TEACHER AND PRINCIPAL PRACTICE RUBRIC PROVIDERS
TECHNICAL PROPOSAL - APPLICATION

Please check the most appropriate category:

	Teacher and/or Principal Practice Rubric	Required Submission
☒	This is an application for providing **Teacher Practice Rubric services**. Please check the most appropriate category below: ☐ This rubric is for classroom observation, **only**. ☒ This rubric is for all applicable teacher evaluation criteria, including classroom observation.	A full application with all required materials (including this cover page) shall be submitted for **each*** rubric. Your rubric(s) must be attached in the Appendix section of your submission.
☒	This is an application for providing **Principal Practice Rubric services**. Please check the most appropriate category below: ☐ This rubric is for principal observation, **only**. ☒ This rubric is for all applicable principal evaluation criteria, including principal observation.	A full application with all required materials (including this cover page) shall be submitted for **each*** rubric. Your rubric(s) must be attached in the Appendix section of your submission.

Section III

Rubric Design and Implementation
(*Form B-2*)

1. Describe and detail any empirical or statistical evidence of demonstrated professional achievement for teachers and/or principals over time as a result of provider services.

For the Marzano Teacher Evaluation system, the following applies:

Marzano Research Laboratory conducted independent studies at 38 schools in 14 school districts (Haystead & Marzano, 2009). The studies involved 7,872 students in the experimental groups and 6,415 students in the control groups. Teachers selected two groups of students being taught the same unit or related lessons. In one group, the *experimental* group, a specific instructional strategy was used, such as graphic organizers. In the other group, the *control* group, the instructional strategy was not used. All studies employed a quasi-experimental design, referred to as a pretest-posttest non-equivalent groups design. The pretest scores were used as a covariate to partially control for differing levels of background knowledge and skill. The following questions were considered through a meta-analysis, a synthesis of relevant research findings, from the 329 independent studies:

1. What effect does the utilization of instructional strategies have on students' achievement regarding the subject matter content taught by their teachers?
2. Does the effect of instructional strategies differ between school levels?
3. Does the effect of instructional strategies differ from strategy to strategy?

The average effect size (ES) for all 329 independent studies was statistically significant ($p < .0001$). When corrected for attenuation, the percentile gain associated with the use of the instructional strategies is 16 (ES = .42). This means that on the average, the strategies used in the independent studies represent a gain of 16 percentile points over what would be expected if teachers did not use the instructional strategies.

For the Marzano Principal Evaluation system, the following applies:

The Marzano Principal Evaluation Model is grounded in four primary pieces of research: (1) the Wallace Foundation study (Louis, Leithwood, Wahlstrom, & Anderson, 2010), (2) the study of what works in Oklahoma schools (Marzano Research Laboratory, 2010, 2011), (3) the Marzano, Waters, and McNulty (2005) meta-analysis of school leadership, and (4) the Marzano (2003b) study of effective schooling. A brief explanation of each follows.

<u>The Wallace Study</u>

The most current and comprehensive study on the relationship between school administrator behaviors and actions and student academic achievement is that funded by the Wallace Foundation and cooperatively conducted by the Center for Applied Research and Educational Improvement (CAREI) at the University of Minnesota and the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education at The University of Toronto (Louis, Leithwood, Wahlstrom, & Anderson, 2010). This multiyear study, titled *Investigating the Links to Improved Student Learning*, involved survey data from 8,391 teachers and 471 school administrators; interview data from 581 teachers and administrators, 304 district level educators, and 124 state personnel; and observational data from 312 classrooms. Student achievement data for literacy and mathematics in elementary and secondary schools were also obtained using scores on state tests designed to measure Adequate Yearly Progress as mandated by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2002. To date, this study stands as the seminal examination of the relationship between administrator actions and behaviors and student academic achievement.

<u>What Works in Oklahoma Schools</u>

The study of what works in Oklahoma schools was conducted by Marzano Research Laboratory for the Oklahoma State Department of Education (OSDE) over the 2009/2010 school year and

the 2010/2011 school year. This study was conducted to determine those elements that are related to being classified as an *improvement school* (i.e., a school that needs improvement) as opposed to a school that is not classified as needing improvement (i.e., schools not on improvement status). Fifty-nine matched elementary, middle, and high schools were involved in the study. Of those 59 schools, 32 were classified as needing improvement and 27 were not. Survey data from teachers, administrators, students, and parents were used in the study along with on-site observations of teachers, interviews with administrators, and videotapes of classroom activities. State test data in mathematics and the English language arts were the primary dependent variable when examining the effects of specific elements. From the 59 matched schools, 1,117 teachers, 13,373 students, and 516 parents were involved. General results indicated that specific actions on the part of administrators are statistically related to student academic achievement.

Marzano, Waters, and McNulty Meta-Analysis of School Leadership

This meta-analysis of school leadership research was published in the book, *School Leadership That Works* (Marzano et al., 2005). The purpose of the study was to examine the research literature from 1978 to 2001 on those school leadership factors that have a statistically significant relationship with student achievement. Over 300 studies were examined and 69 met the criteria for inclusion, one of which was that student achievement data were correlated with school administrator actions, or that correlations could be computed from the data available. In all, 2,802 K–12 schools were involved in the studies synthesized, with an estimated 14,000 teachers and 1,400,000 students. The overall finding was that school leadership has a statistically significant relationship with student achievement. Such leadership can be explained as 21 specific types of actions and behaviors enacted by school leaders.

The Marzano Study of School Effectiveness

The Marzano study of effective schools was published in the book *What Works in Schools* (Marzano, 2003b). Although it did not focus specifically on school leadership, the study did specify 11 factors that schools must attend to if they are to enhance student achievement and the school leadership implications regarding those 11 factors.

2. What is the methodology used to collect evidence of the demonstrated professional achievement for teachers or principals (*i.e. measures and analyses used, comparison groups, etc.*)?

In the Haystead and Marzano (2009) study, teachers selected two groups of students being taught the same unit or related lessons. In one group, the *experimental* group, a specific instructional strategy was used such as graphic organizers. In the other group, the *control* group, the instructional strategy was not used.

Because students could not be randomly assigned to experimental and control groups, all studies employed a quasi-experimental design, referred to as a pretest-posttest non-equivalent groups design. These groups are considered to be non-equivalent, because it is unlikely that two intact groups would be as similar as would be the case if randomly assigned.

A pretest and posttest was administered in both groups. The pretest scores were used to statistically "adjust" the posttest scores using a technique referred to as analysis of covariance (ANCOVA). This is a way of controlling for differences in what students know about a topic prior to the beginning of instruction on the topic. ANCOVA is commonly used when random assignment is not possible. Although ANCOVA was used to statistically equate students in terms

of prior academic knowledge, arguments about causal relationships are not as strong as they would be if group members were assigned randomly.
Teachers were instructed to teach a short unit on a topic of their choice to the two groups of students, one experimental group and one control group. Instructional activities in both groups were to be as similar as possible except for the fact that a specific instructional strategy was used in the experimental group only.

3. What type of research design has been established to support these findings (*e.g., experimental, non-experimental, quasi-experimental, etc.*)?

Experimental/Control Studies

Perhaps one of the more unique aspects of the research on this model is that a growing number of experimental/control studies that have been conducted by practicing teachers on the effectiveness of specific strategies in their classrooms (Haystead & Marzano, 2009). This is unusual because these studies are designed to establish a direct causal link between elements of the model and student achievement. Studies that use correlation analysis techniques (see next section), can establish a link between elements of a model and student achievement but causality cannot be easily inferred. Other evaluation models currently used throughout the country have correlational data only regarding the relationship between their elements and student achievement. To date, over 300 experimental/control studies have been conducted. Those studies involved over 14,000 students and 300 teachers in 38 schools across 14 districts. The average effect size for strategies addressed in the studies was .42, with some studies reporting effect sizes of 2.00 and higher. An average effect size of .42 is associated with a 16 percentile point gain in student achievement. Stated differently, on average, when teachers use the classroom strategies and behaviors in the model, their typical student achievement increased by 16 percentile points. However, even larger gains (i.e., those associated with an effect size of 2.00) can be realized if specific strategies are use in specific ways.

Correlational Studies

As mentioned above, correlational studies are the most common approach to examining the validity of an evaluation model. Such studies have been and continue to be conducted on various elements of the Marzano Evaluation Model. For example such a study was conducted in the state of Oklahoma as a part of their examination of elements related to student achievement in K-12 schools (see *What Works in Oklahoma Schools: Phase I Report* [Marzano Research Laboratory, 2010] and *What Works in Oklahoma School: Phase II Report* [Marzano Research Laboratory, 2011]). Those studies involved 59 schools, 117 teachers and over 13,000 K-12 students. Collectively, those reports indicate positive relationships with various elements of the Marzano Evaluation Model across the domains. Specific emphasis was placed on Domain 1, particularly in the Phase II report. Using state mathematics and reading test data, 96% of the 82 correlations (i.e., 41 correlations for mathematics and 41 for reading) were found to be positive, with some as high as .40 and greater. A .40 correlation translates to an effect size (i.e., standardized mean difference) of .87 which is associated with a 31 percentile point gain in student achievement. These studies also aggregated data across the nine design questions in Domain 1. All correlations were positive for this aggregated data. Seven of those correlations ranged from .33 to .40. These correlations translate into effect sizes of .70 and higher. Relatively large correlations such as these were also reported for the total number of Domain 1 strategies teachers used in a school. Specifically, the number of Domain 1 strategies teachers used in school had a .35 correlation with reading proficiency and a .26 correlation with mathematics proficiency.

Technology Studies

Another unique aspect of the research conducted on the model is that its effects have been examined in the context of technology. For example, a two-year study was conducted to determine (in part) the relationship between selected elements from Domain 1 and the effectiveness of interactive whiteboards in enhancing student achievement (see *Final Report: A Second Year Evaluation Study of Promethean ActivClassroom* [Haystead & Marzano, 2010]). In all, 131 experimental/control studies were conducted across multiple grade levels. Selected elements of Domain 1 were correlated with the effect sizes for use of the interactive white boards. All correlations for Domain 1 elements were positive, with some as high as .70. This implies that the effectiveness of interactive whiteboards as used in these 131 studies was greatly enhanced by the use of Domain 1 strategies.

4. Describe and detail the proposed scoring or rating system associated with the rubric being submitted.

The New York State Education Department (NYSED) uses an evaluation scale that involves four levels:

- Highly Effective
- Effective
- Developing
- Ineffective

The Marzano Evaluation models for both teachers and administrators can be readily applied to this framework. Teacher Evaluation Scores are considered first.

COMPUTING SCORES FOR TEACHERS

The Marzano Evaluation model employs a five point scale. The generic form of the scale is depicted in figure 1.

Figure 1: Generic Form of the Marzano Teacher Scale

Innovating (4)	**Applying (3)**	**Developing (2)**	**Beginning (1)**	**Not Using (0)**
Adapts and creates new strategies for unique student needs and situations	Engages students in the strategy and monitors the extent to which it produces the desired outcomes	Engages students in the strategy with no significant errors or omissions	Uses strategy incorrectly or with parts missing	Strategy was called for but not exhibited

© 2011 Robert J. Marzano

As described below, the difference in the number of components from the two scales is not problematic as long as the NYSED scale is used as a summary scale (i.e., a summative score) for proficiency levels. This noted, if a district wishes the Marzano scale to have the same metric as the New York scale a simple translation like that depicted in figure 2 (page 31) can be employed.

Figure 2: Mapping the Marzano Teacher Scale onto the NYSED Scale

Marzano Scale	**Innovating (4)**	**Applying (3)**	**Developing (2)**	**Beginning (1)**	**Not Using (0)**
	Adapts and creates new strategies for unique student needs and situations	Engages students in the strategy and monitors the extent to which it produces the desired outcomes	Engages students in the strategy with no significant errors or omissions	Uses strategy incorrectly or with parts missing	Strategy was called for but not exhibited
NYSED Scale	**Highly Effective (4)**	**Effective (3)**	**Developing (2)**	**Developing (2)**	**Ineffective (1)**

As indicated in figure 2, the NYSED category of *Developing* covers two categories in the Marzano scale—*Beginning* and *Developing*. Both of these categories represent developmental stages on the way to developing expertise in a strategy. *Applying* on the Marzano scale signals proficiency in using a specific strategy—the teacher not only uses the strategy fluently and without error but monitors its effect on students. *Not Using* on the Marzano scale translates to *Ineffective* on the NYSED scale. *Innovating* on the Marzano scale translates to *Highly Effective* on the NYSED scale—the teacher is so adept at the strategy that he or she has adapted it to specific situations in class. Again, it is important to note that the translation depicted in figure 2 is not necessary if districts utilize the suggestions below.

Aggregating Scores

Ultimately, teacher scores on the elements within any evaluation model are typically aggregated to constitute an overall or "omnibus" score. There are two basic approaches to aggregating scores: the compensatory approach and the conjunctive approach.

The Compensatory Approach

The compensatory approach involves computing a weighted or unweighted average. When an average is used, high scores on one element can "compensate" for low scores on other elements. For example, consider the 5 elements for Domain 3. A given teacher might receive the following five scores in a given year: 1, 2, 2, 2, 4. The average of these five scores is 2.2. The high score of 4 has compensated for the low score of 1 to bring the overall average above 2.0. To translate average scores in each domain to the NYSED performance rating categories, score bands like those depicted in figure 3 can be articulated.

Figure 3: Score Bands Translated to NYSED Performance Rating Categories

Ineffective	Average below 2.00
Developing	Average above 2.00
Effective	Average above 2.50
Highly Effective	Average of 3.00 or above

Note: Average scores based on the Marzano scale

Using figure 3, the teacher described above with the average score of 2.2 would be classified as *Developing* for Domain 3. The compensatory approach depicts the "central tendency" of a set of

scores but can mask high and low scores on specific elements of the model. If a district were to use a compensatory approach to summarize teacher status on the Marzano Evaluation Model, it would compute a weighted or unweighted average across the 60 elements and then evaluate teacher average scores using intervals like those in figure 3.

The Conjunctive Approach

The conjunctive approach does not focus on the central tendency of a set of scores. Rather, for each level of a scale, minimum scores are set for the various elements in each domain. This is depicted in figure 4 for the Marzano Evaluation Model.

Figure 4: The Conjunctive Approach

Ineffective	Some scores of 0 and 1
Developing	Minimum scores of 2 on all elements
Effective	Minimum scores of 2 and majority of scores of 3
Highly Effective	Minimum scores of 3 and majority of scores of 4

Note: Score values based on the Marzano scale © 2011 Robert J. Marzano

It is important to note that the cut scores above are illustrative in nature only. Individual districts or the NYSED could and should adjust these cut scores to meet their specific needs. In figure 4, teachers would progress from one proficiency level to the next by meeting the minimum requirements for a given level. For example, a teacher would be scored *Effective* for Domain 1 once he or she had attained minimum scores of 2 on all elements and a majority of scores of 3. Stated differently, if the teacher had a majority of scores of 3 for Domain 1 and remaining scores of 2 except for one score of 1, the teacher would be classified as *Developing*. In the conjunctive approach, then, a teacher must have attained all minimum scores for a given proficiency level in order to classified at that level.

The most severe disadvantage to using the continuums depicted in figure 3 and figure 4 is that teachers early in their careers would characteristically receive low proficiency scores. For example, it would not be uncommon for a first year teacher to receive scores of 1 or 0 (on the Marzano Scale) in a number of elements of the model, thus being classified as *Ineffective*. From a developmental perspective, this is perfectly legitimate. When one is a novice within a profession as complex as teaching, it is reasonable to have many areas of skill weakness. Over time these weaknesses become strengths as the individual engages in deliberate practice regarding specific elements of the craft.

This noted, at political, perceptual, and psychological levels, assigning *Ineffective* proficiency scores to a large number of beginning teachers could have severe negative consequences. To remedy this situation, but still provide substantive feedback to teachers within a framework that allows them increase their competence over time without perceived negative consequences, a continuum that is sensitive to time in service can be used.

Using an Continuum That Is Sensitive to Time in Service

A continuum that is sensitive to time of service would have different proficiency levels for different intervals of time in service (i.e., years in the teaching profession). To illustrate, assume that a district has identified three tiers of time of service:

- Level 1: 1 to 5 years of service or when tenure is granted (whichever comes first)
- Level 2: 6 to 10 years of service
- Level 3: Beyond 10 years of service

For each level of time in service the proficiency levels of Ineffective, Developing, Effective, and Highly Effective would be defined differently. This is depicted in figure 5.

Figure 5: Proficiency Levels That Are Sensitive to Time in Service

Level 1	
L1: Ineffective	Some scores of 1 and 0
L1: Developing	Majority of scores of 2 on all elements
L1: Effective	Minimum scores of 2 on all elements
L1: Highly Effective	Minimum scores of 2 on all elements and at least 5 scores of 3
Level 2	
L2: Ineffective	Some scores below 2 but none below 1
L2: Developing	Minimum scores of 2
L2: Effective	Minimum scores of 2 and majority of scores of 3
L2: Highly Effective	Minimum scores of 2, a majority of scores of 3 and at least 5 scores of 4
Level 3	
L3: Ineffective	Some scores below 3 but none below 2
L3: Developing	Minimum scores of 3
L3: Effective	Minimum scores of 3 and at least 8 scores of 4
L3: Highly Effective	Minimum scores of 3 and majority of scores of 4

Note: Scores based on the Marzano scale © 2011 Robert J. Marzano

The levels described in figure 5 can be applied to any domain. As depicted in figure 5, a teacher at Level 1 in terms of years of service (i.e., 1 to 5 years or tenure) can be assigned the proficiency level of *Highly Effective* even though he or she has not mastered all elements of the model. For example, in Domain 1, minimum scores of 2 on all elements and a majority of scores of 3 constitutes *Highly Effective* performance. In contrast, a teacher at Level 3 in terms of time in service (i.e., beyond 10 years) must exhibit minimum scores of 3 and a majority of scores of 4 in Domain 1 to be assigned *Highly Effective* status. Again, it is important to note that the cut scores above are illustrative in nature only. Individual districts or the NYSED could and should adjust these cut scores to meet their specific needs. Thus, schemes like that in figure 5 can provide a clear continuum regarding teacher growth in expertise throughout a career while still allowing for recognition and celebration of milestones along the way.

Including Teacher Yearly Growth

Up to this point, the discussion of teacher proficiency has been based on status—a teacher's proficiency levels for the domains of the model at the end of the year. As described in the book, *Effective Supervision* (Marzano et al., 2011), the Marzano Evaluation Model recommends the inclusion of teacher growth in the elements of Domains 1 through 4 as an aspect of teacher evaluation. Specifically, each year teachers might identify a minimum of 3 elements from Domain 1, and 1 element from each of Domains 2, 3, and 4 for a total of 6 growth targets—6 specific areas on which the teacher is going to improve over the year. These elements would be selected by teachers along with input from administrators and supervisors. Growth on these selected elements would then be assessed using a scale like that in figure 6 (page 34).

Figure 6: Proficiency Scale for Growth on Selected Elements

Proficiency Level	**Description**
Ineffective	Meets less than a majority of growth targets
Developing	Meets a majority of growth targets
Effective	Meets all growth targets
Highly Effective	Meets all growth targets plus increases competence on 4 or more elements not identified as growth targets

Each teacher's growth score would then be included as an element in teacher evaluation. Specifically, a teacher's final score for a given year could be computed as weighted average of current **status** and **growth**.

COMPUTING SCORES FOR ADMINISTRATORS

The design of scores for administrators follows exactly the same logic as the design of scores for teachers creating a coordinated evaluation system for teachers and administrators. The generic form of the administrator scale is depicted in figure 7.

Figure 7: Generic Form of the Marzano Administrator Scale

Innovating (4)	**Applying (3)**	**Developing (2)**	**Beginning (1)**	**Not Using (0)**
The administrator makes adaptations in the approach to the element that meet the unique needs of his/her staff and students.	The administrator addresses the element with no major errors or omissions.	The administrator completes the effort to address the element but does so with some minor errors or omissions.	The administrator attempts to address the element but does not complete or follow through with the effort.	The administrator does not attempt to address the element.

© 2011 Robert J. Marzano

Like the teacher evaluation system scale, the administrator scale can be used as a summary scale (i.e., a summative score) or can be translated to correspond to the NYSED scale as shown in figure 8 (page XX).

Figure 8: Mapping the Marzano Evaluator Scale onto the NYSED Scale

Marzano Scale	**Innovating (4)**	**Applying (3)**	**Developing (2)**	**Beginning (1)**	**Not Using (0)**
	The administrator makes adaptations in the approach to the element that meet the unique needs of his/her staff and students.	The administrator addresses the element with no major errors or omissions.	The administrator completes the effort to address the element but does so with some minor errors or omissions.	The administrator attempts to address the element but does not complete or follow through with the effort.	The administrator does not attempt to address the element.
NYSED Scale	**Highly Effective (4)**	**Effective (3)**	**Developing (2)**	**Developing (2)**	**Ineffective (1)**

Again, it is important to note that the translation depicted in figure 8 is not necessary if districts utilize compensatory or conjunctive approaches to principal evaluation. The example cut scores illustrated in figures 3 and 4 can be used with the Marzano Administrator Evaluation system as well as with the Teacher Evaluation system. Additionally, administrator evaluators can use a continuum for administrators that is sensitive to time in service. The example proficiency levels in figure 5 are also applicable to the Marzano Administrator Evaluation system. Finally, principal scores can also be computed for yearly growth on elements in each Administrator Domain. A principal might identify 1 or 2 elements from each of the five domains on which to improve over the year. Growth on these selected elements would then be assessed using a scale like the one in figure 6. As noted above, it is important to note that the cut scores above are illustrative in nature only. Individual districts or the NYSED could and should adjust these cut scores to meet their specific needs.

5. Describe and detail your organization's demonstrated ability to adapt and sustain the submitted rubric to align with the requested needs of participating LEAs.

Marzano Research Laboratory (MRL), under the direct leadership of Dr. Robert Marzano, has extensive capabilities to support development of evaluation systems and systemic implementation of capacity building and quality assurance programs including evaluator and observer training, professional development, teacher and principal growth, and teacher pedagogy in all classroom practices contained within the evaluation criteria.

The MRL team consists of highly skilled consultants handpicked by Dr. Marzano for their ability to train teachers on researched-based strategies that can lead to improved student achievement. MRL associates will work with New York schools to help analyze their current evaluation systems and implement a system that aligns with the New York Teaching Standards, provides feedback to teachers to promote continual growth in professional practices, and connects state and district student data as the key measure of effectiveness.

MRL can adapt the basic rubric to meet the needs of any school or district and support the implementation of the rubric with multiple support methods. A few examples of this process currently in progress across the nation include:

- Wenatchee School District in Wenatchee, Washington
- Douglas Mid-High School in Oklahoma City, Oklahoma
- Cherry Creek Public School District in Denver, Colorado
- Round Rock High School in Round Rock, Texas

This process includes MRL seeking self-evaluative information from the teachers in the form of an electronic or paper survey in which teachers rate their own skills on the behaviors measured in the Marzano model. The survey data is used to help produce a customized protocol model. Other data contributing to the customized protocol can include school improvement initiatives that align with specific teaching behaviors measured by the rubric. For example, in one case a school had a clear improvement initiative for teachers to establish classroom routines for students to assist in classroom management. That particular learning goal was identified as critical in the school improvement plan and was in direct alignment with design question 6:. What will I do to establish and maintain classroom routines? (see Appendix A, pages 53-54). Therefore the elements associated with design question 6 were a high priority for the school and became key evaluation items in their customized protocol.

MRL provides continued support, training, and resources for schools throughout the entire implementation school year and beyond if the school or district contracts for the support. One example of this is MRL's work with a diverse 2,750 student urban high school in Round Rock, Texas. MRL provided initial trainings for the staff and administrative team to establish the key foundational knowledge within the *Art and Science of Teaching* framework. MRL then administered a survey to teachers asking for them to rate their current performance levels for the 41 elements of the observational protocol. MRL disaggregated the survey data and produced a customized version of the observational protocol for implementation at Round Rock High School. The initial customized protocol was presented to administrators via a video conferencing session with an MRL associate. Using administrators' input, MRL made subtle adjustments to the customized protocol to be sure specific elements within the school improvement plan were prioritized in the customized protocol. The school implemented the customized version using the long, short, and snapshot versions of the protocol. During the implementation, Dr. Marzano and MRL associates answered questions and provided ongoing support via video conferencing sessions and on-site trainings for evaluators throughout the implementation year. During these sessions, an MRL associate conducted on-site guided practice and trainings for evaluators to continue aligning their practices and use of the protocol.

6. What is the instructional content, methodology, and format of any proposed evaluator training that your organization may be able to offer participating LEAs?
Please note: providers are not obliged to provide training nor are districts obligated to buy training from providers.

Content for proposed trainings would include the following:

- Instruction: MRL will train teachers and network teams in *The Art and Science of Teaching*, which is a comprehensive model of instruction. Our emphasis would be on reflective practice—helping teachers determine their areas of strength and weakness and then targeting specific weakness on which the will improve over the course of a year. We can also provide all NY teachers with scales (rubrics) for reflective practice that can be used to perform self-audits.
- Teacher Evaluation: MRL will train administrators in a comprehensive model of teacher effectiveness that includes four domains:

Domain 1: Classroom Strategies and Behaviors (with 41 elements; see Appendices A, B, & C, pages 49-101)
Domain 2: Planning and Preparing (with 8 elements; see Appendix D, pages 102-110)
Domain 3: Reflecting on Teaching (with 6 elements; see Appendix E, pages 111-116)
Domain 4: Collegiality and Professionalism (with 5 elements; see Appendix F, pages 117-123)

We can provide scales (rubrics) for all components of this model. Additionally, we can train network teams in how the model can be used for walkthroughs, instructional rounds, comprehensive observations, and other forms of feedback to teachers including feedback from students. The Marzano model of feedback has an inherent growth component for value-added data.

- Administrator Evaluation: MRL will train administrators and administrative evaluators in a comprehensive model of school leadership for teacher effectiveness that includes:
  1. School Improvement Means People Improvement
  2. The District's Role in Supporting the PLC Process
  3. The Principal's Role in Leading a Professional Learning Community
  4. Creating the Collaborative Culture of a Professional Learning Community
  5. Developing a Guaranteed and Viable Curriculum
  6. Ongoing Monitoring of Student Learning
  7. Ensuring Effective Instruction
  8. Responding When Kids Don't Learn
  9. Leadership Is an Affair of the Heart

  Marzano Research Laboratory will use a variety of direct instruction, interactive video conferencing, action research, on-site implementation coaching, phone consultation, and email support to personalize the training. In addition to these methods of differentiation, MRL can provide intensive, incremental, and academy models that allow for spiraling learning over the time periods suggested. Intensive training allows just-in-time learning for network or inquiry teams. Additionally, MRL can provide an academy model that allows for training of cohorts progressing through the content. For example, an academy model would allow for training all teachers or inquiry teams within a cohort process over the course of two to three years. Each inquiry team or teacher group would have a designated number of teammates (10-15) from their local site in a cohort of 12-15 other district teams. Expert MRL Associates with recent experiences in using and implementing the aforementioned evaluation rubrics will share implementation pacing ideas, assist with prioritization based upon local needs, and share practical application from respective educational experiences. In addition to pacing, prioritization, and application ideas, MRL will use the extensive resources, detailed below, to communicate with and lead the work of these groups.
- Human Expertise: Dr. Robert Marzano leads a team of professionals that are committed to MRL's mission and vision. His leadership, along with his incredible accessibility to clients, has made MRL a valuable resource to educators around the world. In addition to Dr. Marzano, MRL has some of the finest and most experienced consultants and technical support personnel in the country. These trainers will be available both on-site and through distance-learning media. Finally, because of Dr. Marzano's reputation, and

through our relationship with Solution Tree, MRL has access to the nation's top educational leaders and thinkers.

- Print: MRL maintains an extensive library of books, articles, and white papers appropriate to these topics. Print media can also be generated as a part of this effort.
- On-line: MRL has a strong on-line presence with resources that include sample assessment items, academic and life-skill standards documents, an extensive database of action research projects from around the country, discussion forums, and more.
- Media: MRL makes valuable use of our interactive video conferencing capabilities to communicate with all stakeholders in our projects through the nation. We use videotaping extensively to provide stakeholders with feedback to enhance their reflective practice. We host many webinars both for national audiences and for our long-term clients. Additional tools are available at marzanoresearch.com for use by teachers and leaders:
    - Evidence of Effectiveness data
    - Recorded event presentations, webinars, and podcasts
    - On-site consulting, coaching, and training; workshops; keynotes; training academies
    - Videoconferencing
    - Classroom Strategies series:
        Designing and Teaching Learning Goals and Objectives (Marzano, 2009)
        Formative Assessment and Standards-Based Grading (Marzano, 2010)
        The Highly Engaged Classroom (Marzano & Pickering, 2011)
        Teaching and Assessing 21st Century Skills (Marzano & Heflebower, 2012)
    - Classroom tools:
        Observation and feedback protocol
        Proficiency scale bank
        Vocabulary games and strategies
        Cooperative learning strategies
        Reproducibles from MRL publications
        Specific strategies for effective teaching
        Vocabulary lists
- Special Services: Marzano Research Laboratory creates customized tools based on district/school needs and goals:
    - Analysis of Effectiveness of Teaching
    - Program and Product Evaluation
    - Standards Evaluation and Proficiency Scale Creation
    - Tool Development (including, but not limited to, walkthrough protocols, development of instructional rounds protocols, materials to support instruction, manuals for staff, and validation of common assessments)
    - Vocabulary List Creation

7. Describe and detail the projected costs associated with the adoption of your teacher or principal rubric evaluation tool, which would include the projected cost(s) for the adoption of the practice rubric and any supplemental costs involved (*i.e. training/instruction, implementation costs, materials, etc.*).

- Option #1: Developing Expert Teachers Academy Model
- Option #2: Onsite Workshops

- Option #3: Development of Customized Teacher Rubric – single site or school
- Option #4: Multiple Site or District-Wide Implementation of Rubrics
- Option #5: Interactive Video Conferencing (IVC)

Section IV

Organizational Capacity
(*Form B-3*)

1. A description of the organization, including information such as length of time in operation, number of existing locations, number of staff, an organization chart, etc.
Marzano Research Laboratory (MRL), founded in 2008, is a private, for-profit research and consulting firm co-owned by Dr. Robert Marzano and Solution Tree (ST). MRL specializes in research, evaluation, and training for educators at the local, state, and federal levels. MRL employs a team of associates, authors, project administrators, statisticians, and researchers to provide expert-level professional development.
Marzano Research Laboratory employees 13 full time staff and 16 associate professional developers and trainers. The staff brings together a broad background including teaching of pre-K through postsecondary students, school administration, professional development, writing, and research. Experienced senior-level staff members monitor the creation, development, and application of all research products, writing, and product development, assessment services, and professional development.
Two full-time employees of Solution Tree coordinate and support MRL. A 15-person marketing department provides support through web designers, graphic designers, catalog production experts, editors, and social media managers. ST staff also has the expertise to produce high quality DVD and videos. The publications department and professional development enable customized support and dissemination of information through print material, "travel-free" professional development, electronic media, and on-site training. Experienced coordinators produce all events, featuring keynote speakers and workshops.
Solution Tree maintains staff to write, produce, edit and publish documents from booklets to book-length manuscripts. Solution Tree provides order fulfillment and warehousing facilities and capabilities to take requests for resources from individual schools, districts, and education service centers.
The "Institutes" department staff at Solution Tree are skilled in executing all aspects of events, from registration through food and beverage service for as few as 100 people or for more than 4,000. Solution Tree's professional development is provided by authors who are leaders in their fields and passionate about their work.
All accounting services for MRL are performed in the Solution Tree Bloomington, Indiana office.
MRL's resource center, combined with Solution Tree's marketing and professional development products, gives us the ability to put research into practice through three tiers of educational service: 1) Research-based, practical books and videos, 2) Thought-provoking and engaging events to inspire and inform, and 3) customized onsite professional development to deepen the learning experience. Continuous action research ensures MRL strategies are always at the forefront of best practice.

2. A description of the organization's history of providing similar teacher and/or principal evaluation services, including the outcomes achieved, number of previous contracts, the diversity of clients, the number of students served, etc.
MRL works with numerous districts around the nation providing training and support for the implementation of the teacher and/or principal evaluation rubric. A sampling of schools and districts that MRL is working with includes:

- Round Rock High School, Round Rock, Texas: multi-year contract ongoing, urban high school, approximate enrollment=3000 students consisting of 55% Caucasian, 25% Hispanic, 15% African American, 5% Asian

- Oklahoma City Public Schools, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma: 2-year contract ongoing, multiple schools, elementary through high school, 43,000 students in district consisting of 20% Caucasian, 27% African American, 45% Hispanic, 5% Native American and 3% Asian
- Wenatchee Public Schools, Wenatchee, Washington: multi-year contract ongoing, suburban school district, approximate enrollment=7,800 students consisting of 57% Caucasian, 39% Hispanic, 1% African American, 1% Asian

A specific example of the process and results can be seen in MRL's work with Round Rock High School. MRL provided initial trainings for the staff and administrative team to establish the key foundational knowledge within the *Art and Science of Teaching* framework. MRL then administered a survey to teachers asking for them to rate their current performance levels for the 41 elements of the observational protocol. MRL disaggregated the survey data and produced a customized version of the observational protocol for implementation at Round Rock High School. The initial customized protocol was presented to administrators via a video conferencing session with an MRL associate. Using administrators' input, MRL made subtle adjustments to the customized protocol to be sure specific elements that were goals within the school improvement plan were prioritized in the customized protocol. The school implemented the customized version using the long, short, and snapshot versions of the protocol. During the implementation, Dr. Marzano and MRL associates answered questions and provided ongoing support via video conferencing sessions and on-site trainings for evaluators throughout the implementation year. During these sessions, an MRL associate conducted on-site guided practice and trainings for evaluators to continue aligning their practices and use of the protocol.
This particular school implemented the *Art and Science of Teaching* and the use of the observational protocol in the fall of 2009. Achievement growth occurred in all of their core content areas and within all sub-populations within their student body. The following is a sample of the school's achievement results for all students as measured by the state assessment (TAKS) over a two-year period:

- Math: 14% increase over two years; 77% to 91% passing
- Science: 4 % increase over two years; 85% to 89% passing
- English: 5% increase over two years; 93% to 98% passing
- Social Studies: 2% increase over two years; 96% to 98% passing

3. Copies of the organization's tax returns for the past two years, or other evidence of fiscal soundness, e.g. annual financial statements, fiscal audits, Dunn & Bradstreet reports, etc., submitted as Appendices.
Please see Appendix L (page 153).

4. Copy of the organization's 501(c)3 certificate or State license.
Please see Appendix L (page 153).

5. Information as to whether lawsuits have been filed against the organization for educational and/or fiscal mismanagement, civil rights violations, criminal act(s), or other reason(s); and indicate the outcome of each instance.
No lawsuits have been filed against Marzano Research Laboratory.

6. Information as to whether the organization has been denied the ability to conduct business in any state and indicate the reason(s) for such denial.
Marzano Research Laboratory has never been denied the ability to conduct business in any state.

7. Information as to whether the organization has been debarred or suspended from doing business with any local government, state, or the federal government.
Marzano Research Laboratory has never been debarred or suspended from doing business with any local government, state, or the federal government.

8. Information as to whether the organization has been approved as a teacher and/or principal evaluation service provider in another state and specify such state(s).
The Marzano evaluation model has been approved for use as an official evalution model in the states of Florida, Washington, and New Jersey.

Section V

Service Summary Form
(*Form C*)

TEACHER AND PRINCIPAL PRACTICE RUBRIC PROVIDERS
TECHNICAL PROPOSAL - SERVICE SUMMARY (*INFORMATIONAL-ONLY*)

1.	Name of organization: Primary location: Contact information: (phone / email / website):	Marzano Research Laboratory 9000 E. Nichols Ave Ste. 112 Englewood, CO 80112 303.766.9199 / jane.stjohn@solution-tree.com www.marzanoresearch.com
	LEAs where service will be provided (or is intended to be provided):	
2.	The number of years the provider has delivered service:	3
3.	Title of the Teacher and/or Principal Rubric Evaluation model to be used (if appropriate):	Marzano Teacher Practice Rubric and Marzano School Administrator Evaluation System
4.	Professional population that the provider has served, and that they are requesting to serve (i.e. teachers, principals, admin., etc.):	Central Office Administrators, Building Administrators, Lead Teachers, Teachers, Support Staff
5.	Number of teachers and/or principals that have received an evaluation using the submitted rubric tool (approximately):	50,000 plus
6.	Number of teacher and/or principal evaluation instructional sessions provided per year, if applicable:	2-3 per year
7.	Average length of each training session for the training of evaluators (minutes/hours):	6 hours per day

If approved as a provider of Teacher and/or Principal Practice Rubrics, we are prepared to provide services to:

Please indicate by clicking on the appropriate boxes below:

☒ **All** Districts/LEAs in the State of New York, or

☐ Only to those eligible Districts/LEAs indicated below:

TEACHER AND PRINCIPAL PRACTICE RUBRIC PROVIDERS
Assurances and Signature

In submitting this application to be included in the State Education Department's Teacher and Principal Practice Rubric Service Provider list, I certify that:

1. The organization will comply with all applicable Federal, State and local health, safety, and civil rights laws.

2. All individuals employed by or otherwise associated with the organization, who will have direct contact with eligible teachers, principals, or students, will be subject to all of the fingerprint and criminal history record check requirements contained in law, including, Education Law §§305(30), 1125(3), 1604(39), 1604(40), 1709(39), 1709(40), 1804(9), 1804(10), 1950(4)(ll), 1950(4)(nnn), 2503(18), 2503(19), 2554(25), 2554(26), 2590-h (20), 2854(3)(a-2), 2854(3)(a-3), 3035 and Part 87 of the regulations of the Commissioner of Education.

3. All instruction and content will be secular, neutral, and non-ideological.

4. All instruction and content provided to LEA's will be aligned to the applicable professional standards of practice for teachers and/or principals, including but not limited to, the New York State Teaching Standards, ISLCC 2008 Leadership standards, New York State Education Law, and the Commissioner's regulations.

5. The organization is fiscally sound and will be able to complete services to the eligible local educational agency.

The undersigned hereby certifies that I am an individual authorized to act on behalf of the organization in submitting this application and assurances. I certify that all of the information provided herein is true and accurate, to the best of my knowledge. I understand that, if any of the information contained herein is found to have been deliberately misrepresented, that may constitute grounds for denying the applicant's request for approval to be placed in the list of Teacher and Principal Practice Rubric Service Providers or for removal from that same list. I further certify that the organization will comply with all of the assurances set forth herein.

1. Name of Organization (PLEASE PRINT/TYPE) Marzano Research Laboratory	4. Signature of Authorized Representative (PLEASE USE BLACK/BLUE INK) Robert J Marzano
2. Name of Authorized Representative (PLEASE PRINT/TYPE) Dr. Robert J. Marzano	5. Date Signed 8/18/2011
3. Title of Authorized Representative (PLEASE PRINT/TYPE) C.E.O.	