



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

**Please check the most appropriate category:**

|                          | <b>Teacher and/or Principal Practice Rubric</b>  | <b>Required Submission</b> |
|--------------------------|--|----------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | This is an application for providing <b>Teacher Practice Rubric services</b> . Please check the most appropriate category:<br><br><input type="checkbox"/><br><br><input type="checkbox"/> | _____                      |
|                          | <input type="checkbox"/><br><br><input checked="" type="checkbox"/>  | _____                      |

---

---

---

|  |  |
|--|--|
|  |  |
|  |  |

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <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><b>Clearly labeled tables or charts depicting this scoring/rating system should be submitted as appendices.</b></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 al-</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

|  |  |
|--|--|
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |











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 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 §§ 805(30), 1125(3), 1604(39), 1604(40), 1709(39), 1709(40), 1804(9), 1804(10), 1950(4)(1950(4)(mm), 2503(18), 2503(19), 2554(25), 2554(26), 2590-h (20), 2854(3)(a-2), 3r5r7yr0005 Tc

|  |  |
|--|--|
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |