



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

Name of Entity	Michael Kim Marshall	
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	Kim Marshall, consultant	
Address (if different from above)	(same)	
City, State Zip	(same)	
Phone	(same)	
Fax	(same)	
E-mail (REQUIRED)	Kim.marshall48@gmail.com	
Tax I.D. 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: Individual proprietor
Vendor Responsibility Questionnaire (VRQ)		Click either: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Submitted online (preferred) <input type="checkbox"/> Paper form enclosed with application <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.¹ (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

¹ 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: Michael Kim Marshall

Name of Rubric: Teacher Evaluation Rubric

Please check the most appropriate category:

	Teacher and/or Principal Practice Rubric	Required Submission
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>This is an application for providing Teacher Practice Rubric services. Please check the most appropriate category below:</p> <p align="center"> <input type="checkbox"/> This rubric is for classroom observation only. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> This rubric is for all applicable teacher evaluation criteria, including classroom observation. </p>	<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"/>	<p>This is an application for providing Principal Practice Rubric services. Please check the most appropriate category below:</p> <p align="center"> <input type="checkbox"/> This rubric is for principal observation only. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> This rubric is for all applicable principal evaluation criteria, including principal observation. </p>	<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 rubric aligns with this standard in its emphasis on teachers' knowledge of children's development (Aa), respect and cultural sensitivity (Aa), planning for differentiation (Ah), and professional outreach and growth (Fi)
II.	Knowledge of Content and Instructional Planning	Yes	The rubric addresses 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 (Ai)
III.	Instructional Practice	Yes	The rubric addresses 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 (Cc).
IV.	Learning Environment	Yes	The rubric emphasizes creating a safe and well-ordered learning environment (Ai), 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), setting and maintaining routines (Bd), teaching responsibility and self-reliance (Be), maximizing learning time (Bg), and preventing disruptions and wasted time (Bh).
V.	Assessment for Student Learning	Yes	The rubric addresses planning assessments (Ad) using on-the-spot assessments to fine-tune instruction in real time (Dd), getting students to self-assess (Dc), using interim assessments to gain insights on student misunderstandings and misconceptions (Df), and working with colleagues to improve instruction and help struggling students (Di, Fh)
VI.	Professional Responsibilities and Collaboration	Yes	The rubric addresses use of appropriate language in professional settings (Fa), reliability, professionalism, and good judgment (Fb, Fc, Fd), exercising leadership (Ff), and working collaboratively with other educators (Fh). 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 rubric emphasizes being open to new ideas and other viewpoints (Fg), collaborating with colleagues (Fh), getting effective ideas from colleagues, workshops, and other sources (Fi), and using assessment data to continuously reflect and improve instruction and results (Df, Dg, Dh, Di).
	Student Learning Outcomes	Yes	Although the Marshall rubric does not purport to measure student learning outcomes, the teaching inputs described in the rubric are research-based and, if faithfully executed in the classroom at the Effective or Highly Effective level, should 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 rubric addresses 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 (Eb, Ec, and Ed), involving

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

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 rubric 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 and most equitable student learning for students.
	is grounded in research about teaching practice that supports positive student learning outcomes.	Yes	The Marshall rubric is based on research on effective teaching practices, including Enhancing Professional Practice: A Framework for Teaching by Charlotte Danielson (ASCD, 1996, 2024), 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, this rubric 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 ratings categories.	Yes	The four levels of performance are Highly Effective, Effective, Improvement Necessary, and

			Does Not Meet Standards. Although the wording of the lower two levels is different from New York State's, the intent and basic message is the same - mediocrity and unacceptability, respectively. 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	This rubric was 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 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	This rubric was designed to be used from pre-kindergarten through the senior year of high school and for all subject areas. The 54 criteria are sufficiently generic that administrators can rate all teachers with them, while indicating NA (not applicable) where appropriate.
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 original publication in Kappan EDGE Magazine, the rubric

	<p>teachers and administrators.</p>		<p>has been through eight revisions, each responding to feedback from teachers and administrators that made the rubric clearer and more precise. The latest revision (2024) reduced the number of lines in each domain to nine and eliminated the 4-3-2-1 numerical ratings at the top of each page.</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 and can be assessed in conversations with teachers and points of contact during the year.</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 this rubric 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 repeating 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 accurately fill out this rubric at the end of a school year, they must make frequent, short, systematic, and 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 (if necessary) 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 student work and interim assessment results. Marshall's book, "Rethinking Teacher Supervision and Evaluation" (Jossey-Bass, third edition 2024) spells out in detail the process for using mini-observations, curriculum planning, and the professional learning community process to compile an accurate assessment of</p>

			each teacher. Marshall's training workshops give administrators practice in these key skills.
--	--	--	---



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 Rubric speaks clearly of the importance of a results-driven mission (Ad), a theory of action (Ae), a strategy shaped by outreach to staff, students, parents, and the community (Af), 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 rubric addresses how the principal's work shapes a positive school culture (Ea, Eb, Ec, Eg), a robust instructional program (Ca, Cc, Cd, Ci), data-driven continuous improvement (Ce, Cf, Cg, Ch, Ci), and professional development (Da, Db, Dc, Dd, Df), as well as effective teacher supervision and evaluation and hiring (Df, Dg, Dh)
III.	ensuring management of the organization, operation, and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment.	Yes	The rubric addresses the work of building a positive and safe student culture (Ea, Eb, Ec), effective operational management (Fb, Fc, Fd), and efficient operations and external relations (Ff, Fg, Fh, and Fi)
IV.	collaborating with faculty and community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources.	Yes	The rubric addresses 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, Fi)
V.	acting with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner.	Yes	Underlying the rubric's 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, Ad, Be,

			Ca, Dg, Ea). In addition, ethics (Fa) and transparency are specific criteria (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 (Ci), communicating effectively across all groups (Ef, Ei), keeping the school on the legal straight and narrow (Ff, Fg), and schmoozing with district and external personnel who can help the school (Fh), the rubric evaluates principals on all the levers they can and should use to work the political and educational system, internally and externally, for the benefit of effective teaching and learning and equitable results.
	"Other"	Yes	The rubric emphasizes the importance of principals making frequent, short, systematic, unannounced visits to classrooms and giving all teachers frequent, face-to-face feedback that helps them improve their practice (Df), as well as stepping up to the plate to have difficult conversations where necessary (Dg, Dh).



TEACHER AND PRINCIPAL PRACTICE RUBRIC NARRATIVE:

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 rubric covers the full range of instructional leadership and management standards in the professional literature and ISLLC and PESL standards, 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	This rubric is an extensive, research-based revision of rubric 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 rubric have updated that research, drawing on the work of Jon Saphier, Charlotte Danielson, Douglas Reeves, Robert Marzano, and others. The most recent revision (2024) included a greater emphasis on cultural competence.
	has four performance rating categories.	Yes	The four rating levels – Highly Effective, Effective, Improvement Necessary, and Does Not Meet Standards – are 50 percent identical to those of New York State. The bottom two rating descriptions can be modified as needed.
	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 encourage excellence beyond a minimally acceptable level of effort or compliance.	Yes	The rubric uses 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, 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 this rubric have gone in the last ten 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 has helped create language that is more direct and forceful. The most recent revision (2024) reduced the number of lines in each domain to nine and eliminated the 4-3-2-1 numerical ratings at the top of each page.
	is specifically designed to assess the effectiveness of school leaders.	Yes	This rubric is an action document designed to make those who supervise and evaluate principals more effective. It supplies the words to communicate 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 rubric focuses 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 superintendent or designee to fill out the rubric with knowledge and insight: multiple visits to the school, classrooms visits, attending meetings, and reaching out for input and 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**

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 (Manhasset Public Schools, 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 the correlates of effective teaching and student achievement and incorporating those criteria into both rubrics. See the bibliographies of the teacher and principal rubrics for sources.</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>Quasi-experimental. 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 performance; Effective (for solid professional practice); Improvement Necessary (for mediocre performance); and Does Not Meet Standards (for unsatisfactory, ineffective performance). There is a clear description of performance at each level.</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 eight revisions since their original form in 2006. Kim Marshall has a track record of responding to feedback and suggestions and continuously improving the rubrics. The most recent revision (2024) tightened the criteria (from 60 to 54 in each rubric), tweaked language based on feedback, put more emphasis</p>

	<p>on cultural competence, and eliminated the 4-3-2-1 numerical ratings at the top of each page.</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) short, frequent, systematic, unannounced 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 rubric 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 (including Manhasset, NY, and Hamilton County, TN), Marshall has done follow-up workshops 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 and any supplemental costs involved (<i>i.e. training/ instruction, implementation costs, materials, etc.</i>).</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 gearing 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 trouble-shoot (\$500). Further training, practice, videotape simulations, role-playing, and problem-solving</p>

	<p>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 – 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:	Michael Kim Marshall, Consultant
	Primary location (city/state):	Brookline, MA
	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):	Any in New York State
2.	The number of years the provider has delivered service:	23
3.	Title of the Teacher and/or Principal Rubric Evaluation model to be used (if appropriate):	Marshall Teacher Evaluation Rubric
4.	Professional population that the provider has served, and that they are requesting to serve (i.e., teachers, principals, admin., etc.):	Teachers, administrators, and instructional coaches
5.	Number of teachers and/or principals that have received an evaluation using the submitted rubric tool (approximately):	With the previous edition of the Marshall rubric, hundreds in New York, New Jersey, and elsewhere
6.	Number of teacher and/or principal evaluation instructional sessions provided per year, if applicable:	20-30
7.	Average length of each training session for the training of evaluators (minutes/hours):	180 minutes (3 hours)

Following is information provided as of July 3, 2024 date (contact the provider for the most up-to-date information):

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



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: Michael Kim Marshall – No exemption requests

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