (TEQIP) tool to help districts use effectiveness data to inform district support, hiring, and placement decisions [MA-4, p. 105].</p>  | <p>Yes, in its Race to the Top application, New Jersey described its plans to develop an effectiveness-management system as part of the NJ SMART portal. This online dashboard will be designed for administrators to track student achievement and teacher effectiveness data. The online portal also will have an observation toolset that will track data from classroom observations [NJ-7, sec. C, p. 14].</p>   |
| <p><b>C. Has the state provided teachers with training to use the data to inform teacher practice?</b></p> | <p>The state also has placed data coaches in its regionally located district support and assistance centers to assist districts and educators [Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, personal communication].</p>   | <p>In its Race to the Top application, New Jersey committed to creating Web-based training modules [NJ-7, sec. C, p. 9]. The professional development modules will develop skills in the following areas:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Data interpretation and inference</li> <li>2. Data conversations</li> <li>3. Differentiated instruction</li> <li>4. Inquiry work and action-research</li> <li>5. Online collaboration</li> </ol> <p>[NJ-7, sec. C, pp. 16–17]</p> <p>These data training modules have not, however, been mentioned in any more recent information from the state since its Race to the Top application.</p> |

| Use of Data  | <u>Massachusetts</u>  | <u>New Jersey</u>  |
|--|---|--|
| <b>A. How frequently is evaluation data shared with the education community?</b>                             | Not yet determined  | Not yet determined—the state will make a decision on sharing evaluation results after the pilot program [New Jersey Department of Education, personal communication].                          |
| <b>B. What evaluation data is shared? (component scores, summative scores, school-level scores)</b>          | Not yet determined  | Not yet determined—the state will make a decision on sharing evaluation results after the pilot program [New Jersey Department of Education, personal communication].                          |
| <b>C. How are the evaluation results shared with the community? (website, press releases, town meetings)</b> | Not yet determined  | Aggregated teacher ratings must be publicly posted on every district's website, per State Fiscal Stabilization Fund requirements [New Jersey Department of Education, personal communication]. |
| <b>D. Is evaluation data used to inform changes in the evaluation design?</b>                                | Yes. The regulations specify that all information that may be linked to an individual educator shall be considered personnel information and shall not be subject to disclosure under the public records law [MA-5, sec. 35.11(6)]. | Yes, New Jersey plans to use the evaluation data after it has been in place for three years to inform any changes in the evaluation design [NJ-7, sec. D, p. 30].                              |
| <b>E. Has the state put protections in place to prevent misuse of the evaluation data?</b>                   | Yes. The regulations specify that all information that may be linked to an individual educator shall be considered personnel information and shall not be subject to disclosure under the public records law [MA-5, sec. 35.11(6)]. | Not specified  |

| Component 7: Using Results  |  |   |
|---|--|---|
| Trigger Points for Action   | <u>Massachusetts</u>   | <u>New Jersey</u>   |
| <b>A. Does the state mandate, recommend, or allow evaluation results to be used in human resource decisions? (teacher distribution, promotion, dismissal, renewal, tenure, compensation, etc.)</b>  | Yes, mandates that evaluation results may be used in decisions for tenure, compensation, promotions, and dismissals [MA-5, sec. 35.08.07; MA-8, p. 6].   | Yes, mandates for tenure and dismissal [NJ-4, sec. 9(b)]. The state recommends that evaluation results be used for hiring and compensation [NJ-5, pp. 12, 38; NJ-7, sec. D, pp. 37–40].   |
| <b>A1. If yes, under what conditions does the state mandate, recommend, or allow evaluation results to trigger promotion, retention, dismissal? (three unsatisfactories over three years, etc.)</b> | Professional teacher status should only be granted to teachers "who have achieved proficient or exemplary on each Performance Standard, and overall"; however, a principal may choose to extend professional teaching status to teachers who do not meet this criteria if approval is obtained from the superintendent [MA-5, sec. 35.08(6)]. Teachers who achieve a summative performance rating of exemplary and receive an impact rating on student learning of moderate or high "shall be rewarded with leadership roles, promotion, additional compensation, public commendation, or other acknowledgment" [MA-5, sec. 35.08(7)]. Educators rated at proficient or above are eligible for additional roles, responsibilities, and compensation, as determined by the district and through collective bargaining, where applicable [MA-5, sec. 35.06(7)(a)(1)(c)]. | The state mandates that teachers receive two effective or highly effective ratings within the first three years of employment [NJ-4, sec. 9(b)]. Teachers who are charged with inefficiency must be given written notice and given 90 days to improve their performance [NJ-2]. |
| <b>B. Does the state mandate (or recommend) how and when teachers are to be notified of next steps toward professional growth or termination?</b>   | Yes, mandates that teachers receive information on steps toward professional growth at the end of their individual respective Educator Plans [MA-5, sec. 35.06(7)(a)–(c)].   | Yes, mandates that teachers must be notified of termination in writing [NJ-2].  |
| <b>C. What is the timeline for rolling out the incorporation of high-stakes decisions?</b>  | Implementation began in the fall of 2011 in 34 Level 4 schools, Chelsea High School, and in 11 districts and 4 collaboratives whose applications to serve as "early adopter" sites were accepted this summer. Implementation will continue in  | 2013–14 [NJ-16, p. 73; NJ-17, p. 20]  |

|  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
|  | Race to the Top districts in fall 2012 and in remaining districts in fall 2013 [MA-10].   |  |
| <b>Evaluation Cycle and Evaluation Results</b>   | <b><u>Massachusetts</u></b>   | <b><u>New Jersey</u></b>   |
| <b>A. Does the state mandate (or recommend) that teachers who are identified as ineffective be given sufficient opportunities and support to improve before termination is considered?</b> | Yes, mandates that educators who receive a rating of "unsatisfactory" are placed on an Improvement Plan [MA-5, sec. 35.06(7)(c); MA-14, pp. 23, 32].  | Yes, all teachers will have an individual professional development plan and districts will provide additional professional development opportunities to struggling teachers [NJ-4, sec. 16]. |
| <b>B. Does the state mandate (or recommend) that data obtained through evaluation inform professional development offerings?</b>   | Yes, mandates that professional development is incorporated into an educator's improvement/growth plan [MA-5, sec. 35.05(3) (f); MA-14, pp. 23, 32].  | Yes, the state requires that an individual professional development plan be created on the basis of a teacher's evaluation results [NJ-1, 6A:32-4.4-4.5; NJ-7, sec. D, p. 35].               |
| <b>C. Does the state mandate (or recommend) that evaluation results be used to identify teachers for roles such as mentor teachers, master teachers, and consulting teachers?</b>          | Yes, mandates that teachers who achieve a summative performance rating of exemplary and receive an impact rating on student learning of moderate or high "shall be rewarded with leadership roles, promotion, additional compensation, public commendation, or other acknowledgment" [MA-5, sec. 35.08(7)]. Educators rated at proficient or above are eligible for additional roles, responsibilities, and compensation, as determined by the district and through collective bargaining, where applicable [MA-5, sec. 35.06(7)(a)(1)(c)]. | No, but New Jersey plans that teachers who earn a highly effective rating for three consecutive years will be eligible for promotion to Master Teacher status [NJ-7, sec. D, p. 36].         |

| Component 8: System Evaluation   |  |  |
|--|--|--|
| Evaluation Process   | <u>Massachusetts</u>   | <u>New Jersey</u>  |
| <b>A. Has the state mandated (or recommended) a process to assess the system's effectiveness?</b>                                  | Yes, recommends. Under Race to the Top, the state's human capital strategies are being evaluated by a third-party vendor [MA-3, p. 27].  | Yes, New Jersey plans to evaluate the fairness, reliability, and validity of its measures of effective teaching and examine the impact of the evaluation system on student learning and instructional practice. The New Jersey State Department of Education will evaluate the pilot sites in the 2011–12 and 2012–13 school years and will collect information from sample LEAs once the evaluation system is implemented full-scale in 2013–14 [NJ-17, p. 20]. |
| <b>B. Has the full evaluation system model been piloted or are there plans to pilot it?</b>  | The state's model system is being piloted during 2011–12 in 34 Level 4 schools, Chelsea High School, and 11 districts and 4 collaboratives who volunteered to serve as "early adopter" districts [MA-10].              | Yes, New Jersey piloted the evaluation system in the 2011–12 school year and is launching a second pilot year in 2012–13 [NJ-18, pp. 6–9; NJ-16, p. 76].   |
| <b>C. Had the state detailed any plans for research to assess correlation between growth model scores and observation ratings?</b> | Yes, this is one of the analyses that will be part of the third-party evaluation as well as the state's own ongoing review and analysis [MA-3, p. 27].   | Yes, the state will gather data on growth ratings and observation ratings to determine correlation. The state has contracted with an external researcher and technical assistance provider to assist with this process in preparation for statewide implementation [New Jersey Department of Education, personal communication].   |
| Effectiveness of Outcomes  | <u>Massachusetts</u>   | <u>New Jersey</u>  |
| <b>A. Has the state selected outcomes to determine the overall effectiveness of the system?</b>                                    | Yes, the state articulated several outcomes in terms of the percentage of teachers rated as effective or highly effective, as well as outcomes specific to the equitable distribution on teachers [MA-3, pp. 101–105]. | Not specified  |
| <b>B. What benchmarks or targets have</b>  | The state's benchmarks for teachers in math,   | By 2015, all New Jersey's students will be taught  |

|   |  |  |
|---|--|--|
| <p><b>been established?</b></p>   | <p>science, special education, and language instruction range from 85–88 percent rated as effective or higher. For teachers in specific types of schools (poverty-level/minority population) the benchmark percentages range from 10–30 percent of teachers rated as effective or higher [MA-3, p. 101].</p> | <p>by an effective or a highly effective teacher [NJ-7, sec. D, p. 16].</p>  |
| <p><b>C. Has the state created a data infrastructure for tracking data over time?</b></p> | <p>Yes. Districts currently report to ESE course, subject, and roster information, as well as changes in teacher assignment, using the SIMS, EPIMS, and SCS data systems [Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, personal communication].</p>                                       | <p>No, but New Jersey plans on enhancing its state longitudinal data system, NJ SMART, and develop a Web-based instructional-improvement system. The system will include an effectiveness-management system that will provide a dashboard to track student achievement and teacher effectiveness data. The dashboard will collect and track data from classroom observations and assist in building targeted professional development plans [NJ-7, sec. C, pp. 10–14].</p> |