TEACHER AND PRINCIPAL PRACTICE R

ratings had students with average gains (Holtzapple, 2003).

4. A multi-year, mixed-methods study was conducted in Cincinnati, OH; Los Angeles, CA; Reno/Sparks, NV; and Coventry, RI, to analyze the validity of teacher evaluation. The study found a "fairly high correlation" between teacher activities observed in the classroom and student achievement gains in two of the four sites. The authors noted these high correlations could be from use of data from multiple observations and highly trained evaluators, and a common understanding of good teaching (Heneman, Milanowski, Kimball, and

2. What is the methodology used to collect evidence of the demonstrated professional achievement for teach-	

		growth effects are provided in Appendix C. **(3) For the Evaluation of the Excellence in Teaching Pilot project Year 2 report an experimental design was used. Principals and external observers collected classroom observation data using the Danielson Framework for Teaching. The Framework reliability study hinges on collecting two sets of Framework ratings from two independent observers—the principal and the external observer. Both parties go into the classroom simultaneously, observe a less (usually 30-45 minutes), and align their evidence from the observation with the Framework to assign a level of performance for 10 components. Principals and external observers do not discuss the lesson and assign rating independently.** **Because a major component of this study is to determine if the Danielson Framework for Teaching can be used reliably, the researchers used a Many-Facet Rasch Measurement (MFRM) Analysis. Rather than use a simple Rasch model, which would not take into account the fact that there are many different raters or judges, the researchers applied the MFRM method. MFRM extends the Rasch model to include additional facets. The facets included in the analysis are teacher, Framework component, rater (includes three external observers and each principal), prior checklist evaluation rating, observation year, principal cohort, subject area and grade level. The MFRM model shows the probability that a teacher will get a particular rating (unsatisfactory, basic, proficient, or distinguished) taking into consideration these categories, or facets, including rater severity. The model also provides us with a measure of rater severity for each of the observers and principals. What results, then, is a measure of teacher ability controlling for rater severity.**
3.	What type of research design has been established to support these findings? *(e.g., experimental, non-experimental, quasi-experimental, etc)*	**The research designs for these findings were experimental and quasi-experimental.**
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.** **All versions of the Framework for Teaching include de-tailed rubrics describing teaching practice in four do-mains at each of the four performance levels (Unsatis-factory, Basic, Proficient, and Distinguished). Please refer to Appendix A for the complete Framework for**

	Teaching Evaluation Instrument, 2013 Instructionally Focused Edition. Appendix B presents a table showing the evolution of the Framework since 1996 along with the streamlined rubrics for Domain 1 and 4 in the Focused Evaluation Instrument. These rubrics still allow observers and supervisors to assess and score teaching practice in the areas of Planning and Preparation (Domain 1) and Professional Responsibilities (Domain 4), but now simplify this process by presenting domain-level descriptions at the four performance levels, rather than component-level descriptions as with other versions of the Framework.
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.	**The Framework for Teaching is being used in thousands of schools and districts across the country. Because it helps establish a common language for effective teaching across all grades and subject areas, the Framework is adaptable to align with the needs of LEAs.** **In New York, the Framework for Teaching Evaluation Instrument, 2011 Edition, was submitted by Teachscape and Charlotte Danielson and approved by NYSED in 2011.**
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.*	**The initial face-to-face training in the Framework for evaluators and teachers is highly recommended but not required. Training is provided by members of the Danielson Group, a highly experienced and high-caliber cadre of consultants selected and trained by Charlotte Danielson. This training will help each LEA teachers and evaluators gain a deep understanding of what teaching looks like at each level of performance of the Framework, and how teachers will be assessed under the LEA's teacher evaluation system.** **Face-to-face training can be augmented by and used in** ecadre oac

	Teachscape has a long history of working with districts to implement the Framework for Teaching, and, with our partner, The Danielson Group, we provide both face-to-face and online professional development for teachers and evaluators. We are happy to discuss the local needs of each LEA and tailor services and tools to meet those needs and ensure a successful implementation with positive and sustainable results.

	Rhode Island, Texas, Kentucky, and Nevada. Over 30,000 evaluators have been trained using our online evaluator training and assessment system, Teachscape Focus, which has also been adopted statewide in Illinois.

TEACHER AND PRINCIPAL PRACTICE RUBRIC PROVIDERS
TECHNICAL PROPOSAL – S

☐ ☒	
☐ ☒	
☐ ☒	
☒ ☐	

Request for Exemption from Disclosure
Pursuant to the Freedom of Information Law

New York State Public Officers Law, Article 6 (Freedom of Information Law) requires that each agency shall make available all records maintained by said agency, except that agencies may deny access to records or portions thereof that fall within the scope of the exceptions listed in Public Officers Law §87(2).

Any proprietary materials submitted as part of, or in support of, an applicant's proposal, which applicant considers confidential or otherwise excepted from disclosure under the Freedom of Information Law, must be specifically so identified, and the basis for such confidentiality or other exception must be specifically set forth.

Please list all such documents for every portion of the proposal on the form below.