



## TEACHER AND PRINCIPAL PRACTICE RUBRIC PROVIDERS

## Section III. 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.

<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><b>Clearly labeled tables or graphs depicting this improvement should be submitted as appendices.</b></p> <p>Balanced Leadership®, the research-based professional learning series that is the foundation of McREL's evaluation instruments, is based on research that demonstrates a connection between specific leadership responsibilities and student achievement. In fact, this professional development was studied through a randomized controlled trial (RCT) study funded by the Institute of Education Sciences (IES) that met the What Works Clearinghouse (WWC) standards without reservations (<a href="https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/WWC/Study/81452">https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/WWC/Study/81452</a>; Jacob, Goddard, Kim, Miller, &amp; Goddard, 2015). It is also included in the WWC for positively supporting school leader retention (<a href="https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/EvidenceSnapshot/699">https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/EvidenceSnapshot/699</a>). Additionally, McREL's updated Balanced Leadership for Student Learning program is currently being studied through a 5-year IES-funded grant to determine its effectiveness on leadership, teacher, and student outcomes.</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>McREL's R&amp;E team follow a prescribed plan to study and report on the effects of our evaluation instruments across various applications and contexts. In fact, the development and validation of principal and teacher evaluation systems in use in North Carolina led to the creation of McREL's Principal and Teacher Evaluation Systems. Specifically, during the 2009-10 school year, a mixed-methods validation study of the North Carolina Department of Public Instruction's teacher and principal evaluation systems was conducted using a representative sample of personnel that included 1,413 teachers, 70 principals, and 81 assistant principals. The study used the following analyses:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Correlation between evaluation scores and student performance to determine predictive validity.</li> <li>2. Growth in leadership performance checking the</li> </ol>

	<p>evidence against the quality and depth of leadership performance.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. Rater reliability and distribution scores.</li> <li>4. Examination of rating by teacher/principal characteristics.</li> <li>5. Examination of rating distributions by school characteristics including academic performance history of the school.</li> <li>6. Correlations between primary elements and sub-elements to determine proper “loading.”</li> <li>7. Focus groups/interviews with study participants.</li> <li>8. Survey of study participants.</li> </ol>
3. What type of research design has been established to support these findings? (e.g., <i>experimental, non-experimental, quasi-experimental, etc.</i> )	See above.
4. Describe and detail the proposed scoring or rating system associated with the rubric being submitted.	<p><b>Clearly labeled tables or charts depicting this scoring/rating system should be submitted as appendices.</b></p> <p>McREL’s <i>Balanced Leadership: Rubrics—Principal Evaluation System (May 2024)</i>, shown in Appendix B, uses an evidence-based approach that includes examining work artifacts combined with scoring a formative rubric that rolls into a summary rating form. To ensure rater consistency, McREL clearly defines the rubric-scoring process during the training to ensure fair and consistent scoring among evaluations and between buildings in each school district. The rubrics are designed as cumulative and additive across the five categorical ratings. Each categorical rating has a clear definition that establishes performance parameters:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. <i>Developing</i>: The principal/assistant principal (AP) demonstrated adequate growth toward achieving the standard(s) during the period of performance, but did not demonstrate competence on the standard(s) of performance</li> <li>b. <i>Proficient</i>: The principal/AP demonstrated basic competence on the standard(s) of performance.</li> <li>c. <i>Accomplished</i>: The principal/AP exceeded basic competence on the standard(s) of performance most of the time.</li> <li>d. <i>Distinguished</i>: The principal/AP consistently and significantly exceeded basic competence</li> </ol>

	<p>on the standard(s) of performance.</p> <p>e. <i>Not Demonstrated</i>: The principal/AP did not demonstrate competence on or adequate growth toward achieving the standard(s) of performance. (Note: If the <i>Not Demonstrated</i> rating is used, the evaluator must comment about why it was used.)</p> <p>To determine a level (categorical rating) of performance, begin in the first column (<i>Developing</i>). If the practice listed in the <i>Developing</i> column describes the principal/AP's performance throughout the year, mark the box beside the descriptor. Continue to work down the column of Developing practices. Then, the evaluator should continue to the <i>Proficient</i> category, working down that column and marking all of the practices that describe the principal/AP's work throughout the year, and continue this process for the <i>Accomplished</i> and <i>Distinguished</i> categories.</p> <p>To ensure consistency in scoring, McREL encourages the district to continue to analyze the rubrics and internally establish agreements on what educational practice looks like at each categorical rating. Internal conversation will continue in the district to clearly articulate how each descriptor (behavior) captured in the rubrics will be defined, identified, and supported through artifacts, actual performance, and/or collaborative dialogue.</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>McREL has provided services to adapt the existing Principal Evaluation System to meet local needs in several districts, including Long Branch Public Schools (New Jersey) and Haysville Unified School District #261 (Kansas). While McREL recommends not altering the "Theory of Action" employed in the construction of the rubrics, categorical ratings, and evaluation process, we will work with districts to adapt our existing instruments to meet local needs. We do this work in a manner that will maintain the integrity of the research that supports the evaluation rubrics and instrumentation. We also require piloting and field testing any adaptations to ensure a degree of validity.</p> <p>Building on and leveraging our years of research and experience in developing school leaders, McREL will develop and validate a set of customized elements and related practices that</p>

	<p>exemplify specific expectations and goals of LEAs. In addition to information provided by key stakeholders, McREL staff will draw from their considerable expertise and experience gained from conducting similar work in other locations. Further, McREL will conduct a validation study to determine whether the "Adapted" principal evaluation tool, as modified, is valid and reliable for the purposes for which it is designed. At the conclusion of this task, LEAs will have a principal evaluation instrument customized to the district's needs that accurately and fairly measures principal performance. Further, the district will have a set of customized principal performance reports based on annual principal evaluations that may be used to develop school and district leadership professional development plans and assist decision makers in the development of district policies and procedures related to recruitment, training and retention of highly effective principals.</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>As part of McREL's Principal Evaluation System, we offer training via webinar and onsite sessions. Please contact McREL directly at <a href="mailto:info@mcrel.org">info@mcrel.org</a> to discuss what will work best for your district and related pricing for those services.</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 and any supplemental costs involved (<i>i.e., training/instruction, implementation costs, materials, etc.</i>).</p>	<p>McREL offers the rubrics as fillable PDFs and for use on a school/district's own internal system. Pricing is on an annual basis and is based on district enrollment. Contact McREL at <a href="mailto:info@mcrel.org">info@mcrel.org</a> for pricing.</p> <p>Proposed option for building state capacity: McREL can train New York Regional Service Agency (NYRSA) providers to build statewide capacity to deliver professional development to LEAs across the state. This model will help to ensure implementation sustainability and maximize financial resources of the LEAs by allowing the NYRSA providers to charge their daily rate for professional development services. In addition, trained NYRSA's can provide the "on-the-ground" assistance often required to facilitate the implementation of such significant initiatives.</p>



## TEACHER AND PRINCIPAL PRACTICE RUBRIC PROVIDERS

## Section IV. Technical Proposal – Service Summary

**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:	McREL International
	Primary location (city/state):	Denver, CO
	Contact information: (phone/email/website)	Beth Watson 800-858-6830 or 303-337-0990 <a href="mailto:bwatson@mcrel.org">bwatson@mcrel.org</a> <a href="http://www.mcrel.org">www.mcrel.org</a>
	LEAs where service will be provided (or is intended to be provided):	All NY districts
2.	The number of years the provider has delivered service:	20 years
3.	Title of the Teacher and/or Principal Rubric Evaluation model to be used (if appropriate):	Balanced Leadership Rubrics: Principal Evaluation System
4.	Professional population that the provider has served, and that they are requesting to serve (i.e., teachers, principals, admin., etc.):	Principals/assistant principals and other administrative non-teaching personnel.
5.	Number of teachers and/or principals that have received an evaluation using the submitted rubric tool (approximately):	20,000+ principals
6.	Number of teacher and/or principal evaluation instructional sessions provided per year, if applicable:	~6–10 principal evaluation instructional sessions provided annually
7.	Average length of each training session for the training of evaluators (minutes/hours):	3 hours

**Following is information provided as of date** (contact the provider for the most up-to-date information):

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




## TEACHER AND PRINCIPAL PRACTICE RUBRIC PROVIDERS

### Section V. 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) <b>McREL International</b>	4. Signature of Authorized Representative (PLEASE USE <b>BLACK/BLUE</b> INK) 
2. Name of Authorized Representative (PLEASE PRINT/TYPE) <b>Sue Desch</b>	5. Date Signed <b>4/16/2025</b>
3. Title of Authorized Representative (PLEASE PRINT/TYPE) <b>Chief Financial Officer</b>	