OSPI Study Group Report*

Framework Specific Guidance

In addition to the general guidance provided, the Marzano Teacher Evaluation Model offers the following suggestions based on the feedback gathered from the Specific Learning Environment study groups:

1. It is imperative to understand the language of the Marzano framework as outlined in the rubrics. To clarify, we provide the following definitions:
   a. Criterion: The WA State Criteria, which is uniform for all frameworks.
   b. Components: Marzano specific framework language that supports the state criterion.
   c. Elements: As stated in the rubric, 'Elements are designed to allow teachers to select specific strategies on which to improve and then track their progress using the scales.' Stated differently, the elements support the components, which ultimately support the state criterion. Our recommendation is that teachers are evaluated on the components rather than each individual element. The elements can, and should, be used to support teacher development in a specific component as appropriate. As an example, if a teacher is working on Component 2.1, under WA State Criterion 2, he/she will find support and guidance to grow by utilizing one or more of the provided elements.

2. We strongly recommend that teachers work on their own or ideally, with grade-level or department teams, to revise the 'Possible Teacher Evidence' and 'Possible Student Evidence' portions of the rubric to reflect their own situations, students, and needs. The examples that are currently provided were created to bring the Components and Elements to life and certain bullet points may or may not work for specific grade-levels and/or environments. The Criterion, Components, and Elements language should not be altered, but the Possible Teacher/Student Evidence boxes may be adjusted to be developmentally/situationally appropriate for specific learning environments.
   a. For example, under Component 1.1, Providing Clear Learning Goals and Scales (Rubrics), an alternative learning environment PLC may alter the Possible Teacher Evidence to include utilizing a Classroom Management System and the Possible Student Evidence to include a Written Student Learning Plan while a Kindergarten PLC may alter the Possible Student Evidence to include utilizing 'I Can' statements.
   b. As another example, for Component 1.2 (Celebrating Success), an online course teacher may alter the Possible Teacher Evidence to include posting an announcement online and/or writing the student a congratulatory email and under Component 2.3 (Organizing Students for Cognitively Complex Tasks), the following may be added to Possible Teacher Evidence: Makes himself/herself available and offer resources and guidance as needed via email, Blackboard Instant Messenger, and/or phone.
   c. Evaluators should be part of these conversations in order to understand how the rubric operates in various environments.

3. Additionally, we recommend that grade-level/department team's work together to create examples and scenarios that bring the Criterion/Components/Elements to life.