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In the past decade, K-12 school reform in the United States has been dedicated, in the main, to answering a single question: What are the most effective policies, procedures, and practices that will measurably increase student achievement?

The multi-part study conducted by the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation (2013), *Ensuring Fair and Reliable Measures of Effective Teaching*, has provided new insights into effective teaching and effective schooling. Further, Race to the Top has influenced state and district policy with its requirements to improve teacher and school leader performance (U.S. Department of Education, 2011).

Now, school districts focused on elevating student achievement steadily and measurably are beginning to take a closer look at the interdependent relationships among teachers, instructional support members, school leaders, and district leaders. Increasingly, researchers and policymakers understand that the classroom behaviors of teachers, the behavior of instructional support members, the vision and daily practices of principals and assistant principals, and the priorities of the central office constitute a dynamic body of influence both up and down the chain. A misaligned system — one without mutual goals, clear focus, and a common language of instruction — will struggle to meet high standards for student performance.

Most districts understand the benefits of a common language of instruction, although many are someways from implementing a system that encourages it. A common language of instruction allows district leadership to focus on improving instruction and student achievement. Visionary district leadership will use implementation of a common language of instruction as a measure and criterion for all district-level decisions, recognizing that teacher behavior and strategies are a leading indicator in predicting student achievement (U.S. Department of Education, 2011; Gates Foundation, 2013; Marzano & Toth, in press). Along these lines, Shannon and Bysm (2004) have written, “Effective leadership that focuses on all students learning is at the core of improved school districts. Leadership is committed, persistent, proactive, and distributed through the system . . . and district vision and strategies must be sustained by educational leaders for significant change to occur” (p. 13). As such, district-level focus “cascades down” to principals and school leaders, who ought to receive the support they need to drive instructional improvement both for themselves, their teachers, and instructional support members (or licensed non-classroom personnel).

Before entire districts can achieve alignment, however, some longstanding issues must be addressed. Principals and school leaders do not consistently have the instructional expertise to conduct the more extensive, frequent, and
rigorous teacher evaluations required by state legislatures and Race to the Top. In a 2008 report the National Association of Elementary School Principals (NAESP) found for example, that the average percentage of school time principals allocated to professional development by principals was just 2% (as quoted in Schachter, 2013). As Schachter (2013) noted in a recent issue of *District Administration*, this lack of professional development, particularly in classroom instruction, has left many superintendents tasked with developing principals who are well-qualified for these new responsibilities and more. Ensuring that principals have the instructional expertise they need, then, should be a top priority.

Teachers facing more rigorous evaluations, too, want principals who are qualified instructional leaders. MetLife (2012) reported in the 29th Annual MetLife Survey of the American Teacher that teachers rated experience as a classroom teacher as the most critical attribute for principals.

**Common Language and Common Goals**

An understanding of a common language and of common goals allows for clear communication across the system, both vertically (from district leader, to school leader, to teacher) and horizontally (between teachers and instructional support members and between teachers across the district). One powerful way to ensure that the components of the entire system are aligned is to employ **hierarchical evaluation** (Marzano & Toth, in press). With hierarchical evaluation, district leaders are evaluated on the extent to which they produce specific results in the actions of school leaders; school leaders are evaluated on the extent to which they produce specific results in the actions of teachers; and teachers and instructional support members are evaluated on the extent to which they produce specific results in students. By definition, hierarchical evaluation produces a fully aligned system.
In 1983, the National Commission on Excellence in Education produced a groundbreaking report, *A Nation at Risk*, which concluded that declining student performance was rooted in school-related processes. Among the accountability recommendations were higher standards for professional growth and higher and measurable standards for academic performance. Goals 2000: Educate America Act (1994) legislation followed with its emphasis on improving learning and teaching. The objective of Goals 2000 was to provide a nationwide framework for education reform, advancing research and systemic changes.

Research on effective schools has supported that, systemically, schools “can beat the odds” to increase student learning with “a tremendous impact on student achievement if they follow the direction provided by the research” (Marzano, 2003, p. 4). There are highly effective schools “that almost entirely overcome the effects of student background” (p. 7).

Leadership is an integral factor of school reform for student achievement (Scheerens & Bosker, 1997; Teddlie & Reynolds, 2000; Marzano, 2003). And a partnership approach to improve teaching that engages the spirit of teachers and school leaders is proposed by Hiebert and Morris in “Teaching, Rather Than Teachers, as a Path toward Improving Classroom Instruction” (2012) as the most productive way to improve student performance.

**A Dynamic System of Influences**

Researchers are beginning to agree that teachers, school leaders, and district leadership constitute a dynamic system of interrelated influences that work together to impact student learning. *How Leadership Influences Student Learning* (Leithwood et al., 2004), a landmark review of existing literature on the subject conducted by The Wallace Foundation, concluded that “The chance of any reform improving student learning is remote unless district and school leaders agree with its purposes and appreciate what is required to make it work” (p. 4).

Six years later, The Wallace Foundation built on that conclusion in what may be the most comprehensive study to date on the relationship between administrator behavior and actions and student achievement. The multiyear study, *Investigating the Links to Improved Learning*
(Louis et al., 2010), corroborated the findings of previous research. Louis and colleagues noted that “leadership practices targeted directly at improving instruction have significant effects on teachers’ working relationships and, indirectly, on student achievement” (p. 37). At the district level, the authors found that “District leaders should consider the school leaders’ collective sense of efficacy for school improvement to be among the most important resources available to them for increasing student achievement” (p. 147).

The most salient aspect of the 2010 Wallace study was the conclusion that district leadership, school leadership, teacher actions, and student achievement represent a complex system of interacting influences. When all elements within this system are operating in concert, the impact of K-12 schooling is maximized.

Cultivating a Shared Vision

A shared vision and approach are crucial, since no piece of the system operates independently of any other. As Marzano and Toth (in press) note, “What happens in classrooms is influenced by decisions made by the leadership in schools, and what happens in schools is influenced by decisions made by the leadership in the district.” Clifford, Behrstock-Sherratt, and Fetters (2012) called this symbiotic relationship “The Ripple Effect.” In a paper of the same title, the authors argued that school leadership has a profound impact on student achievement:

Although the nearly 90,000 public school principals constitute a relatively small percentage of the public education sector, their work can have a “ripple effect” on the 3.4 million teachers and 55 million PK–12 students in the United States . . . . Although many factors in student learning have not been fully explained, leadership is the second most influential school-level factor on student achievement, after teaching quality (Hallinger & Heck, 1998; Leithwood, Louis, Anderson, & Wahlstrom, 2004; Marzano, Waters, & McNulty, 2005). (p. 1)

Not only do school leaders impact teachers, but the effect of district leadership upon schools is just as pronounced. In “Central Office Transformation for District-wide Teaching and Learning Improvement,” Honig and colleagues (2010) pointed to the important role that the central office plays in driving district-wide improvement:

... leadership is the second most influential school-level factor on student achievement, after teaching quality.”
Hierarchical Evaluation: The Impact on Student Achievement

Marzano and Waters (2009) demonstrate the combined effects of districts, schools, and teachers on student achievement. When schools and districts are operating at the 98th percentile of effectiveness, for example, the predicted achievement gain for a 50th percentile student is 17 points even when the teacher is classified as average. Figure 1 depicts these relationships.

Such examples of exemplary effectiveness among a school system’s components may be rare, to be sure, but the point is that when these systems are aligned, the combined impact on student achievement can be dramatic. In a fully aligned, hierarchical system, district leader evaluation is designed to support school leaders in the execution of their duties. School leadership evaluation supports teachers and instructional support members, and teacher evaluation is designed to drive positive gains in student learning. Marzano and Toth (in press) have called this relationship “cascading domains of influence.”

A hierarchical evaluation system is designed so that domains at higher levels articulate elements that directly influence elements at lower levels.

Although “hierarchical” implies that influence is unidirectional, in fact, as we noted previously, the influence exerted travels both up and down — and horizontally across — the system.

District leaders collaboratively align support to schools and teachers in terms of goals, budgetary resources, and curriculum; principals align school policies, professional development, and evaluation to teacher classroom practice and the behaviors of instructional support members; teachers, in turn, provide feedback up the chain to principals, and principals up the chain to district leadership. No one works in isolation, and responsibility is shared by all adults in the system. Perhaps this is the ultimate manifestation of collective efficacy (Louis, et al, 2010).

A focus on student achievement requires, as we have noted, complete vertical alignment, all the way from the classroom, the library, or the guidance counselor’s office, across the desks of principals and assistant principals, and up to the district offices, as illustrated in Figure 2.

Furthermore, a hierarchical evaluation system which focuses on growth, rather than merely measurement, is more likely to meet the goals outlined here. Such a system has at least two defining characteristics: Cascading Domains of Influence and Correlated Rubric Structures.
Cascading Domains of Influence Foster Shared Goals

A hierarchical evaluation system ought to be designed to demonstrate and encourage alignment among district, school, teacher, and instructional support members. One way to achieve alignment is to construct the domains in each evaluation framework to correspond, so that domains at higher levels articulate elements that directly influence elements at lower levels.

Figure 3, below, illustrates these relationships.

For example, both the district and school leader evaluation models illustrated below share five domains focused on 1) achievement, 2) instruction, 3) curriculum, 4) cooperation and collaboration, and 5) school climate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Achievement</th>
<th>Instruction</th>
<th>Curriculum</th>
<th>Cooperation and Collaboration</th>
<th>Climate</th>
<th>Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>District</strong></td>
<td><strong>School</strong></td>
<td><strong>Teacher</strong></td>
<td><strong>Instructional Support Members</strong></td>
<td><strong>Achievement of Individual Students</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domain 1</td>
<td>Domain 1</td>
<td>Domain 1</td>
<td>Domain 4</td>
<td>Domain 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-negotiable goals to support student learning</td>
<td>A data-driven focus on student learning</td>
<td>Classroom strategies and behaviors</td>
<td>Collegiality and professionalism</td>
<td>Collegiality and professionalism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domain 2</td>
<td>Domain 2</td>
<td>Domain 2</td>
<td>Domain 3</td>
<td>Domain 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for continuous improvement of instruction</td>
<td>Continuous improvement of instruction</td>
<td>Planning and preparing</td>
<td>Reflecting on teaching</td>
<td>Reflecting on teaching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domain 3</td>
<td>Domain 3</td>
<td>Domain 3</td>
<td>Domain 4</td>
<td>Domain 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuous support for a guaranteed and viable curriculum</td>
<td>Guaranteed and viable curriculum</td>
<td>Instructional strategies and behaviors</td>
<td>Domain 1</td>
<td>Domain 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>District</strong></td>
<td><strong>School</strong></td>
<td><strong>Teacher</strong></td>
<td><strong>Instructional Support Members</strong></td>
<td><strong>Achievement of Individual Students</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domain 4</td>
<td>Domain 4</td>
<td>Domain 4</td>
<td>Domain 4</td>
<td>Domain 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperation and collaboration</td>
<td>Cooperation and collaboration</td>
<td>Collegiality and professionalism</td>
<td>Collegiality and professionalism</td>
<td>Collegiality and professionalism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domain 5</td>
<td>Domain 5</td>
<td>Domain 5</td>
<td>Domain 5</td>
<td>Domain 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District climate</td>
<td>School climate</td>
<td>School climate</td>
<td>School climate</td>
<td>School climate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domain 6</td>
<td>Domain 6</td>
<td>Domain 6</td>
<td>Domain 6</td>
<td>Domain 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FIGURE 3**
Cascading Domain of Influence
The teacher and instructional support member evaluation models, similarly, share four domains: 1) instructional strategies and behaviors; 2) planning and preparing; 3) reflecting on teaching; and 4) collegiality and professionalism. Figure 4 illustrates the influential relationships established between the two leader and the two teacher models.

This direct alignment and influence among the four evaluation systems foster a sense of shared purpose, improve collegiality, build strong partnerships between administration and other school personnel, and clearly articulate district-wide goals. Each person in the system has both a well-defined role and a distinct understanding of the impact that role has on the larger system.

Each person in the system has both a well-defined role and a distinct understanding of the impact that role has on the larger system.

Advanced implementation services, tools, and training for highly aligned educator evaluation and growth systems.

Visit our website or contact us to learn more about how Learning Sciences Marzano Center can help your school or district develop a common language of instruction to help drive student achievement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District/School Domains 1,2,3</th>
<th>District/School Domain 4</th>
<th>District/School Domain 5</th>
<th>District Domain 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALIGNMENT</td>
<td>ALIGNMENT</td>
<td>INFLUENCES</td>
<td>INFLUENCES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher/Instructional Support Member Domains 1,2,3</td>
<td>Teacher/Instructional Support Member Domains 1,2,3</td>
<td>Teacher/Instructional Support Member Domains 1,2,3,4</td>
<td>Teacher/Instructional Support Member Domains 1,2,3,4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FIGURE 4**
Alignment and influence of specific domains for each evaluation model form a cohesive system.
A Correlated Rubric Structure Provides Clear Performance Expectation

Further, all the evaluation frameworks in such a hierarchical system will share a correlated rubric structure. In Figure 5, the evaluation rubric is composed of five categories to describe the behavior of and the expectations for the person being evaluated. Each member of the system, from the 30-year district veteran teacher to the first-year speech therapist, is evaluated using a five-point scale that identifies the behaviors and strategies from “innovating” to “not using.”

This common rubric structure serves several purposes. As with cascading domains of influence, it encourages the perception that all actors in the system are participating in a partnership. It works to help alleviate antagonism between leadership and staff — the sense of “us” against “them.” Each person in the system, ideally, will share an understanding of what kinds of behavior constitute “innovating,” “applying,” or “developing” so that teachers and administrators are using a common language to describe common expectations of performance. And once again, direct alignment fosters consensus and reemphasizes shared priorities and goals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Innovating (4)</th>
<th>Applying (3)</th>
<th>Developing (3)</th>
<th>Beginning (2)</th>
<th>Not Using (1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The district leader ensures adjustments are made or new strategies are created so that all personnel know and attend to the achievement and goals.</td>
<td>The district leader ensures clear and measurable goals are established for all relevant areas of responsibility that are focused on critical needs for improving student achievement and the needed operational support at the district, school, and individual student levels and monitors the extent to which personnel know and attend to these goals.</td>
<td>The district leader ensures clear and measurable goals are established for all relevant areas of responsibility that are focused on critical needs for improving student achievement and the needed operational support at the district, school, and individual student levels.</td>
<td>The district leader attempts to ensure clear and measurable goals for all relevant areas of responsibility but does not complete the task or does so partially.</td>
<td>The district leader does not attempt to ensure clear and measurable goals for all relevant areas of responsibility.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FIGURE 5**

District Leader Evaluation Rubric for the Elements: The district leader ensures that clear and measurable goals are established for all relevant areas of responsibility that are focused on critical needs for improving student achievement and the needed operational support at the district, school, and individual student levels.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Innovating (4)</th>
<th>Applying (3)</th>
<th>Developing (3)</th>
<th>Beginning (2)</th>
<th>Not Using (1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The school leader ensures adjustments are made or new methods are utilized so that all stakeholders sufficiently understand the goals.</td>
<td>The school leader ensures clear, measurable goals with specific timelines focused on critical needs regarding improving student achievement are established at the school level AND regularly monitors that everyone has understanding of the goals.</td>
<td>The school leader ensures clear, measurable goals with specific timelines focused on critical needs regarding improving student achievement are established at the school level.</td>
<td>The school leader attempts to ensure clear, measurable goals with specific timelines focused on critical needs regarding improving student achievement are established at the school level but does not complete the task or does so partially.</td>
<td>The school leader does not attempt to ensure clear, measurable goals with specific timelines focused on critical needs regarding improving student achievement are established at school level.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FIGURE 6**

School Leader Evaluation Rubric for the Elements: The school leader ensures clear and measurable goals are established and focused on critical needs regarding improving overall student achievement at the school level.
The figures above illustrate how district leader, school leader, teacher, and instructional support personnel rubrics have identical structures. The lowest score (Not Using) indicates that a specific desired behavior is not employed. A Beginning score indicates that a desired behavior is attempted but is not completed or contains errors and omissions. A Developing score indicates that the desired behavior is executed without significant error. Applying is the target score for all rubrics — that is, all district leaders, school leaders, and teachers are encouraged to achieve the Applying level within the rubrics for their respective evaluation systems. Finally, an Innovating score indicates that the district leader, school leader, teacher, or support person is making adaptations to ensure that all constituents are receiving positive benefits from the desired behavior.

Like all the frameworks discussed here, the Marzano District Leader Evaluation Model prioritizes all district actions to support or affect student achievement. The non-negotiable focus and goal is improvement of student learning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Innovating (4)</th>
<th>Applying (3)</th>
<th>Developing (3)</th>
<th>Beginning (2)</th>
<th>Not Using (1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adapts and creates new strategies for unique student needs and situations in order for the desired effect to be evident in all students.</td>
<td>Provides a clearly stated learning goal accompanied by a scale or rubric that describes levels of performance and monitors for evidence of the majority of students understanding of the learning goal and the levels of performance.</td>
<td>Provides a clearly stated learning goal accompanied by a scale or rubric that describes levels of performance, but the majority of students are not monitored for the desired effect of the strategy.</td>
<td>Uses strategy incorrectly or with parts missing.</td>
<td>Strategy was called for but not exhibited.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FIGURE 7**

Teacher Evaluation Rubric for the Elements: The teacher provides a clearly stated learning goal accompanied by a scale or rubric that describes levels of performance relative to the learning goal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Innovating (4)</th>
<th>Applying (3)</th>
<th>Developing (3)</th>
<th>Beginning (2)</th>
<th>Not Using (1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adapts and creates new strategies for unique situations.</td>
<td>Provides clearly stated goals accompanied by a scale that describes levels of performance and monitors understanding of goals and levels of performance.</td>
<td>Provides clearly stated goals accompanied by a scale that describes levels of performance.</td>
<td>Uses strategy incorrectly or with parts missing.</td>
<td>Strategy was called for but not exhibited.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FIGURE 8**

Non-classroom Instructional Support Member Evaluation Rubric for the Elements: The instructional support member provides clearly stated goals based on areas of responsibility that align with school and/or district goals and have a scale that describes levels of performance.
THE MARZANO MODELS

District Leader Evaluation: Calibrating Priorities for Student Success

The Marzano District Leader Evaluation Model was developed based on extensive research and collaboration between Learning Sciences Marzano Center experts and Dr. Robert J. Marzano. The District Leader Evaluation Model builds upon three decades of research into the relationship among administrator behaviors, teacher efficacy, and student achievement. As discussed above, the model was developed as the capstone of an aligned, hierarchical evaluation system to both measure and grow district leaders, school leaders, teachers, and instructional support personnel.

Research Background

A great deal of research has examined how district leadership impacts school performance (Cawelti & Protheroe, 2001; Corcoran, Fuhrman, & Belcher, 2001; Hightower, 2002; Hightower, Knapp, Marsh, & McLaughlin, 2002; Marsh, 2002; Massell & Goertz, 2002; McLaughlin & Talbert, 2002; Snipes, Dolittle, & Herlihy, 2002; Snyder, 2002; Togneri & Anderson, 2003).

Karl Weick (1976, 1982), for example, found that, for the most part, K-12 education systems are “loosely coupled” in comparison to other organizations. As a result, they have difficulty self-correcting and are less likely to achieve consensus on common goals. This loose coupling also allows a fairly high tolerance for poor performance. In districts where schools and leadership are more tightly coupled, in contrast, district leaders have a more profound impact on school operations and teacher behaviors.

Early studies conducted by Louis, Rosenblum, and Molitor (1981) found that the ways in which district leaders addressed problems, for example, had an impact on how well programs were implemented at the school level. Additional studies have noted the relationship between effective schools and districts where improving teaching and learning was a high priority (Berman et al., 1981; Rosenholtz, 1989). This early research has been corroborated by later findings, such as the Marzano/Waters meta-analysis and the multiyear Wallace Foundation study discussed below.

In their meta-analyses of 27 studies completed or reported between 1970 and 2003, Marzano and Waters (2009) concluded that district leadership has a measurable and definable relationship with student achievement. They found that when district leaders carry out their leadership responsibilities effectively, student achievement across the district is positively affected (p. 5).
Finally, a multiyear study by The Wallace Foundation, *Learning from Leadership: Investigating the Links to Improved Learning*, corroborated the findings of previous research that both school and district leadership can indirectly influence student achievement. The authors noted, “District leaders should consider the school leaders’ collective sense of efficacy for school improvement to be among the most important resources available to them for increasing student achievement” (Louis et al., 2010, p. 147).

**A District Leader Evaluation Model with a Focus on Improved Instruction**

Increasingly, contemporary reports are beginning to pinpoint instructional improvement goals as integral to effective district leadership. A 2009 report, “The District Leadership Challenge: Empowering Principals to Improve Teaching and Learning,” from the Southern Regional Education Board (SREB), recommended that districts provide clear direction and focus for improving instruction to raise student achievement. The authors noted the following:

*The most consistent research finding about school district effectiveness is this: Districts must maintain a strong focus on improving instruction and raising standards and achievement by supporting principals to become instructional leaders. (p. 6)*

The Marzano District Leader Evaluation Model focuses on the non-negotiable goal of student achievement and encourages district leaders to deliberately undertake the actions that support principals and drive learning. The District Leader Evaluation Model includes six domains, five of which correspond to domains in the School Leader Evaluation Model. When used together, the two models achieve Weick’s “tightly coupled” organizational structure discussed above, with an emphasis on measurable student achievement as supported by data.

**The most consistent research finding about school district effectiveness is this: Districts must maintain a strong focus on improving instruction and raising standards and achievement by supporting principals to become instructional leaders.**
A Data-Driven Focus on Student Achievement

Element 1:
The district leader ensures clear and measurable goals are established for all relevant areas of responsibility that are focused on critical needs for improving student achievement and the needed operational support at the district, school, and individual student levels.

Element 2:
The district leader ensures data are analyzed, interpreted, and used to regularly monitor the progress toward district, school, and individual student goals.

Element 3:
The district leader ensures each district goal receives appropriate district, school-level, and classroom-level support to help all students meet individual achievement goals when data indicate interventions are needed.

Domain 2: Continuous Support for Improvement of Instruction

Element 1:
The district leader provides a clear vision regarding the district instructional model and how to guide personnel and schools in operationalizing the model.

Element 2:
The district leader effectively supports and retains school and department leaders who continually enhance their leadership skills through reflection and professional growth plans.

Element 3:
The district leader ensures that district and school leaders provide clear, ongoing evaluations of performance strengths and weaknesses for personnel in their areas of responsibility that are consistent with student achievement and operational data.

Element 4:
The district leader ensures that personnel are provided with job-embedded professional development that is directly related to their growth plans.

Domain 3: Continuous Support of a Guaranteed and Viable Curriculum

Element 1:
The district leader ensures that curriculum and assessment initiatives and supporting operational practices at the district and school levels adhere to federal, state, and district standards.

Element 2:
The district leader ensures that district-level program, curricular, and operational initiatives are focused enough that they can be adequately addressed in the time available to the district and schools.

Element 3:
The district leader ensures that students are provided with the opportunity to access educational programs and learn critical content.

Domain 4: Cooperation and Collaboration

Element 1:
The district leader establishes clear guidelines regarding the areas for which schools are expected to follow explicit district guidance and the areas for which schools have autonomy of decision making.

Element 2:
The district leader ensures that constituents (e.g., school board, administrators, teachers, students, and parents) perceive the district as a collaborative and cooperative workplace.

Element 3:
The district leader ensures that constituents (e.g., school board, administrators, teachers, students, and parents) have effective ways to provide input to the district.

Element 4:
The district leader ensures leadership development and responsibilities are appropriately delegated and shared.

Domain 5: District Climate

Element 1:
The district administrator is recognized as a leader (in his or her area of responsibility) who continually improves his or her professional practice.

Element 2:
The district leader has the trust of constituents (e.g., school board, administrators, teachers, students, and parents) that his or her actions are guided by what is best for all student populations and the district.

Element 3:
The district leader ensures constituents (e.g., school board, administrators, teachers, students, and parents) perceive the district as safe and orderly.

Element 5:
The district leader acknowledges the success of the whole district, as well as individual schools and employees within the district.

Domain 6: Resource Allocation

Element 1:
The district leader manages the fiscal resources of the district in a way that focuses on effective instruction and achievement of all students and optimal district operations.

Element 2:
The district leader manages the technological resources of the district in such a way that focuses on effective instruction and the achievement of all students and optimal efficiency throughout the district.

Element 3:
The district leader manages the organization, operations, instructional programs, and initiatives in ways to maximize the use of resources to promote effective instruction and achievement of all students.
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The Parallel Domains of Leader Evaluation

Domain 1 of the District Leader Evaluation Model (non-negotiable goals to support student learning) relates directly to Domain 1 of the School Leader Evaluation Model (a data-driven focus on student learning). The relationship between these two domains continues throughout the elements:

**District Leader Domain 1, Element 1**
The district leader ensures that clear and measurable goals are established for all relevant areas of responsibility that are focused on critical needs for improving student achievement and the needed operational support at the district, school, and individual student levels.

**School Leader Domain 1, Element 1**
The school leader ensures that clear and measurable goals are established and focused on critical needs regarding improving overall student achievement at the school level.

**District Leader Domain 1, Element 2**
The district leader ensures that data are analyzed, interpreted, and used to regularly monitor the progress toward district, school, and individual student goals.

**School Leader Domain 1, Element 3**
The school leader ensures that data are analyzed, interpreted, and used to regularly monitor progress toward school achievement goals.

These parallel domains and elements, along with the shared scales discussed above, create a highly objective measurement and growth platform. Evidences of desired effects are either seen or not seen, and they are performed at precisely measured levels. All actors in the system are aligned to student achievement. The common language of instruction becomes a measure and criterion for all district-level decisions.

To further illustrate: School leadership elements for Domain 1 provide specific details regarding expectations for how each school in the district should establish its goals. To support these efforts of school leaders, the elements of the Marzano District Leader Evaluation Model for Domain 1 ensure that district leaders use data from all the schools within the system to set their own goals. Each department or division at the district level sets goals according to its area of responsibility, goals that address the critical needs for improving student achievement across the district, and goal that identify the operational support needed for the district, individual schools, and students.

If district and school leaders perform their functions well, teachers should be motivated to experience success in their classrooms. Virtually all behaviors and actions on which district leaders and school leaders are evaluated are designed to support teachers in effectively addressing the four domains of their evaluation model.
Visionary district leadership realizes that all departments within the district must be held accountable; each must answer the question: “How does this department or division, within the scope and sequence of a plan of action and responsibility, make instruction its primary focus?” The challenge is to develop an understanding throughout the system that all departments, as their primary focus, exist to support instruction.

The Marzano District Leader Evaluation Model places additional focus on resource allocation in Domain 6. When allocating resources, student achievement is the primary filter. All district leaders must be geared to support instruction — even in those departments that do not appear on the surface to be connected to student achievement.

This student-centered approach is supported by findings in the SREB report, “Three Essentials: Improving Schools Requires District Vision, District and State Support, and Principal Leadership” (Bottoms & Schmidt-Davis, 2010):

- A focus on motivating and engaging students in learning and achievement can become an individual mandate that all educators follow — from the superintendent to the classroom teacher. The focus on students’ intellectual and academic growth can become a matter of teachers’ self-regulation rather than a response to external pressure as the district establishes benchmarks to ensure that students are on track to graduate from high school prepared for college and careers. (p.14)

This new direct and aligned focus on instruction differs from the way many districts have traditionally operated. For example, in the past, a late bus might have been seen as an operational or transportation challenge. The Marzano District Leader Evaluation Model recalibrates this understanding: now a late bus, instead, represents an instructional roadblock — it reduces the time a student has in front of a teacher getting quality instruction. Similarly, when budgets get tightened, a model such as this one clarifies the district’s mission: operations may decide to cut their painting budget rather than eliminate its foreign language classes. Foreign languages support learning; fresh paint does not. When faced with such a choice, the model encourages district leaders to support the decision that supports student achievement.

Visionary district leadership realizes that all departments within the district must be held accountable; each must answer the question: “How does this department or division, within the scope and sequence of a plan of action and responsibility, make instruction its primary focus?”
The Marzano Center School Leader Evaluation Model: The Principal as Instructional Leader

While teachers are arguably the most powerful alterable variable in student achievement, research shows that they are certainly not the only variable. School leaders have an even greater effect on student achievement than district leaders, primarily because they are closer to teachers and classrooms but only if they are managing learning, not buildings. “This view of the principalship — that it should center on instruction, not building management or other administrative matters — is one that has gained currency in recent years,” notes Pamela Mendels (2012) in The Effective Principal. “So has the idea that if instruction is the heart of their job, principals have a vital role to play in school improvement” (p. 54).

Effective school leaders support teachers with meaningful feedback and goals geared toward student achievement. School leaders must lead toward improved student achievement; to do so, leaders need a deep understanding of instruction. School leaders must function as instructional leaders capable of helping teachers develop.

Like the Marzano District Leader Evaluation Model, the Marzano School Leader Evaluation Model is also built on a foundation of evidences and criteria; each element has clearly defined evidences of the desired effect, and each outcome is rated on the extent to which the desired effect was achieved. As with the district model, in the School Leader Evaluation Model, all actions and decisions are based on best practices to improve student learning.

Research Background

The school leader evaluation model was developed based on four primary documents related to school leadership: (1) the Wallace study (Louis, Leithwood, Wahlstrom, & Anderson, 2010); (2) What Works in Oklahoma Schools (Marzano Research Laboratory, 2010); (3) the Marzano, Waters & McNulty (2005) meta-analysis of school leadership; and (4) the Marzano (2003) study of school effectiveness.

As discussed previously, the report funded by The Wallace Foundation, Learning from Leadership: Investigating the Links to Improved Student Learning, stands as the seminal examination of the relationship between school leader actions and behaviors and student academic achievement. The report confirmed through quantitative data that effective school leadership is linked to student achievement; it concluded that principals play the central role in leadership, while “collective leadership” shared between teachers, parents, and other stakeholders plays a contributing part. Researchers found that, for example, “Leadership practices targeted directly at teachers’ instruction (i.e., instructional leadership) have significant, although indirect, effects on student achievement” (p. 10).
The authors further noted that "Leadership effects on student learning occur largely because leadership strengthens professional community; teachers’ engagement in professional community, in turn, fosters the use of instructional practices that are associated with student achievement" (p. 10). And they added that "the professional community effect may reflect the creation of a supportive school climate that encourages student effort above and beyond that provided in individual classrooms" (p. 10). The report confirmed that school leaders have a profound impact on school culture, and that a culture focused on student learning will yield results in improved student performance.

The study of What Works in Oklahoma Schools conducted by Marzano Research Laboratory (2010) for the Oklahoma State Department of Education also indicated that specific actions on the part of administrators are statistically related to student academic achievement. In addition, Marzano, Waters & McNulty’s meta-analysis of School Leadership, published in School Leadership that Works (Marzano et al., 2005), which examined the research literature from 1978 to 2001, also found that school leadership has a statistically significant relationship with student achievement. Such leadership can be explained as 21 responsibilities of effective school leaders. These responsibilities were useful but were not defined as specific actions. Finally, the Marzano study of effective schools published in What Works in Schools (Marzano, 2003), specified 11 factors that schools must attend to if they are to enhance student achievement and the school leadership implications regarding those 11 factors. The Marzano School Leader Evaluation Model was developed based on these key findings from the previous works and translated into specific actions with concrete outcomes, all of which focus on student learning.

As outlined above, 24 categories of principal actions and behaviors were identified, elements designed to be interpreted as concrete actions school leaders should take to support teacher development and enhance student learning. The elements were organized into five domains: (1) a data-driven focus on student achievement, (2) continuous improvement of instruction, (3) a guaranteed and viable curriculum, (4) cooperation and collaboration, and (5) school climate.
The Marzano School Leader Evaluation Model Learning Map

For each element within each of the domains, the Marzano School Leader Evaluation Model establishes a common scale and sample evidences.
The goal of the model is to provide clear, objective measurement of whether a leader is, or is not, achieving a standard.

The combination of a clearly defined goal, a precise scale, and a detailed description of a desired effect creates an approach that not only measures but also diagnoses misalignment in the system. When the goal is to support the teacher in support of the student, it follows that leaders are responsible for providing professional development for specific purposes to achieve desired student outcomes — not for mere compliance. Leaders must support teachers by aligning resources, curriculum, and professional development to Common Core State Standards, state assessments, and other high-stakes assessments required by the district and/or state.

The School Leader Evaluation Model elements are based on achieving measurable desired outcomes, with all elements geared toward supporting student achievement. As with the District Leader Evaluation Model, the School Leader Evaluation Model is optimized for alignment with the Marzano Teacher Evaluation Model and the Marzano Center Non-Classroom Instructional Support Personnel Evaluation Model.

The Marzano Teacher Evaluation Model: Designed for Teacher Growth

Teacher development should be founded on improving skills shown to impact student achievement. Marzano (2007) found that teachers can improve their pedagogical expertise by focusing on and deliberately practicing specific instructional strategies which have been connected to student learning gains in working classrooms. The Marzano Teacher Evaluation Model incorporates research-based strategies linked to raising student achievement when teachers use the strategies with fidelity. (For more on the research base of the model and the results of in-classroom studies, see Marzano, Schooling & Toth, 2012, Examining the Role of Teacher Evaluation in Student Achievement).

Continuous Improvement of Instruction

The Marzano Teacher Evaluation Model provides not only a collection of 41 categories of teaching strategies (depicted in figure 11), but also a system to continuously improve specific skills over time. Thus, the model is designed to not only measure teacher skill at a discrete point in time but also to provide the feedback, resources, and coaching necessary to improve teacher skill year by year over the course of a professional career. Like the two models previously discussed, the assumption is that teachers will be held accountable for specific actions and behaviors identified in the model’s domains. Accountability is explicit in the feedback teachers receive from school leaders and in their evaluations. The feedback is specific enough and the development plans concrete enough, to allow teachers to focus on skills they most need to improve.

Thus, the four domains of the Marzano Teacher Evaluation Model work to support each other with a strong focus on Domain 1 (Classroom Strategies and Behaviors). The 41 elements in Domain 1 constitute those classroom behaviors that have been shown, in numerous studies, to have a positive effect on student achievement. These strategies constitute a map to guide new teachers and to refresh the practices of veterans.

Leaders must support teachers by aligning resources, curriculum, and professional development to Common Core State Standards, state assessments, and other high-stakes assessments required by the district and/or state.
The Marzano Teacher Evaluation Model Learning Map

Domain 1: Classroom Strategies and Behaviors
Domain 1 is based on the Art and Science of Teaching Framework and identifies the 41 elements or instructional categories that happen in the classroom. The 41 instructional categories are organized into 9 Design Questions (DQs) and further grouped into 3 Lesson Segments to define the Observation and Feedback Protocol.

Note: DQ refers to Design Question in the Marzano Art and Science of Teaching Framework. The nine (9) DQs organize the 41 elements in Domain 1. The final Design Question, DQ10: Developing Effective Lessons Organized into a Cohesive Unit is contained in Domain 2: Planning and Preparing.

Domain 2: Planning and Preparing
Planning and Preparing
- Planning and Preparing for Lessons and Units
  - 42. Effective Scaffolding of Information within Lessons
  - 43. Lessons within Units
  - 44. Attention to Established Content Standards
- Planning and Preparing for Use of Resources and Technology
  - 45. Use of Available Traditional Resources
  - 46. Use of Available Technology
- Planning and Preparing for the Needs of English Language Learners
  - 47. Needs of English Language Learners
- Planning and Preparing for the Needs of Students Receiving Special Education
  - 48. Needs of Students Receiving Special Education
- Planning and Preparing for the Needs of Students Who Lack Support for Schooling
  - 49. Needs of Students Who Lack Support for Schooling

Domain 3: Reflecting on Teaching
Reflecting on Teaching
- Evaluating Personal Performance
  - 50. Identifying Areas of Pedagogical Strength and Weakness
  - 51. Evaluating the Effectiveness of Individual Lessons and Units
  - 52. Evaluating the Effectiveness of Specific Pedagogical Strategies and Behaviors
- Developing and Implementing a Professional Growth Plan
  - 53. Developing a Written Growth and Development Plan
  - 54. Monitoring Progress Relative to the Professional Growth and Development Plan

Domain 4: Collegiality and Professionalism
Collegiality and Professionalism
- Promoting a Positive Environment
  - 55. Promoting Positive Interactions with Colleagues
  - 56. Promoting Positive Interactions about Students and Parents
- Promoting Exchange of Ideas and Strategies
  - 57. Seeking Mentorship for Areas of Need or Interest
  - 58. Mentoring Other Teachers and Sharing Ideas and Strategies
- Promoting District and School Development
  - 59. Adhering to District and School Rules and Procedures
  - 60. Participating in District and School Initiatives

FIGURE 11
Marzano Teacher Evaluation Model Learning Map
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Taken together, the 60 elements in the four domains constitute a systematic approach to teacher development that incorporates self-assessment, peer review, evaluation, and focused mentoring to give teachers a solid, measurable foundation for improving their practice, thereby raising student achievement year by year.

Specific Tools to Attain Mastery
The Marzano Teacher Evaluation Model is designed to give teachers and administrators specific instructional tools to organize their pedagogical goals and attain mastery. The model provides a foundation of research conducted in the real-world environment of working classrooms. It accommodates evolving state standards and directives. And it drives measurable increases in student achievement.

“... the Marzano Teacher Evaluation Model acts as the fulcrum around which the duties and priorities of all other members of the system pivot. “

and student growth over time. When teachers are evaluated with the Marzano model, they are shown where they are in relation to where they have been, as well as where and how to achieve the next level of improvement in the targeted instructional strategies. The Marzano Teacher Evaluation Model identifies the relationship between teaching practices and student achievement and helps teachers and leaders make informed, deliberate decisions to yield the greatest benefits for their students. Most importantly, the model makes steady, measurable increases in student achievement an achievable goal.

Combining the insights of reflection, professional development, and formative assessment, the model guides each teacher to know where and how to improve to become highly effective. Expert guidance and specificity in the framework sets teachers on a career path of continuous improvement leading to expertise and continuous growth in the profession. Along with tools for observer feedback, teachers are provided the tools and insights needed for adaptive, real-time improvement of teaching strategies that lead to specific desired outcomes. Each teacher’s continuous improvement is supported by relevant, job-embedded professional development and calibration to the most current educational research.

The model brings extreme granularity to the measurement of teacher growth and continuous improvement, and it does so at consistent intervals through the year. Ultimately, this brings the evaluation process much closer to the classroom. In a hierarchical evaluation system like the one described here, the Marzano Teacher Evaluation Model acts as the fulcrum around which the duties and priorities of all other members of the system pivot.

We are with you every step of the way.

- Observer training
- Professional Development workshops
- Proven tools to build teacher and leader expertise
- Personalized implementation services for unique district and school needs
- Dedicated to your success from day one
The question of how to evaluate non-instructional personnel (certificated instructors) has been a thorny one for many school districts. As teacher evaluation systems have been rolled out to meet Race to the Top and other policy requirements, non-instructional personnel have often been left with traditional methods of evaluation, methods which are subject to the same pitfalls as previous evaluations for classroom teachers. They may, for example, be evaluated with instruments that do not reflect their expertise. Typically, the evaluation rubric may offer a handful of behaviors that evaluators look for (engaging students, creating effective environments for student learning, understanding and organizing subject matter effectively, planning instruction, meeting standards, etc.); however, most such non-instructional evaluation systems do not employ either a sufficiently granular set of behaviors or sample evidences of those behaviors for which observers may look.

Focused Decisions About Best Practices

In addition, few, if any, such evaluation systems are aligned with other educator evaluation frameworks to achieve the focus on student achievement we have discussed. As with other members of the district system, the Marzano Center Non-Classroom Instructional Support Personnel Model helps focus decisions about best practices in the field. Teachers such as media specialists, nurses, athletic coaches, art therapists, and speech pathologists can make decisions based on the question of how their behaviors will impact student learning.

The Marzano Center Non-Classroom Instructional Support Personnel Model, adapted by Dr. Beverly Carbaugh, has been designed to align with the Marzano teacher, school leader, and district leader evaluation models. The model is an evaluation framework for certificated instructors whose primary job is not day-to-day instruction of students. The categories of support personnel who may be evaluated using this model is a district-level decision.

Like the previous models we have discussed, the Non-Classroom Instructional Support Personnel Model is based on a review of research literature identifying specific instructional strategies correlated with student achievement. The instructional support model is rooted in the common language of the Marzano evaluation models but has been adapted to capture the unique responsibilities of personnel who support instruction at the school and district levels. And like those models, the Instructional Support Personnel Evaluation Model has been designed for growth as well as measurement, with focused goals and specific behaviors correlated with increased student achievement.
The Model
Like the Marzano Teacher Evaluation Model, the Instructional Support Personnel Model is organized into four domains, the domains containing 33 elements representing categories of strategies and behaviors used by instructional support personnel to ensure the success of students, schools, and districts. Domain 1, “Instructional Support Strategies and Behaviors,” includes elements that represent routine segments, establishing goals and content, and facilitating engagement. Each element is accompanied by evidences and a development scale for targeted feedback to drive growth. Domain 2, “Planning and Preparing for Implementation of Goals and Scaffolding of Content or Activities,” is unique for non-classroom instructional support personnel, and the elements and evidences in this domain have been adapted to be relevant and focused (for example, planning ways to scaffold content; use of traditional resources and technology; and preparing for the needs of ELL and special needs students). Domain 3, “Reflecting on Teaching,” supports the reflective and self-assessment practices of the non-classroom teacher and includes development of a professional growth plan. And, finally Domain 4, “Collegiality and Professionalism,” includes elements to support the context in which the other domains function: contributing to a positive school environment. Figure 12, below, illustrates the four domains and 33 elements of the model.

Marzano Center Instructional Support Personnel Evaluation Learning Map
### Scales and Evidences

For each of the 33 elements within the four domains, scales have been developed along with example evidences of success. To illustrate, consider Element 1 (“The instructional support member provides clearly stated goals based on area of responsibility that align with school and/or district goals and has a scale that describes levels of performance.”). Accompanying the scale for each of the 24 elements are evidences of successful performance. It is important to note that these are sample evidences only in that other evidences specific to a given school or district might also depict successful performance. Evidences for the first element in Domain 1 are depicted in Figure 13.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Providing Clear Goals and Scales (Rubrics)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The instructional support member provides clearly stated goals based on area of responsibility that align with school and/or district goals and has a scale that describes levels of performance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Sample Instructional Support Member Evidence

- Instructional support member establishes a defined work plan or set of goals aligned with school and district goals
- Instructional support member communicates work plan or goals and scale to appropriate people
- Instructional support member makes references to his/her goals throughout the year
- Instructional support member can explain how goals support and align with school and/or district goals
- Instructional support member can explain the meaning of the levels of performance articulated in the scale
- Instructional support member can explain how his/her activities relate to the goal

#### Sample Participant Evidence

- When asked, participants, colleagues, and/or administrators can explain how the instructional support member goals relate to and/or support the school or district goals
- When asked, participants, colleagues, and/or administrators can explain how the instructional support member’s activities relate to the school and/or district goals

**Participant** is a generic term to include anyone the Instructional Support Member is supporting, such as: PreK 12 participants, adult participants, faculty, staff, colleagues, parents, or community members.

**School** is used generically to represent participants, teachers, staff, or other colleagues in the instructional support member’s area of responsibility.

#### Scale Levels: (choose one)

- Not Using
- Beginning
- Developing
- Applying
- Innovating
- Not Applicable

---

**FIGURE 13**

*Instructional Support Strategies and Behaviors*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not Using</th>
<th>Beginning</th>
<th>Developing</th>
<th>Applying</th>
<th>Innovating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Providing clear goals and scales (rubrics).</td>
<td>Strategy was called for but not exhibited.</td>
<td>Uses strategy incorrectly or with parts missing.</td>
<td>Provides clearly stated goals accompanied by a scale that describes levels of performance.</td>
<td>Provides clearly stated goals accompanied by a scale that describes levels of performance and monitors understanding of goal levels of performance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FIGURE 14**
Instructional Support Personnel Scale
CONCLUSION

Taken together, the three Marzano evaluation models and the non-instructional personnel framework offer a comprehensive growth system that addresses the complex challenges each stakeholder faces, from the district meeting room, to the classroom, to the guidance counselor’s office. In this aligned hierarchical system, common formative scales drive self-assessment, and common terms of measurement use common criteria. There is a shared scale across all frameworks: a shared progression, a shared language, shared standards, shared scales, and — most importantly — the shared goal of student achievement.

Effective schools rarely occur in a vacuum. District leadership, school leadership, teacher, and staff actions and behaviors are all working parts in a complex system of interacting influences that positively impact student achievement — if they function in harmony. If initiatives and goals are misaligned among these levels, the dynamics ultimately work against student growth. Even if individual initiatives within schools, districts, and classrooms are well-executed, in a misaligned system, they tend to cancel each other out.

A common language of instruction allows district leadership to focus on improving instruction and student achievement. Recognizing that teacher behavior and strategies are the leading indicators in predicting student achievement and that student achievement is the lagging indicator, district leadership can use the implementation of and support for establishing a common language of instruction as a measure and criterion for all district-level decisions. Visionary district leadership realizes that all departments within the district must be held accountable for answering the question, “How does this department or division make instruction the primary focus?”

Operations in non-academic divisions within a district support student achievement by supporting teacher strategies and behaviors.
The challenge is to develop an understanding and belief that all departments exist to support effective instruction and student achievement. The response to this challenge might begin with each department auditing its current level of support for schools, specifically for the indirect support that allows teachers to maintain their focus on instruction.

A Realigned Mission
As research has shown, coherence between policies, programs, and practices linked to district goals is one of the primary characteristics of improved districts. In such improved districts, “All district systems are explicitly included in reinforcing common goals and efforts to attain those goals” (Shannon & Bylsma, 2004). In many contemporary public school systems, however, finance, maintenance, transportation, or even food service departments have not yet embraced support for instruction and student achievement as a primary mission within their areas of responsibility. It is precisely this change of mission-essential processing that can drive all departments within a district to support improving student achievement. Each department may take a unique approach, but the goal is shared. The plan to align divisions and resources can create opportunities for goal setting with new or different outcomes from what was previously expected. Such a change or realignment of mission will highlight that everyone within a district is a supporting arm for improving student achievement.

The aligned Marzano models place a heightened focus on professional development to support understanding of the common language of instruction; they also align professional development with growth needs. The four Marzano frameworks discussed above provide district leaders, principals, administrators, and support staff with the necessary strategies and tools to empower their teachers so leaders, teachers, and staff can focus together on one non-negotiable objective: improving student learning.

The Learning Sciences Marzano Center for Teacher and Leader Evaluation offers a full slate of technical assistance, implementation services, training, tools, and resources for the evaluation frameworks discussed in this paper. The full models and frameworks are available for download at MarzanoCenter.com. For a complimentary consultation or more information about our products and services, visit MarzanoCenter.com or contact us at 1.877.411.7114.
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