1 NV TLC Teacher Evaluation Framework~~/Model~~

Spheres: general areas of teacher impact. There are two sphere: Student Achievement/Engagement and Educational Practice.

Domains: exist within each sphere and are aligned to the general principles referenced in the Iowa Core, InTASC Propositions, CO Teaching Standards and the NBPTS.

Categories: are specific features to be measured. **Standards** are clearly defined statements and/or illustrations of what all teachers are expected to know and do.

Indicators: the class of potential data-gathering tools such as assessments, observations, and surveys

Measures: are the specific tool(s) that will be used to assess the performance on the standards in each category. More than one measure may be tied to a single standard.

Criteria: are the specific performance thresholds that need to be met for each score/rating. The levels shown here are a sample based on the 4-tiered RTTT model

Educational Practice

6 Model: Weight greater than Professional Responsibilities

Instructional Practice

Teacher behavior in the classroom that enables every students' learning.

Categories: (Iowa Core; Standards from InTASC)
1) Student- centered classroom
2) Teaching for understanding
3) Assessment for learning
4) Rigorous and relevant curriculum
5) Teaching for learner differences

Potential Measures:
- Student survey score(s)
- Parent survey score(s)
- Principal/Advisor observation scores
- Teacher self-assessment
- Evaluation of Artifacts
- Other

Criteria TBD
For each standard:
- Highly Effective looks like:
- Effective looks like:
- Minimally Effective looks like:
- Ineffective looks like:

Professional Responsibilities

Everything a teacher does outside of instruction to influence and prepare for learning at the highest level in the classroom and promote effectiveness of the school community.

Categories: (CO Teaching Standards)
1) Content knowledge
2) Learning environments
3) Facilitation of learning
4) Reflection on practice
5) Leadership
6) *Family Engagement*
7) *Planning*

Potential Measures:
- Parent survey score(s)
- Principal/Advisor observation scores
- Principal/Advisor ratings
- Peer ratings
- Teacher self-assessment
- Other

Criteria TBD
For each standard:
- Highly Effective looks like:
- Effective looks like:
- Minimally Effective looks like:
- Ineffective looks like:

Measures: Move to Educational Practice Domain

5 Model: Remove from domain level and include as 5th category

2 Student Performance ~~Achievement/ Engagement~~

Student Engagement

The students' are motivated and active participants in the learning process.

Categories: (Tripod)
1) Caring
2) Captivating
3) Conferring
4) Controlling
5) Clarifying
6) Challenging
7) Consolidating

Potential Measures:
- Student attendance rate
- Student survey score(s)
- Other student measures()
- Parent survey score(s)
- Principal/Advisor Observation scores(s)
- Principal/Advisor ratings

Criteria TBD
For each standard:
- Highly Effective looks like:
- Effective looks like:
- Minimally Effective looks like:
- Ineffective looks like:

Measures: "Academic Performance"

4 Model: "Student Outcomes"

3 Model: Weight at 50%, for now

~~Student Achievement~~

Students show appropriate, expected growth over time in their subject/content area. Students show proficiency in their subjects and grade level.

Categories:
1) Proficiency
2) Growth
3) Grade-level or subject-based benchmarks/ thresholds
4) Reducing gap
5) Student Engagement

Potential Measures:
- CRT and HSPE performance level/score
- CRT and HSPE year-to-year academic growth
- MAP /other interim assessment scores (cannot be implemented until interim assessments are used state-wide)
- Other classroom-based

Criteria TBD
For each standard:
- Highly Effective looks like:
- Effective looks like:
- Minimally Effective looks like:
- Ineffective looks like: