

Feature of State Model	Summary of State approach	Features to consider for NH	Features to avoid	Rationale/ recommendation
<p>Approach to measuring teacher practices</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Standards used in measurement State/local determination 	<p>-Heavy focus on novice teachers.eg obs. and eval quantitative w/o tiers -growth model for teachers (prof dev. Continuous improvement, prof. practice and student learning) -understandable, clear , laid out well -opportunity /structure for midcourse eval</p>	<p>-primary and complementary evaluator roles, -opportunity/structure for mid-course eval -conferencing including timeline and goal-setting -PD and alignment w/personal growth plan -prof dev. Rubric and common understanding of expectations -quick reference guides(P. 73 and 85) -gradual and full implementation (use of “at least” language -Emphasis on working as a team</p>	<p>-Only numeric measure know who evaluator is from beginning of yr.</p>	<p>-min. of 10 learning walk coupled with structured conversation (Vs. long announced observations) -Tiered system that differentiates types of observations ensuring fidelity of the system</p>
<p>Approach for measuring student growth in tested subjects and grades</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> State/local determination 	<p>-combo of team approach student learning objectives and growth percentiles -aligned to standards w/school and district flexibility -using backwards design starting with SLO’s -Numerically driven and benchmarked -maintaining common formative assessments to inform practice</p>	<p>-required to use common assessment tool if it exists -expectation of monitoring and data collection -Using backward design starting with SLO’s -expectations of monitoring and data collection -Evaluator review SLO’s and Teacher Eval must agree -Team approach to goal setting -goal setting to be a differentiated, tiered -goals can be revisited in context continuous</p>	<p>-Using NECAP in its final two years -loss of balanced content</p>	<p>-Use multi-year implementation process(using backward design process) -Use of multiple measures of student</p>

		<p>improvement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> =clearly articulates multiple measures -rigorous, ambitious and attainable,(connects to revisiting goals) 		
<p>Approach for measuring student growth in non-tested subjects and grades</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State/local determination 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -using SLO's w/o growth percentiles -combo of team approach student learning objectives and growth percentiles -aligned to standards w/school and district flexibility -using backwards design starting with SLO's -Numerically driven and benchmarked -maintaining common formative assessments to inform practice 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -required to use common assessment tool if it exists -expectation of monitoring and data collection -Using backward design starting with SLO's -expectations of monitoring and data collection -Evaluator review SLO's and Teacher Eval must agree -Team approach to goal setting -goal setting to be a differentiated, tiered -goals can be revisited in context continuous improvement =clearly articulates multiple measures -rigorous, ambitious and attainable,(connects to revisiting goals) 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -cross grade content application -provide structure for developing SLO's that align with course structure and scheduling
<p>Approach for combining various indicators into an overall teacher evaluation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State or local determination 				

Consequences and rewards based on ratings <ul style="list-style-type: none">• State/local determination				