



TEACHER AND PRINCIPAL PRACTICE RUBRIC PROVIDERS

Section III. Technical Proposal – Rubric Design and Implementation

Rubric Design and Implementation (INFORMATION-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.

<p>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.</p>	<p>Clearly labeled tables or graphs depicting this improvement should be submitted as appendices. anecdotal evidence suggests that contextualizing</p> <p>Anecdotal evidence from work with districts strongly suggests that contextualizing Part 1 of the MPPR inside personal/professional, district and/or school goals or improvement foci (also supported by part 2 of the rubric) provides deeper and more coherent connection between the rubric criteria and actual leadership practice, and further supports the attainment of the school and district improvement priorities. This does not mean that Part 2 of the rubric is required, only that it can be used to further support district and individual practice.</p> <p>Additionally, following “best practice” in rubric implementation, the use of the MPPR in Diagnostic and Formative assessment opportunities, as well as Summative evaluation appears to promote stronger discourse around leadership, and lessens some of the angst around professional evaluation by providing rubric-specific feedback early on, giving those being evaluated the opportunity to focus on improving practice before the summative score is assigned.</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, etc.</i>)?</p>	<p>Methods have included mixed qualitative and quantitative methods incorporating survey research, interviews, document analysis, as well as pre-post and ongoing formative assessment from professional development. In collaboration with Brett Lane from Instill, social network research was implemented to assess the organizational capacity of a school system, the nature and content of professional interactions among staff, and the informal and formal leadership roles.</p>
<p>3. What type of research design has been established to support these findings? (<i>e.g., experimental, non-experimental, quasi-experimental, etc.</i>)</p>	<p>A Grounded Theory approach continues, with action research key to our research design, allowing the MPPR to remain practical and grounded in the leadership practices, questions and growth of those implementing the tool.</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>In our experience, most districts sort out their scoring with NYSED guidance and in consultation with their unions. For those who wish to have a model to work from, we can provide a series of unprotected, customizable Excel scoring spreadsheets.</p> <p><i>See Appendix D</i></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>SOAR (and its predecessor, Learner Centered Initiatives) has years of experience supporting LEAs in adapting and sustaining the MPPR to support the specific needs of their constituents. Examples can be most clearly seen in our support for the various BOCES across the state, the NYC DOE’s adoption of the MPPR (which included a comprehensive implementation plan, with training for evaluators, principals and assistant principals, integrated work with the administrators’ union, the DOE administration and developed institutional capacity through training and certification of a cadre of MPPR facilitator/coaches) and finally, our work with SCDN to support ongoing leadership evaluation and development, including the MPPR and other measures.</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>Evaluator training is available, as is Facilitator certification training. These experiences are learner-centered in approach and are developed based on goals set by the client. Evaluator training would include a deep understanding of the rubric and how the criteria manifests itself in principal practice with emphasis on district specific illustrations of practice that anchor both formative discourse and summative evaluation.</p> <p><i>See Appendix E for a sample activity supporting evaluators</i></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>The MPPR can be downloaded and used free of charge, in hard copy, printed form.</p> <p>A yearly, per user license is required for any electronic or technology-assisted use. The cost of this license ranges from \$100 - \$175/user, depending on the number of licenses purchased and if they are purchased in conjunction with professional development.</p>

A ***Field Guide*** (including a book and workbook) is can be purchased for \$50. Field Guides are available in two parallel versions. Both communicate the same approach, framework and content, but each is customized to the unique perspective and needs of the “Evaluator” and the “Leader.”

See Appendix F for excerpt from Field Guide

Customized in-person, telephone or virtual consultation and/or professional development is available upon request. Costs vary, dependent upon format, timeframe and number of sessions and participants.

Phone and virtual consultation is also available.



TEACHER AND PRINCIPAL PRACTICE RUBRIC PROVIDERS

Section IV. Technical Proposal – Service Summary

(Information-only)

Please complete this form if the applicant provides training or professional development services around evaluation and/or the use of their rubric. If the applicant does not provide additional services, please enter “N/A” into the first field below.

1.	Name of organization:	SOAR Leadership LLC
	Primary location (city/state):	Central Islip/New York
	Contact information: (phone / email / website)	516-662-6101 joannepz@soarleaders.org
	LEAs where service will be provided (or is intended to be provided):	Interested LEAs across NYS and NJ - and nationwide
2.	The number of years the provider has delivered service:	6 years as SOAR Leadership, 25 years as Vice President and partner in LCI
3.	Title of the Teacher and/or Principal Rubric Evaluation model to be used (if appropriate):	Multidimensional Principal Performance Rubric (MPPR)
4.	Professional population that the provider has served, and that they are requesting to serve (i.e., teachers, principals, admin., etc.):	principals, principal evaluators, district leaders, unions, professional developers, coaches, pre-service leadership development programs
5.	Number of teachers and/or principals that have received an evaluation using the submitted rubric tool (approximately):	As of Feb 2023, 517 NYS districts were using the MPPR for principal evaluation. Additionally, the rubric is used widely in New Jersey and also used in Colorado, Massachusetts and Illinois.
6.	Number of teacher and/or principal evaluation instructional sessions provided per year, if applicable:	determined with client – individualized based on client needs and goals for the work
7.	Average length of each training session for the training of evaluators (minutes/hours):	2.5-5 hours per session seem to work best , Number of sessions depends on outcomes established with the client

Following is information provided as of 3/13/25 date (contact the provider for the most up-to-date information):

<p>Teacher/Principal Rubric Tool: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> **Free <input type="checkbox"/> For Cost <u>**Free if used in hard copy. Fee-based license required to use the rubric in any other form, including through electronic or technology services provided by another vendor</u></p>
<p>If for cost, to which does a fee apply: <input type="checkbox"/> Rubric <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ** Related services (e.g., training or professional development associated with the use of the rubric) <u>**license required for use with electronic or technology assisted use/“solutions”</u></p>

If services are offered by the applicant, are any mandatory in order to use the rubric?

Yes **No

****license required for use with electronic or technology assisted use/“solutions”**

If approved as a provider of a teacher and/or principal practice rubric, we are prepared to provide services to:

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

Only to the following Districts/LEAs:



TEACHER AND PRINCIPAL PRACTICE RUBRIC PROVIDERS
Section V. 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(3), 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) SOAR Leadership LLC</p>	<p>4. Signature of Authorized Representative (PLEASE USE BLACK/BLUE INK)</p> 
<p>2. Name of Authorized Representative (PLEASE PRINT/TYPE) Joanne Picone-Zocchia</p>	<p>5. Date Signed 3/13/2025</p>
<p>3. Title of Authorized Representative (PLEASE PRINT/TYPE) President (and author of the MPPR)</p>	