Michigan Educator Evaluation Tool Application Rubric

Evidence of Reliability	Meets Requirements	Provisionally Meets Requirements	Does not meet Requirements
	The proposal provides empirical evidence that observation ratings are statistically reliable. The applicant provides a specific estimate of reliability, that is derived using a defensible methodology.	The applicant has not yet conducted a reliability study, but lays out a detailed and appropriate plan for estimating the reliability of the scores generated using the observation tool.	The proposal does not adequately discuss reliability, or does so in a way that fundamentally misunderstands reliability as a measurement principle. Or the reliability study suffers from one or more critical flaws. Plans to examine reliability are deemed to be unlikely to generate the evidence required by legislation.
Evidence of Validity	**Meets Requirements**	**Provisionally Meets Requirements**	**Does not meet Requirements**
Evidence of Validity	The proposal first states the intended score interpretation(s) that the instrument is intended to yield. It then presents a coherent case that describes and summarizes the evidence that scores on the instrument can be interpreted as intended. The proposal may consider one or more types of validity (e.g. content validity, criterion validity, consequential validity, etc).	The applicant has not yet conducted a validity study, but lays out a detailed and appropriate plan for studying the content validity, criterion validity, and/or consequential validity.	The proposal does not adequately discuss reliability, or does so in a way that fundamentally misunderstands validity as an evaluation/ measurement principle. Plans to examine validity are deemed to be unlikely to generate the evidence required by legislation.
Alignment to: InTASC Professional Standards - Teacher Evaluation Tool or **PSEL (formerly ISLLC) Professional Standards for Education Leaders - Administrator Evaluation Tool**	The proposal provides an adequate crosswalk between the applicable professional standards for Michigan educators (InTASC for teacher evaluation or PSEL for administrator evaluation). This alignment supports the content validity claims of the application.		The tool is either unaligned to standards, or the provided crosswalk did not demonstrate satisfactory alignment. The observation tool may over-emphasize components which are not aligned to standards, or may lack components aligned to critical standards.
Evidence of Efficacy	**Meets Requirements**	**Provisionally Meets Requirements**	**Does not meet Requirements**
	The proposal includes evidence that the use of the evaluation tool improves educator practice. This evidence may be empirical (such as an experimental or quasi-experimental study). Alternately, the proposal provides a well-specified logic model that is informed by research or evaluation. Relevant research or an evaluation suggest that the use of the framework/tool is likely to improve teacher practice, student learning, or other relevant outcomes.	The proposal does not include evidence of efficacy, but lays out a detailed and appropriate plan for studying the efficacy of the framework/tool.	The proposal does not adequately discuss the efficacy of the framework/tool. Plans to examine efficacy are deemed to be unlikely to generate the evidence required by legislation.

Michigan Educator Evaluation Tool Application Rubric

Evaluation frameworks and rubrics	Meets Requirements	Provisionally Meets Requirements	Does not meet Requirements
	The proposal presents an instructional framework which provides rich descriptors for each performance level on key summative indicators which: • Communicate clear performance standards • Establish a common language on instructional practice • Ensure evaluations result in accurate distributions of performance ratings • Help evaluators provide high-quality developmental feedback to teachers • Clearly delineate how performance can improve within each performance level of the rubric using clear and concise language which remains consistent throughout the frameworks and rubrics • Suggestions for teacher and student observables are clearly articulated for every performance level within every standard	The proposal presents an instructional framework which provides descriptors for each performance level on key summative indicators which: • Communicate clear performance standards • Establish a common language on instructional practice • Ensure evaluations result in accurate distributions of performance ratings • Help evaluators provide high-quality developmental feedback to teachers • Clearly delineate how performance can improve within each performance level of the rubric using clear and concise language which remains consistent throughout the frameworks and rubrics	The proposal is lacking at least one component of a clearly articulated instructional framework providing detailed descriptors for each performance level on key summative indicators.
Observation and Feedback Protocol	**Meets Requirements**	**Provisionally Meets Requirements**	**Does not meet Requirements**
	The proposal provides a highly-detailed description of the required observation protocol and systematic feedback/ implementation model utilizing best practice methodology with an emphasis on the culmination of a collaborative climate which promotes a growth mindset. The model requires multiple touchpoints for evaluator/evaluatee over the course of an evaluation cycle. It meets the legislative requirements for observation and feedback, and requires frequent, high-quality, collaborative dialogue between observer and observed, evaluator and evaluatee.	The proposal provides a clear description of the required observation protocol and systematic feedback/ implementation model utilizing best practice methodology with an emphasis on the culmination of a collaborative climate which promotes a growth mindset. The model requires multiple touchpoints for evaluator/evaluatee over the course of an evaluation cycle. Frequent, high-quality, collaborative dialogue between observer and observed, evaluator and evaluatee is a defined expectation. Elements of the legislative requirements for observation and feedback are lacking clarity or not fully developed.	The proposal's protocol and feedback/implementation model do not meet legislative requirements for observation and feedback.

Michigan Educator Evaluation Tool Application Rubric

Professional Development Plan	Meets Requirements	Provisionally Meets Requirements	Does not meet Requirements
	The proposal provides a highly-detailed description of the expected and appropriate district-level professional development plan designed to maximize fidelitous implementation consistent with validity, reliability and efficacy claims including all of the following: • Recommended timeframes • Methodologies • Intended stakeholders • Allocation of resources such as time, money, personnel • Training to calibrate evaluators • Implementation monitoring mechanisms • Inter-rater reliability monitoring plan • Implementation monitoring plan.	The proposal provides a clear description of the expected and appropriate district-level professional development plan designed to support fidelitous implementation consistent with validity, reliability and efficacy claims including most of the following: • Recommended timeframes • Methodologies • Intended stakeholders • Allocation of resources such as time, money, personnel • Training to calibrate evaluators • Implementation monitoring mechanisms • Inter-rater reliability monitoring plan • Implementation monitoring plan. .	The proposal does not provide a description of the expected and appropriate district-level professional development plan designed to support fidelitous implementation consistent with validity, reliability and efficacy claims.