



Rhode Island Group Notes – DRAFT REVIEW, January 24, 2012

Key Principles -

Pro's

- a. #1, There may be some positives to having the terms (effective, ineffective, etc.) the same across the state.
- b. The principles represent summative of our work so far.
- c. #5, we like the idea that multiple years would be used to support determining effectiveness. Two years ensures that teachers are challenged in an ongoing way.

Con's

- a. Our terminology needs to be consistent (for example "Standards of Professional Practice")
- b. Again, on terminology, should the principles reference that there is a four point scale - rather than saying highly effective, effective, etc.
- c. Glossary of our terms as part of this document
- d. Clarify whether or not NH Frameworks Standards work for all personnel (school nurses, psychologists, etc.)
- e. Overall, the principles as written are not engaging - having read Colorado, Massachusetts and Rhode Island's plans - we need to more positively engage the reader and balance our communication. The principles are really about the rating system - connected to student performance vs. the whole model.
- f. #5, Two years may be restrictive. Did we hear Principals will have 3-5 years of data?
- g. #6, unclear about what this means. It sounds like it negates the model and the process.

Questions/Recommendations

- a. We really want the Principles to reflect the tone and tenor of this group.
- b. Will the terms used in the four point scale be the same for everyone or will districts have autonomy in selecting language?
- c. In addition on principle #3, " including measures of student outcomes"
- d. In addition on principle #3, "multiple measure to be"
- e. In looking at #4, we would like to see more components of the whole model defined.
- f. #5, Will tenure and RIF decisions use multiple years of evaluations?

- g. #6, Rigor is applied to those implementing the system could say, in all developing systems reflection, evaluation, formative assessment are used to enhance strengths, modify weaknesses to continually improve system.
- h. How do we handle teachers who have been moved around each year.
- i. Rubrics need to be included to provide clarity for each part of the scale.

EFFECTIVE TEACHING, visual model

Pro	Con	Questions/Recommendations
		Why were dispositions not included?
	Measures of Professional Practice - does not match model	
	SLO's refer to 30-70 split	How do we measure a year's growth in things like drama? Do we want teachers assessed in grades/subjects What is meant by SLOs as written here (CCSS, GLE)?
		Where does goal setting occur?
Need to show how this graphic fits into the entire system - Venn diagram?		We would modify the graphic to have Student Performance above Effective Teaching.

Pages 2 - 4 on Matrix

Include "components of the system" in the visual model

Page 2: Standards of Professional Practice - Answer to question: No, what's important is clear goals and agreement on standards. Yes, but don't limit them - at the state level there is an agreed set. Missing component on goal setting

Page 3: Measurement Procedures - this is not connected to the model we reviewed (Rhode Island) or our discussion about what is useful