

**Educator Standards Board**

**V. MASTER TEACHER RENEWAL CANDIDATE'S SCORE REPORT**

I. CANDIDATE NAME \_\_\_\_\_

II. SCHOOL BUILDING(S) – ALL \_\_\_\_\_

III. LICENSE NUMBER \_\_\_\_\_

IV. DATE SCORED \_\_\_\_\_

V. MASTER TEACHER DESIGNATION RENEWED:                      YES                      NO

VI. COMMITTEE CHAIR SIGNATURE \_\_\_\_\_

VII. COMMITTEE COMMENTS (If the candidate did not successfully renew Master Teacher Designation, this section should include comments that would assist the Master Teacher in further attempts for professional growth and resubmission if applicable.)

Cc: Candidate  
Committee chair  
Original in personnel file

## VIII: Scoring Guide for Master Teacher Renewal Committee

Master Teacher Renewal is a process that is designed to reflect on past progress, analyze present processes, and envision future steps and professional goals. That being said, as the scorers read each Master Teacher narrative, the lens for evaluation is a holistic one; the Master Teacher has successfully or unsuccessfully addressed the designated prompts thereby creating an accomplished teacher portrait of past, present, and future practices.

Using the table below, review the indicators of a successful candidate for Master Teacher Renewal. Successful candidates will exemplify most or all of the descriptors. **This is NOT meant to be a checklist.**

Successful	Not Successful
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Narratives and/or evidence present details regarding the professionalism and leadership of the Master Teacher.</li> <li>• Narratives and/or evidence describe past accomplishments, present practices, and future professional goals.</li> <li>• Narratives demonstrate Master Teacher's ability to analyze practice.</li> <li>• Narratives demonstrate Master Teacher's commitment to continuous learning and growth.</li> <li>• Narratives reflect best practices based on the Standards for Ohio Educators.</li> <li>• The events/information included in the narratives and/or the evidence is current (within the past five years).</li> <li>• The Master Teacher provides evidence of demonstrations of job performance at the accomplished level:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ collegial collaborative inquiry,</li> <li>○ deep reflective practices,</li> <li>○ lesson planning for deep learning,</li> <li>○ integrated assessments that require application as well as knowledge,</li> <li>○ learning environments where teacher and students can thrive.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Candidate struggles to identify details of professionalism and leadership. Details that are provided are vague or require more support.</li> <li>• Narratives and/or evidence are not relevant or do not strongly convey past accomplishments, present practices, and/or future professional goals.</li> <li>• Narratives and/or evidence are not analytical in nature. The teacher does not present analysis of practice or the analysis is so vague that the scorers were unable to understand the intent of the response.</li> <li>• Candidate's responses/submissions do not demonstrate change or growth in practice.</li> <li>• Narratives and/or evidence do not reflect best practices based on the Standards for Ohio Educators.</li> <li>• The events/information included in the narratives and/or the evidence is not current (within the past five years).</li> <li>• The Master Teacher does not provide convincing evidence of demonstrations of job performance at the accomplished level:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ collegial collaborative inquiry,</li> <li>○ deep reflective practices,</li> <li>○ lesson planning for deep learning,</li> <li>○ integrated assessments that require application as well as knowledge,</li> <li>○ learning environments where teacher and students can thrive.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>