TEACHER AND PRINCIPAL PRACTICE RUBRIC PROVIDERS

TECHNICAL PROPOSAL - APPLICATION

Name of Entity	Learning Sciences International, LLC
Address	175 Cornell Road, Suite 15
City, State Zip	Blairsville, PA 15717
Phone	724-459-2100
Fax	724-459-6373
E-mail	rfp@learningsciences.net
Name and Title of Authorized Contact	Brandi Campisano, Proposal Manager
Address (if different from above)	
City, State Zip	
Phone	724-459-2100 x 122
Fax	724-459-6373
E-mail ***(REQUIRED)***	bcampisano@learningsciences.com
Tax I.D. Number	33-0998789

The organization is: (Please indicate by clicking on the appropriate boxes below:)

Local Educational Agency (LEA)	☐	
For-profit corporation	☐	Click either: ☐ **NY corp.** or ☐ **Foreign corp.**
Non-profit corporation	☐	Click either: ☐ **NY corp.** or ☐ **Foreign corp.**
Limited Liability Company (LLC)	☒	Click either: ☐ **NY LLC** or ☐ **Foreign LLC**
Other	☐	Please specify:
Vendor Responsibility Questionnaire (VRQ)		Click either: ☒ Submitted online (preferred) ☐ Paper form enclosed with application ☐ Will not be filed due to exempt status as follows (please specify):

IMPORTANT: For-profit corporations, non-profit corporations, and LLCs, are required to attach the following document(s), as applicable:

- **If a New York State corporation:** the Certificate of Incorporation, together with any Certificates of Amendments to such document filed to date.[24] (See important footnote below.)
- **If a foreign corporation**: (1) the Application for Authority to do business in New York State filed with the NYS Dept of State, **and** (2) the Certificate of Incorporation filed in the State of incorporation, (3) together with any amendments to such documents filed to date.* (See important footnote below.)
- **If a New York State LLC**: the Articles of Organization, together with any amendments to such document filed to date. * (See important footnote below.)
- **If a foreign LLC**: (1) the Application for Authority to do business in New York State filed with the NYS Dept of State, **and** (2) the articles of organization filed in the State of formation, (3) together with any amendments to such documents filed to date.* (See important footnote below.)
- **If the corporation or LLC will use an assumed name in New York State**: the certificate of Assumed Name

[24] **Ensure that these documents include appropriate language authorizing the provision of these services. Information pertaining to the "Consent Obtaining" process may be accessed at the SED Office of Counsel website at www.counsel.nysed.gov or you may also contact the Office at 518-474-6400 if you have any questions regarding this requirement.**

TEACHER AND PRINCIPAL PRACTICE RUBRIC PROVIDERS
TECHNICAL PROPOSAL - APPLICATION

Name of Applying Entity: Learning Sciences International, LLC

Name of Rubric: Marzano Focused Teacher Evaluation Model

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.

* **A separate technical proposal must be submitted for each rubric to be approved.**

TEACHER AND PRINCIPAL PRACTICE RUBRIC PROVIDERS
TECHNICAL PROPOSAL – RUBRIC DESIGN AND IMPLEMENTATION

Rubric Design and Implementation (*INFORMATION-ONLY*):

In this section, the applicant should present evidence that their submitted practice rubric has a demonstrated record of effectiveness in contributing to teacher and/or principal achievement.

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.	**Clearly labeled tables or graphs depicting this improvement should be submitted as appendices.** The Focused Evaluation Model draws from the foundational concepts and research articulated in Robert Marzano's *The Art and Science of Teaching* (2007), and from earlier works including *What Works in Schools* (Marzano, 2003), *Classroom Instruction that Works* (Marzano, Pickering, & Pollock, 2001), *Classroom Management that Works* (Marzano, Pickering, & Marzano, 2003), and *Classroom Assessment and Grading that Work* (Marzano, 2006), as well as from the findings outlined in John Hattie's seminal work, *Visible Learning* (2008), which synthesized 800 meta-analyses related to student achievement. Taken together, these books represent the largest ever evidence-based research into what actually works in schools to improve learning. The model's design was also influenced by the work of cognitive psychologist Anders Eriksson, whose research dispelled many of the myths surrounding the acquisition of expertise. A major premise of Eriksson's research is that individuals can improve when they have clear goals and expert feedback. More recently, Hattie has suggested that the difference between novice and expert teachers is that they focus their attention on improving their practice in specific areas. The evaluation model was designed to focus teachers' attention on specific instructional elements correlated to student achievement, and to support a common language of instruction throughout schools and districts. The original Marzano Evaluation Model is an aggregation of the extensive research on those elements and practices that have been shown to correlate with student academic achievement. In addition to a dozen research papers and several updates to the teacher evaluation model since 2010, Marzano and Toth published *Teacher Evaluation that Makes a Difference* in 2013. We discussed in some depth our recommendations for future iterations of teacher evaluation models to meet the requisite levels of high accuracy and fairness. Those challenges and others have been addressed in the updated Focused Model.
2. What is the methodology used to collect evidence of the demonstrated	**Further Research on the Comprehensive Marzano Teacher Evaluation Model**

professional achievement for teachers or principals *(i.e., measures and analyses used, comparison groups, etc.)*?	Between 2012-2016, Learning Sciences Marzano Center conducted research projects utilizing the largest dataset available to analyze correlations between student growth on state assessments and raw observation scores in the Marzano Teacher Evaluation Model. The Center's dataset included: • 1.48 to 1.85 million scores for instructional elements collected during evaluative classroom observations over three years • 248,000 to 277,000 evaluative observations across three years • 58,000 to 63,000 total teachers across three years (12,000 to 13,000 teachers each year) Our researchers matched student growth on state assessments with observation scores (the final dataset includes tested teachers only). Our findings were as follows: • There was a small, positive, statistically significant correlation between observation scores and value-added measures (VAM). • All elements in the model have a small positive significant correlation to student learning gains • The observation score was the second largest predictor of the VAM accounting for teacher and school level characteristics. • Correlations coefficients appeared to increase for principal observers who received training and side-by-side coaching • When examining teacher attributes including advanced degrees, the teacher observation score was the largest predictor in the study of student growth on state assessments It is important to emphasize that the original Marzano Teacher Evaluation Model has been supported by research. However, teacher evaluation is not, and should not be a static enterprise— any evaluation system needs to respond to current research, national policy initiatives, and data collected from implementations in the field. It has always been our goal to continue to evolve the Marzano Evaluation Models as our Center has continued our research and received implementation evidence from schools and districts. Our design of these updates has also taken into account inputs from our partner districts. Further, national initiatives such as Common Core State Standards, State College and Career Readiness Standards, and the Professional Standards for Educational Leaders, have continued to influence our revisions as the need for rigorous, standards-based evaluation models utilizing student evidence of learning has become more urgent.

	During more than half a decade of ongoing development, we have worked to support increasingly reliable teacher and leader evaluation scores; to encourage teachers and leaders to improve their pedagogy and leadership skills; and to increase transparency, ease of use, and validity for teachers, school leaders, and district personnel. The Marzano Focused Teacher Evaluation Model addressed in this paper is a distillation of all that we have learned. The Focused Model provides greater clarity of expectations for both teachers and observers, improves the focus on key pedagogical principles, and significantly improves ease of adoption and use. With the need for a shift in teacher practice to address rigorous standards, there is also a call for a shift in observer practice to refocus the lens of teacher evaluation. Evaluation systems must move from compliance with human resource processes (i.e., rating teachers) to a greater emphasis on leveraging the observational and feedback process to support necessary teaching shifts with new standards. Observers must now focus on classroom implementation of new academic standards, and on helping teachers identify and plan for the level of instruction necessary for students to demonstrate evidence of progress toward those standards. The evaluation supports a standards-based classroom.
3. What type of research design has been established to support these findings? *(e.g., experimental, non-experimental, quasi-experimental, etc.)*	The Focused Evaluation Model draws from the foundational concepts and research articulated in Robert Marzano's *The Art and Science of Teaching* (2007), and from earlier works including *What Works in Schools* (Marzano, 2003), *Classroom Instruction that Works* (Marzano, Pickering, & Pollock, 2001), *Classroom Management that Works* (Marzano, Pickering, & Marzano, 2003), and *Classroom Assessment and Grading that Work* (Marzano, 2006), as well as from the findings outlined in John Hattie's seminal work, *Visible Learning* (2008), which synthesized 800 meta-analyses related to student achievement. Taken together, these books represent the largest ever evidence-based research into what actually works in schools to improve learning. Based on over forty years of research including a series of quasi-experimental studies conducted as action research projects regarding the extent to which the utilization of selected instructional strategies enhances the learning of students. The data used for analysis can be found in Marzano Research Laboratory's Meta-Analysis Database (see marzanoresearch.com).
4. Describe and detail the proposed scoring or rating system associated with the rubric being submitted.	**Clearly labeled tables or charts depicting this scoring/rating system should be submitted as appendices.** The Focused Model makes the following recommendations for scoring. 1) A score of Innovating is awarded when there is evidence that 91-100% of students have reached the desired effect. 2) Scoring of all 23 elements during the course

of the year is recommended. 3) Competency-based scoring is recommended.

The table below illustrates the scale for previewing new content.

Innovating (4)	Based on student evidence, implements adaptations to achieve the desired effect in more than 90% of the student evidence at the taxonomy level of the critical content.
Applying (3)	Engages students in previewing activities that require students to access prior knowledge as it relates to the new content. The desired effect is displayed in the majority of student evidence at the taxonomy level of the critical content.
Developing (2)	Engages students in previewing activities that require students to access prior knowledge as it relates to the new content, but less than the majority of students are displaying the desired effect in student evidence at the taxonomy level of the critical content.
Beginning (1)	Uses strategy incorrectly or with parts missing.
Not Using (0)	Strategy was called for but not exhibited.

The 5-Step Process for Classroom Observation

The Focused Model is also supported by guidelines for a 5-step observation process. The 5-step observation process was developed to improve inter-rater agreement among observers.

Step 1—What elements am I seeing when I observe a teacher? Does the teacher use the strategy correctly?

- Before making any decisions, observe the teacher in action, then select an element to score and move to the Example Teacher Instructional Techniques box.
- Scroll through the menu and check any techniques that the teacher is implementing.
- If the teacher is using the technique correctly, the observer can move to the scale and indicate a Level 2/Developing.

Step 2—What technique or techniques does the teacher use to monitor for the desired effect/ outcome?

- This step concerns teacher techniques for monitoring for student learning as a result of using an Instruction element, or monitoring to determine if implementing a Conditions for Learning element produces the desired effect or desired outcome.

	• After identifying the element from Instruction or Conditions, how does the teacher monitor to determine if students are learning or changing their behavior? • Observe the teacher and check the box for any monitoring technique that is implemented. If observing Conditions for Learning, the observer monitors student behaviors and quickly notes how many students demonstrate the desired effect or desired outcome. • Note—the use of a monitoring technique does not change the teacher's rating on the scale. However, it is the bridge for moving from a 2/ Developing, to a 3/Applying, and ultimately a 4/ Innovating (see Step 3, below). **Step 3—What percent of students demonstrate achievement of the desired effect at the appropriate level of the target?** • Step 3 is directly connected to Step 2, but it transitions from a focus on teacher action to a focus on the student and student work. At this point, the teacher is monitoring to determine if students are learning. The observer moves to the Example Student Evidence box, and checks the applicable boxes based on observed student evidence. • The critical step is to determine the number of students who achieve the desired effect or desired outcome. The observer must examine student work to determine: a) if the work is at the correct level of the target; and b) the number of students who demonstrate the desired effect or outcome. • At this point, the observer moves to the scale. If less than half the class exhibits the desired effect, the score remains a 2/Developing. If 51% to 90% demonstrate the desired effect, the teacher earns a 3/Applying on the scale. If more than 90% show the desired effect, at the appropriate level of the target, then the score moves to a Level 4/ Innovating. • If the teacher does not earn a 3 or 4 on the scale, the observer moves to step 4. **Step 4—After monitoring student evidence and determining the number of students who demonstrate the desired effect, does the teacher make an adaptation?** • The observer moves to this step if the teacher monitors student evidence and notes that less than 91% of the students are demonstrating the desired outcome. • If the teacher makes an adaptation, continues to monitor student evidence, and confirms that more than 90% of students achieve the desired outcome, the observer moves the teacher's score to a 4.

	• If the outcome remains less than 91%, the score remains at 3, or if less than 51%, at level 2. **Step 5—Use student evidence to assign the final score on the scale for all elements observed in the lesson.** • Can take place in a post-conference • The teacher may bring evidence to confirm the percentage of students who demonstrate the desired effect **Competency-Based Scoring** As we have indicated, observers will plan to score all 23 elements during the course of the school year. This goal encourages teachers to practice and achieve competency in those instructional elements so critical to rigorous classrooms: helping students examine errors in reasoning, revise knowledge, and engage in cognitively complex tasks. Scoring all the elements encourages teachers to build expertise in areas where they need to grow. The Focused Teacher Evaluation Model not only measures current instructional practice, but helps teachers develop the practices they need to improve their teaching. Competency-based scoring allows school leaders to move away from traditional scoring models that simply average scores toward a scoring system that supports teachers to practice and master higher-order strategies in rigorous classrooms and requires teachers to demonstrate a full range of instructional skills. Competency-based scoring provides teachers with the safety they need to deliberately practice and improve those skills incrementally. With this system, each element is a competency that teachers are expected to master. At the end of the year, **observers average all the highest scores for the elements** to achieve an overall proficiency score for the year. Thus if, in the course of four observations during a year, a teacher scores a 1, 2, 2, 4 in "Helping Students Examine Their Reasoning," the teacher would receive a score of 4 for that element, having achieved competency. This system allows for feedback on any early low scores to be non-punitive and formative, as there is no averaging at the element level. Competency-based scoring encourages teachers to adopt a growth mindset. It is the scoring system we believe to be most fair and accurate for measuring individual teachers' competencies. Further, teachers will be able to access up-to-date, real-time data on the iObservation platform, so that every teacher knows precisely which of the 23 elements have been scored during the course of the year.
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.	Our goal in designing the Marzano Focus Teacher Evaluation Model is to ensure that schools and districts utilizing the model can take advantage of the most current framework available, one that is both validated by research and that

	meets national and state policy initiatives. We have simplified and integrated the Focused Teacher Evaluation Model in a way we believe will increase fairness, accuracy of scoring, and inter-rater reliability, and that also keeps the evaluative focus on standards-based classroom instruction and teacher instructional growth. We have further emphasized a competency-based approach to observation and scoring, with clearly delineated desired effects for student learning, that will help teachers develop their professional expertise over time. Additionally, LSI has extensive capabilities to support state and district redevelopment of their evaluation systems and systemic implementation of capacity building and quality assurance programs including evaluator and observer training, professional development, teacher and principal growth, development and evaluation software systems, graduate education programs, and teacher pedagogy and observer certification programs. LSI's experience ranges from working collaboratively in developing and implementing frameworks for effective teaching and school leadership to the creation of a continuum of differentiated professional development aligned to these frameworks. LSI also blends advanced adult learning methodologies with leading-edge technologies to produce online learning courses that foster exceptional learning, retention, and application of new knowledge. In partnership with the Florida Department of Education (FLDOE), LSI provided statewide technical assistance for teacher evaluation to its 67 school districts and charter schools through the federal Race to the Top initiative. The FLDOE selected Dr. Marzano's Causal Teacher Evaluation Model as its state model. LSI is providing training, tools, and technical assistance service to guide districts through four years of design, implementation, and improvement for their local teacher evaluation models. LSI's has also provided statewide implementations in Pennsylvania's 500 school districts includes a full range of economically, racially, and culturally diverse students and teachers from rural, suburban, and urban centers that includes both Pittsburgh Public Schools and the School District of Philadelphia with 115,000 and 210,000 students, respectively. Beyond LSI's experience in urban and suburban districtwide implementations, LSI has experience working with single schools in rural settings. LSI works closely with all school leaders, regardless of the school's size or structure, to ensure that their professional development solutions target the school, district, or state goals. Pennsylvania initiatives included delivering over 1 million hours of online continuing

	professional education, delivering online, in-person, and graduate education to support state initiatives including high school reform, 21st Century skills, and early literacy.
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 obligated to provide training nor are districts obligated to buy training from providers.*	LSI offers the NYSED a proven technical approach that includes a 3-day training on the Marzano Focused Teacher Evaluation Model to prepare observers to support teachers as they make the shifts necessary for successful implementation of rigorous, standards-based teaching in their classrooms; as well as Side-by-Side Observer coaching and if desired, technical training on iObservation, LSI's exclusive online platform that house the Focused Model.
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.).*	The sealed cost proposal details the costs for the Marzano Focused Teacher Evaluation Model Professional Development and related technology platform, iObservation. The purchase of either the professional development services or iObseravtion includes the Marzano Focused Teacher Evaluation Model (rubrics) at no additional charge. For pricing information, see the Cost Proposal.

TEACHER AND PRINCIPAL PRACTICE RUBRIC PROVIDERS
TECHNICAL PROPOSAL – SERVICE SUMMARY
(INFORMATION-ONLY)

Please complete this form if the applicant provides training or professional development services around evaluation and/or the use of their rubric. If the applicant does not provide additional services, please enter "N/A" into the first field below.

1.	Name of organization:	Learning Sciences International, LLC
	Primary location (city/state):	Blairsville, PA
	Contact information: (phone / email / website):	Beth Carr 717-845-6300 x 170 bcarr@learningsciences.com www.learningsciences.com
	LEAs where service will be provided (or is intended to be provided):	Onsite at LEAs in the state of New York
2.	The number of years the provider has delivered service:	12
3.	Title of the Teacher and/or Principal Rubric Evaluation model to be used (if appropriate):	The Marzano Focused Teacher Evaluation Model
4.	Professional population that the provider has served, and that they are requesting to serve (i.e., teachers, principals, admin., etc.):	K-12 School Administrations, Teachers, Teacher Leaders, Instructional Coaches, and external stakeholders
5.	Number of teachers and/or principals that have received an evaluation using the submitted rubric tool (approximately):	Although the Art and Science of Teaching Observation and Feedback Protocol (2007) has been implemented with thousands of evaluations across the country, the Marzano Focused Evaluation Model will be implemented throughout United States districts adopting the Marzano model in the 2017-2018 School Year.
6.	Number of teacher and/or principal evaluation instructional sessions provided per year, if applicable:	3
7.	Average length of each training session for the training of evaluators (minutes/hours):	6 hours per day, 3 days for a total of 18 hours

Following is information provided as of April 18, 2017 date (contact the provider for the most up-to-date information):

Teacher/Principal Rubric Tool: ☐ Free ☒ For Cost
If for cost, to which does a fee apply: ☐ Rubric ☒ Related services (e.g., training or professional development associated with the use of the rubric)
If services are offered by the applicant, are any mandatory in order to use the rubric? ☐ Yes ☒ No
If approved as a provider of a teacher and/or principal practice rubric, we are prepared to provide services to: ☒ All Districts/LEAs in the State of New York, or ☐ Only to the following Districts/LEAs:

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)(mm), 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) Learning Sciences International, LLC	4. Signature of Authorized Representative (PLEASE USE **BLACK/BLUE** INK) Michael Toth
2. Name of Authorized Representative (PLEASE PRINT/TYPE) Michael Toth	5. Date Signed June 8, 2017
3. Title of Authorized Representative (PLEASE PRINT/TYPE) CEO	

TEACHER AND PRINCIPAL PRACTICE RUBRIC PROVIDERS
TECHNICAL PROPOSAL – SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION

Supplemental Information (*INFORMATION-ONLY*):

In this section, the applicant should provide information to 1) identify the subcomponents/domains of the practice rubric that are observable and 2) clarify how all observable subcomponents/domains of the practice rubric can be assessed without utilizing the prohibited elements identified on page 3 of this RFQ.

1. A description of which subcomponents/domains of the rubric are observable.	LSI recommends observers working with the Focused Teacher Evaluation Model aim to score all 23 elements, or competencies, during the course of each year.
2. A description of how all observable subcomponents/domains of the rubric can be assessed without using the prohibited elements identified on page 3 of this RFQ.	N/A

CONFIDENTIALITY INFORMATION

Supplemental Information (*INFORMATION-ONLY*):

If an applicant requests an educational agency (as that term is defined in Education Law §2-d) to provide it with access to the educational agency's confidential personnel and/or student records in connection with any training and implementation services provided to the educational agency, the applicant must take all steps necessary to protect the integrity and confidentiality of the individual student and educator data received from the educational agency. The applicant must comply with all applicable federal and state laws and regulations (including, but not limited to, the federal Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act and Social Security Act, and New York State Social Services Law, Personal Privacy Protection Law and Education Law §2-d); and the applicant must enter into data protection or sharing agreements, confidentiality agreements, or non-disclosure agreements with the educational agency, as the case may be, that are required by the above-referenced federal and state laws and regulations.

In the text box below, please describe the process you will use to maintain the confidentiality of personnel and/or student records if access to such records is required as part of the training and implementation services you provide. If necessary, you may submit additional pages as an attachment.

N/A

LSi LEARNING SCIENCES INTERNATIONAL

The State Education Department
Office of Educator Quality & Professional Development
89 Washington Avenue, 1071 EBA
Albany, NY 12234

October 19, 2017

Re: LSI-Marzano Focused Teacher Inquiry dated October 4, 2017

Dear Rubric RFQ Team,

Please find LSI's responses to the questions you provided in your letter dated October 4, 2017 regarding our submission of the Marzano Focused Teacher Evaluation Model as an approved rubric in the state of New York.

1. *Under Education Law §3012-d, all observable components of a selected rubric must be scored on a 1-4 scale. Scores from all observed components are then weighted based on a formula selected by the district to arrive at an overall score and rating for the observation category. Please clarify how the submitted rubric can be used by school districts and BOCES consistent with this statutory requirement.*

The Marzano Focused Teacher Evaluation rubric is adapted by combining the 0 and 1 scores. This allows flexibility to use the rubric in states that have 4 or 5-point scale.

2. *Each domain of the submitted rubric carries a considerable number of specific attributes of preferred practice that an observer is required to note during an observation. Please clarify the scoring regime that will be utilized by evaluators, including a description of how observers are trained to note these attributes to arrive at a score for the component.*

The first step in observation is to identify the instructional strategy that the teacher is using. The evidences listed on the protocol are descriptors or attributes, but the real point of measure is how the teacher implements all constructs of the element statement (focus statement). The most important factor in determining the score for each component/element is based on student evidences in the *Standards-Based Instruction* and *Conditions for Learning* domains; where, if the teacher is correctly implementing the strategy, then the observer is trained to look for student evidence of learning. The score is calculated based on the percentage of students who demonstrate the desired effect for the component/element.

3. *A full reading of the rubric and supplemental materials implies that the rubric components could be scored holistically rather than attribute by attribute. Is this method contemplated by the designers? If so, please describe how evaluators are trained for this method, including how reliability is maintained across evaluators and observations.*

Yes, each element is designed to be scored holistically, not attribute by attribute. Evaluators are trained to score the attribute holistically at Level 2, or "Developing". For a teacher to receive a score of 3 or higher, it must include monitoring of student work and student learning. In LSI's training, this is emphasized through actual analysis of student evidence of learning, video observations, and post-conference videos. The rubric is extremely detailed and clearly delineates scoring for each level to ensure reliability. Further, the reduction of elements in the model from 60 to 23 also improves reliability. Ongoing training teaches observers and evaluators a 5-step observation process that substantially improves reliability when implemented correctly.

If you have additional questions, please feel free to reach out. We look forward to the Marzano Focused Teacher Evaluation model being approved by your team and look forward to serving New York school districts and BOCES.

Very Respectfully,

Michael Toth

Michael Toth, CEO
Learning Sciences International

175 Cornell Rd. Suite 118
Blairsville. PA 15717

724.459.2100
877.411.7114

www.learningsciences.com