

[show names](#)

[show group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/28/2010 2:25 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: American Federation of Teachers Educational Foundation -- AFT Educational Issues, - AFT Educational Issues, (U396C100376)

Reader #1:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Summary Statement		
1. Summary Statement	N/A	N/A
Selection Criteria		
1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)	25	25
2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)	25	25
3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)	5	5
4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)	10	10
5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)	10	10
Competitive Preference		
1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point)	1	1
4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)	2	0

Technical Review Form

Development 03: 84.396C

Reader #1:

Applicant: American Federation of Teachers Educational Foundation -- AFT Educational Issues, - AFT Educational Issues, (U396C100376)

Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement

Selection Criteria

1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)

In determining the need for the project and quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet (i.e., addresses a largely unmet need, particularly for high-need students, and is a practice, strategy, or program that has not already been widely adopted).

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has a clear set of goals and an explicit strategy, with the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project clearly specified and measurable and linked to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet.

Strengths

The applicant proposed an approach to addressing the unmet needs of high need students. The project will identify methods for identifying effective teachers. Substantial references to the data supporting the connection between student achievement and teacher effectiveness was compelling. The design is proposed to not only evaluate teachers but to improve instruction. (p.2-5) This reader was convinced this represents an exceptional approach to

the priority.

The project description is very detailed and responsive to the need of improving teacher evaluation systems. (p.5-14)

The applicant provided a clear set of goals and strategies with measurable outcomes. (p.5-7)

The applicant provided a well-designed proposal that this reader believes can be successfully implemented. (p.8-14)

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 25

2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)

In determining the experience of the eligible applicant, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (1) The past performance of the eligible applicant in implementing projects of the size and scope proposed by the eligible applicant.**
- (2) The extent to which an eligible applicant provides information and data demonstrating that -**
 - (a) In the case of an eligible applicant that is an LEA, the LEA has -**
 - (i) Significantly closed the achievement gaps between groups of students described in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA, or significantly increased student achievement for all groups of students described in such section; and**
 - (ii) Made significant improvements in other areas, such as graduation rates or increased recruitment and placement of high-quality teachers and principals, as demonstrated with meaningful data; or**
 - (b) In the case of an eligible applicant that includes a nonprofit organization, the nonprofit organization has significantly improved student achievement, attainment, or retention through its record of work with an LEA or schools.**

Strengths

The applicant provided evidence of past performance of implementing projects of the size and scope of this project. (p.19-22) This reader concurs that the capacity exists to bring this project to completion successfully. The following represents some examples of past success.

The applicant has partnered with the Toledo Board of Education since 1981 to implement a successful program of teacher professional development and evaluation. (p.20)

The Fresh Start Program was an example cited for improving student achievement. (P.21) The data provided by the applicant convinced this reader of the applicant's ability to improve student achievement.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 25

3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)

In determining the quality of the strategy and capacity to further develop and bring to scale the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(1) The number of students proposed to be reached by the proposed project, and the capacity of the eligible applicant and any other partners to reach the proposed number of students during the course of the grant period.

(2) The eligible applicant's capacity (e.g., in terms of qualified personnel, financial resources, or management capacity) to further develop and bring to scale the proposed practice, strategy, or program, or to work with others (including other partners) to ensure that the proposed practice, strategy, or program can be further developed and brought to scale, based on the findings of the proposed project.

(3) The feasibility of the proposed project to be replicated successfully, if positive results are obtained, in a variety of settings and with a variety of student populations. Evidence of this ability includes the availability of resources and expertise required for implementing the project with fidelity, and the proposed project's evidence of relative ease of use or user satisfaction.

(4) The eligible applicant's estimate of the cost of the proposed project, which includes the start-up and operating costs per student per year (including indirect costs) for reaching the total number of students proposed to be served by the project. The eligible applicant must include an estimate of the costs for the eligible applicant or others (including other partners) to reach 100,000, 250,000, and 500,000 students.

(5) The mechanisms the eligible applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication.

Strengths

The applicant was responsive to all criterion in this section. The number of students proposed to be impacted is approximately 81,199. The project will be staffed by AFT teacher quality experts, NYSUT and RIFTHP staff who are familiar with the districts to be included in the project. (p.29) A strong indication of the applicant's capacity to be taken to scale is validated by the collective bargaining agreements in member districts. (p. 29-32) Because the participating districts represent a good cross-section of the American public education system it is proposed by the applicant that this will aid in generalizing how to implement in districts with a variety of students. (p.31) The applicant proposed an average cost per student per year of \$18.50. The costs for 100,000, 250,000 and 500,000 are provided as required. (p.31-32) The applicant proposed a variety of existing dissemination systems it uses to support further development or replication. (p.32) This reader found the applicant to be responsive to all the criterion in this section with sound strategies.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 5

4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)

In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that it has the resources, as well as the support from stakeholders (e.g., State educational agencies, teachers' unions) to operate the project beyond the length of the Development grant.

(2) The potential and planning for the incorporation of project purposes, activities, or benefits into the ongoing work of the eligible applicant and any other partners at the end of the Development grant.

Strengths

The applicant provided evidence that relationships already exist with major stakeholders and resources are available to operate the project beyond the grant period. (p.32-33) This project is viewed as a top priority for the union and this organization. (p.32) This reader saw this as a substantial demonstration of support from stakeholders. The applicant states that improving teacher evaluation systems to support improved student achievement is a top priority. The president of the

organization has publicly announced commitment to the goals of this project. Lessons learned from the project will be incorporated into the work of the organization. (p.33-34)
This reader was favorably impressed with the commitment of the applicant to the ongoing success of this project.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 10

5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)

In determining the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(1) The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks.

(2) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of the project director and key project personnel, especially in managing projects of the size and scope of the proposed project.

Strengths

The applicant provided a logical sequence for the development of this project. All the required details for this section were included. There are clearly defined responsibilities, timelines and milestones for project tasks. (p.34-37) This reader was impressed with the clarity of the plan and the ease of being able to identify the evidence of response to the criterion. Additionally, the applicant specifically addressed standards for LEP and SWDs. (p.34-36)

A project director and project team are identified by the applicant. The relevant training and experience of the key personnel was provided. (p.37-41) This reader is confident the team, as identified, has the experience to manage a project of the size and scope of the one proposed.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 10

Competitive Preference

1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 Point)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve educational outcomes for high-need students who are young children (birth through 3rd grade) by enhancing the quality of early learning programs. To meet this priority, applications must focus on:

- (a) improving young children's school readiness (including social, emotional, and cognitive readiness) so that children are prepared for success in core academic subjects (as defined in section 9101(11) of the ESEA);
- (b) improving developmental milestones and standards and aligning them with appropriate outcome measures; and
- (c) improving alignment, collaboration, and transitions between early learning programs that serve children from birth to age three, in preschools, and in kindergarten through third grade.

Strengths

Weaknesses

This priority was not addressed.

Reader's Score: 0

2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 Point)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to enable kindergarten through grade 12 (K-12) students, particularly high school students, to successfully prepare for, enter, and graduate from a two- or four-year college. To meet this priority, applications must include practices, strategies, or programs for K-12 students that

- (a) address students' preparedness and expectations related to college;
- (b) help students understand issues of college affordability and the financial aid and college application processes; and
- (c) provide support to students from peers and knowledgeable adults.

Strengths

Weaknesses

This priority was not addressed.

Reader's Score: 0

3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to address the unique learning needs of students with disabilities, including those who are assessed based on alternate academic achievement standards, or the linguistic and academic needs of limited English proficient students. To meet this priority, applications must provide for the implementation of particular practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve academic outcomes, close achievement gaps, and increase college- and career-readiness, including increasing high school graduation rates (as defined in this notice), for students with disabilities or limited English proficient students.

Strengths

The applicant addressed this competitive priority in several places in the application. (p.1,37). This reader is confident the applicant intends to use this project to address the unique learning needs of students with disabilities and limited English proficiency.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 1

4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to focus on the unique challenges of high-need students in schools within a rural LEA (as defined in this notice) and address the particular challenges faced by students in these schools. To meet this priority, applications must include practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or improve teacher and principal effectiveness in one or more rural LEAs.

Strengths

Weaknesses

This priority was not addressed.

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/28/2010 2:25 PM

[show names](#)

[show group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/25/2010 8:49 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: American Federation of Teachers Educational Foundation -- AFT Educational Issues, - AFT Educational Issues, (U396C100376)

Reader #2:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Summary Statement		
1. Summary Statement	N/A	N/A
Selection Criteria		
1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)	25	25
2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)	25	25
3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)	5	5
4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)	10	10
5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)	10	10
Competitive Preference		
1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point)	1	1
4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve	2	0

Technical Review Form

Development 03: 84.396C

Reader #2:

Applicant: American Federation of Teachers Educational Foundation -- AFT Educational Issues, - AFT Educational Issues, (U396C100376)

Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement

Selection Criteria

1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)

In determining the need for the project and quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet (i.e., addresses a largely unmet need, particularly for high-need students, and is a practice, strategy, or program that has not already been widely adopted).

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has a clear set of goals and an explicit strategy, with the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project clearly specified and measurable and linked to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet.

Strengths

<p>There is a growing need in the field of education for the development of effective performance-based teacher evaluation systems, which this project addresses. According to page 5, these evaluations will be based on professional teaching standards and will encompass multiple areas of</p>
--

teaching practice. According to page 9, the design of the project includes Danielson's Framework for Teaching and criteria for high quality professional development. As stated on page 10, experts from the Danielson Group will deliver stakeholder education training and observation skills and coach training which are critical elements for effective performance-based teacher evaluations.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 25

2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)

In determining the experience of the eligible applicant, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (1) The past performance of the eligible applicant in implementing projects of the size and scope proposed by the eligible applicant.**
- (2) The extent to which an eligible applicant provides information and data demonstrating that -**
 - (a) In the case of an eligible applicant that is an LEA, the LEA has -**
 - (i) Significantly closed the achievement gaps between groups of students described in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA, or significantly increased student achievement for all groups of students described in such section; and**
 - (ii) Made significant improvements in other areas, such as graduation rates or increased recruitment and placement of high-quality teachers and principals, as demonstrated with meaningful data; or**
 - (b) In the case of an eligible applicant that includes a nonprofit organization, the nonprofit organization has significantly improved student achievement, attainment, or retention through its record of work with an LEA or schools.**

Strengths

According to page 20, AFT has developed and implemented performance-based evaluation in Toledo and that work will be valuable in developing the "next-generation model of teacher evaluation" outlined in the proposal. According to page 21, the applicant has experience managing grants and large scale programs and has demonstrated progress toward

closing the achievement gap in Chicago Public Schools.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 25

3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)

In determining the quality of the strategy and capacity to further develop and bring to scale the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(1) The number of students proposed to be reached by the proposed project, and the capacity of the eligible applicant and any other partners to reach the proposed number of students during the course of the grant period.

(2) The eligible applicant's capacity (e.g., in terms of qualified personnel, financial resources, or management capacity) to further develop and bring to scale the proposed practice, strategy, or program, or to work with others (including other partners) to ensure that the proposed practice, strategy, or program can be further developed and brought to scale, based on the findings of the proposed project.

(3) The feasibility of the proposed project to be replicated successfully, if positive results are obtained, in a variety of settings and with a variety of student populations. Evidence of this ability includes the availability of resources and expertise required for implementing the project with fidelity, and the proposed project's evidence of relative ease of use or user satisfaction.

(4) The eligible applicant's estimate of the cost of the proposed project, which includes the start-up and operating costs per student per year (including indirect costs) for reaching the total number of students proposed to be served by the project. The eligible applicant must include an estimate of the costs for the eligible applicant or others (including other partners) to reach 100,000, 250,000, and 500,000 students.

(5) The mechanisms the eligible applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication.

Strengths

As stated on page 29, over 81,000 students will be impacted over the course of four years. On page 30 it is noted that AFT's relationship with collective bargaining units in local LEAs will help to bring the project to scale. The average cost per student is moderate, as explained on pages 31 and 32. As

stated on page 31, "the experience of working with a wide range of districts from this project will make it easier to replicate the model in districts of many different sizes and locations." According to page 32, webinars, seminars, and reports will be made available to the broader education community to share lessons learned from the project.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 5

4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)

In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that it has the resources, as well as the support from stakeholders (e.g., State educational agencies, teachers' unions) to operate the project beyond the length of the Development grant.

(2) The potential and planning for the incorporation of project purposes, activities, or benefits into the ongoing work of the eligible applicant and any other partners at the end of the Development grant.

Strengths

The ability to sustain the program is helped greatly by AFT's stakeholder support in 3,000 LEAs nationwide, as explained on page 32. Also on page 32 it is stated that AFT has 360 employees and a \$172 million budget. On page 33 it is noted that the president of AFT has publicly announced the union's commitment to research and development of teacher evaluation systems. Also on page 33, AFT expects partners and affiliates of participating districts will be eager to continue development and scale-up upon completion of the grant.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 10

5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)

In determining the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed

project, the Secretary considers:

(1) The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks.

(2) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of the project director and key project personnel, especially in managing projects of the size and scope of the proposed project.

Strengths

The management plan is of high quality. The 8 major tasks listed for Year One on pages 35 and 36 and the 6 major tasks listed for Year Two on page 36 are reasonable for staying on time and on budget. The "Innovative Milestones" on page 37 are focus on progress toward the goals. The Danielson Group and American Institutes of Research are well respected and highly skilled. According to page 34, the Danielson Group has done more than 20 years of work on performance-based teacher evaluations and AIR is highly skilled at evaluating professional development programs. According to pages 38-41, the key personnel are well qualified for their individual tasks.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 10

Competitive Preference

1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 Point)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve educational outcomes for high-need students who are young children (birth through 3rd grade) by enhancing the quality of early learning programs. To meet this priority, applications must focus on:

- (a) improving young children's school readiness (including social, emotional, and cognitive readiness) so that children are prepared for success in core academic subjects (as defined in section 9101(11) of the ESEA);**
- (b) improving developmental milestones and standards and aligning them with appropriate outcome measures; and**
- (c) improving alignment, collaboration, and transitions between early learning**

programs that serve children from birth to age three, in preschools, and in kindergarten through third grade.

Strengths

Weaknesses

The applicant did not respond to this priority.

Reader's Score: 0

2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 Point)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to enable kindergarten through grade 12 (K-12) students, particularly high school students, to successfully prepare for, enter, and graduate from a two- or four-year college. To meet this priority, applications must include practices, strategies, or programs for K-12 students that

- (a) address students' preparedness and expectations related to college;**
- (b) help students understand issues of college affordability and the financial aid and college application processes; and**
- (c) provide support to students from peers and knowledgeable adults.**

Strengths

Weaknesses

The applicant did not respond to this priority.

Reader's Score: 0

3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to address the unique learning needs of students with disabilities, including those who are assessed based on alternate academic achievement standards, or the linguistic and academic needs of limited English proficient students. To meet this priority, applications must provide for the implementation of particular practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve academic outcomes, close achievement gaps, and increase college- and career-readiness, including increasing high school graduation rates (as defined in this notice), for students with disabilities or limited English proficient students.

Strengths

According to page 1, the evaluation system will be multifaceted, including components to measure effective instruction for students with disabilities and LEP students. Furthermore, page 1 explains that working groups will be formed to focus on LEP students and students with disabilities to develop standards and performance rubrics.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 1

4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to focus on the unique challenges of high-need students in schools within a rural LEA (as defined in this notice) and address the particular challenges faced by students in these schools. To meet this priority, applications must include practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or improve teacher and principal effectiveness in one or more rural LEAs.

Strengths

Weaknesses

The applicant did not respond to this priority.

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/25/2010 8:49 AM

[show names](#)

[show group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/28/2010 9:22 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: American Federation of Teachers Educational Foundation -- AFT Educational Issues, - AFT Educational Issues, (U396C100376)

Reader #3:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Summary Statement		
1. Summary Statement	N/A	N/A
Selection Criteria		
1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)	25	25
2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)	25	25
3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)	5	5
4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)	10	10
5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)	10	10
Competitive Preference		
1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 Point)	1	0
3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point)	1	1
4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve	2	0

Technical Review Form

Development 03: 84.396C

Reader #3:

Applicant: American Federation of Teachers Educational Foundation -- AFT Educational Issues, - AFT Educational Issues, (U396C100376)

Summary Statement

1. Summary Statement

The applicant has developed an excellent and innovative proposal. The proposal seeks to develop and incorporate the use of professional teaching standards for general education teachers of LEP students and SWDs to judge teacher effectiveness and assist teachers in improving their practice. Including professional teaching standards for LEP students and SWDs in an overall teacher evaluation system will identify effective practices for working with diverse students in general education settings and assist teachers in successfully educating students with varied learning and linguistic needs.

Selection Criteria

1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 25 Points)

In determining the need for the project and quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet (i.e., addresses a largely unmet need, particularly for high-need students, and is a practice, strategy, or program that has not already been widely adopted).

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has a clear set of goals and an explicit

strategy, with the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project clearly specified and measurable and linked to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet.

Strengths

The proposed E3TL Consortium will work in 10 districts in New York and Rhode Island to support the implementation of rigorous and comprehensive performance-based teacher evaluation systems that include standards for effectiveness in instructing limited English proficient (LEP) students and students with disabilities in mainstream classrooms. The project is innovative and an exceptional approach that has not been adopted.

Through the project the applicant is expecting that positive changes will occur in teacher attitudes regarding the purposes and potential uses of teacher evaluation; and there will be increased accuracy in identifying effective teaching practices and teachers; an increase in the percentage of teachers meeting the standards over time; and increase in student achievement and closing of achievement gaps.

The ultimate goal is to develop a set of standards with performance rubrics for assessing teacher practices in the instruction of LEP students and SWDs in inclusionary settings.

The theory of action undergirding this project is that implementing performance-based teacher evaluation systems will strengthen teaching and increase student learning. Such systems are based on professional teaching standards that identify effective practices that lead to desired student outcomes.

The applicant's proposal clearly defines the premise that when implemented with fidelity, the project could provide valuable information on a teacher's strengths and weaknesses, thus allowing for targeted professional development to develop and improve teachers.

Additionally, through the project the applicant is aiming to create and refine training and materials to certify evaluators to accurately assess teaching performance and to interpret teacher evaluation data to help teachers develop and improve.
(p.2-15)

Weaknesses

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 25

2. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 25 Points)

In determining the experience of the eligible applicant, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The past performance of the eligible applicant in implementing projects of the size and scope proposed by the eligible applicant.

(2) The extent to which an eligible applicant provides information and data demonstrating that -

(a) In the case of an eligible applicant that is an LEA, the LEA has -

(i) Significantly closed the achievement gaps between groups of students described in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA, or significantly increased student achievement for all groups of students described in such section; and

(ii) Made significant improvements in other areas, such as graduation rates or increased recruitment and placement of high-quality teachers and principals, as demonstrated with meaningful data; or

(b) In the case of an eligible applicant that includes a nonprofit organization, the nonprofit organization has significantly improved student achievement, attainment, or retention through its record of work with an LEA or schools.

Strengths

The proposed program is a partnership between AFTEF and 10 districts. AFTEF is a nonprofit 501(c)(3) foundation that conducts, sponsors and disseminates research in education and related fields with the main objective of improving and restructuring the education system. One of the strengths of is that the AFTEF has an outstanding history of implementing high-quality projects similar in size and scope to the proposed project.

For example, the AFT has worked since 1981 with the Toledo Board of Education and the Toledo Federation of Teachers to implement a highly successful program of teacher professional development and evaluation. The Toledo Plan includes components for new and veteran teachers. Trained teacher-evaluators, along with management, conduct evaluations based on performance standards set by the Toledo Public Schools, with help from the AFT.

Created in 1981, the AFT Educational Research and Dissemination (ER&D) Program is a research-based professional development program designed to help local unions build the capacity to deliver high-quality professional development services in collaboration with their school districts. ER&D delivers scientifically based research in a focused, sustained framework that promotes the application of research-validated concepts and strategies.

Another strength of the applicant's experience is AFTEF's work has led to improved teacher professional development, evaluation, and practice, as well as increased student achievement, attainment and retention.

The AFTEF has worked with the Chicago Public Schools (CPS) and the Chicago Teacher's Union (CTU) on the Fresh Start Program demonstrates the AFTEF's longitudinal success in implementing projects focused on at-risk student populations that has resulted in positive teacher and student outcomes.

The project was a major grant project which provides some measure of evidence of AFTEF experience in implementing projects of the size and scope of the E3TL as well as its capacity to forge a strong LEA-level collaborations.

The applicant provides data and narrative that clearly indicates their nonprofit organization has significantly improved student achievement, attainment, or retention through its record of work with an LEA or schools.
(p.19-22)

Weaknesses

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 25

3. E. Strategy and Capacity to Further Develop and Bring to Scale (up to 5 Points)

In determining the quality of the strategy and capacity to further develop and bring to scale the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(1) The number of students proposed to be reached by the proposed project, and the capacity of the eligible applicant and any other partners to reach the proposed number of students during the course of the grant period.

(2) The eligible applicant's capacity (e.g., in terms of qualified personnel, financial resources, or management capacity) to further develop and bring to scale the proposed practice, strategy, or program, or to work with others (including other partners) to ensure that the proposed practice, strategy, or program can be further developed and brought to scale, based on the findings of the proposed project.

(3) The feasibility of the proposed project to be replicated successfully, if positive results are obtained, in a variety of settings and with a variety of student populations. Evidence of this ability includes the availability of resources and expertise required for implementing the project with fidelity, and the proposed project's evidence of relative ease of use or user satisfaction.

(4) The eligible applicant's estimate of the cost of the proposed project, which includes the start-up and operating costs per student per year (including indirect costs) for reaching the total number of students proposed to be served by the project. The eligible applicant must include an estimate of the costs for the eligible applicant or others (including other partners) to reach 100,000, 250,000, and 500,000 students.

(5) The mechanisms the eligible applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support further development or replication.

Strengths

The applicant proposes that the project will impact approximately 81,199 students over four years.

The project will be fully staffed by AFT teacher quality experts, NYSUT and RIFTHP staff who know the districts well and are experts in their field, and district- and school-level educators in 10 local education agencies. In addition, the project will benefit from the guidance of AFT Teacher Evaluation Advisory Panel who members include some of the top experts in the field. All of which have long-term established relationships with schools, districts, educators, policymakers, researchers and experts across the country and the world.

The E3TL project and its external evaluator will document the process of developing the system and identify successes and pitfalls. This information will help other districts across the country implement performance based teacher evaluation systems.

The E3TL Consortium project design includes the piloting of a web-based application to support evaluator capacity. On-site training to certify evaluators can be timely and costly. This project seeks to test other methods that will still ensure accuracy but will be feasible and cost-effective as well. Data from this project will inform the use (including the validity and

reliability) of online, web-based applications to certify teacher evaluators.

With an estimated cost of approximately \$1.5 million per year for implementation of the E3TL project within the participating districts, the average cost per student per year is \$18.50. It is estimated that it would cost \$1.85 million per year to reach 100,000 students, \$4.625 million to impact 250,000 students and \$9.25 million to reach 500,000 students.

To share the lessons learned with the broader education community, AFTEF, along with NYSUT and RIFTHP plan to present webinars, seminars and reports. The AFT will continue to use its existing Teacher Evaluation Community web portal to disseminate information on the project. Ongoing updates and evaluation of E3TL will be posted, as well as blogs by various project stakeholders. (p. 29-32)

Weaknesses

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 5

4. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)

In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that it has the resources, as well as the support from stakeholders (e.g., State educational agencies, teachers' unions) to operate the project beyond the length of the Development grant.**
- (2) The potential and planning for the incorporation of project purposes, activities, or benefits into the ongoing work of the eligible applicant and any other partners at the end of the Development grant.**

Strengths

The AFTEF has the resources and stakeholder support to operate and sustain the E3TL Consortium beyond the length of the Development grant based it's previous experiences, expertise and stakeholder support. The AFT has

approximately 360 employees and annual budget of roughly \$172 million and has a healthy financial history that extends back to its founding in 1916.

The AFT represents nearly 3,000 local education agencies nationwide, 43 state educational agencies and more than 1.4 million members. The AFT has well-developed and institutional structures and close working relationships with LEAs, many of which serve large populations of the most at-risk students in the country.

Over the past few years, AFT has invested approximately \$775,000 to support an innovative teacher evaluation framework, both from its own funds and from major foundation donors including the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation and the Carnegie Foundation.

The applicant has provided letters of support from the 10 participating E3TL districts in the Appendix.

The applicant has the resources and connections to recruit other district partners that are not currently part of the E3TL Consortium participate in a development and scale-up following completion of this project. Priority will be given to districts who meet the following criteria: the capacity to participate in the work of the project, a district/union formal agreement to participate, and a district wide student population where at least 40 percent are eligible to receive free and reduced price lunches (FRPL) and at least 15 percent are ELLs. The applicant presented a well documented narrative that evidenced alternative plans to collaborate with additionally districts if needed to further develop the project. (p. 32-34)

Weaknesses

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 10

5. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)

In determining the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(1) The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks.

(2) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of the project director and key project personnel, especially in managing projects of the size and

scope of the proposed project.

Strengths

The applicant has developed a management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks. The applicant has listed all major tasks to be accomplished by year.

For example: There are eight major tasks to be accomplished in Year One:

1. The training materials for stakeholders and evaluators must be developed;
2. The pilot schools must be selected;
3. Initial training of a stakeholders group must be completed;
4. Evaluators must be trained and certified;
5. The teacher evaluation must be implemented in pilot schools;
6. Protocols for data collection must be developed;
7. Materials must be refined as a result of pilot;and
8. A committee must be formed to develop standards for assessing teacher effectiveness in dealing with LEP students and SWDs in mainstream classes.

The applicant has commitments in place from several organizations who will have significant roles in accomplishing all the tasks involved in the project. For example, The Danielson Group will assist the union/district partnerships in developing materials and training and the American Institutes of Research will evaluate the project.

The Danielson Group has a track record of more than 20 years of work on performance-based teacher evaluations, particularly in regard to assessing instructional practice. AIR has a long history of working with state and local districts.

The E3TL Consortium has developed a comprehensive project management plan that details partner responsibilities and milestones for accomplishing the project objectives on time and within budget. The applicant listed the key personnel and the roles of each. All have very impressive expertise and experience in managing projects of the size and scope of the proposed project.

All resumes of the key personnel have been include in the proposal. The key personnel will oversee the work of the state and district development committees and a project coordinator assigned to each district to assure that the development of materials, training and the implementation of the system occurs in a timely manner and to address issues of implementation as they arise in the field. (p. 34)

Weaknesses

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 10

Competitive Preference

1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 Point)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve educational outcomes for high-need students who are young children (birth through 3rd grade) by enhancing the quality of early learning programs. To meet this priority, applications must focus on:

- (a) improving young children's school readiness (including social, emotional, and cognitive readiness) so that children are prepared for success in core academic subjects (as defined in section 9101(11) of the ESEA);
- (b) improving developmental milestones and standards and aligning them with appropriate outcome measures; and
- (c) improving alignment, collaboration, and transitions between early learning programs that serve children from birth to age three, in preschools, and in kindergarten through third grade.

Strengths

Weaknesses

The applicant does not address.

Reader's Score: 0

2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 Point)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to enable kindergarten through grade 12 (K-12) students, particularly high school students, to successfully prepare for, enter, and graduate from a two- or four-year college. To meet this priority, applications must include practices, strategies, or programs for K-12 students that

- (a) address students' preparedness and expectations related to college;**
- (b) help students understand issues of college affordability and the financial aid and college application processes; and**
- (c) provide support to students from peers and knowledgeable adults.**

Strengths

Weaknesses

The applicant does not address.

Reader's Score: 0

3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to address the unique learning needs of students with disabilities, including those who are assessed based on alternate academic achievement standards, or the linguistic and academic needs of limited English proficient students. To meet this priority, applications must provide for the implementation of particular practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve academic outcomes, close achievement gaps, and increase college- and career-readiness, including increasing high school graduation rates (as defined in this notice), for students with disabilities or limited English proficient students.

Strengths

The applicant is proposing to meet Competitive Priority #7 by developing and incorporating the use of professional teaching standards for general education teachers of LEP students and SWDs to judge teacher effectiveness and assist teachers in improving their practice. The program is innovative and designed to improve student outcomes and close achievement gaps.(p.1)

Weaknesses

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 1

4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to focus on the unique challenges of high-need students in schools within a rural LEA (as defined in this notice) and address the particular challenges faced by students in these schools. To meet this priority, applications must include practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or improve teacher and principal effectiveness in one or more rural LEAs.

Strengths

Weaknesses

The applicant does not address.

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/28/2010 9:22 AM

[show names](#)

[hide group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/21/2010 6:57 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: American Federation of Teachers Educational Foundation -- AFT Educational Issues, - AFT Educational Issues, (U396D100376)

Reader #1:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Evaluation Criteria		
1. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 10 Points)	10	7
2. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)	15	11
<i>SUB TOTAL</i>	25	18
TOTAL	25	18

Technical Review Form

Development Tier 2 Panel 09: 84.396D

Reader #1:

Applicant: American Federation of Teachers Educational Foundation -- AFT Educational Issues, - AFT Educational Issues, (U396D100376)

1. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 10 Points)

The Secretary considers the strength of the existing research evidence, including reported practice, theoretical considerations, and the significance and magnitude of

any effects reported in prior research, on whether the proposed project will improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or increase college enrollment and completion rates. Eligible applicants may also demonstrate success through an intermediate variable that is strongly correlated with improving these outcomes, such as teacher or principal effectiveness.

In determining the strength of the existing research evidence, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that there are research-based findings or reasonable hypotheses that support the proposed project, including related research in education and other sectors.

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has been attempted previously, albeit on a limited scale or in a limited setting, with promising results that suggest that more formal and systematic study is warranted.

(3) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that, if funded, the proposed project likely will have a positive impact, as measured by the importance or magnitude of the effect, on improving student achievement or student growth, closing achievement gaps, decreasing dropout rates, increasing high school graduation rates, or increasing college enrollment and completion rates.

Strengths

There is a clear, reasonable hypothesis about the effects of a performance-based teacher evaluation system. Given the prominence of alternative teacher evaluation systems in the modern education policy dialogue, this represents a worthwhile hypothesis that merits testing.

The authors provide excellent support for the potential utility of performance-based teacher evaluation systems, with a focus on the ability of performance-based evaluation systems to help teachers improve their practice, the relationship between performance-based evaluations and student achievement gains, and the importance of fidelity of implementation in affecting the impacts of the performance-based evaluation system. All components of their proposed intervention are adequately discussed in this review.

Weaknesses

There is little evidence about the magnitude of effects on teachers or students (or, at least, the magnitudes are not much discussed). The one piece of evidence is the narrowing of achievement gaps in MCPS (p. e19), but it is difficult to attribute this change to the performance-based evaluation system

with just the evidence provided. Based on this section, it is not clear what the expected magnitudes of the effects of the performance-based evaluation system would be, either for the effects on teachers or the effects on value-added.

The performance-based evaluation system proposed by the applicant is similar to programs in other urban districts that have already been implemented. If anything, it is not entirely clear why new approaches to performance-based evaluation are needed.

Reader's Score: 7

2. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)

In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers the following factors.

(1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation are appropriate to the size and scope of the proposed project.

(2) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide high-quality implementation data and performance feedback, and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.

(3) The extent to which the evaluation will provide sufficient information about the key elements and approach of the project to facilitate further development, replication, or testing in other settings.

(4) The extent to which the proposed project plan includes sufficient resources to carry out the project evaluation effectively.

Strengths

There is a comprehensive set of research questions guiding the evaluation, focusing on the full spectrum of implementation and intermediate and more distal outcomes (including student outcomes).

The research plan is very focused on fidelity of implementation, which will be useful in explaining program effects (or lack thereof). The plan for investigating implementation fidelity includes multiple methods and sources of data (interviews, surveys, observations) which will allow for triangulation of data and a richer understanding of fidelity of implementation of the performance-based evaluation program.

It is good that AIR will be evaluating the pilot year of the intervention, and that the evidence from the pilot year will be used to inform potential

revisions to the program for subsequent years.

There will be a wide array of data gathered on teachers' instruction, teacher and leader beliefs, and student outcomes, which will be helpful in evaluating the processes by which performance-based evaluation lead to effects. The extensive array of sources of evidence from the proposed research will allow a better understanding of the perspectives of multiple stakeholders.

Weaknesses

It appears as though the intervention will be implemented completely in all districts after the initial pilot year. This means there will be no direct comparison group for evaluating the impact of the study, a threat to the internal validity of the research. A stronger approach from the standpoint of internal validity would be to split the sample of schools in half (randomly or by matching) and assign schools to receive the intervention or not.

Reader's Score: 11

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/21/2010 6:57 PM

[show names](#)

[hide group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/21/2010 8:24 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: American Federation of Teachers Educational Foundation -- AFT Educational Issues, - AFT Educational Issues, (U396D100376)

Reader #2:

	POINTS POSSIBLE	POINTS SCORED
Evaluation Criteria		
1. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 10 Points)	10	8
2. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)	15	9
<i>SUB TOTAL</i>	25	17
TOTAL	25	17

Technical Review Form

Development Tier 2 Panel 09: 84.396D

Reader #2:

Applicant: American Federation of Teachers Educational Foundation -- AFT Educational Issues, - AFT Educational Issues, (U396D100376)

1. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 10 Points)

The Secretary considers the strength of the existing research evidence, including reported practice, theoretical considerations, and the significance and magnitude of

any effects reported in prior research, on whether the proposed project will improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or increase college enrollment and completion rates. Eligible applicants may also demonstrate success through an intermediate variable that is strongly correlated with improving these outcomes, such as teacher or principal effectiveness.

In determining the strength of the existing research evidence, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that there are research-based findings or reasonable hypotheses that support the proposed project, including related research in education and other sectors.

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has been attempted previously, albeit on a limited scale or in a limited setting, with promising results that suggest that more formal and systematic study is warranted.

(3) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that, if funded, the proposed project likely will have a positive impact, as measured by the importance or magnitude of the effect, on improving student achievement or student growth, closing achievement gaps, decreasing dropout rates, increasing high school graduation rates, or increasing college enrollment and completion rates.

Strengths

On pp. e15-17 the proposers provide citations from peer-reviewed journals that indicate Performance Based Teacher Evaluation correlates with improved teaching and improved student performance. They also provide citations indicating the fidelity of implementation correlates with positive outcomes as well as systematic review training and systematic communication related to the Evaluation.

The proposers provide two examples of school district and union officials working together to develop a performance evaluation system (pp.e. 17-18). The first is very similar to the proposed intervention because it involves AFT working with a school system to develop a teacher evaluation system using adaptations of Charlotte Danielson's Framework: A Continuous Improvement Model For Teacher Development and Evaluation. The second project is similar as well.

Weaknesses

While the results of previous similar projects have indicated relationships between teacher performance evaluation systems, the proposers provide very little information about the size and magnitude of effects in previous

research. The only indication is that in one example the achievement gap was reduced for third-grade white and African American Students from 35 to 19 points and for Hispanics 43 to 17 points (p. e19). This seems like very specific data for a narrow range of students.

Reader's Score: 8

2. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)

In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers the following factors.

(1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation are appropriate to the size and scope of the proposed project.

(2) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide high-quality implementation data and performance feedback, and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.

(3) The extent to which the evaluation will provide sufficient information about the key elements and approach of the project to facilitate further development, replication, or testing in other settings.

(4) The extent to which the proposed project plan includes sufficient resources to carry out the project evaluation effectively.

Strengths

The proposers have laid out 7 research questions on pp e23 and e24.

The proposers intend to create and refine evaluation instruments and protocols by treating the first year of implementation as a pilot and also providing baseline data.

The proposers describe the types of information that will be measured and those are relevant to the components of the evaluation system.

On pp. e 25 and e26 the proposers describe evaluation instruments that include Observations of training, teacher focus groups, telephone surveys and online surveys at reasonable intervals. These data can provide adequate information for judging fidelity of implementation and subsequent development and replication.

There are sufficient resources for conducting an evaluation on p. e2 of the budget narrative. The total amount contracted for AIR will be \$737,516.

Weaknesses

The evaluation does not include a focus on LEP and SWD students although this is a major feature of the grant.

On p. e 23 the proposers say that AIR will conduct an implementation evaluation. However, the research questions also include changing teacher practice and student achievement which are summative in nature. Their use of terminology is inaccurate.

Insufficient attention has been paid to establishing comparison groups It is important in projects such as this that in the end we have the highest quality information possible. The addition of comparison groups would allow the proposers to make stronger statements about the causal relationship between the intervention and changes in teacher behavior and changes in student achievement.

Reader's Score: 9

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/21/2010 8:24 PM