TEACHER AND PRINCIPAL PRACTICE RUBRIC PROVIDERS
TECHNICAL PROPOSAL - APPLICATION

Please check the most appropriate category:

	Teacher and/or Principal Practice Rubric	Required Submission
☒	This is an application for providing **Teacher Practice Rubric services**. Please check the most appropriate category below: ☐ This rubric is for classroom observation, **only**. ☒ This rubric is for all applicable teacher evaluation criteria, including classroom observation.	A full application with all required materials (including this cover page) shall be submitted for **each*** rubric. Your rubric(s) must be attached in the Appendix section of your submission.
☐	This is an application for providing **Principal Practice Rubric services**. Please check the most appropriate category below: ☐ This rubric is for principal observation, **only**. ☐ This rubric is for all applicable principal evaluation criteria, including principal observation.	A full application with all required materials (including this cover page) shall be submitted for **each*** rubric. Your rubric(s) must be attached in the Appendix section of your submission.

* **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. Between the fall of 2004 and spring of 2009, 300 volunteer teachers conducted independent studies at 38 schools in 14 school districts in research conducted by the Marzano Research Laboratory. The independent studies involved 7,872 students in the experimental groups and 6,415 students in the control groups. Participating teachers selected two groups of students both of which were being taught the same unit or set of related lessons. However, in one group (the "experimental" group) a specific instructional strategy was used (e.g., graphic organizers), whereas in the other group (the "control" group) the instructional strategy was not used. Because students could not be randomly assigned to experimental and control groups, all studies employed a quasi-experimental design, referred to as a pretest-posttest non-equivalent groups design. The pretest scores were used as a covariate to partially control for differing levels of background knowledge and skill. The following questions were considered through a meta-analysis of the 329 independent studies: 1. What effect does the utilization of instructional strategies have on students' achievement regarding the subject matter content taught by their teachers? 2. Does the effect of instructional strategies differ between school levels? 3. Does the effect of instructional strategies differ from strategy to strategy? The average effect size (ES) for all 329 independent studies was statistically significant ($p < .0001$). When corrected for attenuation, the percentile gain associated with the use of the instructional strategies is 16 (ES = .42). This means that on the average, the strategies used in the independent studies represent a gain of 16 percentile points over what would be expected if teachers did not use the instructional strategies.
2. What is the methodology used to	For the quasi-experimental study (see #3), participating

collect evidence of the demonstrated professional achievement for teachers or principals *(i.e. measures and analyses used, comparison groups, etc.)?*	teachers selected two groups of students both of which were being taught the same unit or set of related lessons. However, in one group (the "experimental" group) a specific instructional strategy was used (e.g., advance organizers), whereas in the other group (the "control" group) the instructional strategy was not used. Because students could not be randomly assigned to experimental and control groups, all studies employed a quasi-experimental design, referred to as a pretest-posttest non-equivalent groups design. These groups are considered to be non-equivalent, because it is unlikely that two intact groups would be as similar as would be the case if randomly assigned. A pretest and posttest was administered to students in both groups. The pretest scores were used to statistically "adjust" the posttest scores using a technique referred to as analysis of covariance (ANCOVA). In basic terms, the adjustment translates the posttest scores into those that would be expected if students in both groups started with the same scores on the pretest. In effect, it is a way of controlling for students' differences in what they know about a topic prior to the beginning of instruction on the topic. ANCOVA is commonly used when random assignment is not possible. Although ANCOVA was used to statistically equate students in terms of prior academic knowledge, arguments about causal relationships are not as strong as they would be when group members are assigned through a random lottery. Again, teachers were instructed to teach a short unit on a topic of their choice to two groups of students—one experimental and one control. Instructional activities in both groups were to be as similar as possible except for the fact that the instructional strategy was used in one group only (i.e., the experimental group).
3. What type of research design has been established to support these findings? *(e.g., experimental, non-experimental, quasi-experimental, etc)*	The Marzano Evaluation Model is based on over forty years of research including a series of quasi-experimental studies conducted as action research projects regarding the extent to which the utilization of selected instructional strategies enhances the learning of students. As stated above, over 300 volunteer teachers conducted independent studies at 38 schools in 14 school districts between fall 2004 and spring 2009. The data used for analysis can be found in Marzano Research Laboratory's Meta-Analysis Database (see marzanoresearch.com).
4. Describe and detail the proposed scoring or rating system associated with the rubric being submitted.	Clearly labeled tables or charts depicting this scoring/rating system should be submitted as appendices. The Marzano Causal Evaluation Model provides guidance on a calculation system that balances fairness with expectations for results. In order to understand the relationship of rating levels for domain elements to the instructional prac-

	tice score, you need to understand the process of assigning the instructional practice score based on the results of multiple data sources and ratings on domain elements. Scoring of a Teacher's Instructional Practice Rating the Elements: A 5-Level rubric is used to rate and provide feedback to teachers on their use of the 60 Elements of the Art and Science of Teaching Framework: Innovating (4), Applying (3), Developing (2), Beginning (1), Not Using (0) Instructional Practice Score - A 4-Level Scale is used to determine Teacher Instructional Practice Score: Highly Effective (4), Effective (3), Developing (2), and Ineffective (1) The performance rating for each category takes into consideration the Category level of the teachers, with the understanding that teachers with more years of service will have greater subject matter expertise. There are three categories of proficiency scales, including: Category I: teachers with 1-3 years of service Category II: teachers with 4 or more years of service Category III: teachers with 10 or more years of service Category I Proficiency Scale a. Highly Effective teachers perform at Level 4 at least 65% of the time, and perform 0% of the time at Level 1 b. Effective teachers perform at Level 3 or higher at least 65% of the time c. Developing teachers perform less than 65% at Level 3 or higher, and less than 50% at Level 1 d. Ineffective teachers perform greater than or equal to 50% at Level 1 Category II Proficiency Scale a. Highly Effective teachers perform at Level 4 at least 75% of the time, and perform 0% of the time at Level 1 b. Effective teachers perform at Level 3 or higher at least 75% of the time c. Developing teachers perform less than 75% at Level 3 or higher, and less than 50% at Level 1 d. Ineffective teachers perform greater than or equal to 50% at Level 1 Category III Proficiency Scale a. Highly Effective teachers perform at Level 4 at least 85% of the time, and perform 0% of the time at Level 1 b. Effective teachers perform at Level 3 or higher at least 85% of the time

	c. Developing teachers perform less than 85% at Level 3 or higher, and less than 50% at Level 1 d. Ineffective teachers perform greater than or equal to 50% at Level 1 The teacher's status score reflects his/her overall understanding and application of the Art and Science of Teaching framework across the Marzano Causal Evaluation Model Four Domains: Domain 1: Classroom Strategies and Behaviors; Domain 2: Planning and Preparing; Domain 3: Reflecting on Teaching; Domain 4: Collegiality and Professionalism. The following steps outline the process used to calculate status score. The Status Score aggregates teachers' ratings across all observed elements within the framework to result in a score. 1. Using the Domain Forms, rate observed elements at each of the following levels: Innovating (4), Applying (3), Developing (2), Beginning (1), and Not Using (0) 2. Count the number of ratings at each level for each of the four domains 3. For each domain, determine the percentage of the total each level represents (this process is automated in a spreadsheet) 4. For each domain, apply the results from Step 3 to the description for each level on the Proficiency Scale (based on teacher's experience level). This is a domain proficiency score and will be a number between 1 and 4. 5. Using the four domain frequency scores, compute the weighted average to obtain the Status Score. The 3 Category Proficiency Scales can be used to determine a numerical value that represents a proficiency score for each domain. Each domain can be weighted to obtain an overall Status Score. LSI recommends the following weight for each domain but percentages can be adjusted by the district: a. Domain 1: 68%, 41 Elements b. Domain 2: 14%, 8 Elements c. Domain 3: 8%, 5 Elements d. Domain 4: 10%, 6 Elements This weighting system distinguishes the Marzano Causal Evaluation Model from traditional evaluation models in that Domain 1 carries the most weight as these strategies are directly related to student learning. Additionally, the most emphasis is placed on the domain proven by research to have the most direct, CAUSAL impact on student achievement. The weighted average of the 4 domain proficiency scores will result in a single number that can be translated

	into the following final scale: a. Highly Effective (3.5 – 4.0) b. Effective (2.5 – 3.4) c. Developing (1.5 – 2.4) d. Ineffective (1.0 – 1.4)
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.	LSI has extensive capabilities to support state and district redevelopment of their evaluation systems and systemic implementation of capacity building and quality assurance programs including evaluator and observer training, professional development, teacher and principal growth, development and evaluation software systems, graduate education programs, and teacher pedagogy and observer certification programs. LSI's experience ranges from working collaboratively in developing and implementing frameworks for effective teaching and school leadership to the creation of a continuum of differentiated professional development aligned to these frameworks. LSI also blends advanced adult learning methodologies with leading-edge technologies to produce online learning courses that foster exceptional learning, retention, and application of new knowledge. Learning Sciences also offers staff certification to exceptional teachers who can participate in a professional development certification program and become qualified facilitators on the framework. Marzano Staff Developer Certification allows teachers to provide professional development workshops around Dr. Marzano's official framework and to build internal capacity by establishing a cadre of skilled and knowledgeable professional staff developers. LSI has extensive experience implementing solutions for large organizations. As part of the Houghton Mifflin Harcourt partnership for Florida, LSI is currently engaged by the Florida Department of Education to provide statewide technical assistance for teacher evaluation to its 67 school districts and charter schools through the federal Race to the Top initiative. The Florida Department of Education selected Dr. Marzano's Causal Teacher Evaluation Model as its state model. LSI is providing training, tools, and technical assistance service to guide districts through four years of design, implementation, and improvement for their local teacher evaluation models. LSI's has also provided statewide implementations in Pennsylvania's 500 school districts includes a full range of economically, racially, and culturally diverse students and teachers from rural, suburban, and urban centers that includes both Pittsburgh Public Schools and the School District of Philadelphia with 115,000 and 210,000 students, respectively. Beyond LSI's experience in urban and subur-

	ban district-wide implementations, LSI has experience working with single schools in rural settings. LSI works closely with all school leaders, regardless of the school's size or structure, to ensure that their professional development solutions target the school, district, or state goals. Pennsylvania initiatives included delivering over 1 million hours of online continuing professional education, delivering online, in-person, and graduate education to support state initiatives including high school reform, 21st Century skills, and early literacy. LSI has demonstrated experience with school districts classified as rural, suburban, and low performing. In these districts, LSI provides administrators with customized tools in alignment with their district's framework to conduct teacher performance reviews and provide feedback to over 20,000 classroom teachers. Additionally, LSI hosts virtual conferences to discuss instructional improvement with teachers and principals at elementary, middle, and secondary levels. LSI has hosted over 850 such conferences. Dr. Robert Marzano is world renown for synthesizing educational research into accessible components that teachers and principals can use to obtain gains in student learning. Ongoing field research in the form of randomized control studies ensures the most current and up to date research. The Marzano Research Laboratory (MRL) employs a team of professional developers and authors to provide expert professional development to schools and districts worldwide. The vision of the Marzano Research Laboratory is "To continuously develop tools that translate high-quality educational research into practical applications educators can put to use." Learning Sciences International and Dr. Robert Marzano offer the state of New York comprehensive consulting services in teacher evaluation while also continually supporting the growth of teacher effectiveness with a resulting measurable impact on student achievement. These highly skilled consultants will work with New York school districts to help analyze their current evaluation systems and implement a teacher rubric that: • Systematically aligns with the New York Teaching Standards • Provides meaningful feedback to teachers to promote ever-improving professional practices • Connects with state and district student data as the ultimate measure of effectiveness These consultants bring years of experience in the Art and Science of Teaching; as well as, the wealth of knowledge gained from the research of Dr. Marzano to this important new project. As they work with each school district

	or consortia, strategies and evaluation frameworks that have resulted from the work of Dr. Marzano will be available and used to enhance current practices, fill gaps, and increase transparency. Forty years of research reveal that student achievement in classes with highly skilled teachers is better than student achievement in classes with less skilled teachers. While it would be unreasonable to expect all teachers to reach the 90th percentile or higher regarding their skills, it is reasonable for teachers to make incremental gains from year to year, and those gains would increase student achievement incrementally with a powerful cumulative effect. This is the model LSI will use as we work with New York educators. Educational leaders will learn how to give clear, timely, and specific feedback. This feedback, combined with student achievement data, will help leaders to focus teachers on their improvement needs through a professional growth plan.
6. What is the instructional content, methodology, and format of any proposed evaluator training that your organization may be able to offer participating LEAs? *Please note: providers are not obligated to provide training nor are districts obligated to buy training from providers.*	LSI and Dr. Marzano offer the NYSED a proven technical approach that includes technical assistance provided by LSI on behalf of NYSDE for participating schools including 3-day Teacher Evaluation Academies to introduce the Causal Teacher Evaluation Model and contemporary research to district teacher evaluation redevelopment team members. The academies provide participants with tools for implementing or adapting the Marzano Causal Teacher Evaluation Model with observation forms, evidence forms, annual evaluation forms, scales and rating model, etc. They also thoroughly explain the common language and model of instruction based on the research of Dr. Robert Marzano that aligns to the New York Teaching Standards for deep classroom implementation and instructional improvement. LSI recommends school districts participate in a "Hold Harmless" period to begin walkthroughs and observations and practice feedback and scoring teacher practice. This would allow teachers and principals to calibrate practices to the new expectations and norming their school culture. After the brief "phase in" period, ratings generated from classroom visits and observations will begin counting toward the annual evaluation. LSI offers a comlpete line of supplemental fee-based services that districts may access to support their implementation efforts including:: • A series of technical assistance working sessions for district teacher evaluation redevelopment teams to work through the decisions for implementing the teacher rubric. • Training for evaluator observers and also for non-evaluative observers which creates informal feedback

	loops to support teacher growth and development • Certified Facilitator Program to build professional development capacity in a teacher leader that will complete the program from each participating school and conduct workshops on the model for the school staff • A performance management system (iObservation) for teachers and principals • Evaluator and observer professional development and certification program for accuracy, effective feedback, and inter-rater reliably • Marzano Certified Staff Developer program for staff developers to become deeply immersed in the framework and then to be able to deliver packaged workshops for teachers with consistent, high-quality delivery • Graduate education delivered online and applied in the classroom resulting in an MSEd in the Art and Science of Teaching and a teacher certification in pedagogy that is aligned to the framework including having teachers submit videos of their lessons for scoring and feedback • Marzano School Improvement program for intensive implementation and monitoring for struggling school systems All training materials are accompanied by participant notebooks, PowerPoint presentations which are made available in hard copy and are available for access from our website.
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.e. training/ instruction, implementation costs, materials, etc.).*	The sealed cost proposal details the costs for the Marzano Causal Teacher Evaluation Model Professional Development and related technology platform, iObservation. The purchase of either the professional development services or iObseravtion includes the Marzano Causal Teacher Evaluation Model (rubrics) at no additional charge. For pricing information, see the Cost Proposal.

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.

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.	Learning Sciences was founded by former university researchers in 1999. From its founding, LSI has focused on improving student achievement through the professional growth of teachers and administrators. Our mission is to help teachers become highly effective classroom practitioners through blending new technologies with research-based pedagogy. LSI is organized as a limited liability corporation and currently operates from two locations within the State of Pennsylvania. 1. Corporate Services Division (home office), 175 Cornell Road, Suite 18, Blairsville, PA 15717 2. The Educational Services Division is located at 221 W. Philadelphia Street, Suite 112E, York, PA 17401 Our Corporate Services Division is a 10,000 square foot facility which houses LSI's software engineering department, production department; including a full video production group, corporate IT services, corporate accounting, and customer service department. The LSI software engineering department is responsible for all design and implementation of our performance growth platform, iObservation. Our Production department produces content for online non-credit and graduate education courses. The video production group travels onsite to school districts to capture raw footage and has full video editing capabilities in-house. LSI's customer service department has a robust and scalable capability and currently provides technical support to over 51,000 users. Customer Service Representatives are available during business hours Monday – Friday from 8 AM to 5 PM EST and provide support via telephone and email. Toll-free numbers are available at all levels of service to our clients. Our Educational Services Division is a 6,000 square foot facility augmented with educational experts around the nation. Additionally, this location houses our professional development facility, sales and marketing teams, multimedia department, and research and design center. Further, LSI has 50 employees including implementation program managers, expert trainers, information systems specialists, customer service

	representative, research and development specialists, business managers, instructional designers, multimedia designers, and videographers. LSI's research and development team works closely with the subject matter experts in coordinating the product roadmap for all LSI products. This process is built on the input gained from field experience and product enhancements are prioritized based on customer requests and needs. All of these staff members are credentialed in their specialization areas, and will be available to support this effort as needed.
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.	Learning Sciences is exclusively partnered with Dr. Robert Marzano to co-develop aspects of his Causal Teacher Evaluation Model and provide technical assistance for states and school districts. LSI provides statewide technical assistance for teacher evaluation for the Florida Department of Education serving 67 county system public school districts with over 170,000 teachers and 2.6 million students. Additionally, LSI provides implementation services to school districts in 38 states and has over 10 years of experience in successful large state implementations including teacher evaluation, professional development, high school reform, 21st Century skills, and early literacy. One of LSI's divisions is the Marzano Center for Teacher Evaluation where research is conducted and best practices are identified for implementing teacher evaluation within school districts. The National Consortium on Teacher Evaluation, one of our current projects, allows districts who participate in the project to be involved in structured sharing of best practices and results. LSI is also a proud partner with Dr. Douglas Reeves and The Leadership and Learning Center, and through collaboration with Drs. Marzano and Reeves, the Leadership Performance Matrix for principal evaluation is now linked with Dr. Marzano's Causal Teacher Evaluation Model for a powerful combination of teaching and leadership practices focused at raising student achievement. Having teacher evaluation work in concert with principal evaluation is a critical reform strategy and one pioneered by Drs. Marzano and Reeves through the work of LSI and The Center. While the focus on teacher effectiveness must be centered on improving student learning, a complex evaluation system must focus on improving the expertise of the teacher across an entire system and provide clear mechanisms for teachers to improve their instruction so

	that increases in teacher skills result in increases in student learning.
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.	Please clearly identify and attach this documentation in the Appendix section.
4. Copy of the organization's 501(c)3 certificate or State license.	Please clearly identify and attach this documentation in the Appendix 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.	1. Confidential Settlement Agreement and General Release was entered into between LSI and an ex-employee at the end of April, 2010, settling discrimination charges/allegations, with a non-admission of wrongdoing on the part of LSI agreed to by the ex-employee. There was never any finding by either the EEOC and/or the Pennsylvania Human Relations Commission whatsoever in this matter and all charges/allegations were withdrawn. The terms of the Confidential Settlement Agreement and General Release cannot otherwise be disclosed. 2. The only other matter is: Adrienne Tinsley vs. Learning Sciences International; EEOC Charge No. 530-2010-01411. Charging Party, Adrienne Tinsley, alleged that she was discriminated against by LSI because of her race and her age and her sex and was retaliated against. She alleged violations of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended and the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967. She alleged retaliation in violation of Title VII. LSI put forward vigorous defenses to the allegations and supplied extensive information and exhibits and relevant data to rebut all of the allegations. Based upon all the information submitted to the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC), on August 25, 2010 the EEOC closed its file on Ms. Tinsley's charge because it found based upon its investigation that the EEOC was unable to conclude that the information obtained establishes violations of the statutes. At this time, Ms. Tinsley was issued a Dismissal and Notice of Rights letter which is legally required in these matters. Ms. Tinsley was advised by the EEOC that she must file a lawsuit within 90 days of her receipts of this August 26, 2010 Notice or her right to sue based on her charge will be lost. As of our submission, contained in our response to this RFQ, no lawsuit was initiated against LSI, and her right

	to sue based on her charges have expired.
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.	No
7. Information as to whether the organization has been debarred or suspended from doing business with any local government, state, or the federal government.	No
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).	Yes, Florida.

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

1.	Name of organization:	Learning Sciences International, LLC
	Primary location:	Blairsville, Pennsylvania
	Contact information: (phone / email / website):	Michael Toth 717-845-6300 x 172 mtoth@learningsciences.net www.learningsciences.net
	LEAs where service will be provided (or is intended to be provided):	On-site at LEAs in the state of New York
2.	The number of years the provider has delivered service:	10
3.	Title of the Teacher and/or Principal Rubric Evaluation model to be used (if appropriate):	Marzano Causal Evaluation Model
4.	Professional population that the provider has served, and that they are requesting to serve (i.e. teachers, principals, admin., etc.):	K-12 School Administrations, Teachers, Teacher Leaders, Instructional Coaches, and external stakeholders
5.	Number of teachers and/or principals that have received an evaluation using the submitted rubric tool (approximately):	Although the Art and Science of Teaching Observation and Feedback Protocol (2007) has been implemented with thousands of evaluations across the country, the Marzano Causal Evaluation Model annual assessment will be implemented throughout Florida districts adopting the Marzano model in the 2011-2012 School Year.
6.	Number of teacher and/or principal evaluation instructional sessions provided per year, if applicable:	8
7.	Average length of each training session for the training of evaluators (minutes/hours):	6 hours each for a total of 48 hours

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.

1. Name of Organization (PLEASE PRINT/TYPE) Learning Sciences International, LLC	4. Signature of Authorized Representative (PLEASE USE **BLACK/BLUE** INK)
2. Name of Authorized Representative (PLEASE PRINT/TYPE) Michael Toth	5. Date Signed
3. Title of Authorized Representative (PLEASE PRINT/TYPE) CEO	