



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 style="margin-left: 40px;"><input type="checkbox"/> This rubric is for classroom observation, only.</p> <p style="margin-left: 40px;"><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 style="margin-left: 40px;"><input type="checkbox"/> This rubric is for principal observation, only.</p> <p style="margin-left: 40px;"><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.

The Center has established a record of sustainable improvement in high-poverty, high-minority school systems. Documentation includes not only data gathered directly from educational systems but also that provided by independent researchers. In addition, we have gathered video testimony from teachers, administrators, board members, and students about the successful impact of the Center's Data Teams process.

For example, the long-term success of Norfolk Public Schools (VA), a system that implemented the Center's comprehensive accountability system, Data Teams, and other teaching and leadership support systems, has been documented in the following publications: "Accountability for Learning: How Teachers and School Leaders Can Take Charge," by Douglas B. Reeves, Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (2004); and "Bringing School Reform to Scale" by Heather Zadavsky, Harvard Education Press (2009). Further, long-term success in the Fort Bend Independent School District (IN) is documented in The Center's white paper and also in "Motion Leadership" by Michael Fullan, Corwin/OPC (2010).

In addition to these case studies, we have conducted large-scale statistical analyses, studying more than 2,000 school improvement plans along with the student achievement data from those schools, linking specific leadership and teaching practices with gains in student achievement. Those findings were published by Columbia University Teachers College Press in "Finding Your Leadership Focus" (2010) and are actively applied in The Center's professional development, leadership performance coaching, and implementation support.

Finally, the Center makes use of extensive resources of other researchers and scholars in the field.

<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, etc.</i>)?</p>	<p>Student achievement data are gathered using not only traditional state tests but also district and school level formative assessments.</p> <p>The Center gathers data on teacher and leadership professional practices using rubrics from our Implementation Audit and Leadership Performance Coaching systems. These provide for multiple sources of evidence, including direct observation, interviews, focus groups, and anonymous and confidential surveys. We also analyze district-level policy and resource allocation decisions in order to provide a comprehensive systems-level understanding of school improvement, including student achievement, teaching practices, leadership practices, and policy-maker decisions.</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>HMH is committed to multi-method research, including: quantitative analysis and quasi-experimental design; random assignment to experimental and control groups; case studies; qualitative inquiry; and action research.</p> <p>We believe that all of these approaches are essential, as even the best experimental research and case studies are more likely to be implemented when teachers and administrators demonstrate the practical application of that research in their own contexts. We documented this finding in "Reframing Teacher Leadership to Improve Your School," by Douglas B. Reeves, the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (2008).</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>Please refer to Appendix B for a sample of the Reeves Leadership Performance Matrix, which can be customized to meet the needs of NYSED and New York districts/LEAs. As previously described, the rating system (scale levels) of the Matrix includes four performance categories:</p> <p>1) Exemplary—the principal offers frank acknowledgement of prior personal and organizational failures and clear suggestions for system-wide learning resulting from those lessons; 2) Proficient—the principal readily acknowledges personal and organizational failures and offers clear suggestions for personal learning; 3) Progressing—the principal acknowledges personal and organizational failures when confronted with evidence; 4) Not Meeting Standards—the principal is defensive and resistant to the acknowledgement of error.</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>The Center has been providing leadership performance assessment for over 10 years; thousands of educational leaders have used this tool, with many using our expertise in customizing the matrix to meet state and local standards. Currently, the Reeves Leadership Performance Matrix is used in and meets the specific state requirements of Arkansas and Florida.</p> <p>Additionally, we have completed statewide leadership development in Connecticut, Ohio, and Oregon. Our extensive experience providing this assessment tool and our knowledge of the educational environment in New York demonstrate our ability to adapt our Matrix to meet the needs of participating LEAs.</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>Please refer to Appendix D for two sample agendas for professional development activities related to using the Reeves Leadership Performance Matrix. In addition to training principals on the use of the Matarix, HMH can meet with each school district/LEA, if desired by NYSED, to share the specific benefits, features, and impact of the Leadership Performance Matrix.</p> <p>The following components can also be addressed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Defining the state’s overall strategies and goals •Prioritizing activities in the implementation plan •Identifying specific action steps that will lead the state or district successfully through the change process using the Concerns Based Adoption Model •Designing and developing an integrated plan focused on the professional learning of teachers and administrators toward improving educator effectiveness •Specifying clear measures or a defined criteria of success to include short term, intermediate, and long term outcomes to help all stakeholders review their progress and adjust implementation and professional learning •Clarifying roles and responsibilities for school leaders, teachers, coaches, and consultants for the leadership evaluation system •Communication planning to inform and engage all stakeholders in the change process •Leadership support involving ongoing meetings that include key stakeholder groups such as central office administrators, principals, teachers, and representatives from teacher associations to analyze trend data and review implementation efforts and professional development outcomes •Project reporting through ongoing feedback regarding

	<p>progress to goals, key trends and patterns that emerge from multiple sources of data</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Establishing structures for sustainability through a differentiated and comprehensive plan of ongoing professional learning designed to build the capacity of teachers, teacher leaders, and administrators to continue facilitating the work through a Professional Developer Certification Program, online non-credit courses, and graduate programs.
<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>Please refer to our Estimated Service Costs in the sealed envelope that accompanies this response binder.</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>Houghton Mifflin Harcourt is the preeminent educational publisher in the United States and the world's largest publisher of educational materials for Pre-K–12 schools. With origins dating back to 1832, Houghton Mifflin Harcourt combines its tradition of excellence with a commitment to innovation. For more than a century and a half, the company has shaped ideas, information, and instructional methods into a variety of forms to satisfy people's lifelong learning needs. For more information about HMMH, including existing locations, number of staff, and an organization chart, please refer to Appendix G.</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>Please refer to our response to Question 1 of Form B–2 for our narrative regarding outcomes achieved, diversity of clients, etc.</p> <p>During the 2009–2010 academic year, our experienced consultants delivered more than 2,600 days of professional development, research, and consulting services to hundreds of clients in every state as well as in multiple international locations. The Center works with public school systems, as well as charter schools and our consultants have the unique capability to work with all demographics, including those of urban, suburban, and rural communities. We have considerable experience raising achievement for specific student populations, including English Language Learners, special education, and gifted and talented students.</p> <p>As mentioned, the Reeves Leadership Performance Matrix is used in and meets the specific state requirements of Arkansas and Florida. Additionally, we have completed statewide leadership development in Connecticut, Ohio, and Oregon.</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</p>	<p>Please clearly identify and attach this documentation in the Ap-</p>

certificate or State license.	pendix section.
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.	Houghton Mifflin Harcourt has not been a party in litigation in a matter regarding its performance on a governmental agency contract. From time to time, Houghton Mifflin Harcourt is involved in litigation incidental to its business
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.	Houghton Mifflin Harcourt has not been denied the ability to conduct business in any state.
7. Information as to whether the organization has been debarred or suspended from doing business with any local government, state, or the federal government.	Houghton Mifflin Harcourt has not been debarred or suspended from doing business with any local government, state, or the federal government.
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).	Currently, the Reeves Leadership Performance Matrix is used in and meets the specific state requirements of Arkansas and Florida. Additionally, we have completed statewide leadership development in Connecticut, Ohio, and Oregon. Our extensive experience providing this assessment tool and our knowledge of the educational environment in New York demonstrate our ability to adapt our Matrix to meet the needs of participating New York LEAs.



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

1.	Name of organization:	Houghton Mifflin Harcourt
	Primary location:	Boston, MA
	Contact information: (phone / email / website):	Herb Miller, Ed.M., Director of Client Solutions Phone: 303-504-9312, Ext. 220 E-mail: hmiller@leadandlearn.com Website: www.hmhco.com
	LEAs where service will be provided (or is intended to be provided):	HMH will provide the principal practice rubric to all participating New York LEAs.
2.	The number of years the provider has delivered service:	More than 10 years
3.	Title of the Teacher and/or Principal Rubric Evaluation model to be used (if appropriate):	The Reeves Leadership Performance Matrix
4.	Professional population that the provider has served, and that they are requesting to serve (i.e. teachers, principals, admin., etc.):	Principals and school leaders
5.	Number of teachers and/or principals that have received an evaluation using the submitted rubric tool (approximately):	Thousands of school leaders have used this tool.
6.	Number of teacher and/or principal evaluation instructional sessions provided per year, if applicable:	HMH's The Center provides dozens of training per year on how to use the tool and how to align it to leader professional development.
7.	Average length of each training session for the training of evaluators (minutes/hours):	Typically, each evaluator is involved in three full days of training/intensive professional development, with six- to seven-hour sessions daily.

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>See appendix</p>	<p>4. Signature of Authorized Representative (PLEASE USE BLACK/BLUE INK)</p>
<p>2. Name of Authorized Representative (PLEASE PRINT/TYPE)</p> <p>See appendix</p>	<p>5. Date Signed</p>
<p>3. Title of Authorized Representative (PLEASE PRINT/TYPE)</p> <p>See appendix</p>	