



**TEACHER AND PRINCIPAL PRACTICE RUBRIC PROVIDERS
TECHNICAL PROPOSAL - APPLICATION**

Name of Entity	Michael Kim Marshall, Educational Consultant	
Address	222 Clark Road	
City, State Zip	Brookline, MA 02445	
Phone	617-566-4353	
Fax	877-538-6549	
E-mail	kim.marshall48@gmail.com	
Name and Title of Authorized Contact	Michael Kim Marshall, Consultant	
Address (if different from above)		
City, State Zip		
Phone		
Fax		
E-mail (REQUIRED)	kim.marshall48@gmail.com	
Tax I.D. Number	Social Security number 017-42-3995	
The organization is: (Please indicate by clicking on the appropriate boxes below:)		
Local Educational Agency (LEA)	<input type="checkbox"/>	
For-profit corporation	<input type="checkbox"/>	Click either: <input type="checkbox"/> NY corp. or <input type="checkbox"/> Foreign corp.
Non-profit corporation	<input type="checkbox"/>	Click either: <input type="checkbox"/> NY corp. or <input type="checkbox"/> Foreign corp.
Limited Liability Company (LLC)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Click either: <input type="checkbox"/> NY LLC or <input type="checkbox"/> Foreign LLC
Other	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Please specify: Sole proprietor, consultant, based in Massachusetts
Vendor Responsibility Questionnaire (VRQ)		Click either: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Paper form enclosed with application <input type="checkbox"/> Submitted online <input type="checkbox"/> 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.¹⁹ (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.)

¹⁹ 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.

- **If the corporation or LLC will use an assumed name in New York State:** the certificate of Assumed Name



**TEACHER AND PRINCIPAL PRACTICE RUBRIC PROVIDERS
TECHNICAL PROPOSAL - APPLICATION**

Name of Applying Entity: Michael Kim Marshall

Name of Rubric: Teacher Evaluation Rubrics

Please check the most appropriate category:

	Teacher and/or Principal Practice Rubric	Required Submission
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	This is an application for providing Teacher Practice Rubric services.	<p>A full application with all required materials (including this cover page) shall be submitted for each* rubric.</p> <p>Your rubric(s) must be attached in the Appendix section of your submission.</p>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	This is an application for providing Principal Practice Rubric services.	<p>A full application with all required materials (including this cover page) shall be submitted for each* rubric.</p> <p>Your rubric(s) must be attached in the Appendix section of your submission.</p>

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

**TEACHER AND PRINCIPAL PRACTICE RUBRIC PROVIDERS
TECHNICAL PROPOSAL - NARRATIVE**

Teacher and Principal Practice Rubric Narrative:

In this section, the applicant must describe in detail the nature of the teacher and/or principal practice rubric services they will provide. **Please be advised that your responses in Section I will be thoroughly reviewed and rated on a point-based evaluation system.** We strongly encourage you to be as complete and detailed as possible in your responses. *If you are attaching supporting documentation, please do not simply indicate "see attached" in the response fields.*

*Please complete **Table 1.1 (and 1.2)** only, if you are submitting a **TEACHER PRACTICE RUBRIC.***

Table 1.1			
New York State Teaching Standards	Domain	My rubric covers the following (Yes or N/A):	Please thoroughly describe any evidence to support your rubric's alignment with the categories listed. If your rubric does not align with the category listed, please indicate "N/A."
I.	Knowledge of Students and Student Learning	Yes	The Marshall rubrics align with this standard in their emphasis on teachers' knowledge children's development (Aa), respect and cultural sensitivity (Ea), planning for differentiation (Ai), and professional outreach and growth (Fj)
II.	Knowledge of Content and Instructional Planning	Yes	The rubrics address content knowledge (Aa), planning with standards in mind (Ab), building in assessments of student learning (Ad), anticipating learning difficulties and misconceptions (Ae), designing lessons and units and using materials that are engaging and relevant (Ac, Af, Ag, Ah), and creating a classroom environment conducive to learning (Aj)
III.	Instructional Practice	Yes	The rubrics address the importance of standards alignment (Ab), high expectations (Ca), using a "growth" mindset (Cb), setting clear goals (Cc), making connections with prior knowledge (Cd), teaching clearly so students understand (Ce), using a repertoire of instructional strategies (Cf), engaging all students in active learning (Cg), differentiating instruction (Ch), taking advantage of teachable moments (Ci), and getting students to the point where they can apply what they are learning to new situations (Cj).
IV.	Learning Environment	Yes	The rubrics address a safe and well-ordered learning environment (Aj), clear expectations for

			behavior (Ba), establishing and maintaining positive relationships with students (Bb), fostering respect in the classroom, both among students and between students and teachers (Bc, Bd), setting and maintaining routines (Be), teaching responsibility and self-reliance (Bf), maximizing learning time (Bh), and preventing disruptions and wasted time (Bi).
V.	Assessment for Student Learning	Yes	The rubrics address using on-the-spot assessments to fine-tune instruction in real time (Dc), getting students to self-assess (Dd), using interim assessments to gain insights on student misunderstandings and misconceptions (Df, Di), and working with colleagues to improve instruction and help struggling students (Di, Dj, Fi)
VI.	Professional Responsibilities and Collaboration	Yes	The rubrics address teachers' attendance (Fa), use of appropriate language in professional settings (Fb), reliability, professionalism, and good judgment (Fc, Fd, Fe), exercising leadership (Fg), and working collaboratively with other educators (Fi); in addition, there is a standard for going above and beyond (Ff). See "other" for working with families and the community.
VII.	Professional Growth	Yes	The rubrics emphasize being open to new ideas and other viewpoints (Fh), collaborating with colleagues (Fi), getting effective ideas from colleagues, workshops, and other sources (Fj), and using assessment data to continuously reflect and improve instruction and results (Df, Dg, Di, Dj).
	Student Learning Outcomes	Yes	The teaching inputs described in the rubrics are research-based and, if faithfully executed in the classroom at the Effective or Highly Effective level, bring about high levels of student achievement, regardless of students' economic status or family background. In addition, in the Monitoring, Assessment, and Follow-up domain, Marshall's rubrics address the kind of individual teacher work and teacher teamwork that looks at student learning results in real time and uses on-the-spot and interim assessment data to continuously improve achievement.
	"Other"	Yes	Parent and community outreach, including respect and multicultural sensitivity (Ea), communicating high expectations and specific curriculum content (Ec, Ed), involving parents in

			their children's education (Ee), responding quickly to parent concerns (Eg), reporting achievement on a regular basis (Eh), and using parents and others in the community as classroom resources (Ej).
--	--	--	--

FORM B-1



TEACHER AND PRINCIPAL PRACTICE RUBRIC NARRATIVE:

*Please complete **Table 1.2 (and 1.1)** only, if you are submitting a **TEACHER PRACTICE RUBRIC.***

Table 1.2			
Approval Category	Approval Criteria	My rubric covers the following (Yes or N/A):	Please thoroughly describe any evidence to support your rubric’s alignment with the categories listed. If your rubric does not align with the category listed, please indicate “N/A.”
Alignment with Overall New York State Evaluation System	<i>My rubric:</i> broadly covers the New York State Teaching Standards, and its related elements.	Yes	The research base for Marshall's rubrics overlaps with that used to develop New York State's Teaching Standards, which is why the match is so close. Influential writers, including Robert Marzano, Dylan Wiliam, Jon Saphier, Douglas Reeves, and others, have synthesized decades of research on effective practice, forming a consensus on which teacher actions produce the best student learning for the most students.
	is grounded in research about teaching practice that supports positive student learning outcomes.	Yes	These rubrics are based on research on effective teaching practices, including Enhancing Professional Practice: A Framework for Teaching by Charlotte Danielson (ASCD, 1996, 2007), Linking Teacher Evaluation and Student Learning by Pamela Tucker and James Stronge (ASCD, 2005), The Skillful Teacher by Jon Saphier et al. (Research for Better Teaching, 1997), and What Works in Schools: Translating Research Into Action by Robert Marzano (ASCD, 2003). In addition, these rubrics drew on other research-based rubrics, including those designed for Alexandria, Virginia by James Stronge and district staff, the Aspire Charter School rubrics, and the City on a Hill Charter School (Boston) rubrics.
	has four performance	Yes	The four levels of performance are Highly

	ratings categories.		Effective, Effective, Improvement Necessary, and Does Not Meet Standards. Although the wording of the bottom two levels is different from New York State's, the intent and basic message is the same - mediocrity and unacceptability. If required, these two can be changed to conform with New York's wording.
	does not have four levels that match the rating categories of highly effective, effective, developing, and ineffective, but the rubric's summary ratings are easily convertible to the four rating categories that New York State has adopted.	N/A	
	clearly defines the expectations for each rating category. The Highly Effective and Effective rating categories must encourage excellence beyond a minimally acceptable level of effort or compliance.	Yes	These rubrics were written with the clear philosophy that the top two levels define teaching that is effective and highly effective in terms of student outcomes. Teachers performing at these levels raise the achievement of all students and narrow the racial and economic gap. The top level - Highly Effective - is reserved for truly outstanding, master teaching. The next level, Effective, is solid performance and no teacher should be embarrassed to score at this level. Level 2 defines mediocrity, and the label - Improvement Necessary - carries the clear message that continued performance at this level is not acceptable (it is not a "gentleman's C"). The bottom level is clearly unsatisfactory and should result in dismissal if improvement does not occur on a tight timeline .
	is applicable to all grades and subjects or, is designed explicitly for specific grades/subjects as indicated herein.	Yes	These rubrics were designed to be used from pre-kindergarten through the senior year of high school and for all subject areas. The 60 criteria are sufficiently generic that administrators can rate all teachers with them.
Ease of Implementation	uses clear and precise language that facilitates common understanding among	Yes	Marshall was at pains to use plain English and keep each descriptor as brief as possible. Note that all the left-column headlines are single words or two-word hyphenated phrases. Since their

	<p>teachers and administrators.</p>		<p>original publication in Kappan EDge Magazine, the rubrics have been through seven revisions (the latest in response to comments from NYSED staff), each responding to feedback from teachers and administrators that made the rubrics clearer and more precise.</p>
	<p>is specifically designed to assess the classroom effectiveness of teachers.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The first four domains address planning and preparation for learning, classroom management, delivery of instruction, and monitoring, assessment, and follow-up with students - all quintessentially classroom-based activities. The fifth and sixth domains deal with outside-classroom criteria - family and community outreach and professional responsibilities - that nonetheless have an impact on classroom effectiveness.</p>
	<p>to the extent practicable, relies on specific, discrete, observable, and/or measurable behaviors by students and teachers in the classroom with direct evidence of student engagement and learning.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The intent in drafting and revising these rubrics has been to give administrators clear wording and criteria on which they can "hang their hats" as they evaluate teachers. The wording at each of the four performance levels draws a clear distinction between excellent, solid, mediocre, and unsatisfactory performance - not by using the words "Always", "Mostly", "Sometimes", and "Rarely/Never", but by using clear, descriptive language to distinguish each level in terms of concrete, observable behaviors.</p>
	<p>includes descriptions of any specific training and implementation details that are required for the rubric to be effective.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The cover page to the rubrics states that for school administrators to responsibly and knowledgeably fill out these rubrics at the end of a school year, they must make multiple, unannounced visits to each teacher's classroom and have face-to-face feedback conversations with each teacher each time, identifying strengths and weaknesses and coaching them to improve in specific areas. In addition, it is essential for principals to be involved with teacher teams as they develop curriculum units and analyze and follow up on interim assessment results. Marshall's book, "Rethinking Teacher Supervision and Evaluation" (Jossey-Bass, 2nd Ed, 2013) spells out in detail the process for using mini-observations, curriculum planning, the professional learning community process, and possibly student surveys to compile an accurate assessment of each teacher. Marshall's training workshops give administrators practice in these</p>

			key skills.
--	--	--	-------------

**FORM B-1****TEACHER AND PRINCIPAL PRACTICE RUBRIC NARRATIVE:**

*Please complete **Table 1.3 (and 1.4)** only, if you are submitting a **PRINCIPAL PRACTICE RUBRIC**.*

Table 1.3			
ISLLC 2008 Standards	Domain	My rubric covers the following (Yes or N/A):	Please thoroughly describe any evidence to support your rubric's alignment with the categories listed. If your rubric does not align with the category listed, please indicate "N/A."
I.	<i>An education leader promotes the success of every student by:</i> facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a vision of learning that is shared and supported by all stakeholders.	Yes	Marshall's Principal Evaluation Rubrics speak clearly of the importance of a results-driven mission (Ad), a theory of action (Af), a strategy shaped by outreach to staff, students, parents, and the community (Ag), and developing support and investment from all quarters (Ah and Ai).
II.	advocating, nurturing and sustaining a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth.	Yes	The rubrics address how the principal's work shapes a positive school culture (EA, Eb, Ec), a robust instructional program (Ca, Cc, Cd, Cj), data-driven continuous improvement (Ce, Cf, Cg, Ch, Ci), and professional development (Da, Db, Dc, Dd, De), as well as effective teacher supervision and evaluation and hiring (DG, Dh, Di, Dj)
III.	ensuring management of the organization, operation, and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment.	Yes	The rubrics address the work of building a positive and safe student culture (Ea, Eb, Ec), effective operational management (Fa, Fb, Fc, Fd), and efficient operations and external relations (Ff, Fg, Fh, and Fj)
IV.	collaborating with faculty and community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources.	Yes	The rubrics address faculty collaboration (Da, Db, Dc, Dd, De), communication with parents and the community (Ef, Eg, Eh, Ei), and bringing in resources to achieve the mission (Ei, Ej)
V.	acting with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner.	Yes	An important revision in the November 2012 edition of these rubrics is Fa. Ethics. This explicitly addresses the principal's ethical and professional conduct, and expectations for colleagues to behave in like manner. Underlying the rubrics' criteria on mission, planning, curriculum, data-driven instruction,

			professional development, and parent relations is a deep professionalism and bedrock value system about equity, achievement, and fairness toward adults and children. A theme throughout the rubrics is high expectations (Ac, Be, Ca, Dd, Ea). In addition, transparency is a specific criterion (Fe).
VI.	understanding, responding to, and influencing the political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context.	Yes	Starting with a "brutal facts" assessment of the school's achievement status (Ab, Ac), setting ambitious and measurable goals (Ad, Ae), enlisting broad support (Ah, Ai, Dd)), delegating authority (Bf), celebrating success (Cj), communicating effectively across all groups (Ef, Ei), keeping the school on the legal straight and narrow (Ff), and schmoozing with district and external personnel who can help the school (Fi), the rubrics evaluate principals on all the levers they can and should use to work the political and educational system, internally and externally.
	"Other"	Yes	The rubrics emphasize the importance of principals making regular, unannounced visits to classrooms and giving all teachers frequent, face-to-face feedback that helps them improve their practice (Dg), as well as stepping up to the plate to have difficult conversations where necessary (Dh, Di).



TEACHER AND PRINCIPAL PRACTICE RUBRIC NARRATIVE:

FORM B-1

*Please complete **Table 1.4 (and 1.3)** only, if you are submitting a **PRINCIPAL PRACTICE RUBRIC.***

Table 1.4			
Approval Category	Approval Criteria	My rubric covers the following (Yes or N/A):	Please thoroughly describe any evidence to support your rubric’s alignment with the categories listed. If your rubric does not align with the category listed, please indicate “N/A.”
Alignment with Overall New York State Evaluation System	<i>My rubric:</i> broadly covers the Educational Leadership Policy Standards: ISLLC 2008 and its related domains and elements.	Yes	The rubrics cover the full range of instructional leadership and management standards in the professional literature and ISLLC 2008, packaging them in six domains and boiling down the key points to one-word headlines that focus principals and their supervisors on the most important change levers in schools - those most likely to bring about improvements in teaching and learning.
	is grounded in research about leadership practice that supports positive student learning outcomes.	Yes	These rubrics are an extensive, research-based revision of rubrics developed by New Leaders for New Schools in 2004, which were, in turn, based on research by New Leaders staff on effective school leadership (please see the new Sources list on page 10). Revisions of the rubrics have updated that research, drawing on the work of Jon Saphier, Charlotte Danielson, Douglas Reeves, Robert Marzano, and others.
	has four performance rating categories.	Yes	The four rating categories - Highly Effective, Effective, Improvement Necessary, and Does Not Meet Standards - closely parallel those of New York State.
	does not have four levels that match the rating categories of highly effective, effective, developing, and ineffective, but the rubric’s summary ratings are easily convertible to the four rating categories that New York State has adopted.	N/A	
	clearly defines the expectations for each rating category. The Highly Effective and	Yes	The rubrics use clear, detailed language at each level, spelling out performance that is outstanding, solid, mediocre, and unacceptable. The philosophy behind the levels is that the Effective level is solid,

	Effective rating categories encourage excellence beyond a minimally acceptable level of effort or compliance.		expected professional practice, while the top level is reserved for truly outstanding performance.
Ease of Implementation	uses clear and precise language that facilitates common understanding among building principals and their evaluators.	Yes	The multiple revisions through which these rubrics have gone in the last six years have led to continuous refinement of the language, making it clearer and more succinct (the original New Leaders for New Schools rubrics had 12 domains and were considerably wordier and longer). Feedback from numerous administrators, teachers, graduate students, and other educators (most recently comments from NYSED staff last month) has helped create language that is more direct and forceful.
	is specifically designed to assess the effectiveness of school leaders.	Yes	These rubrics are action documents designed to make those who supervise and evaluate principals more effective. They supply the words to communicate their clear, high expectations and hold principals accountable.
	to the extent practicable, relies on specific, discrete, observable, and/or measurable behaviors by principals and their staff and students.	Yes	The rubrics focus on observable behaviors and specific actions that principals take or do not take to bring about high achievement.
	includes descriptions of any specific training and implementation details that are required for the rubric to be effective.	Yes	The cover page describes the kind of supervision that would allow a principal's boss to fill out these rubrics with knowledge and insight - multiple visits to the school, visiting classrooms, attending meetings, getting feedback. In addition, watching videotapes of classroom instruction and working with current literature are essential to developing these skills and habits of mind.



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

FORM B-2

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.

<p>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.</p>	<p>Clearly labeled tables or graphs depicting this improvement should be submitted as appendices.</p> <p>Numerous schools and districts are using these rubrics and revised versions of them, including schools that are getting very high student achievement (Greater Newark Academy, Friendship Charter Schools, and Hamilton County Schools (TN). More research is needed on the role of rubrics, but initial evidence is that clear definitions of quality teaching and leadership have played an essential role in improving student achievement.</p>
<p>2. What is the methodology used to collect evidence of the demonstrated professional achievement for teachers or principals (<i>i.e. measures and analyses used, comparison groups, etc.</i>)?</p>	<p>Most of the methodology has been in finding correlates of effective teaching and student achievement and incorporating those criteria into both rubrics.</p>
<p>3. What type of research design has been established to support these findings? (<i>e.g., experimental, non-experimental, quasi-experimental, etc</i>)</p>	<p>Schools and districts using the Marshall rubrics are beginning to do this kind of analysis.</p>
<p>4. Describe and detail the proposed scoring or rating system associated with the rubric being submitted.</p>	<p>Clearly labeled tables or charts depicting this scoring/rating system should be submitted as appendices.</p> <p>The rubrics have four levels: Highly Effective (for truly exemplary, master-level performance; Effective (for solid professional practice); Improvement Necessary (for mediocre performance); and Does Not Meet Standards (for unsatisfactory performance). There is a clear description of performance at each level. Page 9 of the rubrics packet is a chart showing how data from a faculty or school district might be displayed to highlight strong and weak areas.</p>

<p>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.</p>	<p>These rubrics have gone through ten revisions since their original form in 2006. Kim Marshall has a track record of responding to feedback and suggestions and continuously improving the rubrics.</p>
<p>6. What is the instructional content, methodology, and format of any proposed evaluator training that your organization may be able to offer participating LEAs?</p> <p><i>Please note: providers are not obligated to provide training nor are districts obligated to buy training from providers.</i></p>	<p>Marshall has conducted hundreds of training workshops, courses, and consulting visits with principals, central-office personnel, teacher leaders, instructional coaches, and teacher union officials. The agenda for these sessions focuses on problems with the conventional teacher supervision and evaluation process, the "logic model" for how supervision and evaluation should work under ideal conditions, and a four-part model for reaching the ideal: (a) unannounced, frequent mini-observations, ten per teacher per year, with face-to-face feedback to each teacher each time, followed up with brief written summaries; (b) principals working with teacher teams to backwards-design curriculum units so there is clarity on the broader purpose of each lesson, including Big Ideas and Essential Questions; (c) principals working with teacher teams to analyze and follow up on interim assessment results, constantly asking what's working and what's not working in classrooms based on student learning and adopting the most effective practices to bring all students to high levels of achievement; and (d) using the rubrics to sum up each teacher's performance at the end of each year, based on formative information from the mini-observations and teachers' performance in the other two domains. Training to implement this model does not have to be extensive and time-consuming. Kim Marshall has found that a single full-day workshop is usually enough to get principals started, with regular staff and leadership inservice time providing reinforcement and follow-up. In some districts, Marshall has done a follow-up workshop for principals once the process has been in motion for some months. The key success factor is the district's central-office administrators working closely with principals and conveying a clear understanding of the logic model and the best practices in each area</p>
<p>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</p>	<p>The rubrics themselves are free of charge and open source, so there is no cost associated with adopting them, unless the school or district decides to commit staff time to revising them (as Hamilton County, Tennessee did; they took two days with committees for each of the six domains). Marshall estimates that gear-</p>

<p>and any supplemental costs involved (<i>i.e. training/ instruction, implementation costs, materials, etc.</i>).</p>	<p>ing up to implement the rubrics would involve a full-day training session for all administrators (\$1,000 for his time, perhaps more for other consultants) and a follow-up meeting mid-year to fine-tune and troubleshoot (\$500). Further training, practice, videotape simulations, role-playing, and problem-solving should take place in regularly-scheduled administrative meetings; introduction of the rubrics to teachers should take place in regularly-scheduled school-based staff meetings.</p>
--	--



**TEACHER AND PRINCIPAL PRACTICE RUBRIC PROVIDERS
TECHNICAL PROPOSAL – ORGANIZATIONAL CAPACITY**

FORM B-3

Organizational Capacity (INFORMATION-ONLY):

In this section, the applicant should demonstrate that it has adequate human, organizational, and technical resources to provide the proposed teacher and/or principal practice rubric services.

<p>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.</p>	<p>Marshall has been conducting workshops, teaching graduate courses, and writing articles and a book about this approach to teacher supervision and evaluation since 1996, and on principal evaluation since 2010. In 2011 alone, he conducted 125 workshops around the United States. He has formed a partnership with the Leadership and Learning Center to support his work on teacher evaluation, should there be more demand that Marshall can handle.</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>As above. Numerous school districts, charter management organizations, and individual schools have adopted all or parts of Marshall's approach, including Hamilton County, Tennessee, and urban-suburban district centered in Chattanooga, the Friendship Charter Schools in Washington, D.C., and Westwood, Massachusetts. Manhasset and Mamaronek, NY have adopted Marshall's rubrics and approach to teacher supervision and evaluation. A full list is available on request.</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>Please clearly identify and attach this documentation in the Appendix section.</p>
<p>4. Copy of the organization’s 501(c)3 certificate or State license.</p>	<p>Please clearly identify and attach this documentation in the Appendix section.</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>No lawsuits have been filed against Kim Marshall, educational consultant, regarding his work with teacher supervision and evaluation and the rubrics he has written.</p>
<p>6. Information as to whether the or-</p>	

<p>ganization has been denied the ability to conduct business in any state and indicate the reason(s) for such denial.</p>	
<p>7. Information as to whether the organization has been debarred or suspended from doing business with any local government, state, or the federal government.</p>	<p>This has not occurred.</p>
<p>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).</p>	<p>Tennessee has approved the Marshall Teacher and Principal rubrics developed by Hamilton County (based on Marshall's) for statewide use. New York and New Jersey have approved Marshall's teacher and principal evaluation rubrics, and he has done a number of trainings around those states. Other states and charter management organizations are using the rubrics as baseline documents as they develop their own evaluation rubrics. Since the Marshall rubrics are "open source", there is no way to get an accurate count of districts and others using them.</p>



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

FORM C

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:	Michael Kim Marshall, Educational Consultant
	Primary location (city/state):	222 Clark Road, Brookline, MA 02445
	Contact information: (phone / email / website):	617-566-4353 kim.marshall48@gmail.com www.marshallmemo.com
	LEAs where service will be provided (or is intended to be provided):	I will respond to requests from any New York State LEA, depending on availability
2.	The number of years the provider has delivered service:	17 years
3.	Title of the Teacher and/or Principal Rubric Evaluation model to be used (if appropriate):	Marshall Teacher Evaluation Rubrics, Marshall Principal Evaluation Rubrics
4.	Professional population that the provider has served, and that they are requesting to serve (i.e., teachers, principals, admin., etc.):	Superintendents, central-office supervisors of principals, curriculum directors, principals and other school-based administrators, teacher leaders, teachers, teacher union officials
5.	Number of teachers and/or principals that have received an evaluation using the submitted rubric tool (approximately):	Approx. 7,500 (during 2013)
6.	Number of teacher and/or principal evaluation instructional sessions provided per year, if applicable:	122 (during 2013)
7.	Average length of each training session for the training of evaluators (minutes/hours):	3-7 hours

Following is information provided as of December 27, 2013 date (contact the provider for the most up-to-date information):

<p>Teacher/Principal Rubric Tool:</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Free <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> For Cost</p>
<p>If for cost, to which does a fee apply:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Rubric <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Related services (e.g., training or professional development associated with the use of the rubric)</p>

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:



FORM D

**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.

<p>1. Name of Organization (PLEASE PRINT/TYPE) Michael Kim Marshall, Educational Consultant</p>	<p>4. Signature of Authorized Representative (PLEASE USE BLACK/BLUE INK)</p>
<p>2. Name of Authorized Representative (PLEASE PRINT/TYPE) Michael Kim Marshall</p>	<p>5. Date Signed</p>
<p>3. Title of Authorized Representative (PLEASE PRINT/TYPE) Educational Consultant</p>	



FORM E

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. Materials which are not indicated below may be released in their entirety upon request without notice to you.

According to law, the entity requesting exemption from disclosure has the burden of establishing entitlement to confidentiality. Submission of this form does not necessarily guarantee that a request for exemption from disclosure will be granted. If necessary, NYSED will make a determination regarding the requested exemptions, in accordance with the process set forth in Public Officers Law §89(5).

Name of Organization:

Material for which Exemption is Requested	Location / Page Number(s)	Basis for Request