

**Memorandum of Agreement
between the
Belmont School Committee
and the
Belmont Education Association**

Re: Unit A Evaluation Adjustment Agreement

WHEREAS, the parties of this Agreement are the Belmont School Committee (Committee) and the Belmont Education Association (Association); and

WHEREAS, the parties are parties to a Unit A collective bargaining agreement for educators effective September 1, 2014 through August 31, 2017 (CBA); and

WHEREAS, the Appendix F of the CBA (Handbook for Evaluation) Sections 19, 20, 21 contains reopeners for Impact on Student Learning Growth, Student Feedback for Educator Evaluation and Staff Feedback on administrator Evaluation, respectively; and

WHEREAS, the parties have bargained over these sections and others in the evaluation system consistent with the standards and principles of 603 CMR 35.00 and M.G.L. ch. 71, § 38G;

THEREFORE, the parties agree that in consideration of mutual covenants, the terms and conditions of employment set forth in the CBA shall remain in full force and effect except as Appendix F is amended herein, effective on the date of ratification, unless otherwise noted.

1. Append to Section 10.A the following subsection:

- v. All announced and unannounced observations must take place during one continuous time period.

2. Change 17.H to the following:

A copy of the signed Plan shall be provided to the Educator. The signature does not indicate agreement or disagreement. For an Improvement Plan beginning at the start of a school year, the Evaluator and Educator will meet to discuss the contents of the Improvement Plan by October 1.

3. In Section 18.A, change the deadline when the educator submits evidence for the summative evaluation from May 15 to May 1.

4. In Section 18.B, change the formative evaluation deadlines in year 1 as follows:

- a. Educator submits evidence: from May 1 to May 15.
- b. Evaluator completes report: from May 15 to June 1
- c. Evaluator conducts meeting, if any: from June 1 to June 10.

5. Replace Section 19 (Impact on Student Learning Growth) with the language in Attachment A.

6. Replace Section 20 (Student Feedback) with the following:

The Educator shall establish an age-appropriate method for seeking student feedback prior to the end of the current educator plan. The Educator will inform students that identifying themselves on the feedback mechanism is optional. The feedback will be used only by the educator to inform his/her self-assessment and goal setting for the subsequent educator plan.

7. Replace Section 21 (Staff Feedback) with the following:

All Educators are ensured the opportunity to provide feedback on administrators in a manner that assures the confidentiality of identity of the Educator unless the educator chooses to identify him- or herself. Educators will have the opportunity to provide feedback to their Principal, Assistant Principal, and Director or Assistant Director.

8. Add the following to the Educator SMART Goals and Plan Form:

Did you solicit student feedback?

Yes

No, I did not work in Belmont last year

9. Effective immediately, replace the Observation Form with the revised Observation Form attached.

10. On the cover page, add "Amended November 20, 2015" after the June 10, 2013 date.

WHEREFORE, the parties have caused this Memorandum of Agreement to be executed, contingent on the ratification by the parties.

For the Committee:

Laurel Meyer

For the Association:

Denise Kalla

Date: 2/2/2016

Date: 1/21/2016

Belmont DDM & Feedback Language

19) Rating of Educator Impact on Student Learning (Student Impact Rating)

A) Basis of the Student Impact Rating

- i. The following student performance measures shall be the basis for determining an educator's impact on student learning, growth, and achievement.
 - (a) Statewide growth measure(s),
 - (1) Where available, statewide growth measures must be selected each year as one of the measures used to determine the educator's Student Impact Rating.
 - (2) Statewide growth measures include the MCAS Student Growth Percentile, or its equivalent, and ACCESS for ELLs gain score.
 - (b) District-Determined Measures (DDMs) of student learning, growth, or achievement.
- ii. The Student Impact Rating for each educator will be based on the trends and patterns of ratings of two measures each year over a three-year period.

B) Identifying and Selecting District-Determined Measures (DDMs)

- i. The joint labor-management evaluation team ("team") maintains a list of DDMs
- ii. The team shall annually review these DDMs by collecting feedback from educators and evaluators regarding the quality (e.g., alignment to curriculum, utility) of the DDMs. Where feedback suggests modifications to the DDMs or the need to create different DDMs, the team shall convene a cohort of educators to make recommendations to the team.
- iii. DDM Selection Criteria
 - (a) DDMs may consist of *direct* or *indirect* measures.
 - (1) A *direct* measure assesses student growth in a specific content area or domain of social-emotional or behavioral learning over time.
 - (i) For all classroom educators, at least one measure in each year that will be used to determine an educator's Student Impact Rating must be a *direct* measure.
 - (ii) *Direct* measures shall be criterion-referenced, such as, 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.

- (2) *Indirect* measures do not measure student growth in a specific content area or domain of social-emotional or behavioral learning but do measure the consequences of that learning.
 - (i) *Indirect* measures include, but are not limited to, changes in: promotion and graduation rates, attendance and tardiness rates, rigorous course-taking pattern rates, college course matriculation and course remediation rates, discipline referral and other behavior rates, and other measures of student engagement and progress.

- (b) DDMs must be common across grade or subject level.
- (c) DDMs must include consistent, transparent scoring processes that establish clear parameters for what constitutes *high*, *moderate*, and *low* student growth. (see B.iii below) If the actual scores are misaligned with the parameters that were determined previously, the parameters will be recalibrated.
- (d) DDMs must be aligned to the Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks, Massachusetts Vocational Technical Education Frameworks, or other relevant Frameworks.

iv. Process for Selecting DDMs

- (a) The team shall identify the DDMs in the list, provided there are at least two DDMs available per educator.
- (b) If the team cannot reach agreement on any DDM, it shall submit the issue to negotiations between the parties.
- (c) If the parties cannot reach agreement within a reasonable period of time, either party may file a petition for arbitration under G.L. c. 71, sec. 38.

C) Determining a Student Impact Rating (SIR)

- i. No later than November 1 of each year, each DDM will be reviewed by the educators and administrators using it, and they will determine if any changes need to be made or if it needs to be replaced. Any changes will be recommended to the team (B. ii).
- ii. Educators shall have an opportunity to review and confirm the roster of students whose scores will be used in the determination of their impact on student growth for each DDM.

- (a) For full-year or fall semester courses, the DDM results from students who are not enrolled in the grade or course by October 1st or do not remain enrolled through the final date the DDM is administered shall not be used in the determination of an educator's impact on student growth.
 - (b) For spring semester courses, the DDM results from students who are not enrolled in the grade or course by the end of the fourth week of the semester or do not remain enrolled through the final date the DDM is administered shall not be used in the determination of an educator's impact on student growth.
 - (c) DDM results from students who are not present for instruction or education services for at least 90 percent of the allotted instructional or service time shall not be used in the determination of an educator's impact on student growth.
 - iii. The evaluator shall use his/her professional judgment to determine whether an educator is having a *high*, *moderate*, or *low* impact on student learning. The evaluator will consider at least three years of data and will apply professional judgment to those determinations in order to designate the educator's Student Impact Rating. The evaluator's professional judgment must account for contextual factors including, but not limited to, learning challenges presented by the students and the learning environment.
 - (a) A rating of *high* indicates that the educator's students demonstrated significantly (50%) higher than one year's growth relative to academic peers in the grade or subject.
 - (b) A rating of *moderate* indicates that the educator's students demonstrated one year's growth relative to academic peers in the grade or subject.
 - (c) A rating of *low* indicates that the educator's students demonstrated significantly (50%) lower than one year's growth relative to academic peers in the grade or subject.
 - iv. The evaluator shall meet with the educator rated *low* to discuss the Student Impact Rating. The evaluator shall meet with the educator rated *moderate* or *high* to discuss the Student Impact Rating, if either the educator or the evaluator requests such a meeting.
- D) Intersection between the Summative Performance Rating and the Student Impact Rating.
 - i. An educator's Summative Performance Rating is a rating of educator practice and remains independent from the educator's Student Impact Rating, which is a rating of impact on student learning and growth.

- ii. Results from DDMs and the Student Impact Rating are used to inform the educator's Self-Assessment, to develop the professional practice goal or the student learning goal and the resulting Educator Plan.
- iii. Educators with PTS whose overall Summative Performance Rating is exemplary or proficient and whose Student Impact Rating is low shall be placed on a one-year self-directed growth plan.
 - (a) In such cases, the evaluator's supervisor shall discuss and review the Summative Performance Rating with the evaluator and the supervisor shall confirm or revise the educator's rating. In cases where the superintendent serves as the evaluator, the superintendent's decision on the rating shall not be subject to review.
 - (b) 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.
 - (c) The Educator Plan may include a goal related to examining elements of practice that may be contributing to low impact.
- iv. Evaluators shall use evidence of educator performance and impact on student learning and growth 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.