



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

Please check the most appropriate category:

	Teacher and/or Principal Practice Rubric	Required Submission
<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>This is an application for providing Teacher Practice Rubric services. Please check the most appropriate category below:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> This rubric is for classroom observation, only.</p> <p><input 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 <u>each*</u> 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><input type="checkbox"/> This rubric is for principal observation, only.</p> <p><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 <u>each*</u> 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 – RUBRIC DESIGN AND IMPLEMENTATION

Rubric Design and Implementation (*Informational-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.

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.

Clearly labeled tables or graphs depicting this improvement should be submitted as appendices.

LCI has a fifteen-year history of evaluation and research activities that documents the success of its school- and district-based efforts. In New York and Buffalo, LCI has produced extensive yearly formative and summative reports of its activities that include substantive data on the program's positive impact on teachers' curriculum and assessment design, instructional activities, student work and learning indicators. In some schools and districts (i.e., PS 315, PS 24, Region 1 Schools, Portage School District, etc.), LCI has collected pre- and post-measures of teacher and student learning to assess the impact and effectiveness of its programs and has used this data to inform program refinements.

Work in New York City schools that relates to the development of standards-based and learner-centered practices has been extensively evaluated on a yearly basis over the last six years. This work has included strategic planning with principals, curriculum mapping and gap analysis curriculum activities curriculum, unit, lesson and activity design, development and use of diversified assessment methods, and ongoing analysis of multiple measures and student work to assess changes in students' learning. Evidence of changes in teachers' knowledge, ability to use and design lessons from standards, and increased instructional repertoire is compelling and has resulted in the renewal and expansion of yearly contracts for six consecutive years.

Another measure of LCI's record of effectiveness lies in the approval of LCI as a Comprehensive School Reform (CSR) provider for schools. LCI supported three schools in Buffalo as their primary provider (School 74, School 18 and School 94) as well as two NYC schools (August Martin, PS 310).

In Buffalo's School 74, where LCI worked for three consecutive years, there were measurable and significant changes in the work of teachers and students that resulted in

	<p>the removal of the school from the SURR list and in a dramatic increase in ELA test scores. Teachers made tangible improvements to their teaching and assessment practices. Specifically, they have 1) incorporated the use of quality-focused rubrics and checklists; 2) used more varied and flexible assignments, allowing for greater student choice; 3) provided students with opportunities for self-reflection and assessment; and 4) improved upon their ability to help students elaborate on their writing. Similar increases in student performance of state tests have been found in schools in NYC, Buffalo and elsewhere where LCI has implemented multi-year professional development programs.</p> <p>Three different empirical studies document the success of LCI. Two of these studies were conducted by fellows from the Center for the Study of Expertise in Teaching and Learning (CSETL) during the 2001-2002 school year. These studies examined the effectiveness of the design and use of curriculum-embedded strategies to address state test demands. Both studies showed that the use of such strategies produced significant gains in students' reflective and writing abilities.</p> <p>In addition, Learner-Centered Initiatives has conducted a study in collaboration with CSETL (now Communities for Learning) that involved the administration of five pre- and post-tests to over 800 students in grades 3-10 from 27 different classes in 14 schools (Martin-Kniep and Lane, 2008). Teachers working with LCI taught approximately half of the students; a control group comprised of teachers in the same schools who had no contact with LCI staff or programs taught the other half. The pre- and post-tests were designed to assess students' ability to interpret and evaluate texts, and to self-assess their strengths and weaknesses as readers, writers, problem-solvers and learners. Data analysis of the entries indicates that students taught by teachers in the treatment group made statistically significantly greater gains over the course of the year in each of the outcome measures than those made by students in the control group.</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,</i></p>	<p>Methods have included mixed qualitative and quantitative methods incorporating survey research, interviews, document analysis. In Communities for Learning, we have used social network research to assess the organizational capacity of the school system, the nature and content of professional</p>

<p><i>etc.)?</i></p>	<p>interactions among staff, and the informal and formal leadership roles. These measures have been developed collaboratively with Brett Lane from Instill and have been used in over 20 districts in NY and NJ.</p>
<p>3. What type of research design has been established to support these findings?</p> <p><i>(e.g., experimental, non-experimental, quasi-experimental, etc)</i></p>	<p>The MPPR has been developed using a grounded theory approach, in that the rubrics were co-constructed from working with principals, district-level administrators and teachers from a variety of school and district settings. They have also been aligned and informed by recent evaluations of principal assessment tools conducted by Goldring and others (2007). The adoption and endorsement of the MPPR by NYSED would enable a more systematic and system-wide review of the construct validity and reliability of the MPPR as a principal evaluation instrument.</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 use of this rubric is flexible depending on how the district implements the principal APPR. If using only the ISSLC-related part of the rubric, the standards themselves can be equally weighted to get to the 60 points; or, the five dimensions of the MPPR could be used as a determining factor, with the possibility that that Culture, the most pervasive dimension which appears in every Standard, gets weighted more heavily than the others. Alternatively, weighing either the Standard or the Dimensions could allow the rubric to be responsive to considerations like prior experience, prior performance, conditions of the school, or goals.</p> <p>As per the specifications of this RFQ, we assume that the MPPR will be the basis for the distribution of up to 60 points where 40-60 points may come from the broad assesment (ISLLC), and 0-20 points come from the goal setting. If the school will use the ISSLC-part of the rubric and the MPPR goal-setting rubric, we recommend that the four dimensions of the goal setting rubric become the basis for allocating the 20 points.</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>Both LCI and Communities for Learning have an extensive track record of co-constructing, developing, refining and assessing a variety of rubrics to measure individual and organization behaviors and practices. LCI was instrumental in creating rubrics used by the SED Assessment Liaisons for over 8 years. Communities for Learning has an extensive record of supporting the development of individual change agents for over 10 years and has created rubrics that were used by an SED three-year initiative seeking to align the work of different networks that supported low performing schools.</p>

	<p>Communities for Learning has developed and used a wide range of individual and organizational capacity tools and measures to support the continued improvement of schools and that are tailored for students, teachers, community members and administrators. These have been used in schools and other organizations nationally and internationally and have been featured by a number of organizations including ASCD, NCSS, and EARCOS.</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>LCI and Communities for Learning could assist LEA's in the design of internal, external or combined, process, program and impact evaluation stemming from the use of the MPPR rubric.</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>Proposed costs are presented as site licenses for the use of the rubric and associated professional development, along with optional elements that would provided opportunities for differentiation, dependent upon individual client needs and goals. For more information, please see attached descriptions in a separate, sealed envelope, as per RFQ instructions</p>



**TEACHER AND PRINCIPAL PRACTICE RUBRIC PROVIDERS
TECHNICAL PROPOSAL – ORGANIZATIONAL CAPACITY**

Organizational Capacity (*Informational-Only*):

In this section, the applicant should demonstrate that it has adequate human, organizational, and technical resources to provide the proposed teacher and/or principal practice rubric services.

<p>1. A description of the organization, including information such as length of time in operation, number of existing locations, number of staff, an organization chart, etc.</p>	<p>LCI has been in operation since 1995. It employs seven full-time consultants, and four part time consultants, all of whom would be significantly engaged in this work as a continuation of our commitment to NYC public schools. In addition, LCI has access to per diem consultants whose work has been proven to meet the standards of our organization and the expectations of our clients. Together, they could provide the equivalent of an additional 3 full-time consultants.</p> <p>LCI also employs a fulltime office assistant and a part time bookkeeper, as well as an IT consultant. Our offices are equipped for video-conferencing, and our website and organization’s server can support programs that integrate and/or rely upon technology for design, delivery and support of professional development experiences.</p> <p>Communities for Learning is a non-profit organization that has been in operation since 1997. It includes four part-time staff members and is overseen by a 9 member Board of Directors. It shares office space and technology resources with LCI .</p>
<p>2. A description of the organization’s history of providing similar teacher and/or principal evaluation services, including the outcomes achieved, number of previous contracts, the diversity of clients, the number of students served, etc.</p>	<p>Without a doubt, the most powerful evidence LCI has of program success is the loyalty, commitment and positive evaluations of its clients. Through recent severely challenging times, the fact that LCI has received consistent support from the NYC schools, networks and individuals with whom it has been associated is a testimony to both the work itself and the relationships developed. Similarly, the fact that nearly all of LCI’s new clients come from the referrals and recommendations of current clients, and the degree to which current clients protect and tout the high standards of LCI work as they discuss the relative degrees of “readiness” of their colleagues for LCI programs is clear evidence of the high regard in which they hold the work. (see letters of support)</p> <p>From 1998 through 2008, LCI was charged by the NYSED with supporting the Assessment Liaisons Program, a program which was jointly supported by the</p>

NYS Supervision and Curriculum Development Network and the NYS Teacher Centers to help operationalize and support NYS Education Department mandates related to standards and curriculum reforms. Professional developers from every BOCES and Teacher Center throughout the state attended the program twice a year, as did NYSED representatives. In 2009, the Assessment Liaisons program reorganized itself into the LCI-sponsored Adult Learning and Facilitation Institute (ALFI), which had its inaugural conference in the spring of 2009. Through 2010, ALFI will continue to support the work of those who facilitate the learning of adults, with the intent of improving the learning of youth. An LCI facilitated two-day ASCD pre-conference is devoted entirely to ALFI and the work of those who facilitate adult learners.

Another measure of LCI's record of success and effectiveness lies in the repeated approval of LCI as a Comprehensive School Reform (CSR) provider for schools. From 2004-2007, LCI was the primary CSR provider of three schools in Buffalo (School 74, School 18 and School 94). LCI has also been a CSR provider for selected NYC schools (August Martin, PS 310).

Based on its success record, methodologies and reputation, LCI was identified as the primary professional development provider in awarded GE funded grants in MS 68 and MS 144 and IS 52 in 2009-2010.

ARCS, the Communities for Learning: Leading lasting change® framework that promotes school-wide leadership, accountability, creativity and continuous improvement, is the centerpiece of Communities for Learning and its most significant assets. Its four components of Alignment, Representation, Culture and Sustainability provide entry points to a recursive inquiry-action-improvement cycle through which a school develops the practices of asking provocative and important questions, engaging in thoughtful discourse, establishing and prioritizing improvement goals, taking action and measuring results.

Communities for Learning has a significant track record working with schools and districts around continuous school improvement. It employs a strategy of co-constructing understanding and use of processes, and facilitates the use of the ARCS framework to enable schools and their stakeholders to unpack and identify

	<p>their own possibilities, find the opportunities in adversity, recognize the importance of thoughtful and measured actions, recognize and utilize existing expertise, tap its passion, and determine and be responsible for its own improvement path. A number of schools have successfully used the ARCS Framework to develop, share and use a school vision to inform and implement guide their school improvement efforts. This includes PS 205, PS 85, CASA, Bronx Writing Academy, Mattituck-Cutchogue School District, and Hunterdon Central School District in NJ.</p> <p>Communities for Learning has developed state of the art measures that provide schools and districts with data that informs the degree to which the organization is improving its culture and making effective use of its human resources. One such measure, the Communities for Learning Survey of Organizational Capacity, is an online measure for adults that provides the school with metrics related to the distance between how individuals see themselves within the school and how they think the school supports their work. It includes items related to vision, goals, professional expertise, long-term and strategic planning, and leadership practices.</p>
<p>3. Copies of the organization’s tax returns for the past two years, or other evidence of fiscal soundness, e.g. annual financial statements, fiscal audits, Dunn & Bradstreet reports, etc., submitted as Appendices.</p>	<p>Please clearly identify and attach this documentation in the Appendix section.</p>
<p>4. Copy of the organization’s 501(c)3 certificate or State license.</p>	<p>Please clearly identify and attach this documentation in the Appendix section.</p>
<p>5. Information as to whether lawsuits have been filed against the organization for educational and/or fiscal mismanagement, civil rights violations, criminal act(s), or other reason(s); and indicate the outcome of each instance.</p>	<p>None have been filed against the organizations</p>
<p>6. Information as to whether the organization has been denied the ability to conduct business in any state and indicate the reason(s) for such denial.</p>	<p>None denied</p>

7. Information as to whether the organization has been debarred or suspended from doing business with any local government, state, or the federal government.	None debarred or suspended
8. Information as to whether the organization has been approved as a teacher and/or principal evaluation service provider in another state and specify such state(s).	No



TEACHER AND PRINCIPAL PRACTICE RUBRIC PROVIDERS
TECHNICAL PROPOSAL - SERVICE SUMMARY (INFORMATIONAL-ONLY)

1.	Name of organization:	Learner-Centered Initiatives, Ltd.
	Primary location:	249-02 Jericho Turnpike, Suite 203 Floral Park, NY 11001
	Contact information: (phone / email / website):	Joanne Picone-Zocchia 516-502-4231 joannepz@lciltld.org www.lciltld.org www.communitiesforlearning.org
	LEAs where service will be provided (or is intended to be provided):	NYC, Long Island, Albany, Western NY, and other locations based on need
2.	The number of years the provider has delivered service:	15
3.	Title of the Teacher and/or Principal Rubric Evaluation model to be used (if appropriate):	Multidimensional Principal Performance Review (MPPR)
4.	Professional population that the provider has served, and that they are requesting to serve (i.e. teachers, principals, admin., etc.):	K-12 teachers, principals and other administrative staff at the school and district levels.
5.	Number of teachers and/or principals that have received an evaluation using the submitted rubric tool (approximately):	This rubric is an original instrument grounded and informed by other measures developed by LCI and Communities for Learning and used extensively in schools nationally and internationally for the past 6 years.
6.	Number of teacher and/or principal evaluation instructional sessions provided per year, if applicable:	as many as are needed
7.	Average length of each training session for the training of evaluators (minutes/hours):	1 day

If approved as a provider of Teacher and/or Principal Practice Rubrics, we are prepared to provide services to:

Please indicate by clicking on the appropriate boxes below:

All Districts/LEAs in the State of New York, or

Only to those eligible Districts/LEAs indicated below:



**TEACHER AND PRINCIPAL PRACTICE RUBRIC PROVIDERS
Assurances and Signature**

In submitting this application to be included in the State Education Department’s Teacher and Principal Practice Rubric Service Provider list, I certify that:

1. The organization will comply with all applicable Federal, State and local health, safety, and civil rights laws.
2. All individuals employed by or otherwise associated with the organization, who will have direct contact with eligible teachers, principals, or students, will be subject to all of the fingerprint and criminal history record check requirements contained in law, including, Education Law §§305(30), 1125(3), 1604(39), 1604(40), 1709(39), 1709(40), 1804(9), 1804(10), 1950(4)(ll), 1950(4)(mm), 2503(18), 2503(19), 2554(25), 2554(26), 2590-h (20), 2854(3)(a-2), 2854(3)(a-3), 3035 and Part 87 of the regulations of the Commissioner of Education.
3. All instruction and content will be secular, neutral, and non-ideological.
4. All instruction and content provided to LEA’s will be aligned to the applicable professional standards of practice for teachers and/or principals, including but not limited to, the New York State Teaching Standards, ISLCC 2008 Leadership standards, New York State Education Law, and the Commissioner’s regulations.
5. The organization is fiscally sound and will be able to complete services to the eligible local educational agency.

The undersigned hereby certifies that I am an individual authorized to act on behalf of the organization in submitting this application and assurances. I certify that all of the information provided herein is true and accurate, to the best of my knowledge. I understand that, if any of the information contained herein is found to have been deliberately misrepresented, that may constitute grounds for denying the applicant’s request for approval to be placed in the list of Teacher and Principal Practice Rubric Service Providers or for removal from that same list. I further certify that the organization will comply with all of the assurances set forth herein.

<p>1. Name of Organization (PLEASE PRINT/TYPE)</p> <p>Learner-Centered Initiatives, Ltd.</p>	<p>4. Signature of Authorized Representative (PLEASE USE BLACK/BLUE INK)</p>
<p>2. Name of Authorized Representative (PLEASE PRINT/TYPE)</p> <p>Joanne Picone-Zocchia</p>	<p>5. Date Signed</p>
<p>3. Title of Authorized Representative (PLEASE PRINT/TYPE)</p> <p>Vice-President</p>	