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Application for Federal Assistance SF-424

* 1. Type of Submission:
□ Preapplication
☑ Application
□ Changed/Corrected Application

* 2. Type of Application:
□ New
□ Continuation
□ Revision

* If Revision, select appropriate letter(s):

* Other (Specify):

* 3. Date Received:
07/27/2012

4. Applicant Identifier:

5a. Federal Entity Identifier:

5b. Federal Award Identifier:

State Use Only:

6. Date Received by State:

7. State Application Identifier:

8. APPLICANT INFORMATION:

* a. Legal Name:
Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey

* b. Employer/Taxpayer Identification Number (EIN/TIN):
1225001086Al

* c. Organizational DUNS:
0019128640000

d. Address:

* Street1:
Research & Sponsored Programs

Street2:
3 Rutgers Plaza, ASB III

* City:
New Brunswick

County/Parish:

* State:
NJ: New Jersey

Province:

* Country:
USA: UNITED STATES

* Zip / Postal Code:
08901-8559

e. Organizational Unit:

Department Name:
GSAPP

Division Name:
Applied and Professional Psyb

f. Name and contact information of person to be contacted on matters involving this application:

Prefix:
Dr.

* First Name:
Linda

Middle Name:
A.

* Last Name:
Reddy

Suffix:
Ph.D

Title:
Associate Professor

Organizational Affiliation:
Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey

* Telephone Number:
848-445-3945

Fax Number:
732-445-4888

* Email:
jreddy@rci.rutgers.edu
### Application for Federal Assistance SF-424

**9. Type of Applicant 1: Select Applicant Type:**

- Public/State Controlled Institution of Higher Education

**Type of Applicant 2: Select Applicant Type:**

**Type of Applicant 3: Select Applicant Type:**

- Other (specify):

**10. Name of Federal Agency:**

U.S. Department of Education

**11. Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Number:**

84.374

**CFDA Title:**

Teacher Incentive Fund

**12. Funding Opportunity Number:**

ED-GRANTS-061412-001

**Title:**

Office of Elementary and Secondary Education (OESE): Teacher Incentive Fund (TIF): TIF General Competition CFDA Number 84.374A

**13. Competition Identification Number:**

84-374A2012-1

**Title:**

**14. Areas Affected by Project (Cities, Counties, States, etc.):**

Add Attachment

**15. Descriptive Title of Applicant’s Project:**

The School System Improvement (SSI) Project was formed to increase school organizational effectiveness in four high poverty LEAs in New Jersey.

Attach supporting documents as specified in agency instructions.

Add Attachments
Application for Federal Assistance SF-424

16. Congressional Districts Of:
   * a. Applicant: NJ-006
   b. Program/Project: NJ-006

   Attach an additional list of Program/Project Congressional Districts if needed.

17. Proposed Project:
   * a. Start Date: 10/01/2012
   * b. End Date: 09/30/2017

18. Estimated Funding ($):
   * a. Federal
     43,975,719.00
   * b. Applicant
     0.00
   * c. State
     0.00
   * d. Local
     0.00
   * e. Other
     0.00
   * f. Program Income
     0.00
   * g. TOTAL
     43,975,719.00

19. Is Application Subject to Review By State Under Executive Order 12372 Process?
   ☑ a. This application was made available to the State under the Executive Order 12372 Process for review on ________ .
   ☑ b. Program is subject to E.O. 12372 but has not been selected by the State for review.
   ☐ c. Program is not covered by E.O. 12372.

20. Is the Applicant Delinquent On Any Federal Debt? (If “Yes,” provide explanation in attachment.)
   ☑ Yes  ☐ No

   If “Yes”, provide explanation and attach

21. “By signing this application, I certify (1) to the statements contained in the list of certifications** and (2) that the statements herein are true, complete and accurate to the best of my knowledge. I also provide the required assurances** and agree to comply with any resulting terms if I accept an award. I am aware that any false, fictitious, or fraudulent statements or claims may subject me to criminal, civil, or administrative penalties. (U.S. Code, Title 218, Section 1001)

   ☑ ** I AGREE

   ** The list of certifications and assurances, or an internet site where you may obtain this list, is contained in the announcement or agency specific instructions.

Authorized Representative:

Prefix: Ms.  * First Name: Casandra
Middle Name: 
* Last Name: Burrows
Suffix: 

* Title: Research Contract Grant Specialist

* Telephone Number: 848-932-6002  Fax Number: 732-932-0162

* Email: caburrow@grants.rutgers.edu

* Signature of Authorized Representative: Casandra Burrows  * Date Signed: 07/27/2012
ASSURANCES - NON-CONSTRUCTION PROGRAMS

Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 15 minutes per response, including time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding the burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project (0348-0040), Washington, DC 20503.

PLEASE DO NOT RETURN YOUR COMPLETED FORM TO THE OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET. SEND IT TO THE ADDRESS PROVIDED BY THE SPONSORING AGENCY.

NOTE: Certain of these assurances may not be applicable to your project or program. If you have questions, please contact the awarding agency. Further, certain Federal awarding agencies may require applicants to certify to additional assurances. If such is the case, you will be notified.

As the duly authorized representative of the applicant, I certify that the applicant:

1. Has the legal authority to apply for Federal assistance and the institutional, managerial and financial capability (including funds sufficient to pay the non-Federal share of project cost) to ensure proper planning, management and completion of the project described in this application.

2. Will give the awarding agency, the Comptroller General of the United States and, if appropriate, the State, through any authorized representative, access to and the right to examine all records, books, papers, or documents related to the award; and will establish a proper accounting system in accordance with generally accepted accounting standards or agency directives.

3. Will establish safeguards to prohibit employees from using their positions for a purpose that constitutes or presents the appearance of personal or organizational conflict of interest, or personal gain.

4. Will initiate and complete the work within the applicable time frame after receipt of approval of the awarding agency.

5. Will comply with the Intergovernmental Personnel Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. §§4728-4763) relating to prescribed standards for merit systems for programs funded under one of the 19 statutes or regulations specified in Appendix A of OPM’s Standards for a Merit System of Personnel Administration (5 C.F.R. 900, Subpart F).

6. Will comply with all Federal statutes relating to nondiscrimination. These include but are not limited to: (a) Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (P.L. 88-352) which prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color or national origin; (b) Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, as amended (20 U.S.C. §§1681-1683, and 1685-1686), which prohibits discrimination on the basis of sex; (c) Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended (29 U.S.C. §794), which prohibits discrimination on the basis of handicaps; (d) the Age Discrimination Act of 1975, as amended (42 U.S.C. §§6101-6107), which prohibits discrimination on the basis of age; (e) the Drug Abuse Office and Treatment Act of 1972 (P.L. 92-255), as amended, relating to nondiscrimination on the basis of drug abuse; (f) the Comprehensive Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism Prevention, Treatment and Rehabilitation Act of 1970 (P.L. 91-616), as amended, relating to nondiscrimination on the basis of alcohol abuse or alcoholism; (g) §§523 and 527 of the Public Health Service Act of 1912 (42 U.S.C. §§290 dd-3 and 290 ee-3), as amended, relating to confidentiality of alcohol and drug abuse patient records; (h) Title VIII of the Civil Rights Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. §§3601 et seq.), as amended, relating to nondiscrimination in the sale, rental or financing of housing; (i) any other nondiscrimination provisions in the specific statute(s) under which application for Federal assistance is being made; and, (j) the requirements of any other nondiscrimination statute(s) which may apply to the application.

7. Will comply, or has already complied, with the requirements of Titles II and III of the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 (P.L. 91-646) which provide for fair and equitable treatment of persons displaced or whose property is acquired as a result of Federal or federally-assisted programs. These requirements apply to all interests in real property acquired for project purposes regardless of Federal participation in purchases.

8. Will comply, as applicable, with provisions of the Hatch Act (5 U.S.C. §§1501-1508 and 7324-7328) which limit the political activities of employees whose principal employment activities are funded in whole or in part with Federal funds.

10. Will comply, if applicable, with flood insurance purchase requirements of Section 102(a) of the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 (P.L. 93-234) which requires recipients in a special flood hazard area to participate in the program and to purchase flood insurance if the total cost of insurable construction and acquisition is $10,000 or more.

11. Will comply with environmental standards which may be prescribed pursuant to the following: (a) institution of environmental quality control measures under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (P.L. 91-190) and Executive Order (EO) 11514; (b) notification of violating facilities pursuant to EO 11738; (c) protection of wetlands pursuant to EO 11990; (d) evaluation of flood hazards in floodplains in accordance with EO 11988; (e) assurance of project consistency with the approved State management program developed under the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 (16 U.S.C. §§1451 et seq.); (f) conformity of Federal actions to State (Clean Air) Implementation Plans under Section 176(c) of the Clean Air Act of 1955, as amended (42 U.S.C. §§7401 et seq.); (g) protection of underground sources of drinking water under the Safe Drinking Water Act of 1974, as amended (P.L. 93-523); and, (h) protection of endangered species under the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended (P.L. 93-205).


14. Will comply with P.L. 93-348 regarding the protection of human subjects involved in research, development, and related activities supported by this award of assistance.

15. Will comply with the Laboratory Animal Welfare Act of 1966 (P.L. 89-544, as amended, 7 U.S.C. §§2131 et seq.) pertaining to the care, handling, and treatment of warm blooded animals held for research, teaching, or other activities supported by this award of assistance.

16. Will comply with the Lead-Based Paint Poisoning Prevention Act (42 U.S.C. §§4801 et seq.) which prohibits the use of lead-based paint in construction or rehabilitation of residence structures.

17. Will cause to be performed the required financial and compliance audits in accordance with the Single Audit Act Amendments of 1996 and OMB Circular No. A-133, “Audits of States, Local Governments, and Non-Profit Organizations.”

18. Will comply with all applicable requirements of all other Federal laws, executive orders, regulations, and policies governing this program.

* SIGNATURE OF AUTHORIZED CERTIFYING OFFICIAL

[Signature]

* APPLICANT ORGANIZATION

Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey

* TITLE

Research Contract Grant Specialist

* DATE SUBMITTED

07/27/2012
**DISCLOSURE OF LOBBYING ACTIVITIES**

Complete this form to disclose lobbying activities pursuant to 31 U.S.C.1352

1. **Type of Federal Action:**
   - [x] a. contract
   - b. grant
   - c. cooperative agreement
   - d. loan
   - e. loan guarantee
   - f. loan insurance

2. **Status of Federal Action:**
   - [x] a. bid/offer/application
   - b. initial award
   - [ ] c. post-award

3. **Report Type:**
   - [x] a. initial filing
   - [ ] b. material change

4. **Name and Address of Reporting Entity:**
   - [x] Prime
   - [ ] Sub-Awardee
   - **Name:** Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey
   - **Street 1:** 4 Rutgers Plaza
   - **City:** New Brunswick
   - **State:** NJ
   - **Zip:** 08901-6559

5. **Congressional District, if known:** NJ-006

6. **Federal Department/Agency:**
   - [ ] N/A

7. **Federal Program Name/Description:**
   - Teacher Incentive Fund
   - CFDA Number, if applicable: 24.374

8. **Federal Action Number, if known:**
   - [ ]

9. **Award Amount, if known:**
   - $ [ ]

10. **a. Name and Address of Lobbying Registrant:**
    - **Prefix:** [ ]
    - **First Name:** [ ]
    - **Middle Name:** [ ]
    - **Last Name:** N/A
    - **Suffix:** [ ]
    - **Street 1:** [ ]
    - **City:** [ ]
    - **State:** [ ]
    - **Zip:** [ ]

11. **b. Individual Performing Services** (including address if different from No. 10a)
    - **Prefix:** [ ]
    - **First Name:** [ ]
    - **Middle Name:** [ ]
    - **Last Name:** N/A
    - **Suffix:** [ ]
    - **Street 1:** [ ]
    - **City:** [ ]
    - **State:** [ ]
    - **Zip:** [ ]

12. **Information requested through this form is authorized by title 31 U.S.C. section 1352. This disclosure of lobbying activities is a material representation of fact upon which reliance was placed by the tier above when the transaction was made or entered into. This disclosure is required pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1352. This information will be reported to the Congress semi-annually and will be available for public inspection. Any person who fails to file the required disclosure shall be subject to a civil penalty of not less than $10,000 and not more than $100,000 for each such failure.**

13. **Signature:**
    - Cassandra Burrows

14. **Name:**
    - **Prefix:** [ ]
    - **First Name:** Cassandra
    - **Middle Name:** [ ]
    - **Last Name:** Burrows
    - **Suffix:** [ ]

15. **Title:** Research Contract Grant Specialist

16. **Telephone No.:** 648-932-6002

17. **Date:** 07/21/2012

18. **Federal Use Only:**

Authorized for Local Reproduction
Standard Form - LLL (Rev. 7-07)
NOTICE TO ALL APPLICANTS

The purpose of this enclosure is to inform you about a new provision in the Department of Education’s General Education Provisions Act (GEPA) that applies to applicants for new grant awards under Department programs. This provision is Section 427 of GEPA, enacted as part of the Improving America’s Schools Act of 1994 (Public Law (P.L.) 103-382).

To Whom Does This Provision Apply?

Section 427 of GEPA affects applicants for new grant awards under this program. ALL APPLICANTS FOR NEW AWARDS MUST INCLUDE INFORMATION IN THEIR APPLICATIONS TO ADDRESS THIS NEW PROVISION IN ORDER TO RECEIVE FUNDING UNDER THIS PROGRAM.

(If this program is a State-formula grant program, a State needs to provide this description only for projects or activities that it carries out with funds reserved for State-level uses. In addition, local school districts or other eligible applicants that apply to the State for funding need to provide this description in their applications to the State for funding. The State would be responsible for ensuring that the school district or other local entity has submitted a sufficient section 427 statement as described below.)

What Does This Provision Require?

Section 427 requires each applicant for funds (other than an individual person) to include in its application a description of the steps the applicant proposes to take to ensure equitable access to, and participation in, its Federally-assisted program for students, teachers, and other program beneficiaries with special needs. This provision allows applicants discretion in developing the required description. The statute highlights six types of barriers that can impede equitable access or participation: gender, race, national origin, color, disability, or age. Based on local circumstances, you should determine whether these or other barriers may prevent your students, teachers, etc. from such access or participation in, the Federally-funded project or activity. The description in your application of steps to be taken to overcome these barriers need not be lengthy; you may provide a clear and succinct description of how you plan to address those barriers that are applicable to your circumstances. In addition, the information may be provided in a single narrative, or, if appropriate, may be discussed in connection with related topics in the application.

Section 427 is not intended to duplicate the requirements of civil rights statutes, but rather to ensure that, in designing their projects, applicants for Federal funds address equity concerns that may affect the ability of certain potential beneficiaries to fully participate in the project and to achieve to high standards. Consistent with program requirements and its approved application, an applicant may use the Federal funds awarded to it to eliminate barriers it identifies.

What are Examples of How an Applicant Might Satisfy the Requirement of This Provision?

The following examples may help illustrate how an applicant may comply with Section 427.

(1) An applicant that proposes to carry out an adult literacy project serving, among others, adults with limited English proficiency, might describe in its application how it intends to distribute a brochure about the proposed project to such potential participants in their native language.

(2) An applicant that proposes to develop instructional materials for classroom use might describe how it will make the materials available on audio tape or in braille for students who are blind.

(3) An applicant that proposes to carry out a model science program for secondary students and is concerned that girls may be less likely than boys to enroll in the course, might indicate how it intends to conduct “outreach” efforts to girls, to encourage their enrollment.

We recognize that many applicants may already be implementing effective steps to ensure equity of access and participation in their grant programs, and we appreciate your cooperation in responding to the requirements of this provision.

Estimated Burden Statement for GEPA Requirements

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless such collection displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is 1894-0005. The time required to complete this information collection is estimated to average 1.5 hours per response, including the time to review instructions, search existing data resources, gather the data needed, and complete and review the information collection. If you have any comments concerning the accuracy of the time estimate(s) or suggestions for improving this form, please write to: U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20202-4537.

Optional - You may attach 1 file to this page.
School System Improvement (SSI) Project

Meeting the General Education Provisions Act (GEPA) Section 427 Requirements

The School System Improvement (SSI) Project is intended to improve the quality of education in high poverty schools by revolutionizing educator evaluation and connecting it to performance-based compensation as part of a sophisticated human capital management system. Students in the LEAs of the SSI Project face multiple barriers to success including a high rate of staff turnover among effective teachers capable of helping them succeed. Helping students with special needs is, therefore, a central tenant of the project. By incentivizing effective instruction and leadership, and by providing job-embedded and individualized professional development, the project will make access to high quality instruction less susceptible to bias based on gender, race, national origin, color, disability, or age. As designers of the Classroom Strategies Scale (CSS) and Instructional Learning Opportunities Guidance System (My iLOGS), the Co-Principal Investigators have a record of designing measurement instruments that meaningfully include all students by focusing on the inputs of educator effectiveness, rather than solely the outputs that can be influenced by a myriad of other factors (e.g., opportunity, SES, health status). The main output for characterizing educator effectiveness has historically been summative tests that, while important, contain too many limitations to be used in isolation. Some potential limitations for student test performance include requirements (a) of visual and graphomotor acuity, (b) of fluency with cultural assumptions of the test items, and (c) of native language skills necessary to interpret tests that are not intended to reflect language abilities. These limitations make it difficult to draw inferences about the achievement of all students, and impossible to draw inferences about the effectiveness of many educators, using only one measure. The educator evaluation systems of the SSI Project incorporate multiple measures from multiple formats,
providing a diverse population of teachers and principals varied opportunities to show their effectiveness.

The leadership of the SSI Project, in addition to ensuring equitable access to the products used in the project, has developed a plan to work with populations that are diverse with regard to gender, race, national origin, color, disability, and age. New Jersey is a heavily populated and diverse state, and our five LEAs represent a cross-section of high poverty districts. Sensitive to assessment issues related to ethnic and language minority students, the SSI Project includes consultants who are experts in the areas of assessment of minorities (Dr. Frank Worrell) and assessment of English Language Learners (Dr. Maria Adelaida Restrepo). Measurement of student growth in achievement is a significant part of both educator evaluation systems, so it is critical that scores used in this area are interpreted within the context of their strengths and limitations.

Lastly, the leadership of the SSI Project will hire persons to support the project in a nondiscriminatory manner. The leadership team (Project Director and Co-Principal Investigators) is already a diverse group with regard to gender, race, and national origin, and project leadership will strive to hire additional high quality personnel, regardless of these three factors, or of color, disability, or age.
CERTIFICATION REGARDING LOBBYING

Certification for Contracts, Grants, Loans, and Cooperative Agreements

The undersigned certifies, to the best of his or her knowledge and belief, that:

(1) No Federal appropriated funds have been paid or will be paid, by or on behalf of the undersigned, to any person for influencing or attempting to influence an officer or employee of an agency, a Member of Congress, an officer or employee of Congress, or an employee of a Member of Congress in connection with the awarding of any Federal contract, the making of any Federal grant, the making of any Federal loan, the entering into of any cooperative agreement, and the extension, continuation, renewal, amendment, or modification of any Federal contract, grant, loan, or cooperative agreement.

(2) If any funds other than Federal appropriated funds have been paid or will be paid to any person for influencing or attempting to influence an officer or employee of any agency, a Member of Congress, an officer or employee of Congress, or an employee of a Member of Congress in connection with this Federal contract, grant, loan, or cooperative agreement, the undersigned shall complete and submit Standard Form-LLL, “Disclosure of Lobbying Activities,” in accordance with its instructions.

(3) The undersigned shall require that the language of this certification be included in the award documents for all subawards at all tiers (including subcontracts, subgrants, and contracts under grants, loans, and cooperative agreements) and that all subrecipients shall certify and disclose accordingly. This certification is a material representation of fact upon which reliance was placed when this transaction was made or entered into. Submission of this certification is a prerequisite for making or entering into this transaction imposed by section 1352, title 31, U.S. Code. Any person who fails to file the required certification shall be subject to a civil penalty of not less than $10,000 and not more than $100,000 for each such failure.

Statement for Loan Guarantees and Loan Insurance

The undersigned states, to the best of his or her knowledge and belief, that:

If any funds have been paid or will be paid to any person for influencing or attempting to influence an officer or employee of any agency, a Member of Congress, an officer or employee of Congress, or an employee of a Member of Congress in connection with this commitment providing for the United States to insure or guarantee a loan, the undersigned shall complete and submit Standard Form-LLL, “Disclosure of Lobbying Activities,” in accordance with its instructions. Submission of this statement is a prerequisite for making or entering into this transaction imposed by section 1352, title 31, U.S. Code. Any person who fails to file the required statement shall be subject to a civil penalty of not less than $10,000 and not more than $100,000 for each such failure.

* APPLICANT’S ORGANIZATION
Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey

* PRINTED NAME AND TITLE OF AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE
Prefix: Ms. * First Name: Cassandra
Last Name: Burrows
Title: Research Contract Grant Specialist

* SIGNATURE: Cassandra Burrows
* DATE: 07/27/2012
SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION
REQUIRED FOR
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION GRANTS

1. Project Director:
   Prefix: Dr.  * First Name: Linda  M.  * Last Name: Reddy  Suffix: PhD
   Address:
   * Street1: 152 Frelinghuysen Rd.
   Street2: Rm. A225
   * City: Piscataway
   County:
   * State: NJ: New Jersey
   * Zip Code: 08854
   * Country: USA: UNITED STATES
   * Phone Number (give area code)  848-445-3945
   Fax Number (give area code)  732-445-4888
   Email Address: lreddy@rci.rutgers.edu

2. Applicant Experience:
   Novice Applicant  ☐ Yes  ☐ No  ☒ Not applicable to this program

3. Human Subjects Research
   Are any research activities involving human subjects planned at any time during the proposed project Period?
   ☐ Yes  ☒ No
   Are ALL the research activities proposed designated to be exempt from the regulations?
   ☐ Yes  ☐ Provide Exemption(s) #:
   ☐ No  ☐ Provide Assurance #, if available:

Please attach an explanation Narrative:
____________________________________________ |
____________________________________________ |
____________________________________________ |
Abstract

The abstract narrative must not exceed one page and should use language that will be understood by a range of audiences. For all projects, include the project title (if applicable), goals, expected outcomes and contributions for research, policy, practice, etc. Include population to be served, as appropriate. For research applications, also include the following:

- Theoretical and conceptual background of the study (i.e., prior research that this investigation builds upon and that provides a compelling rationale for this study)
- Research issues, hypotheses and questions being addressed
- Study design including a brief description of the sample including sample size, methods, principals dependent, independent, and control variables, and the approach to data analysis.

[Note: For a non-electronic submission, include the name and address of your organization and the name, phone number and e-mail address of the contact person for this project.]

You may now Close the Form

You have attached 1 file to this page, no more files may be added. To add a different file, you must first delete the existing file.

* Attachment: [Part 3 Abstract.pdf]  [Delete Attachment]  [View Attachment]
Project Abstract

SCHOOL SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT (SSI) PROJECT

U.S. Department of Education Teacher Incentive Fund (TIF) Program CFDA 84.374A

Project Director: Linda A. Reddy

Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey, a non-profit 501(c)(3) organization, proposes to partner with four high poverty school districts in New Jersey, each its own local education agency (LEA), for a grant under the General Teacher Incentive Fund (TIF) Competition. The School System Improvement (SSI) Project represents Asbury Park, Hillside, Lakewood, and North Plainfield School Districts. This group application includes 22 schools, all of which meet the definition of high poverty schools (i.e., 73% of the 10,000 students receive free or reduced lunch subsidies). Furthermore, SSI Project schools do not meet desired academic progress based on New Jersey’s statewide achievement tests and have high staff turnover rates (25%) compared to the NJ rate of teacher turnover (5%).

The SSI Project meets Absolute Priorities 1 and 2 and Competitive Preference Priority 4. The SSI Project is a new applicant for the TIF grant program. Neither Rutgers University, nor any of the LEAs in this proposal, have previously applied for a TIF grant, nor are any currently implementing: (1) a comprehensive human capital management system (HCMS), (2) a performance-based compensation system (PBCS) or (3) a rigorous educator evaluation system (EES). Thus, the SSI Project will significantly increase the organizational capacity and instructional improvement visions of the high needs schools. Additionally, no LEA from New Jersey has ever received funding from the TIF grant program.

The SSI Project will implement a comprehensive HCMS that includes rigorous (highly reliable and valid) educator evaluation systems (EES) for both teachers and principals that are
familiar to and strongly supported by participating LEAs, who have used components such as the Danielson Framework for years. The EES will generate scores that inform four performance levels of effectiveness to identify and reward teacher and principal effectiveness through a differentiated PBCS. The EES will inform empirically supported professional development for teachers and principals. The HCMS and PBCS will help these high poverty schools attract, develop, motivate, and retain the most effective teachers and principals. Together, the components of the SSI Project will build LEA-wide capacity and effectiveness for long term sustainability.

Through implementation of the proposed HCMS, the SSI Project will accomplish and measure progress on Absolute Priorities 1 and 2 through the following eight objectives nested within three goals. Goal 1 is to: Increase the percent of effective teachers, and includes the following three objectives: (a) Increase effectiveness of current teachers, (b) Increase the recruitment of teachers who are effective or likely to be effective, and (c) Increase the percent of effective teachers retained. Goal 2 is to: Increase the percent of effective principals, includes the following three objectives: (a) Increase effectiveness of current principals, (b) Increase the recruitment of principals who are effective or likely to be effective, and (c) Increase the percent of effective principals retained. Goal 3 is to: Increase student growth in achievement, and includes the following two objectives: (a) Increase student growth in achievement at the classroom and school level, and (b) Increase student growth in achievement across schools.

Under this TIF grant proposal, the SSI Project requests $43,975,719 from the U.S. Department of Education for a five-year grant that will maintain the proposed HCMS in the four LEAs for the duration of the project period and build sustainability for its continuation after the project period.
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THE SCHOOL SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT (SSI) PROJECT

U.S. Department of Education Teacher Incentive Fund (TIF) Program CFDA 84.374A

New Jersey’s education system represents a diverse landscape of quality. On the Global Report Card’s (2007) comparison of national district rankings, districts in New Jersey (NJ) ranged from the 18th to 80th percentile for Math and Reading proficiencies, indicating that NJ includes many academically underperforming school districts (LEAs). Complicating matters in these LEAs are high correlations between poor academic performance, high poverty rates, and high staff turnover rates. Despite these findings, no high needs school district in NJ has received a TIF grant; therefore none of our four LEAs has previously participated in a TIF project.

The School System Improvement (SSI) Project was formed to increase school organizational effectiveness in four high poverty LEAs in NJ. The LEAs of Asbury Park, Hillside, Lakewood, and North Plainfield School Districts have joined with Rutgers, The State University of NJ to enhance school capacity, instructional quality, and leadership for promoting student achievement for 22 schools, all of which meet the TIF definition of high-poverty (i.e., 50% or more of students receive free or reduced lunch). The SSI Project is a natural extension of the school reform efforts that the four LEAs and Rutgers University have had for numerous years (see Section E Management Plan pages 48-58).

In Part 6 Other Required Attachments, High Need Documentation presents the high poverty levels of the schools in each LEA. Across the 22 schools, 73% of students receive free or reduced lunch subsidies. Additionally, the schools do not meet desired academic progress; in language arts between 16% and 84% of students performed below proficient, and in mathematics this range was 23% to 74% (see Table A in Part 6). The four LEAs also exhibit high staff turnover rates (i.e., average 25%) in comparison to the NJ average rate of 5%.
The SSI Project team represents a committed partnership between four high poverty LEAs (see Commitment Letters in Part 6) and Rutgers University. The SSI Project team includes school-based administrators, teachers, and staff, as well as Rutgers project training staff (see Section E Management Plan pages 48-58). Grounded in organizational systems theory and research, the SSI Project views schools as organizations that are guided by strong leadership, strategic management of human capital, data based decision making, and strong education improvement plans (Childress, Elmore, Grossman, & Johnson, 2007). The SSI Project aims to enhance the overall capacity and effectiveness of schools as organizations through collaborative “top-down” system change (policy decision making, infrastructure) that is informed by input of all stakeholders, rigorous measurement using multiple data sources (students, teachers, and principals), and empirically supported professional development (PD). The SSI Project recognizes that high poverty schools have unique community, school, classroom, and student characteristics and needs that will guide project decision-making and efforts. Thus, school-specific factors and contexts will inform all aspects of project implementation and evaluation.

SSI Project Priorities

Under the 2012 TIF grant program, the SSI Project will achieve the following two Absolute Priorities and one Competitive Preference Priority.

**Absolute Priority 1.** The SSI Project team has developed a comprehensive Human Capital Management System (HCMS) with a rigorous Educator Evaluation System (EES) at its center. The SSI Project team has developed a comprehensive HCMS that includes rigorous teacher evaluation and principal evaluation systems, empirically supported PD, and a performance-based compensation system (PBCS) to attract and retain the most effective teachers
and principals in the participating high-need schools. The framework for the SSI Project HCMS is detailed in Section A of the proposal (pages 7-16).

**Absolute Priority 2.** The SSI Project team has developed an LEA-wide rigorous EES focused in part on student growth in achievement. The SSI Project team has designed an LEA-wide EES that will generate highly reliable and valid data for informing educators’ policies and practices that lead to improved student growth in achievement, and that is flexible to existing LEA educator and student achievement evaluation practices. The framework for the SSI Project EES is detailed in Section B of the proposal (pages 16-37).

**Competitive Preference Priority 4.** The SSI Project is a new applicant for the TIF grant program. None of the LEAs in this proposal have previously applied for a TIF grant, nor are currently implementing: (1) a comprehensive and organized HCMS, (2) a PBCS, or (3) a rigorous and comprehensive EES. Thus, the SSI Project will significantly increase the organizational capacity and instructional improvement visions of the high needs schools.

**SSI Project Goals and Objectives**

To accomplish and measure progress on Absolute Priorities 1 and 2, **three goals** are outlined: (1) Increase the percent of effective teachers through rigorous evaluation, empirically supported PD, and differentiated incentives; (2) Increase the percent of effective principals through rigorous evaluation, empirically supported PD, and differentiated incentives; and (3) Increase student growth in achievement. These goals are depicted in Figure 1.

**Goal 1. Increase Percent of Effective Teachers**

**Objective 1. Increase effectiveness of current teachers.** The SSI Project’s teacher evaluation system (TES) will measure teacher effectiveness indicators of student growth and
Figure 1. SSI Project Goals and Theory of Change
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teacher competence (see Figure 3 page 18). In addition to measuring the percent of effective teachers currently within each LEA, the SSI Project will monitor the implementation process of teacher PD and differentiated PBCS at each school. It is anticipated that implementation of the proposed TES will inform PD and consequently enhance the effectiveness of human capital resources already at each LEA. The SSI Project will collect and analyze teachers’ and principals’ input on the usefulness and acceptability of the EES, PD, and PBCS during Project Years 2-5.

**Objective 2. Increase the recruitment of teachers who are effective or likely to be effective.** The EES will guide the recruitment and hiring practices of new teachers, as well as measure the effectiveness of newly hired teachers throughout the course of their first year of teaching using the data described in Objective 1. The SSI Project team will assess and compare qualification data (degrees and certifications) on new applicants to hired teachers to determine the quality of the applicant pool attracted by the schools during the project. The SSI Project team will examine through focus groups and on-line surveys principals’ and newly hired teachers’ perceptions of the effect of the SSI Project on teacher recruitment.
Objective 3. Increase the percent of effective teachers retained. The SSI Project team will analyze teacher retention and turnover across the LEAs and high poverty schools on an annual basis in the context of the effectiveness data described in Objective 1. The SSI Project will measure retention rates using administrative data on staff changes, including exit interview data, and will assess the effectiveness of retained teachers using the TES data obtained in Objective 1. The SSI Project team also will compare past retention data among teachers determined to be effective or not effective using previous practices.

Goal 2. Increase Percent of Effective Principals

Objective 1. Increase effectiveness of current principals. The SSI Project team will measure the effectiveness of principals as defined in this proposal through indicators of student growth and principal competence (see Figure 4 page 33). In addition to measuring the percent of effective principals, the SSI Project team will monitor the ongoing implementation process of the principal evaluation system (PES), principal PD, and differentiated PBCS at each school. As noted, the SSI Project team will collect and analyze teachers’ and principals’ input on the usefulness and acceptability of the PES, PD, and PBCS during Project Years 2-5.

Objective 2. Increase the recruitment of principals who are effective or likely to be effective. The SSI Project PES will measure the effectiveness of newly hired principals at the end of their first year using the data described in Objective 1 in relation to their professional qualifications (degrees and certifications) and experience prior to hiring. The SSI Project team will assess and compare qualification data on new applicants to hired principals to determine the quality of the applicant pool attracted by the schools during the project. The SSI Project team will examine through focus groups and surveys teachers’ and newly hired principals’ perceptions of the effect of the SSI Project on principal recruitment.
Objective 3. Increase the percent of effective principals retained. The SSI Project team will analyze principal retention and turnover across the LEAs and high poverty schools on an annual basis in the context of the effectiveness data described in Objective 1. The SSI Project will measure retention rates using administrative data on staff changes, including exit interview data, and will assess the effectiveness of retained principals using the SSI Project principal evaluation data obtained in Objective 1. The SSI Project team also will compare past retention data among previously LEA determined low and high effective (performing) principals.

Goal 3. Increase Student Growth in Achievement

Objective 1: Increase student growth in achievement at the classroom and school level. The SSI Project team will analyze classroom and school level student growth in achievement using standardized testing and additional measures (e.g., district-specific tests). The team will also examine achievement growth scores for each content area, grade, and student subgroup (e.g., special education populations, general education) to assess the possible differentiated impact of the project in relation to implementation fidelity at the classroom and school level.

Objective 2: Increase student growth in achievement across schools. The SSI Project team will analyze annual statewide achievement test scores across schools (elementary, middle, and high school) in the project. In addition to measuring overall SSI Project progress, the SSI Project team will also examine achievement growth scores for each content area, grade, and student subgroup (e.g., special education versus non-special education populations) to assess the possible differentiated impact of the overall SSI Project in relation to implementation fidelity.

Section A: Coherent and Comprehensive Human Capital Management System

To meet these priorities and performance goals, the SSI Project will implement a comprehensive HCMS that includes a highly reliable and valid EES (see Section B pages 16-38).
Grounded in organizational theory, the proposed HCMS emphasizes the **identification** of highly effective teachers and principals and the **hiring and placement** of key staff at all levels of an LEA (e.g., classroom, school, district office). The SSI Project also recognizes the importance of strategic management of human capital in LEAs throughout all processes of an HCMS. The proposed HCMS is closely linked to each LEA’s overall instructional improvement visions for enhancing the overall student academic performance and growth in schools. The roles and functions of key school personnel needed to effectively execute the HCMS adhere to current policies from the NJ Department of Education and the Teacher Union. During Project Year 1, the proposed HCMS will be tailored to meet each LEA’s specific needs.

At the heart of an effective education HCMS lies the identification of highly effective teachers and principals. The non-profit organization, Strategic Management of Human Capital (SMHC; Odden & Kelly, 2008) highlights the necessity of an education system possessing top talent and high quality human capital at all levels. This would be considered a strategic vertical emphasis on talent or human capital that is ubiquitous throughout an education system’s hierarchy and closely aligned with LEA instructional improvement plans (Gratton & Truss, 2003). Likewise, strategic human capital management is horizontally emphasized across key decision-making processes (e.g., recruitment, placement, induction/mentoring, professional development, compensation). The primary method for empowering the identification of effective teachers and principals is an LEA’s EES. A rigorous EES that consists of empirically supported measures of teacher and principal effectiveness subsequently directs an LEA’s recruitment, development, and retention practices, which are key components of an educational HCMS. The **proposed EES will significantly inform HCMS decision making and LEA-wide policies.** It will be implemented in Project Years 2-5. Figure 2 presents the theoretical model that guides the
SSI Project’s HCMS. The central activity of the model is to **Define Competence**, which has been done by describing the SSI Project’s EES in detail in Section B (pages 16-37). The other main pieces of the HCMS, recruiting, developing, and retaining competence, are dependent on this definition and operationalization of educator competence.

**Recruit Competence.** Historically, many high needs districts (i.e., high-poverty, low-achieving districts) have difficulty recruiting effective teachers and principals (Ingersoll, 2003; Lankford, Loeb & Wyckoff, 2002). Thus, strategic recruitment methods are paramount for the SSI Project LEAs to attract and hire top talent among teachers and administrators into their

*Figure 2. SSI Project Human Capital Management System Theoretical Model*
electronic and printed mediums to recruit effective educators and principals by describing the key competencies, instructional improvement vision, PD, and compensation system. Second, marketing and recruitment will be accomplished through collaborative partnerships with top universities and colleges that train highly effective educators and principals. The SSI Project LEAs have established partnerships with universities (e.g., Rutgers, Fairleigh Dickinson, Seton Hall, and Montclair State) that include top education training programs in NJ. Third, the SSI Project will market and recruit teachers and principals from Teach for America, The New Teacher Project, and New Leaders for New Schools, which are well known recruitment organizations that work with top universities and colleges across the nation. Based on participating LEAs’ staffing needs, every effort will be made to recruit a diverse set of candidates for staffing to fill high priority content areas (e.g., reading, mathematics). Fourth, hiring strategies will consist of specific screening, selection criteria, and interview procedures, as well as a compensation system that are closely aligned with each LEA’s instructional improvement visions and the proposed EES. For hiring, demo lessons as evidence of teaching effectiveness, strategic instructional management plans as evidence of principal effectiveness, and/or past student growth in achievement data will be used. Finally, placement decisions will be carefully considered within and across school staffing needs. The SSI Project strategies will include placement of talent: (1) based on content expertise, (2) as cohorts in schools to enhance capacity impact, and (3) evenly distributed across schools within LEAs. Collectively, these strategies have been found to be highly effective in building school effectiveness and leading to improved student achievement growth (Odden, 2008).

**Develop Competence.** To maintain high quality teacher and principal performance, an LEA must strategically develop and motivate top talent in ways that support the overall goals of
the participating LEAs. Therefore, an adequate support system that generates targeted PD linked to the EES for its constituents is necessary to ensure effective teachers and principals continue to be effective. The SSI Project will include three elements for motivating and developing top school personnel: (1) induction and mentoring, (2) PD, and (3) instructional performance monitoring to inform compensation and career development. The three elements will be closely aligned to LEAs’ instructional improvement vision, LEA-wide policies and the proposed EES.

The processes of induction and mentorship are critical for developing and retaining effective school personnel. Induction and mentorship will focus on helping new teachers and principals to develop the core competencies of instruction and classroom behavioral management in line with the LEA’s vision of instructional improvement. Likewise, mentorship will focus on helping newly hired teachers and principals to learn the LEA’s instructional improvement vision. School-based Master Mentor Teachers will be hired at each participating school and be responsible for the induction and mentoring of teachers and new principals at each school. Also, Rutgers-based Leadership Teachers will provide training, support, and mentorship to all school-based Master Mentor Teachers and work with individual career teachers at each TIF qualifying schools as needed (see Section E Management Plan). To help support principals at each school, Rutgers-based Leadership Principals will provide training, support, and mentorship to all school-based principals and administrative leaders.

SSI Project PD system will be aligned with all core features of effective PD, incorporate existing, empirically supported PD programs of participating LEAs, and advance existing programs by integrating job-embedded personalized PD grounded in classroom observations, teacher self-monitoring, and instructional coaching. For principals, PD will focus on core components and key processes of effective leadership (see Section C PD pages 37-46). Research
has shown that job-embedded, personalized PD can be highly effective at changing instructional and leadership practices that can improve student achievement (Cohen & Hill, 2001; Leithwood et al., 2004). Such PD will be informed by the EES and highly motivating for school personnel.

Following the SSI Project’s targeted PD and mentorship, the EES also will serve as a method for teacher and principal performance monitoring. **Performance monitoring** will help teachers and principals identify the use of best practices and track their PD goal progress. Also, performance monitoring will help guide teachers’ and principals’ career development paths and motivate them to grow professionally. EES guided teacher and principal performance monitoring will inform compensation, tenure, and a range of HCMS decisions in SSI Project schools.

**Retain Competence.** The SSI Project will include four elements for retaining top school personnel: (1) induction and mentoring, (2) instructional and leadership performance monitoring, (3) additional PD, and (4) differentiated compensation and career development. As mentioned, these four elements will be closely aligned to LEAs’ instructional improvement visions, LEA-wide policies, and the EES and have been shown to impact retention (Odden, 2008). For example, formal induction and ongoing mentoring during the first four years of teaching have been found to influence retention especially in high needs districts (Odden, 2008). Also, instructional and leadership performance monitoring combined with PD and career path opportunities will help SSI Project LEAs identify those educators who display exceptional practices from those educators who display insufficient instructional practices. Likewise, **EES-informed differentiated compensation** will recognize and reward the best performing educators. Also, EES-intensive certification training and supervision will enhance principals’ and observers’ proficiency (and therefore, reliability) in using the EES, formulating effective instructional improvement plans from EES data for teachers.
Performance-Based Compensation System

The SSI Project will implement a Design 1 PBCS to attract and retain the most effective teachers and principals in participating LEAs during Project Years 3-5. The proposed EES will be implemented LEA-wide in Project Years 2-5. The EES will identify effective teachers and principals who will then be compensated and recognized through the PBCS. The PBCS has been designed in collaboration with LEA administrative leadership and teachers at each LEA. During Project Year 1, the proposed EES and PBCS are aligned with Allan Odden’s model, tailored to meet the specific needs of the LEA. LEA administrators and teachers are strongly committed to the PBCS (see Commitment Letters in Part 6) and provided valuable input (see Section D Involvement of Educators pages 46-48). No LEA is currently implementing a PBCS.

The PBCS compensates teachers and principals identified by the EES as Effective or Highly Effective. The EES will inform both financial incentives through the PBCS and nonfinancial incentives (e.g., public announcements, awards) for effective teachers and principals. Nonfinancial incentives for effectiveness may include LEA-wide and school level performance awards. Based on theory and research, nonfinancial incentives such as school-wide performance awards are important for promoting professional collaboration, motivation, collegiality, and alignment of organizational resources with instructional improvement goals.

As recommended by the Center for Educational Compensation Reform and HCMS scholars (Odden, 2008), teachers and principals identified by the EES as “effective” will receive a 3% bonus (non-salary base adjustment) and teachers and principals identified as “highly effective” will receive a 5% bonus based on the median salary for teachers or principals at each LEA. For example, the median salary for teachers at North Plainfield is $59,190. “Effective”
teachers would receive a bonus of $1,775.7 and “Highly Effective” teachers would receive a bonus of $2,959 (see Table B in Part 6 for projected distributions by performance levels).

This performance rubric is strongly supported by the LEAs and aligned with the recommendations of the 2011 NJ Educator Evaluation Task Force. The EES scores will be linked to four performance levels of effectiveness: Not Effective, Developing, Effective, and Highly Effective. The rubric also parallels that of the Danielson Framework for Teaching used in the EES, and is familiar to the LEAs (see Section F Sustainability pages 58-60).

**HCMS Alignment with LEA’s Vision of Instructional Improvement**

The proposed HCMS is closely aligned with each LEA’s instructional improvement vision and organization goals (see Commitment Letters in Part 6). In the Spring of 2012, LEA leadership and Rutgers staff met numerous times to discuss LEA goals and needs in the designing of the proposed HCMS. For example, North Plainfield’s *vision of instructional improvement* closely follows the Danielson Framework for Teaching by targeting (1) instructional planning, (2) instructional process, (3) assessment-based instruction, and (4) PD. LEA leaders reported a strong desire to incorporate technology and innovations to improve teachers’ instructional practices and curriculum alignment to the common core standards for math and language arts literacy. These goals are aligned with the proposed EES and PD system.

Visions of instructional improvement from the other three LEAs are also closely aligned with the SSI Project. Like North Plainfield, Asbury Park closely follows the Danielson Framework for Teaching. Their goals are: (1) district reorganization leading to improved curriculum management, (2) student assessment and program evaluation, and (3) enhanced educator evaluation methods linked to a PD system. Since 2010, Asbury Park has been implementing a three phase approach to accomplishing this vision, which includes: (1) aligning
educational goals from the student level to the community level, (2) improving educator
evaluation to meet these goals, and (3) preparing the leadership necessary to carry out these
aspirations. The Asbury Park School District is strongly committed to expanding their current
evaluation efforts and is in full support of the proposed EES.

Hillside School District’s vision of instructional improvement includes four key
competencies and behaviors: (1) content area knowledge, (2) pedagogical capabilities, (3)
communication skills, and (4) professionalism. Hillside’s goals are: (1) continue to improve
academic growth of all students and in particular increase math scores for 3rd through 8th graders
by 5% through the adoption of a new math curriculum, expanded professional development, and
teacher coaching model, (2) increase utilization of technology to enhance instructional
effectiveness and alignment of curriculum to common core standards, (3) improve
communication and outreach to all stakeholders through the use of technology, and (4) increase
minority recruitment of teachers and professional staff (goals of the proposed HCMS).

Lakewood’s vision of instructional improvement involves moving toward data driven
instruction that can identify where each student is academically, where they need to be, and what
teachers can do to get them there. To achieve this, the district is aligning their curriculum to a
rigorous K-8 assessment system that will be linked to specific teacher interventions to support
student achievement. A key component of this vision is the creation of a positive climate for
reform and professional growth. Their vision matches the proposed HCMS’ systemic and
organizational model for affecting school reform via student and teacher assessment methods.

Collectively, the four LEAs’ instructional improvement visions and organizational goals
are strongly aligned with the proposed HMCS and SSI Project priorities and performance
objectives. The SSI Project will include rigorous evaluation systems for teachers and principals,
empirically supported PD, and differentiated compensation to reward and increase teacher and principal effectiveness for improving student growth and achievement. Evidence-based assessment and PD, innovative models of teacher mentorship, and utilization of state-of-the-art technology will be the core features of the proposed HCMS. Additionally, the HCMS is designed to maximize school capacity and sustainability beyond the grant period (see Sections E Management Plan and F Sustainability pages 48-60).

**SSI Project LEAs’ Feasibility and Commitment to Implement HCMS**

The HCMS has been developed in collaboration with LEAs and aligned with LEA instructional improvement visions. The HCMS’s recruitment, development, and retention plans build on existing LEA-wide evaluation and personnel policies. All LEAs have prioritized educator evaluation and initiated systemic changes based on criteria expressed in the Danielson Framework for Teaching. Also, the LEAs have established relationships with local universities and colleges for recruitment efforts, and they have basic induction and mentorship in place. As described in Section D (Involvement of Educators pages 46-48), LEA leadership and teachers are strongly committed to the implementation of the proposed HCMS and believe the HCMS will aid them in achieving their instructional improvement visions and organizational goals.

**B. Rigorous, Valid, and Reliable Educator Evaluation Systems (EES)**

Two EESs, one for teachers and one for principals, are central to the SSI Project. Both evaluation systems include multiple methods and multiple sources of evidence, including student growth on achievement tests to a significant degree, while also considering practices that are critical to being competent as a teacher or principal.

The proposed EESs are strongly influenced by the NJ Educator Effectiveness Task Force’s Interim Report (March, 2011). The task force was composed of nine members with
expertise in and knowledge of education policy, administration, and teaching. The Task Force was formed by Governor Christie in 2010 for the purpose of helping “New Jersey create a new system for evaluating teachers and principals that leads to substantial and lasting improvements in public education” (Task Force, 2011, p. 9). We share the Task Force’s perspective that educator effectiveness evaluation includes both the inputs (i.e., competency as a teacher or principal) and the outputs (i.e., student growth in achievement) of the schooling process, and that both inputs and outputs should be weighted equally. The proposed Teacher Evaluation System (TES) and the Principal Evaluation System (PES) are similar in structure, including multiple sources of highly reliable and valid data. All measurement components of the TES and PES have been reviewed and strongly approved by LEA leadership and educators (see Section D Involvement of Educators pages 46–48).

In congruence with the Task Forces’ recommendations, it is anticipated that the evaluation period of the EES will be for the duration of one year. Observation based data for the EES will be collected during this time (October to June) via four to six formal observations. Student achievement data will also be collected throughout the year and at the beginning of the next school year when standardized test results become available. EES data will be reviewed prior to the beginning of next school year to make HCMS, PBCS, EES, and PD decisions.

**Teacher Evaluation System (TES)**

Teaching facilitates student learning, which can be characterized as positive changes or growth in students’ understanding, as indicated on standardized tests. However, effective teaching is only one of a myriad of factors (e.g., student attendance, nutrition, emotional stability) that contribute to student learning. Student achievement is a distal outcome of educator effectiveness, while teacher competence is a more directly related construct. Teacher competence
can be quantified using direct observations and teacher self-report measures. The TES is equally founded in these two complementary methodologies for characterizing teacher effectiveness.

Figure 3. SSI Project Proposed TES

**TEACHER EVALUATION SYSTEM (TES)**

- **Teacher Competency (50%)**
  - Observations (40%; e.g., Danielson, CSS Observer Form)
  - Teacher Ratings (10%; e.g., MyiLOGS, CSS Teacher Form)

- **Student Growth in Achievement (50%)**
  - Classroom-Level Standardized Testing (40%)
  - Additional Measures (10%; e.g., District Measures)

**TES Framework.** Starting in Year 2 and for each subsequent year, the TES will be implemented LEA-wide and will identify individual teachers as performing in one of four performance levels as indicated by the NJ Task Force (2011): Not Effective, Developing, Effective, and Highly Effective. As indicated in Figure 3, performance levels of effectiveness will be determined by a formula that is based half on Teacher Competency and half on classroom-level Student Growth in Achievement. Of the half that is based on competency, findings from Observations (OBS) will be weighted four to one compared to Teacher Self-Report Ratings (TR). Of the half that is based on classroom-level student growth, Standardized Testing (ST) will
be weighted four to one against Additional Measures (AM). These weights were developed by
the SSI Project leadership team, and are consistent with the recommendations of the New Jersey
Task Force (2011). For each of the four sources of information, a score of one through four will
be assigned annually (1 = Low, 2 = Below Average, 3 = Above Average, 4 = High), with higher
numbers corresponding to better performance based on each measure type. The formula for
determining the teacher’s total score (TTS) in each year will be as follows: \[ TTS = (4 \times OBS) +
(1 \times TR) + (4 \times ST) + (1 \times AM) \]. This system of combining data again follows the
recommendations of the Task Force (2011). Table 1, demonstrates total scores ranging from 10
to 40, and map to the four performance levels.

\[ \text{Table 1. Proposed TES and PES Performance Levels by Score Range} \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Level</th>
<th>Score Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highly Effective</td>
<td>33 to 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>25 to 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing</td>
<td>17 to 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Effective</td>
<td>10 to 16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TES Examples.** For example, Teacher 1 may be found Effective even if she has below
average teaching competence based on direct observations (OBS = 2) and teacher self-report
ratings (TR = 2). This could happen based on high student growth on Standardized Testing (ST =
4) and high student growth on Additional Measures (AM = 4). Her calculations for the year
would be as follows:

\[ TTS = (4 \times OBS) + (1 \times TR) + (4 \times ST) + (1 \times AM) \]
\[ TTS = (4 \times 2) + (1 \times 2) + (4 \times 4) + (1 \times 4) \]
TTS = 8 + 2 + 16 + 4 = 30, Performance Level is Effective

Teacher 2 may also be found Effective, even though his profile is very different. He may have high teaching competence based on direct observations (OBS = 4), but below average competence based on teacher self-report ratings (TR = 2), as well as on student growth on Standardized Testing (ST = 2) and on Additional Measures (AM = 2). His calculations for the year would be as follows:

\[ \text{TTS} = (4 \times \text{OBS}) + (1 \times \text{TR}) + (4 \times \text{ST}) + (1 \times \text{AM}) \]
\[ \text{TTS} = (4 \times 4) + (1 \times 2) + (4 \times 2) + (1 \times 2) \]
\[ \text{TTS} = 16 + 2 + 8 + 2 = 28, \text{ Performance Level is Effective} \]

Teacher 3 may be found Not Effective based on low teaching competence based on direct observations (OBS = 1) and low student growth on Standardized Testing (ST = 1), while receiving high teaching competence based on teacher self-report ratings (TR = 4) and high student growth on Additional Measures (AM = 4). Her calculations for the year would be as follows:

\[ \text{TTS} = (4 \times \text{OBS}) + (1 \times \text{TR}) + (4 \times \text{ST}) + (1 \times \text{AM}) \]
\[ \text{TTS} = (4 \times 1) + (1 \times 4) + (4 \times 1) + (1 \times 4) \]
\[ \text{TTS} = 4 + 4 + 4 + 4 = 16, \text{ Performance level is Not Effective} \]

Our formula ensures that any teacher who is low on classroom-level student growth in Standardized Testing (ST=1) and direct observations of teaching competency (PBS = 1) will be identified by the TES as Not Effective.

**LEA-Wide Implementation.** The SSI Project’s TES is designed to be implemented LEA-wide. It will be used to evaluate the practice of all teachers, including general education, special education, and teachers of English Language Learners (ELLs). Additional measures,
observations, and teacher ratings will be available regardless of grade level, content area, or special student population served by a classroom. Standardized test scores will also be available.

The SSI Project team does not foresee any limitations in evaluating students from any special groups. However, in the event that modifications will need to be considered, the SSI Project team includes leaders and consultants with expertise in general education, special education, and non-academic content, as well as in assessment of minorities, ELLs, and students with disabilities (see Section E Management Plan pages 48-58).

**Proposed TES Measures.** The TES consists of multiple measures to assess both Student Growth in Achievement and Teacher Competency. Student Growth in Achievement is evidenced by performance on large-scale proficiency tests and additional measures currently used by each LEA. Teacher Competency is evidenced by: (1) direct classroom observations (i.e., Danielson Framework of Teaching and Classroom Strategies Scale [CSS] Observer Form) conducted by principals or Master Mentor Teachers and (2) teacher-reported coverage of the NJ Common Core State Standards using MyiLOGS and the CSS Teacher Form.

The TES teacher competency measures are fully aligned with the Interstate Teachers Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC) Core Teaching Standards (see Table C in Part 6). Also, large-scale proficiency tests, additional measures, and direct observations will yield performance levels of teacher effectiveness that will be entered into the aforementioned formulas. While MyiLOGS and the CSS Teacher Form also yield data related to teacher effectiveness (e.g., time on instruction, content coverage, use of instructional practices), the computation of TES performance levels will only include teachers’ timely completion of MyiLOGS and the CSS Teacher Form (i.e., not score data). The rationale for this decision is twofold: (a) timely completion of MyiLOGS and the CSS Teacher Form results in known
beneficial teacher self-monitoring and positive behavior change; and (b) use of credit for timely completion of these two measures (as opposed to credit for higher scores) reduces the potential of teacher self-reporting bias for high-stakes decision making (e.g., tenure, promotion, PBCS).

Given that teacher evaluation involves high stakes decision-making (e.g., dismissal, tenure, promotion, PBCS), it is absolutely critical that measures used to evaluate educators’ effectiveness be of an extremely high quality, so that users can have faith in inferences drawn from their scores. The SSI Project only incorporates instruments yielding scores that have high reliability and validity. The reliability or consistency of scores yielded by an instrument is an essential prerequisite to being able to draw valid inferences. Reliability is often estimated using an index of how well items on a test fit together (e.g., coefficient alpha), or by calculating correlations between administrations at two different times (i.e., test-retest reliability) or between two different raters or observers (e.g., inter-rater reliability or agreement). Investigators conceptualize the construct validity of each instrument using a framework introduced in the Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing (American Educational Research Association [AERA], American Psychological Association [APA], and National Council on Measurement in Education [NCME], 1999), which incorporates multiple forms of evidence indicating that each score represents that which it is intended to represent. The Standards identify four forms of construct validity evidence: (1) content validity, or the degree to which the content of a measure reflects its intended construct; (2) validity based on response processes, or the degree to which the respondents to a measure interact with it as intended; (3) internal structure validity, or the degree to which the various parts of a measure fit together in the way that was intended; and (4) validity based on relations to other variables, or the degree to which scores agree or disagree with scores from measures of similar or dissimilar constructs. A
comprehensive reliability and validity argument typically includes several of these forms of evidence and explains how they are interrelated.

Large Scale Proficiency Tests in NJ. The NJ Assessment of Skills and Knowledge (NJ ASK) is administered to students in NJ 3rd grade through 8th grade, and in 11th grade as the High School Proficiency Assessment (HSPA; NJ Department of Education, 2011). Content areas include language arts literacy (LAL) and mathematics. The NJ ASK is designed to indicate progress students are making in mastering the knowledge and skills described in NJ’s Core Curriculum Content Standards (CCCS), and to fulfill the requirements under the 2001 No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act. Based on NJ ASK scores, students are categorized as Partially Proficient, Proficient, and Advanced Proficient.

The LAL tests cover writing (one persuasive prompt and one explanatory prompt) and reading (Working with Text and Analyzing Text). The reading section includes 18 to 36 multiple-choice questions and 3 to 6 open-ended/constructed response questions per grade level. The LAL tests take between three and four hours to administer.

The reliability and validity argument for the LAL tests of the NJ ASK is good. The tests have adequate reliability as quantified using coefficient alpha (.81 to .84) at the third and fourth grade levels, and good reliability (.87 to .91) at the higher grade levels. Content validity for the tests was confirmed by a New Jersey Teacher Advisory Committee’s critical review of items for alignment to state standards and freedom of bias. Internal structure validity was evidenced by a pattern of correlations shared by scores within content area exceeding correlations between scores from different content areas.

The mathematics tests cover Numbers and Operations; Geometry and Measurement; Patterns and Algebra; and Data Analysis, Probability, and Discrete Mathematics.
mathematics test includes 32 to 35 multiple-choice questions, 6 to 8 short constructed-response items, and 3 extended constructed-response items per grade level. The mathematics tests take a little more than 2 hours to administer.

The reliability and validity argument for the mathematics tests of the NJ ASK is good. The tests have good reliability as quantified using coefficient alpha (.90 to .92) across grade levels. Content validity for the tests was confirmed by a NJ Teacher Advisory Committee’s critical review of items for alignment to state standards and freedom of bias. Internal structure validity was evidenced by a pattern of correlations shared by scores within content area exceeding correlations between scores from different content areas.

Tests at Additional Grade Levels. The SSI Project will include tests of student growth in achievement for all educators (Kindergarten through 12 grade). A competitive proposal will be selected for a vendor to produce tests for Kindergarten, 1st, 2nd, 9th, 10th, and 12th grade levels. Doing so will allow student growth to be measured using highly reliable and valid standardized tests at each grade level (i.e., LEA-wide). The vendor will produce tests similar to the NJ ASK, in order to (1) increase teachers’ and principals’ trust in the student growth data for the TES and PES and (2) enhance the overall psychometric quality and comparability of student growth data LEA-wide (K-12 grades). The addition of these tests is consistent with the NJ Task Force’s (2011) recommendation to “develop assessments capable of generating growth scores in as many additional subjects and grades as appropriate and financially feasible so growth scores can be calculated for more teachers.”

Student Growth in Achievement Model. Incorporating new grade-level tests that are comparable to tests from NJ ASK will ensure that the TES will work equally well across all grades and LEAs. Standardized tests are the most objective tool available for measuring student
growth, and using the same measures in all participating schools is a major strength of the SSI Project. The NJ Department of Education characterizes student growth using student growth percentiles (SGPs; NJ Department of Education, 2012) in the Colorado Model and the four LEAs have experience measuring classroom growth using this model. The use of the Colorado Model represents a second major strength: the model is already used by the participating LEAs.

The Colorado Model characterizes student growth as the difference between achievement tests (i.e., NJ ASK) performance in consecutive years, compared to the projected achievement based on each student’s historical results. According to an August 2011 white paper from The National Center for the Improvement of Educational Assessment (Betebenner, 2011), SGPs (used in the Colorado Model) describe how “typical a student’s growth is by examining his/her current achievement relative to his/her academic peers” (p. 3, Betebenner, 2011). In the simplest case, a student who has only taken one achievement test in the past has her growth compared with the growth of all other students who have obtained that same score at that same grade level (i.e., academic peers). Over the years, as a student develops a longer history of annual achievement testing, more scores are entered into the model to better predict the amount of growth that should be expected. A student with an SGP of 75 showed an improvement over the previous year to a degree that equaled or exceeded the improvement of 75 percent of all other students who had a similar history of achievement performance.

SGPs can be aggregated at the classroom, school, or district level, and reported as median scores indicative of educational effectiveness. In comparison to competing models of student growth, the Betebenner SGP models require neither vertical scaling across grades nor interval scaling within or across grades. The information provided by the SGPs in the Colorado Model is relatively easy to understand, compared to value-added models that may input additional
variables (e.g., demographics) in an attempt to isolate school and teacher effects. The Colorado Model is a good fit within the SSI Project’s TES and PES, which are designed to reflect teacher and principal contributions by combining student growth data with data on educator competencies, rather than attempting to express everything in a single index that may be difficult to interpret.

Additional LEA-Wide Measures. As mentioned, the TES will include additional measures identified as useful by LEAs. While these data are less comparable across SSI Project LEAs, the measures are valued by LEAs and will be included in the EES to an appropriate extent (10% of the total evaluation). To that end, the EES will be customized by district and school to include the measures valued by each. Some of these additional measures include district specific end-of-quarter tests, the Measures of Academic Process (MAP), Star Reading, the Developmental Reading Assessment – Second Edition (DRA-2), Everyday Mathematics, and MyAccess. MAP assessments are adaptive and online, and are available for reading, language arts, mathematics, and science at various grade levels. Star Reading is also an adaptive, online assessment that provides immediate feedback on 36 reading skills across five domains. The DRA-2 is a reading assessment that addresses reading engagement, oral reading fluency, and comprehension, and has a great deal of reliability and validity evidence. Everyday Mathematics is a widely used curriculum that comprehensively covers mathematics skills at kindergarten through sixth grade levels. MyAccess is an online writing assessment that provides immediate feedback and instruction using artificial intelligence. The aforementioned constitute just a sample of the additional measures that will be considered as Additional Measures as part of the EES.

Danielson Framework-Teaching Evaluation Instrument. The LEAs participating in the SSI Project already employ the Danielson Framework in their evaluation of teachers (Danielson,
The Danielson Framework is grounded in a research-based set of components of instruction, the Interstate Teachers Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC) Core Teaching Standards, and a constructivist view of learning and teaching. The Teaching Evaluation Instrument employs observations to evaluate teachers based on seventy-six elements of effective practice, organized into twenty-two components within four domains. The domains include Planning and Preparing for Student Learning (Domain 1), Creating an Environment for Student Learning (Domain 2), Teaching for Student Learning (Domain 3), and Professionalism (Domain 4). On each element, teachers are rated as Distinguished, Proficient, Basic, or Unsatisfactory. Data used to inform the ratings emanate from observations and from portfolio review. The framework is designed to be flexible to fit the needs and preferences of the districts in which it is implemented. Details such as who will serve as evaluator (observer), how many observations will be used, and what evidence warrants advancement along a professional track may vary by LEA (Charlotte Danielson will provide consultative input on the implementation of the Danielson Framework; see letter of support in Part 6). However, the framework promotes high quality assessment by including guidance for making these decisions (e.g., a process for training and certifying the evaluators).

Since the Danielson Framework will influence high stakes decisions for teachers, it is paramount that all persons using the Framework to evaluate teachers use it accurately and reliably. Observer training and calibration for the Danielson Framework will be a rigorous process with multiple methods testing for rater accuracy and high degrees of inter-rater reliability. All observers will be required to undergo a six-day intensive workshop that includes training on the following components: (1) theoretical background of the Danielson Framework, (2) training on how use the framework for observing teachers, (3) critical observer skills and
competencies, and (4) the skills necessary to successfully train future observers. In addition to undergoing the workshop, all Danielson Framework observers will participate in the Teaching Proficiency System, an online training and certification program for the Danielson Framework. Observers will be required to complete the 7.5 hours of online training modules and practice coding videos before undergoing an observer certification test that assesses their accuracy in rating teachings with the framework. To maintain high observer reliability and accuracy, at the start of each project year, all observers will be required to pass recertification tests through the Teachscape system.

The reliability and validity argument for the Danielson Framework – Teaching Evaluation Instrument is good. Based on a large pilot study ($n = 257$ teachers), Sartain et al. (2011) concluded that principals rated teachers reliably at the low end and middle of the scale, and most often agreed with outside observers. Content validity for the indices of the framework is evidenced by principal and teacher testimony that the framework has made conversations more reflective, more evidence-based, less subjective, and more grounded in a shared language about instructional practice and improvement. Validity based on relations to other variables has been evidenced using student achievement as a criterion variable (Kane, Taylor, Tyler, & Wooten, 2010; Sartain et al. 2011). In the Sartain et al. (2011) study, researchers found that student achievement as characterized by value-added scores was higher at each increasing level of teacher performance. In another study, Kane et al. (2010) found that combinations of scores from the instrument have been shown to predict achievement in previous, current, and following years to the expected degrees in both reading (49% to 57% of variance explained) and mathematics (48% to 62% of variance explained).
Classroom Strategy Scale (CSS). The CSS is a brief classroom observation measure grounded in decades of research on instructional and behavioral management practices and aligned with the InTASC core teaching standards. The CSS includes Observer and Teacher Forms. The CSS Observer Form is composed of three assessment stages and the Teacher Form is composed of two assessment stages that include empirically supported items/strategies (e.g., Bender, 2007; Kalis et al., 2007; Marzano, 1988).

The CSS is conducted both during and after classroom observations. During the classroom observation, the observer completes the Stage 1 (Teacher Behavior) assessment, which asks observers to count the frequency at which teachers employ eight behaviors related to instruction and behavior management. Following the observation, observers complete the Stage 2 (Strategy Rating Scales), which consists of a Positive Instructional Strategies (PIS) and Behavioral Management Strategies (BMS) Scales. The PIS scale (26 items) includes a total scale, two composite scales, and five subscales. The BMS scale (25 items) includes a total scale, two composite scales, and four subscales (see Figure A in Part 6).

On the PIS and BMS strategy rating scales, observers rate how often (Frequency Rating) teachers used specific positive instructional and behavioral management strategies on a 7-point Likert scale (1 “never used”, 3 “sometimes used”, 7 “always used”) and then rate how often the teachers should have used each strategy (Ideal Frequency) on a 7-point Likert scale (1 “never used”, 3 “sometimes used”, 7 “always used”). Discrepancy scores are then calculated between the Ideal and Frequency items (Ideal – Frequency), indicating the under use, appropriate use, or over use of a specific item/strategy. Stage 3: Classroom Checklist is completed after the classroom observations and assesses the presence of 10 specific items or procedures in the
classroom related to classroom structure and procedures. Average completion time for observers
is 75 minutes (Observer Form) and for teachers is 10 minutes (Teacher Form).

Like the Danielson Framework, the CSS will be used in the TES to guide high stakes
decisions for teachers. Therefore a rigorous training program will be used to ensure reliability
and validity of the evaluations using the CSS. All observers using the CSS to evaluate teachers
will be required to attend a 3 day workshop that includes training on the following: (1)
thoretical background of the CSS, (2) training on how to use the CSS for observing teachers, (3)
observer skills and competencies, and (4) the skills necessary to successfully train future
observers. Following the three-day workshop, observers will be required to pass an observer
certification and reliability test. The test will be conducted via an online format and require
observers to reach a reliability rating of at least 80% with CSS master coders. To maintain high
observer reliability and accuracy, at the start of each project year, all observers will be required
to pass recertification tests. The Danielson Framework and CSS provide distinct and
complimentary data on teaching effectiveness and will be important inputs for the TES and
proposed PD system.

The reliability and validity argument for the CSS is good. The CSS has strong internal
consistency (Cronbach alphas of .92-.93) across Stages 1 through 3. Good inter-rater reliability
was found for the Stage 1 (Classroom Observation) Total Behaviors ($r = .94$; percent agreement
= 92%), Stage 2 (Strategy Rating Scales) PIS and BMS Total scales ($r = .80, r = .72$; percent
agreement between 92% and 88%), and Stage 3 Classroom Checklist ($r = .86$; percent agreement
= 91%). Good test-retest reliability (approximately 2 to 3 weeks, unadjusted) was found for the
Stage 1 Total Behaviors ($r = .70$; percent agreement = 81%), Stage 2 PIS and BMS Total scales
(r = .86, r = .80, percent agreement between 93% and 85%), and Stage 3 Classroom Checklist (r = .77; percent agreement = 81%).

Evidence based on relations to other variables was tested in a number of studies. In a study with 125 teachers (Reddy, Fabiano, & Dudek, in press), the CSS was found to have good convergent and divergent validity with the Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS), a well-established measure of teacher and classroom quality (Pianta, La Paro, & Hamre, 2008). The CSS Strategy Rating Scales (PIS and BMS discrepancy scores) have been found to be highly predictive of student math and language arts statewide testing scores. Teachers rated as having higher discrepancy scores (greater need for change in specific practices) on their instructional and behavioral management practices were found to have higher percentages of students below language arts and mathematics proficiency benchmarks (Reddy et al., 2012). Finally, in a randomized clinical trial of 90 teachers, CSS scores were found sensitive to change following teacher consultation (Reddy & Fabiano, 2012).

**Instructional Learning Opportunities Guidance System (MyiLOGS).** MyiLOGS is an online teacher log that allows teachers to efficiently record standards-based instruction at the class and student levels on a daily basis. Teachers use the tool to document their classroom instruction along all three key dimensions of the enacted curriculum: time, content, and quality. To this end, MyiLOGS provides teachers with an instructional calendar that features an expandable sidebar, which lists the skills that comprise the intended academic standards as well as custom objectives and IEP objectives (see Figure B in Part 6). Teachers can drag and drop skills onto the respective calendar days and indicate the number of minutes allocated to each skill. On a subsample of days, teachers are further asked to report on additional time emphases (in minutes) related to the academic skills listed on the calendar according to cognitive demands.
(e.g., recall, analyze), instructional groupings (e.g., small group, whole class), and use of
evidence-based instructional practices (e.g., direct instruction, reinforcement). Figure C in Part 6
shows the MyiLOGS matrices. The information logged by teachers yields indices related to (a)
Instructional Time on Standards (Min/Day and %), (b) Instructional Time on Custom Objectives
(Min/Day and %), (c) Instructional Time on IEP Objectives (Min/Day and %), (d) Non-
instructional Time (Min/Day and %), (e) Content Coverage (%), and (f) three scores related to
time emphasis of higher-order cognitive processes, evidence-based instructional practices, and
individual/small group formats. Average completion time based on the results of a large-scale
study (Kurz et al., 2012) was 6 minutes per week.

The reliability and validity argument for MyiLOGS is good. The logs have good
reliability as quantified using coefficient alpha, which ranged from α = .98 to α = .99 across the
five indices. Test-retest reliability averaged r = .72 across indices at a 1-month time interval.
Content validity for the indices was ensured by a panel of experts who reviewed and refined the
respective OTL indices. Validity based on response processes was evidenced by 92% of
participants using MyiLOGS correctly without prompting, and 100% using it correctly when
provided a single prompt. Internal structure validity analyses of MyiLOGS indicated that the
various indices measured relatively independent constructs, with no pair of the five sharing a
correlation greater than r = .38. Validity based on relations to other variables was evidenced by
the extent to which teacher log data were in agreement with the log data of independent
observers recording the same lesson percent agreement = 77%.

**Principal Evaluation System (PES)**

As with teachers, the ultimate goal of any principal or other school leader is to maximize
student learning which can be characterized as student growth on achievement tests. Growth in
achievement is influenced by a large number of variables beyond principal effectiveness, so more direct measures must be included in a comprehensive evaluation. Principal competency can be evidenced through a comprehensive evaluation from supervisors, peers, and supervisees (i.e., teachers), commonly known as a 360° evaluation, as well as through a principal’s rate of retaining teachers who are effective. The SSI Project’s PES can be used to evaluate principals using both Student Growth in Achievement and Principal Competency.

*Figure 4. SSI Project Proposed PES*

**PRINCIPAL EVALUATION SYSTEM (PES)**

- Principal Competency (50%)
- Student Growth in Achievement (50%)

- 360° Evaluation (i.e., VAL-ED; 40%)
- School-Level Standardized Testing (40%)
- Retention of Effective Teachers (10%)
- Additional Measures (10%; e.g., District Measures, CBMs)

**PES Framework**

Each year, the multi-method Principal Evaluation System (PES) will identify each principal as performing in one of four performance levels as indicated by the NJ Task Force (2011): *Not Effective, Developing, Effective, and Highly Effective*. As indicated in Figure 4, performance levels will be determined by a formula that is based half on Principal Competency
and half on School-Level Student Growth in Achievement. Of the half that is based on competency, findings from the 360° Evaluation (EVAL) will be weighted four to one compared to Retention of Effective Teachers (RET). Of the half that is based on student growth, Standardized Testing (ST) at the school level will be weighted four to one against Additional Measures (AM). Basing half of the formula on student growth ensures that principals will strive to focus every teacher, and the school community generally, on student growth. Unlike teachers, who directly instruct students, principals will only be able to affect this critical outcome by taking strong leadership and communicating the importance of student growth to teachers and other members of the school community. These weights were developed by the SSI Project team, and are consistent with the recommendations of the NJ Task Force (2011). For each of the four sources of information, a score of one through four will be assigned annually, with higher numbers corresponding to better performance based on each type measure. The formula for determining the principal’s total score (PTS) in each year will be as follows:

\[
PTS = (4 \times \text{EVAL}) + (1 \times \text{RET}) + (4 \times \text{ST}) + (1 \times \text{AM})
\]

Total scores range from 10 to 40, and map to the four performance levels, as defined in Table 1. The PES directly mirrors the TES, with one major input (EVAL) supplemented by a minor input (RET), and one major output (ST) supplemented by a minor output (AM).

**Proposed PES Measures.** Like the TES, the SSI Project’s PES relies on multiple measures to characterize both the Principal Competency and the Student Growth in Achievement aspects of their job performance. Student Growth in Achievement is evidenced using the same tools described in the TES section, except scores are aggregated exclusively at the school level. Principal Competency is evidenced primarily through the Vanderbilt Assessment of Leadership
in Education (VAL-ED; Porter et al., 2008), and secondarily through the rate of retention of effective teachers.

**VAL-ED.** The VAL-ED is an evidenced-based, multi-rater scale that assesses principals’ learning-centered leadership behaviors known to directly influence teachers’ performance, and in turn students’ learning (Porter et al., 2008). The VAL-ED measures critical learning-centered leadership behaviors for the purposes of diagnostic analyses, performance feedback, progress monitoring, and PD planning. Each principal is evaluated through VAL-ED by her or his supervisors, her or himself, and her or his teachers using an online submission system that ensures confidentiality. The result is a 360° evaluation that provides formative and summative feedback for the principal. Each principal is categorized as *Ineffective, Minimally Effective, Satisfactorily Effective, Highly Effective*, or *Outstandingly Effective*.

The content of VAL-ED is aligned to the Interstate School Leader Licensure Consortium (ISLLC; 2008) standards. Principals receive scores based on six core components (i.e., High Standards for Student Learning, Rigorous Curriculum, Quality Instruction, Culture of Learning and Professional Behavior, Connection to External Communication, and Performance Accountability) and on six key processes (i.e., Planning, Implementing, Supporting, Advocating, Communicating, and Monitoring) that are critical to their job performance.

VAL-ED key components and processes are aligned with the TIF program, and LEAs and SSI Project beliefs of effective leadership. Each principal’s behavior toward every teacher, and the school community generally, on student growth is reflected by the core components of High Standards for Student Learning, Quality Instruction, and Performance Accountability, as well as by the key processes of Planning, Implementing, and Monitoring. (In addition, due to the influence of student growth within the PES, each principal will be motivated to focus teachers
and community members on its importance.) Each principal’s behavior toward establishing a collaborative school culture focused on continuous improvement is reflected by those same three components, as well as by the core component of Culture of Learning and Professional Behavior, and the key processes of Implementing and Communicating. Each principal’s support of the TES and PD connected to its measures (e.g., CSS, MyiLOGS) will be reflected in these core components and key processes. Also, VAL-ED links to its own PD program, allowing principals to model continuous improvement. Each principal’s behavior toward supporting the academic needs of special student populations is addressed by the core component of Connection to External Communication, a skill that allows a good leader to stay current with best practices, as well as by the key processes of Supporting and Advocating. These skills will address a principal’s proficiency at supporting and advocating for special populations, including students with disabilities and English learners, for example, by creating systems to support successful innovative practices (e.g., co-teaching, research-based intervention services, instructional accommodations).

The reliability and validity argument for VAL-ED is very good. Coefficient alphas at the total score level range from .98 to .99. Content validity for the tests was ensured by conducting a sorting study in which nine principals identified the core component and key process connected to each item; accuracy was 75% for each component and 76% for each process. Validity based on response processes was evaluated in cognitive labs, where respondent “thought aloud” while interacting with the instrument. Respondents indicated that VAL-ED reflects key leadership behaviors of principals. Internal structure validity was evaluated using confirmatory factor analyses, one focusing on the six core competencies and one focusing on the six key processes, both yielding goodness-of-fit indices of .99.
Retention of Effective Teachers (RET). Consistent with the recommendations of the NJ Task Force (2011), each principal will be placed in one of four performance levels annually for RET. RET will be based on a simple percentage of those teachers rated as effective in a given year who are retained in the school the following year. Table D in Part 6 outlines the performance levels connected to various teacher retention rates. The SSI Project team considered a more complicated system that would incorporate any activities (recruitment, hiring, PD) that would increase the number of effective teachers in a classroom, but the simpler percentage retained is preferred. More complicated systems opened two possibilities that we seek to avoid: (1) combination of noncomparable data based on teachers already in the district and those that are newly hired, and (2) the conflict of interest present if principals could improve their own compensation by rating their teachers higher based on observations.

C. PD Systems to Support the Needs of Teachers and Principals

PD is a systematic effort to change the knowledge and skills that can improve student learning (Guskey, 2002). Based on review of over 1,300 studies, Yoon et al. (2007) noted that effective PD systems can increase the average student achievement by 21 percentile points compared to the average achievement of control group students. Research has reached consensus on the core features of effective PD (Desimone, 2009). Building on this knowledge base, the SSI Project PD system (a) aligns with all core features of effective PD; (b) incorporates existing, empirically supported PD programs of participating LEAs; and (c) substantially advances existing programs by incorporating job-embedded, personalized PD grounded in classroom observations, teacher self-monitoring, and instructional coaching. This innovative PD approach strictly utilizes validated instruments both at the teacher level—the Danielson Framework (Danielson, 2001), the CSS (Reddy, 2012), MyiLOGS (Kurz, Elliott, & Shrago, 2009)—and the
principal level—VAL-ED (Porter et al., 2008). In addition, technology-based platforms are used to ensure the efficient and timely delivery of PD to individual educators and schools. As such, the proposed PD system is designed to deliver comprehensive excellence by developing and sustaining the knowledge, skills, and practices necessary for highly effective teaching and leadership.

**Evidence for PD System to Improve Teacher Instructional Practices**

All components of the PD system are aligned with the five core features of effective PD (Desimone, 2009): (1) *content focus* (i.e., focus on subject matter content and how students learn that content); (2) *active learning* (i.e., observing expert teachers or being observed, interactive feedback and discussion, reviewing students work and leading discussion); (3) *coherence* (i.e., the extent to which teacher learning is consistent with teachers’ knowledge and beliefs and reform policies); (4) *duration* (i.e., the span of time over which the activity is spread and the number of hours spent in the activity); and (5) *collective participation* (i.e., interaction and discourse among teachers from the same school, grade, or department) (see Table E in Part 6).

The components of the PD system are further aligned with the entire set of core teaching standards established by the *Council of Chief State School Officers* (CCSSO) via its InTASC. InTASC standards describe what teachers should know and do to ensure all students reach the goal of being ready to enter college or the workforce (see Table C in Part 6).

**Danielson Framework.** As noted, the Danielson Framework for Teaching is a research-based set of instructional components grounded in a constructivist view of learning and teaching that is used worldwide. For purposes of PD within the Danielson Framework, the TES categories—*Highly Effective, Effective, Developing,* and *Not Effective*—will yield teacher-specific ratings within these 22 components that are subsequently linked to individualized
growth targets. The PD for each teacher’s targets is provided via easy-to-use, research-based **online multimedia content libraries** for effective instructional strategies, new teacher support, ELLs, mathematics, literacy, elementary science, and early childhood. These content libraries are organized into 44 topics that include 124 modules with over 2,500 videos and 10,000 learning resources. These libraries help teachers and instructional leaders deepen their understanding of academic content while developing effective strategies for improving teaching and learning. Based on the contingencies established through the PBCS, teachers are incentivized to develop professionally in the identified and targeted areas prior to their next evaluation.

The modules allow teachers to review research summaries that support the illustrated instructional practice and help them understand why and how the practice works. The modules further include classroom resources, such as lesson plans, sample student work, assessments of student work, and suggestions for addressing the diverse learning needs of students. To ensure active learning and integration into classroom practice, all modules include activities to build knowledge, such as reflective questions and exercises, as well as interactive tools that model conceptual ideas and allow participants to explore the content and enrich their learning experience. The content of the modules is based on current knowledge about how students learn and based on the work of Robert Marzano, Irene Gaskins, and Carolyn Evertson.

**Classroom Strategies Scale (CSS).** CSS Observer and Teacher Forms are used collaboratively to identify areas for suggested teacher growth, support, and PD. It is important to include information from an outside perspective (observer), but also equally important to direct teacher PD in areas the teacher identifies as personal areas of improvement (goals) and/or greater competence. The CSS measures nine areas related to empirically valid and supported instructional and behavior management strategies (see Figure A in Part 6). Both the Observer
and Teacher Forms assess how frequently the teacher uses these strategies and how often these strategies should ideally be used, based on the observed lesson. The discrepancy between the ideal frequency and actual frequency scores is a difference score that indicates desired direction and magnitude for change. The CSS Observer Form scores inform principals and instructional coaches of target areas for PD, while the CSS Teacher Form allows educators to monitor their own usage of instructional and behavioral management practices and plan areas for personal growth. CSS software tracks how teachers are making progress on the goals selected by their supervisors and by themselves. For purposes of PD, the CSS is designed to be used in an ongoing coach or mentor model. The evaluator uses data from their CSS observations to provide targeted and specific feedback to teachers. Also, the CSS scores can be used to enhance collaboration in professional learning communities.

**Instructional Learning Opportunities Guidance System (MyiLOGS).** The Instructional Learning Opportunities Guidance System (MyiLOGS; Kurz, Elliott, & Shrago, 2009) is an online measure designed to assist teachers with the planning and implementing of intended curricula at the class and student levels (Kurz, 2011). MyiLOGS provides teachers with a personalized report of their instructional data based on twelve indices along three enacted curriculum dimensions: **time, content, and quality** for instructional improvement.

An additional PD framework, the MyiLOGS Instructional Growth Plan (IGP), is used to structure teachers’ engagement with their own instructional data to develop personalized goals of instructional improvement via Goal Attainment Scales (GAS). Teachers can review the MyiLOGS instructional feedback reports after logging approximately one month of instruction. These reports include tables and figures that detail a teacher’s instructional provisions on the basis of the various OTL indices collected via MyiLOGS. Figure D in **Part 6** shows a collection
of three charts related to time allocations for state standards, instructional practices, and content
coverage across the year. Over a dozen charts are available to teachers, several of which provide
information for the overall class as well as individual students. Teachers thus have the ability to
not only monitor the instructional provisions for their class, but also determine the extent to
which they provide **differentiated instruction** for specific students.

The MyiLOGS IGP builds on teachers’ ongoing self-reflection and monitoring of their
own instructional inputs and processes, and structures their engagement in the instructional
feedback reports by developing improvement goals based on personal data. Key aspects of the
MyiLOGS IGP have been used for decades in human behavior change programs. Specifically,
goal attainment scaling (Kiresuk & Sherman, 1968) has been used with adults in a wide range of
behavior change programs and has been found to be an efficient method of goal setting and
reactive measurement (Kiresuk, Smith, & Cardillo, 1994). The change strategies of coaching,
modeling, behavioral rehearsal, self-monitoring, and self-reinforcement also have strong
evidence for being effective when used with integrity to address performance deficits (Elliott &
Gresham, 1991; Witt, Elliott, & Gresham, 1988). Note that teachers will have a choice regarding
which of these change strategies they believe will be effective; some will seek additional support
from an instructional coach or a colleague to model key instructional actions. Other teachers will
primarily use the inherent self-monitoring and self-reinforcement features of MyiLOGS as
change strategies.

**Evidence for PD System to Improve Principal Leadership Practices**

**VAL-ED.** Any comprehensive educator PD system must further address the development
and improvement of effective principal leadership practices. To this end, we have incorporated
VAL-ED, a research-based principal evaluation tool designed to measure the leadership
behaviors known to affect changes in school performance, which in turn lead to student success. The proposed 360-evaluation model under the PES (Section B pages 32-37), which assesses these core components and key processes, is used to inform the proposed principal PD. Based on the norm-referenced and criterion-based VAL-ED data, a personalized PD program is created that provides comprehensive and constructive feedback to principals. This feedback is further aligned to the widely used Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) standards. The proposed PD is supported by a PD coach and unfolds along three phases: (a) collaborative preparation and organization of individualized growth targets (6 hrs); (b) setting implementation guidelines and schedules (6 hrs); and (c) review and analysis of professional growth (6 hrs). The PD dosage of 18 hours is distributed across the school year and requires principals to incorporate their individualized growth targets into their daily practices. This job-embedded and personalized approach to PD is systemic to our entire PD program. The evidence supporting the likely efficacy of the teacher components for improving their instructional practices is provided next.

Because the PD system of the SSI Project is systemic, principals and other district administrative leaders will also benefit and develop professionally from the aforementioned teacher PD components. Principals are the main evaluators of instructional effectiveness and the front line of PD service delivery to teachers. Therefore, they must possess significant knowledge of effective instructional practices and the skills necessary to help teachers implement these practices in their classroom (e.g., scaffolding, modeling, coaching). The utilization of the Danielson Framework and CSS for teacher evaluation and PD simultaneously improves principal knowledge of effective instructional practice via exposure to empirically validated strategies and practices highlighted in these measures. Both assessments are aligned with recent empirical findings on effective instruction, and complement each other by providing a global view of
effective instruction (the Danielson Framework) and specific instructional strategies (the CSS). Furthermore, both measures include significant observation skills training, which will lead to the improved ability of principals to identify and monitor teachers’ effective instructional practices and areas for suggested growth and development.

Furthermore, the combination of these two measures will enhance principals’ delivery of PD services to teachers. Historical observation and feedback processes have placed principals’ evaluations and teachers’ instruction at odds with each other, often leading to disparate understandings of effective instruction and a fear of being evaluated. This has led to teachers’ use of preplanned or specially prepared lessons that are designed to impress the observer and circumvent the evaluation process. As a result, this leads to ineffective PD service delivery since principals do not witness the true level of effective instructional practice in the classroom and teachers fail to receive vital feedback and support.

In contrast, the EES vision of instructional improvement via the Danielson Framework and CSS does not create a disparate knowledge or power base between teachers and principals. Instead, the proposed PD model brings principals’ and teachers’ ideas of effective instruction under the same umbrella and focuses on a collaborative discussion approach for interpreting classroom instruction and providing teachers with feedback. Both the Danielson Framework and CSS include training on PD service delivery components (e.g., scaffolding, coaching, modeling) related to each measure’s effective instructional practices. By improving principals’ abilities to provide PD services, teachers’ growth and development will be enhanced, ultimately leading to improved student achievement.
Job-Embedded, Personalized PD Based on Data from the Educator Evaluation System

All described components of the proposed PD system are personalized according to each educator’s abilities and needs identified during the processes for the TES and PES. That is, the evaluation categories for both teachers and principals are based, in part, on teacher and principal competencies. These competencies are assessed via the aforementioned measures—VAL-ED, the Danielson Framework, CSS, and MyiLOGS—the data from which is not only used to determine their TES and PES scores, but also to inform the PD for both teachers and principals. For example, a teacher may be found Effective due to high student growth on standardized testing (ST = 4) and above average growth on additional measures (AM = 3). However, her competence was judged to be below average based on observation (OBS = 2)—mainly a result of Unsatisfactory ratings for her management of classroom procedures and student behavior via Danielson Framework. Based on this specific information, the teacher can now engage in the “effective instructional strategies” content library and work through several modules on classroom and behavior management. Moreover, these modules will provide her feedback on her content acquisition and require specific implementation tasks in her own classroom. As such, this professional learning exhibits all key characteristics of job-embedded PD (Wolfe, 2001): (a) self-directed learning, (b) past experiences and data used to structure and understand new information, (c) on-demand learning relevant both in timing and content, and (d) problem-centered orientation based on the learner’s professional circumstances. This type of PD has shown to be effective in changing and sustaining adult behaviors (Sparks & Hirsh, 1997).

Timely and School-Based PD to Ensure Transfer of New Knowledge into Practice

Our proposed PD system is predicated on sustainability, which requires capacity building at each LEA. To this end, we have incorporated a rigorous train-the-trainer model for all key
components of the proposed PD system (i.e., the Danielson Framework, CSS, MyiLOGS) during the initial planning year. These LEA-based trainers will be trained in the administration of these measures and their respective PD components. The ability to rely on these experts at the local district level allows the PD components, which are based on measures already in use as part of the EES, to be launched and implemented as soon as the TES and PES scores become available. In addition, the PD system utilizes these LEA-based trainers as instructional coaches at the various school sites for purposes of the CSS and MyiLOGS components. According to Knight (1998), instructional coaches typically employ seven practices: (a) “enrolling” teachers, (b) collaborative planning, (c) modeling lessons, (d) teacher-directed post-conferencing, (e) observing lessons, (f) collaboratively exploring instructional data, and (g) continually supporting teachers during implementation of new practices. A number of studies have indicated these seven practices of instructional coaching impact teacher attitudes (Edwards, Green, & Lyons, 1998; Edwards & Newton, 1995), teaching practices (Bush, 1984; Joyce & Showers, 1982; Showers, Joyce, & Bennett, 1987; Knight, 1998), teacher efficacy (Coladarci & Breton, 1997; Edwards & Green, 1999; Woolfolk & Hoy, 1990), and finally, student achievement (Sanders & Rivers, 1996; Wenglinsky, 2000). Our LEA-based trainers engage in all seven practices put forth by Knight and they do so on a school-by-school basis.

While instructional coaching is intended to support the transfer of new knowledge into practice, our PD components are also specifically designed to assist teachers in the implementation of their new practices. For example, MyiLOGS allows teachers to quickly track their instructional time, content coverage, and basic aspects of instructional quality. The accessibility and use of effective instruction tracking data will allow teachers to use their own instructional data to set individualized growth targets, which may include customized
instructional practices that come directly from the data of the Danielson Framework. For example, a teacher who struggles with classroom and behavior management may begin to learn more about effective management practices through the online PD modules, and subsequently decide to keep track of her instructional time dedicated to these new practices via MyiLOGS. She can then monitor, evaluate, and discuss her implementation practices at the MyiLOGS Instructional Growth Plan (IGP) meetings with her colleagues and the school-based Master Mentor teacher. Potential support needs can be addressed at these meetings, which should ultimately yield improved instructional practices as evidenced by observation scores on the TES evaluation. In essence, our PD approach prevents the shortcomings of typical one-size-fits-all workshops by including PD components that allow a range of teachers such as general and special educators as well as teachers of non-tested subjects to set meaningful PD goals that fit their particular student population and instructional context. This innovative approach to job-embedded, personalized PD grounded in classroom observations, teacher self-monitoring, and instructional coaching represents the cornerstone of the proposed EES to yield highly effective and internationally competitive teaching and leadership practices.

D. Involvement of Educators

Educator Involvement in the Design of the Proposed EES and PBCS

For the past two years, Asbury Park, Hillside, Lakewood, and North Plainfield School Districts established LEA-wide committees for developing: (a) an EES and (b) PD initiatives. Each of these committees has included numerous teachers, union representatives, and administrators. The SSI Project is a natural extension of LEA educators’ involvement and commitment to developing a comprehensive highly reliable and valid EES that guides PD services for teachers and principals. The proposed EES includes assessments (e.g., Danielson
Observational Framework) that are familiar to and have been used by the LEAs for years, thus building on what educators and principals find most useful for instructional practice.

For the SSI Project, general and special education teachers in the four LEAs will offer ongoing input on the tailoring of the EES and PBCS for specific LEA needs. First, Teacher Advisory Committees (TACs) will be established at each TIF school during the winter of 2012 (Project Year 1). At each school, the TAC will include teacher nominated members (e.g., three general education, three special education, and one union representative). During Project Year 1, the TACs will meet at least three times to generate specific feedback on the proposed EES and PBCS. Second, recommendations from each TAC will be shared with all TACs within the LEA. Third, an LEA-wide TAC will be formed that represents one member from each school TAC to enhance collaboration and LEA-wide consensus on the EES and PBCS.

Evidence that Educators Support the Elements of the Proposed EES and PBCS

The proposed EES and PBCS have strong educator and administrator support across LEAs. For example, North Plainfield Public School’s K-12 Instructional Council (eight appointed teachers, two principals, two district supervisors, the Superintendent, and the Assistant Superintendent) has voted (100%) in support of the SSI Project, as has their District PD Committee (six elected teachers and two administrators). Asbury Park’s Educator Evaluation team (nine principals, six teachers, and one union representative) strongly supported the EES and PBCS, as well as the Curriculum and PD Council (assistant superintendent and six teachers). Hillside District-Wide Teacher Assessment Committee (thirteen appointed teachers, one union representative, one board member, and one parent) and PD Committee (four elected teachers, two administrators, and one Director of Guidance) each voted unanimously in support of the SSI Project. In Lakewood the EES and PBCS received strong support from three critical committees.
directing current within district improvements. An ad hoc school climate evaluation committee voted (100%) in favor SSI Project. The Interim Assessment Committee, (responsible for designing the K-8 assessments) provided unanimous support as did the eight-member Parental Involvement Committee. Also, all four of the LEAs’ boards of education voted in June of 2012, offering unanimous approval for the design and goals of the EES and PBCS (see Commitment Letters and Other Evidence of Educator Support in Part 6).

E. Management Plan

For over 40 years, Rutgers and the Graduate School of Applied and Professional Psychology (GSAPP), has formed partnerships with LEAs to increase the capacity of high needs schools with the support of numerous state and federal grants. A core mission of GSAPP and its Center for Applied Psychology (CAP) is to serve the needs of under-served and disadvantaged children, families, schools, and communities. With high needs school districts, GSAPP and CAP have developed new policies and procedures, evidence-based assessment and treatment services, and innovative PD for personnel to meet the challenging and changing needs of school systems. As a result, GSAPP faculty and staff have extensive relationships with LEAs throughout NJ, as well as a proven track record for collaboratively managing and smoothly implementing multi-site projects with LEAs.

SSI Project Roles and Responsibilities of Key Personnel

Given the TIF program’s emphasis on the importance of human capital, it is paramount that large-scale systems like the SSI Project possess experienced and talented leaders. Thus it is a natural extension for GSAPP and CAP to partner with the high poverty LEAs of Asbury Park, Hillside, Lakewood, and North Plainfield, and direct the collaborative efforts to increase effective teacher capacity and student achievement via SSI Project. All partners have signed
Memorandums of Understanding (see Part 6) and will strategically and equally work toward implementing the project goals. The key personnel already involved with the SSI Project is a highly qualified and diverse group with regard to gender, race, ethnicity, color, age, and national origin, and project leadership will strive to hire additional high quality personnel that represent these or other demographic factors (e.g., disability status).

**Project Director and Co-Principal Investigators.** Dr. Linda A. Reddy will serve as the Principal Investigator (PI) and Project Director, and Drs. Ryan J. Kettler and Alexander Kurz will serve as Co-Principal Investigators. Together they will be responsible for overall project leadership, budget oversight, and practical and methodological issues related to implementing an HCMS in each LEA. Also, they will be responsible for reporting to the funding agency and consulting with all LEAs and project staff.

Dr. Reddy is an Associate Professor in the GSAPP at Rutgers. She will be responsible for the overall project, budget, practical, and methodological issues related to implementation of the HCMS, EES, PD, and PBCS. She has extensive experience leading multisite, multistate educator evaluation system programs. Dr. Reddy has published five books and over 70 manuscripts and book chapters in the areas of behavior disorders, test development and validation, and school-based interventions. She has received several research awards and grants and is currently the PI of an IES National Center for Educational Research multi-site teacher measurement grant. Dr. Reddy will coordinate all aspects of the SSI Project, including the EES and PBCS. She will dedicate 41% of her effort during the academic year and 2.5 summer months to the SSI Project.

Dr. Kettler is an Assistant Professor in GSAPP at Rutgers. He will be responsible for overall project leadership, practical and methodological issues related to implementation of the
teacher and principal evaluation systems and student growth. Dr. Kettler has served as Project Director and Co-PI on a general supervision enhancement grant (GSEG) and an enhanced assessment grant (EAG), and has had leadership roles on two additional EAGs, all funded by the U.S. Department of Education (DOE) in the past five years. Dr. Kettler has published over 30 articles and book chapters in the area of educational assessment. He is also Co-Editor of two texts and three measurement instruments in this area. Dr. Kettler will assist Dr. Reddy in coordinating the various aspects of the project, and will closely oversee the EES. He will dedicate 41% of his effort during the academic year and 2.5 summer months to the SSI Project.

Dr. Kurz is an Assistant Research Professor in the Learning Sciences Institute and Affiliated Adjunct Faculty in the Mary Lou Fulton Teachers College at Arizona State University. He will be responsible for overall project leadership for implementation of educator and principal instructional improvement PD and practical issues related to implementation of the EES. He has over 15 years of experience in the field of special education, and currently serves as an investigator for the National Center for Accountability and Assessment for Special Education. Dr. Kurz has published over a dozen journal articles and book chapters related to measurement of opportunity-to-learn (OTL) and its implications for PD. He has conducted PD workshops related to OTL with general and special educators in several states, and also has served on two EAGs funded by the U.S. DOE. Dr. Kurz will focus his expertise on the PD aspects of the SSI Project. He will dedicate 25% of his effort during the full calendar year to the SSI Project.

**Rutgers University Team.** The Rutgers team will be responsible for managing the day-to-day affairs of the SSI Project, overseeing the implementation of the HCMS in each school district, and measuring the impact of the HCMS on teacher competency variables and student achievement.
The Assistant Project Director will be hired for coordination, implementation, and supervision of HCMS activities with the district offices, administrative and teaching staff, and teacher unions at each of the four LEAs. This position will be filled by a person with extensive experience in high poverty school district administration (e.g., a former superintendent of schools) and instructional systems reform. They will oversee the training and activities of the Rutgers Leadership Principals and Teachers. The Project Assistant Director will be hired on a full time 12-month contract to assist in the management of day to day affairs of the SSI Project.

The Business Manager will be hired to manage the human resource components and financial aspects of the Rutgers University Team, and to serve as a coordinator and liaison for all human resource (HR) departments in the participating LEAs. This person will have prior experience working in high poverty schools as a business manager and be responsible for training LEA human resource departments on how the HCMS and EES will impact HR capacities at each LEA. Under the direction of the Assistant Project Director, the Business Manager will assist each LEA in making HR decisions as the HCMS is implemented, including but not limited to: recruitment, placement, PD, compensation, tenure, promotion, and dismissal. This person will also oversee the day to day expenses incurred on the SSI Project, as well as be responsible for managing payroll allocations and disbursement of the Rutgers University Team. The Business Specialist will be hired on a full time 12-month contract.

The Information Technology (IT) Specialist will be hired to assist in the development of the software programs needed to implement and manage the HCMS, PBCS, and EES. The IT Specialist will possess expert knowledge in multiple programming languages to develop local software and the web-based interfaces, and also possess excellent team leadership skills. The IT Specialist’s will be responsible for: (1) coordinating with contracted programming consultants on
the creation and implementation of the SSI Project web-based portal that will track HCMS, PBCS, and EES data for each LEA, and (2) collaborating with LEA’s IT department on accessing the SSI system and training school personnel on its use. The IT Specialist will be hired on a full time 12-month contract.

The Data and Growth Modeling (DGM) Specialist will be hired to assist in data collection management, analysis, and interpretation of teacher and student growth data. The DGM Specialist will have a doctoral degree, prior experience in large scale educational evaluation, and expertise in growth modeling, educational assessment, and knowledge of evidence-based instruction. The DGM Specialist will interface with the Project Director, Co-PIs, and IT Specialist. The DGM Specialist will be hired on a full time 12-month contract.

The Evaluation Manager will assist the DGM Specialist in leading internal evaluation of the project via data collection management, analysis, and interpretation. The Evaluation Manager will have extensive experience with managing datasets for large federally funded school-based evaluation projects. The Evaluation Manager will interface primarily with the Project Director, Co-PIs, DGM Specialist, and External Evaluator. The DGM Specialist will be hired on a full time, 12-month contract.

Three Leadership Principals will be hired for the purposes of coordinating with the 43 school-based principals on implementation of the HCMS model. Leadership Principals will have prior administrative experience in high poverty schools and will be responsible for overseeing the implementation of the PES in each school district, as well as principal level HCMS components. The Leadership Principals will train participating principals at each school on the VAL-ED system, and will provide PD to enhance principal leadership. They will be hired on full time, 12-month contracts.
Six Leadership Teachers will be hired to assist in the implementation of the HCMS, PBCS, EES, and PD for all teacher constituents. Leadership Teachers will possess at least a Master’s Degree in teaching and demonstrate knowledge of empirical practices and evidence of being an effective teacher. Leadership Teachers will be responsible for overseeing the 51 school-based Master Mentor Teachers serving four LEAs (22 schools). They will train and supervise Master Mentor Teachers on the components of the EES, how it relates to the PD, and how to deliver PD for approximately 1,211 teachers. They will be hired on full time, 12-month contracts.

The Program Coordinator will be hired to directly assist the Project Director, Assistant Project Director, Co-PIs, and all SSI Project staff. The Program Coordinator will be responsible for all communications and correspondences between Rutgers SSI Project staff and LEA staff. The Program Coordinator will manage communications between the Rutgers Foundations and Development staff and LEA development officers on possible grant opportunities. Also, this person will prioritize and purchase office supplies and project materials for the entire project.

Fifty-one school-based Master Mentor Teachers will be hired to directly serve the 22 schools (1,211 teachers). Teachers currently employed at high poverty schools or certified teachers not employed by the LEA may apply for Master Mentor teacher positions. Master Mentor Teachers will be hired through a rigorous selection process that emphasizes the ability to successfully work with and train adult learners, as well as a record of exceptional teaching and student achievement results. Master Teachers will be responsible for assisting school-based principals in conducting classroom observations for the EES, as well as additional observations required for ongoing PD and progress monitoring. Master Teachers will be responsible for collecting, analyzing, and presenting EES data to their teacher constituents. They will provide
PD (e.g., coaching, modeling) based on the feedback from the EES. Master Teachers will be hired on full time, 12-month contracts.

**Consultants.** Dr. Steve Elliott will act as a supervising mentor to Dr. Reddy for the SSI Project. He will also offer consultation for the implementation of the VAL-ED system that will be used to evaluate principal leadership and guide principal PD. Dr. Elliott will provide valuable feedback about the criteria for determining principal effectiveness and the role principals play in developing teacher effectiveness. Dr. Elliott is the Mickelson Foundation Professor of Education and Director of the Learning Sciences Institute at ASU, one of the nation’s leading experts in educational assessment. He will commit three days per year to the project.

Dr. Louis Hsu will serve as a statistical and measurement consultant. He will be involved with conceptualizing all data analysis. Dr. Hsu is an expert in psychometrics and measurement. His work is widely cited and has been published in premier measurement journals. Dr. Hsu is a Professor Emeritus at Fairleigh Dickinson University and Senior Analyst at FutureWorkSystems. He will commit seven days per year to the project.

Dr. Frank Worrell will serve as a student minority assessment consultant. He will be responsible for conceptualizing the assessment and analysis of student achievement data for minority populations. Dr. Worrell is a Professor and the Director of the School Psychology Program at Berkeley, and has over 100 publications on psychosocial variables related to academic achievement among minority students and assessment practices for minority students’ achievement. Dr. Worrell will commit one day per year to the project.

Dr. Maria Adelaida Restrepo will serve as English Language Learners (ELL) consultant. She has extensive experience enhancing the evaluation and intervention of language skills in minority children, specifically those who speak Spanish as a native language, and providing PD
to teachers. Her expertise will support the development and implementation of the proposed PD system for teachers of ELL students. She has numerous publications and has received over 30 million dollars in federal funding. Dr. Restrepo will commit one day per year to the project.

Lynn Holdheide, M.S. will serve as a teacher quality consultant on evaluating non-tested subjects. As a Research Associate at the National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality, she has extensive experience in working with states and regional comprehensive centers on teacher effectiveness, teacher evaluation, and assessment of non-tested subjects. She will commit one day per year to the project.

Dr. Dan Reschly will serve as the external evaluator for the project. He will attend meetings, review performance measures, and draft annual reports and a final project report. Dr. Reschly is a Professor of Special Education in Peabody College of Vanderbilt University, and director of the National Comprehensive Center on Teacher Quality. He will commit five days per year to the project.

**Project Evaluation Plan**

A multi-method, multi-source approach will be used to evaluate the outcomes of the SSI project. The project evaluation will address TIF Absolute Priorities 1 and 2, the project’s three goals, and the project’s eight objectives. SSI Project personnel and the external evaluator (Dr. Reschly) will consider both the inputs and outputs of the project. *Inputs* are the steps planned to ensure the success of the HCMS, including (but not limited to) hiring appropriate personnel, implementing the EES in a timely fashion, distributing compensation via the PBCS, and providing PD. *Outputs* are the observed or expected results of successful inputs. Expected outputs of the SSI Project include larger numbers of teachers and principals being rated *Effective*.
or Highly Effective, and larger numbers of students showing growth in achievement that falls in the Proficient or Advanced Proficient ranges.

The project will be evaluated with quantitative and qualitative measures. Data gathered annually will allow SSI Project staff and the external evaluator to assess the relationship between inputs and outputs, as well as the process and outcomes of implementing and LEA-wide HCMS with a PBCS. Data will be used to determine whether the goals and objectives of the SSI Project are ultimately achieved. This data will be reported through the various Performance Measures identified on Table 2.

The external evaluator will be hired to ensure evaluation procedures are objective and unbiased. The PIs and project partners will use the evaluator’s feedback to revise and improve project activities. The evaluator will compare intended results to actual results at the end of each year, as well as at the end of the project.

**Project Objectives and Performance Measures**

The SSI Project has three main goals and eight objectives that will be met and evidenced through multiple performance measures. Table 2 depicts these objectives, relevant performance measures, and their due dates.

**Project Timeline**

The SSI Project will phase in schools and educators, with a planning year included at the beginning, and with implementation of the EES and PD (Years 2-5) preceding implementation of PBCS and fully HCMS (Years 3-5). Year 1 (October 2012 through September 2013) of the SSI Project will be dedicated to tailoring the HCMS, PBCS, and EES to each LEA, hiring staff at the university and LEAs, and training personnel on the EES. Year 2 (10/13 – 9/14) will be the first year of implementation of the EES and provision of PD. The summer of Year 2, and all
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Performance Measures</th>
<th>Due</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1. Increase effectiveness of current teachers</td>
<td>PD Materials</td>
<td>9/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher Effectiveness Report</td>
<td>10/14-10/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2. Increase the recruitment of teachers who are effective or likely to be effective</td>
<td>Teacher Advertising Materials</td>
<td>5/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher Hiring Effectiveness Report</td>
<td>9/13-9/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3. Increase the percent of effective teachers retained</td>
<td>Teacher Retention Reports</td>
<td>8/13-8/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1. Increase effectiveness of current principals</td>
<td>PD Materials</td>
<td>9/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principal Effectiveness Report</td>
<td>10/14-10/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2. Increase the recruitment of principals who are effective or likely to be effective</td>
<td>Principal Advertising Materials</td>
<td>5/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principal Hiring Effectiveness Report</td>
<td>9/13-9/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3. Increase the percent of effective principals retained</td>
<td>Principal Retention Reports</td>
<td>8/13-8/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1. Increase student growth in achievement at the classroom and school level</td>
<td>Classroom Standardized Test Reports</td>
<td>10/14-10/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Classroom Additional Measures Reports</td>
<td>7/14-7/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2. Increase student growth in achievement across schools</td>
<td>School Standardized Test Reports</td>
<td>10/14-10/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School Additional Measures Reports</td>
<td>7/14-7/17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
following summers, will be dedicated to evaluating results from the EES. Year 3 (10/14 – 9/15) will be the second year of the EES and PD, and the first year of the PBCS and full HCMS. All four systems will be implemented, evaluated, and improved throughout the life of the project, and preparations will be made to sustain all four systems following the end of project in September 2017.

**F. Sustainability Plan**

The SSI Project team developed the budget for this project to build toward sustainability beyond the length of the grant. First, the SSI Project plan includes comprehensive and intensive school-based train-the-trainer models for all components of the TES and PES and its aligned teacher and principal PD services. The result will be substantial LEA capacity building and cost savings for continued implementation of these components beyond the project term. Thus, costs for maintenance of the TES, PES, and PD will be significantly less as school capacity grows over the course of the funded project. For example, numerous school personnel will be certified trainers of the Danielson Framework for Teaching as observers and teachers; of the CSS as observers and teachers; of MyiLOGS as self-raters; and of VAL-ED as teachers, principals, and district administrators. Also, the SSI Project team and LEA leadership will hire 1 school-based Master Mentor teacher for every 24 teachers, rather than use the 1 to 12 ratio outlined in the TIF announcement. The 1 to 24 ratio will be used to allow LEAs to fiscally and operationally sustain these important positions after the project term.

Second, the SSI Project will result in an overall increase in the effectiveness of teachers and principals in LEAs. This important change will happen through targeted PD, increased motivation linked to tangible rewards, and human capital decisions based on educator effectiveness. Increased competence will remain years after the end of the project period.
Principals and teachers will still have the benefit of lessons learned through PD sessions. The behaviors that led to external rewards will become strongly internalized (i.e., best practices will become the routine). The most effective staff members will be retained, with a raised set of expectations for which the entire school will strive. Educator and principal competency are central to an effective school system, and the competency of educators and principals in our partner LEAs will undoubtedly have been raised.

Third, LEAs will be provided subcontracts that include funds for all training, evaluation, and PBCS expenses, in order to build their infrastructure. TIF funding and subcontracts enable LEAs to fiscally and operationally implement the HCMS (i.e., EES, PBCS, and PD) during the project and prepare the LEAs operationally to successfully implement the HCMS as a system of doing business in their schools after the project ends.

Fourth, to demonstrate the SSI Project’s commitment to fulfill Absolute Priorities 1 and 2, LEAs will redirect some of their state and federal funds to support the continued implementation of the HCMS beyond the project term. For example, funds from the NJ Department of Education (i.e., Excellent Educators for NJ and Principal Evaluation Pilot), Title I, Title II, Title III, Title VI, IDEA and the School Improvement Grant Funds will be reallocated to support the HCMS system after the project term.

Fifth, LEAs are not at maximum student enrollment capacity (e.g., Asbury Park 60%, Lakewood 66%). The SSI Project will result in increased teacher and principal effectiveness and student achievement, and as a result, student enrollment is expected to grow. It is expected operational costs will remain steady and revenues from student enrollment will increase. These additional revenues will be redirected to sustain the HCMS and PBCS.
Sixth, Rutgers University will provide substantial in kind contributions to support the implementation of the HCMS (see Non-Federal and Non-TIF Federal Program Funds Budget Narrative). Rutgers University will also provide continued leadership and technological assistance after the project term. For example, the SSI Project web-based HCMS portal, web-based host and server space, which will be used to input, combine, analyze, and report results regarding the EES and PBCS during the project, will be maintained and upgraded for an additional 6 years after the project term. This commitment includes regular maintenance of the secure system and its fail-safe backup system, as well as scheduled replacements of the hardware every two years. Rutgers is making this and other contributions to ensure the sustainability of the SSI Project and to strengthen relationships with the LEAs. Rutgers will also commit 32% academic calendar salaries for Drs. Reddy and Kettler for ongoing interface between the LEAs and Rutgers following the period term. This is essential to ensure that the impact of the SSI Project is permanent.

Finally, the SSI Project will establish a grant development team that includes LEA and Rutgers-based staff starting in Project Year 3 that will continue to work together beyond the project term. The grant development team will identify state, federal, national business, and private foundation programs for high poverty schools to continue the HCMS implementation. As a premium research institution, SSI Project staff and Rutgers Office of Research and Sponsored Projects will provide substantial expertise and resources for all grant writing and submissions (see Non-Federal and Non-TIF Federal Program Funds Budget Narrative).
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1. Application Reference Chart

Instructions: These charts are provided to help applicants ensure that their applications address all of the priorities and requirements – as any application that does not do so is ineligible for funding for the 2012 competitions. These charts will be used by Department staff when screening applications.

Applicants should complete and include these charts as an attachment with their application. Go to [http://www2.ed.gov/programs/teacherincentive/applicant.html](http://www2.ed.gov/programs/teacherincentive/applicant.html) to download a Microsoft Word version of this template. Fill out the Word document and submit it as a PDF attachment with your application.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please indicate your eligibility classification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructions: Check the eligibility classification that applies to your application.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Applications from a single entity:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>In the case of a single applicant that is an LEA, check this box.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___ LEA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group Applications:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Group applications involve two or more eligible entities. In the case of a group application, check the box that describes the eligibility classification of all of the applicants. Select only one box.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___ 2 or more LEAs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___ One or more SEAs and one or more LEAs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X One or more nonprofit organizations and one or more LEAs (no SEA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___ One or more nonprofit organizations and one or more LEAs and one or more SEAs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Instructions

Instructions: In each column of the table below, please specify where your application discusses each priority or requirement -- including each provision that applies to each priority or requirement. For information, descriptions, or assurances included in the project narrative, please complete both 1) the Title of the Section(s) or Subsection(s) and 2) the relevant Page Number(s) where this matter is discussed. Otherwise, please indicate the Attachment in which it is discussed.

Please identify every section, page, and/or attachment in which the priority or requirement is discussed. More than one section, subsection, page, or attachment may appear in each cell.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement or Priority</th>
<th>Title of Section or Subsection in which this priority or requirement is discussed</th>
<th>Page Number(s) on which this requirement or priority is discussed</th>
<th>Attachment on which this priority or requirement is discussed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Absolute Priority 1</strong>: HCMS</td>
<td>SSI Project Priorities</td>
<td>Pages 3-7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To meet this priority, the applicant must include, in its application, a description of its LEA-wide HCMS, as it exists currently and with any modifications proposed for implementation during the project period of the grant.</td>
<td>Absolute Priority 1</td>
<td>Pages 3-4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) How the HCMS is or will be aligned with the LEA’s vision of instructional improvement;</td>
<td>HCMS Alignment with LEA’s Vision of Instructional Improvement</td>
<td>Pages 14-16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) How the LEA uses or will use the information generated by the evaluation systems it describes in its application to inform key human capital decisions, such as</td>
<td>Section A: Coherent and Comprehensive HCMS</td>
<td>Pages 7-16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **decisions on recruitment, hiring, placement, retention, dismissal, compensation, professional development, tenure, and promotion:** | **Recruit Competence**  
Develop Competence  
Retain Competence  
Performance-Based Compensation System | **Pages 9-14** |
| **(3) The human capital strategies the LEA uses or will use to ensure that high-need schools are able to attract and retain effective educators** |   | **Part 6 – Page 95, Table B** |
| **(4) Whether or not modifications are needed to an existing HCMS to ensure that it includes the features described in response to paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of this priority, and a timeline for implementing the described features, provided that the use of evaluation information to inform the design and delivery of professional development and the award of performance-based compensation under the applicant’s proposed PBCS in high-need schools begins no later than the third year of the grant’s project period in the high-need schools listed in response to paragraph (a) of Requirement 3--Documentation of High-Need Schools.** | **C. PD Systems to Support the Needs of Teachers and Principals**  
Management Plan – Project Objectives and Performance Measures & Project Timeline  
The School System Improvement (SSI) Project | **Pages 37-46**  
**Pages 48-58**  
**Page 2** |
<p>|   |   | <strong>Part 6 – Page 13, High Needs Documentation</strong> |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement or Priority</th>
<th>Title of Section or Subsection in which this priority or requirement is discussed</th>
<th>Page Number(s) on which this requirement or priority is discussed</th>
<th>Attachment on which this priority or requirement is discussed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Absolute Priority 2</strong>: Educator Evaluation Systems</td>
<td>SSI Project Priorities &lt;br&gt; Absolute Priority 2 &lt;br&gt; B. Rigorous, Valid, and Reliable EES</td>
<td>Pages 3-4 &lt;br&gt; Page 4 &lt;br&gt; Pages 16-37</td>
<td>Part 6 – Page 99, Table D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) The frequency of evaluations, which must be at least annually;</td>
<td>B. Rigorous, Valid, and Reliable EES</td>
<td>Page 17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) The evaluation rubric for educators that includes at least three performance levels and the following--</td>
<td>TES Framework</td>
<td>Page 19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) Two or more observations during each evaluation period;</td>
<td>Danielson Framework – Teaching Evaluation Instrument &amp; Classroom Strategies Scale</td>
<td>Pages 17, 26-31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) Student growth, which for the evaluation of teachers with regular instructional responsibilities must be growth at the classroom level; and</td>
<td>Student Growth in Achievement Model</td>
<td>Pages 24-26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii) Additional factors determined by the LEA;</td>
<td>Additional LEA-Wide Measures</td>
<td>Page 26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(3) How the evaluation systems will generate an overall evaluation rating that is based, in significant part, on student growth; and

| Teacher Evaluation System (TES) |
| Principal Evaluation System (PES) |

Pages 17-32
Pages 32-37

(4) The applicant’s timeline for implementing its proposed LEA-wide educator evaluation systems.

| Management Plan – Project Objectives and Performance Measures & Project Timeline |

Pages 56-58

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Absolute Priority 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Requirement or Priority</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Title of Section or Subsection in which this priority or requirement is discussed</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Page Number(s) on which this requirement or priority is discussed</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attachment on which this priority or requirement is discussed</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Absolute Priority 3: STEM Plan (if applicable)**
To meet this priority, an applicant must include a plan in its application that describes the applicant’s strategies for improving instruction in STEM subjects through various components of each participating LEA’s HCMS, including its professional development, evaluation systems, and PBCS. At a minimum, the plan must describe—

| N/A |

(1) How each LEA will develop a corps of STEM master teachers who are skilled at modeling for peer teachers pedagogical methods for teaching STEM skills and content at the appropriate grade level by providing additional compensation to teachers who—

PR/Award # S374A120060
Page e84
(i) Receive an overall evaluation rating of effective or higher under the evaluation system described in the application;
(ii) Are selected based on criteria that are predictive of the ability to lead other teachers;
(iii) Demonstrate effectiveness in one or more STEM subjects; and
(iv) Accept STEM-focused career ladder positions;

(2) How each LEA will identify and develop the unique competencies that, based on evaluation information or other evidence, characterize effective STEM teachers;

(3) How each LEA will identify hard-to-staff STEM subjects, and use the HCMS to attract effective teachers to positions providing instruction in those subjects;

(4) How each LEA will leverage community support, resources, and expertise to inform the implementation of its plan;

(5) How each LEA will ensure that financial and nonfinancial incentives, including performance-based compensation, offered to reward or promote effective STEM teachers are adequate to attract and retain persons with strong STEM skills in high-need schools; and

(6) How each LEA will ensure that students have access to and participate in rigorous and engaging STEM coursework.
### Competitive Preference Priority 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement or Priority</th>
<th>Title of Section or Subsection in which this priority or requirement is discussed</th>
<th>Page Number(s) on which this requirement or priority is discussed</th>
<th>Attachment on which this priority or requirement is discussed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Competitive Preference Priority 4: New and Rural Applicants (if applicable)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To meet this priority, an applicant must provide at least one of the two following assurances, which the Department accepts:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) An assurance that each LEA to be served by the project has not previously participated in a TIF-supported project.</td>
<td>The School System Improvement (SSI) Project</td>
<td>Page 2</td>
<td>Part 6 – Pages 31 to 35, Commitment Letters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) An assurance that each LEA to be served by the project is a rural local educational agency (as defined in the NIA).</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Competitive Preference Priority 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement or Priority</th>
<th>Title of Section or Subsection in which this priority or requirement is discussed</th>
<th>Page Number(s) on which this requirement or priority is discussed</th>
<th>Attachment on which this priority or requirement is discussed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Competitive Preference Priority 5: An Educator Salary Structure Based on Effectiveness (if applicable)</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To meet this priority, an applicant must propose, as part of its PBCS, a timeline for implementing no later than in the fifth year of the grant’s project period a salary structure based on effectiveness for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
both teachers and principals. As part of this proposal, an applicant must describe—

(a) The extent to which and how each LEA will use overall evaluation ratings to determine educator salaries;

(b) How each LEA will use TIF funds to support the salary structure based on effectiveness in the high-need schools listed in response to Requirement 3(a); and

(c) The extent to which the proposed implementation is feasible, given that implementation will depend upon stakeholder support and applicable LEA-level policies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Requirement or Priority</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Requirement 1:</strong> Performance-Based Compensation for Teachers, Principals, and Other Personnel. In its application, an applicant must describe, for each participating LEA, how its proposed PBCS will meet the definition of a PBCS set forth in the NIA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Design Model 1 or 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• PBCS Optional Features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requirement or Priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Requirement 2:</strong> Involvement and Support of Teachers and Principals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) A description of the extent to which the applicant has educator support for the proposed PBCS and educator evaluation systems; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) A statement indicating whether a union is the exclusive representative of either teachers or principals in each participating LEA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requirement or Priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Requirement 3:</strong> Documentation of High-Need Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Each applicant must demonstrate, in its application, that the schools participating in the implementation of the TIF-funded PBCS are high-need schools (as defined in the NIA), including high-poverty schools (as defined in the NIA), priority schools (as defined in the NIA), or persistently lowest-achieving schools (as defined in the NIA). Each applicant must provide, in its application—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) A list of high-need schools in which the proposed TIF-supported PBCS would be implemented;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) For each high-poverty school listed, the most current data on the percentage of students who are eligible for free or reduced-price lunch subsidies under the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act or are considered students from low-income families based on another poverty measure that the LEA uses (see section 1113(a)(5) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended (ESEA) (20 U.S.C. 6313(a)(5))). [Data provided to demonstrate eligibility as a high-poverty school must be school-level data; the Department will</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not accept LEA- or State-level data for purposes of documenting whether a school is a high-poverty school; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) For any priority schools listed, documentation verifying that the State has received approval of a request for ESEA flexibility, and that the schools have been identified by the State as priority schools.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## High Needs Documentation

### Poverty Levels and TIF Eligibility of Participating School Districts/LEAs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Grade Levels</th>
<th>Total Enrollment</th>
<th>Free &amp; Reduced Lunch Enrollment</th>
<th>Percentage of Students</th>
<th>TIF Fund Eligibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asbury</td>
<td>Barack Obama</td>
<td>K to 5</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bradley</td>
<td>K to 5</td>
<td>508</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thurgood Marshall</td>
<td>K to 5</td>
<td>566</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asbury Park Middle</td>
<td>6 to 8</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>487</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asbury Park High</td>
<td>9 to 12</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillside</td>
<td>Abram P. Morris</td>
<td>PreK – 1st</td>
<td>613</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Calvin Coolidge</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hurden Looker</td>
<td>3rd – 4th</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>George Washington</td>
<td>5th</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Walter O. Krumbiegel</td>
<td>6th – 8th</td>
<td>664</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hillside High</td>
<td>9th – 12th</td>
<td>938</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakewood</td>
<td>Clifton Ave</td>
<td>PreK to 6</td>
<td>911</td>
<td>818</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oak Street</td>
<td>PreK to 6</td>
<td>1070</td>
<td>968</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ella G. Clarke</td>
<td>PreK to 6</td>
<td>788</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spruce Street</td>
<td>PreK to 6</td>
<td>853</td>
<td>792</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lakewood Middle</td>
<td>7 to 8</td>
<td>638</td>
<td>534</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lakewood High School</td>
<td>9 to 12</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>711</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>East End</td>
<td>PreK – 4th</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plainfield</td>
<td>Stony Brook</td>
<td>K – 4th</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West End</td>
<td>K – 4th</td>
<td>563</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Somerset Intermediate</td>
<td>5th – 6th</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>North Plainfield High</td>
<td>7th – 12th</td>
<td>1513</td>
<td>865</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) from Local Educational Agencies

Asbury Park School District
Hillside School District
Lakewood School District
North Plainfield School District
School System Improvement Project (SSIP):
A Grant Proposal to the U.S. Department of Education
Teacher Incentive Fund (TIF) Grant Program

Asbury Park Public School District and Rutgers University

Memorandum of Understanding (MOU)

This Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) is entered into by and between the following entities: Asbury Park Public Schools, and Rutgers University.

These entities are applying to the U.S. Department of Education (ED) as group applicants for a grant award under the fiscal year (FY) 2012 Teacher Incentive Fund (TIF) General TIF Competition (or TIF Competition with a Focus on STEM). The purpose of this MOU is to establish the framework through which, if the US Department of Education approves their application, the group applicants will collaborate and to articulate the specific roles and responsibilities of each applicant in implementing the approved TIF project.

I. Scope of Work

Each group applicant agrees to participate in the proposed TIF project that is set forth in this group application for the FY 2012 TIF competition and conduct activities and carry out responsibilities as may be identified in that application.

II. If Funded, Each Applicant Understands That It Will Be a Grantee of the US Department of Education

Each group applicant understands that, if the group application is funded, it will be, and assume the legal responsibilities of, a grantee.

III. Lead Applicant and Fiscal Agent

Rutgers University will serve as the lead applicant. As the lead applicant, Rutgers University will apply for the grant on behalf of the group and will serve as the fiscal agent for the group in the event a grant is awarded. As fiscal agent, Rutgers University understands that it is responsible for the receipt and distribution of all grant funds; for ensuring that the project is carried out by the group in accordance with Federal requirements.

IV. Use of Funds

Each group applicant that is not the lead applicant agrees to use the funds it will receive from the lead applicant under the MOU agreement in accordance with all Federal requirements that apply to the grant, including any restrictions on the use of TIF funds set forth in the Notice Inviting Applications (NIA), provisions of the approved TIF application, and applicable provisions of the
Education Department General Administrative Regulations (EDGAR), including provisions governing allowable costs in section 74.27 (applicable to non-profit organizations) and section 80.22 (applicable to SEAs and LEAs). (See 34 C.F.R.74.27 and 80.22.)

Each group member may charge indirect costs to TIF funds awarded by the US Department of Education based on the grant funds that it receives and obligates, and its own approved indirect cost rate.

V. Participating LEA Responsibilities

Each participating LEA agrees to—

1) Collaborate with Rutgers University to develop and refine a HCMS specific to the school district’s needs.
2) Implement with full fidelity the human capital management system (HCMS), as it pertains to the educator evaluation system, hiring practices, placement procedures, professional development, and retention/dismissing policies.
3) Implement with full fidelity the educator evaluation system as is designed in coordination with Rutgers University and New Jersey Department of Education guidelines.
4) Implement with full fidelity the performance-based compensation system (PBCS) based on results from the educator evaluation system and in accordance with guidelines in the TIF application.
5) Participate, as requested, in any evaluations of this grant conducted by ED or by evaluators working at the request of the group.
6) Provide full access to project data for the purposes of designing an effective HCMS.
7) To exclusively utilize subcontract funds for expenses associated with the design and implementation of the HCMS and its components.

VI. Other Members’ Responsibilities

Participate in project meetings (phone and/or in person) for district-wide development and implementation of the educator and principal evaluation system, professional development, and PBCS.

VII. Joint Responsibilities for Communications and Development of Timelines

Each member of the group agrees to the following joint responsibilities—

1) Each member of the group will appoint a key contact person for the TIF grant.
2) These key contacts will maintain frequent communication to facilitate cooperation under this MOU.
3) These key contacts will work together to determine appropriate timelines for project updates and status reports throughout the whole grant project period.
VIII. Working Relationship Among Group Members

Asbury Park Public Schools will immediately inform Rutgers University, if for any reason they are unable to implement any aspect of the project goals and requirements so that alternative arrangements may be made to fulfill the project goals at the district.

IX. Assurances

Each member of the group hereby assures and represents that it:
1) Agrees to be bound to every statement and assurance made by the lead applicant in the application;
2) Has all requisite power and authority to execute this MOU;
3) Is familiar with the group's TIF application and is committed to working collaboratively to meet the responsibilities specified in this MOU in order to ensure the TIF project's success;
4) Will comply with all the terms of the Grant and all applicable Federal and State laws and regulations, including laws and regulations applicable to the Program, and the applicable provisions of EDGAR.

X. Modifications

(1) Consistent with the group's responsibility to implement the approved TIF application, this MOU may be amended only by written agreement signed by each of the group members. Modifications of this MOU do not relieve members of the group from implementing the content of the approved TIF application; therefore any modification that would require a change in the approved application must be approved by the US Department of Education.

(2) Moreover, in no case will a modification of this MOU relieve any member of the group of its responsibility to ensure that the MOU details the activities that each member of the group is to perform, or release any member of the group from every statement and assurance made by the group applicant in the application. See section 75.128(b) of EDGAR (34 C.F.R. 75.128(b)).

XI. Effective Date/Duration/Termination

This MOU shall take effect upon the lead applicant's receipt of a notice of grant award of TIF funds from the US Department of Education.

This MOU shall be effective beginning with the date of the last signature hereon, and, if a TIF grant is received, ending upon the expiration of the grant project period. Because any award of TIF funds by ED to support the group application is contingent upon the execution of this MOU by each party to the group application, the members of the group also agree that they will not terminate this MOU prior to the end of the grant project period without ED approval.
XII. Signatures

1) LEA Superintendent (or designee) -- required

[Signature/Date]

Denise Lowe, Ed.D., Superintendent, Asbury Park Public Schools
Print Name/Title/Name of LEA

2) Nonprofit organization CEO (or designee) -- required

[Signature/Date]

Linda A. Reddy Ph.D., Associate Professor, Rutgers University
Print Name/Title/Name of organization
School System Improvement Project (SSIP):  
A Grant Proposal to the U.S. Department of Education  
Teacher Incentive Fund (TIF) Grant Program  

Hillside Public School District and Rutgers University  

Memorandum of Understanding (MOU)  

This Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) is entered into by and between the following entities: Hillside Public Schools, and Rutgers University.  

These entities are applying to the U.S. Department of Education (ED) as group applicants for a grant award under the fiscal year (FY) 2012 Teacher Incentive Fund (TIF) General TIF Competition (or TIF Competition with a Focus on STEM). The purpose of this MOU is to establish the framework through which, if the US Department of Education approves their application, the group applicants will collaborate and to articulate the specific roles and responsibilities of each applicant in implementing the approved TIF project.  

I. Scope of Work  

Each group applicant agrees to participate in the proposed TIF project that is set forth in this group application for the FY 2012 TIF competition and conduct activities and carry out responsibilities as may be identified in that application.  

II. If Funded, Each Applicant Understands That It Will Be a Grantee of the US Department of Education  

Each group applicant understands that, if the group application is funded, it will be, and assume the legal responsibilities of, a grantee.  

III. Lead Applicant and Fiscal Agent  

Rutgers University will serve as the lead applicant. As the lead applicant, Rutgers University will apply for the grant on behalf of the group and will serve as the fiscal agent for the group in the event a grant is awarded. As fiscal agent, Rutgers University understands that it is responsible for the receipt and distribution of all grant funds; for ensuring that the project is carried out by the group in accordance with Federal requirements.  

IV. Use of Funds  

Each group applicant that is not the lead applicant agrees to use the funds it will receive from the lead applicant under the MOU agreement in accordance with all Federal requirements that apply to the grant, including any restrictions on the use of TIF funds set forth in the Notice Inviting Applications (NIA), provisions of the approved TIF application, and applicable provisions of the
Education Department General Administrative Regulations (EDGAR), including provisions governing allowable costs in section 74.27 (applicable to non-profit organizations) and section 80.22 (applicable to SEAs and LEAs). (See 34 C.F.R.74.27 and 80.22.)

Each group member may charge indirect costs to TIF funds awarded by the US Department of Education based on the grant funds that it receives and obligates, and its own approved indirect cost rate.

V. Participating LEA Responsibilities

Each participating LEA agrees to—

1) Collaborate with Rutgers University to develop and refine a HCMS specific to the school district’s needs.
2) Implement with full fidelity the human capital management system (HCMS), as it pertains to the educator evaluation system, hiring practices, placement procedures, professional development, and retention/dismissal policies.
3) Implement with full fidelity the educator evaluation system as is designed in coordination with Rutgers University and New Jersey Department of Education guidelines.
4) Implement with full fidelity the performance-based compensation system (PBCS) based on results from the educator evaluation system and in accordance with guidelines in the TIF application.
5) Participate, as requested, in any evaluations of this grant conducted by ED or by evaluators working at the request of the group.
6) Provide full access to project data for the purposes of designing an effective HCMS.
7) To exclusively utilize subcontract funds for expenses associated with the design and implementation of the HCMS and its components.

VI. Other Members’ Responsibilities

Participate in project meetings (phone and/or in person) for district-wide development and implementation of the educator and principal evaluation system, professional development, and PBCS.

VII. Joint Responsibilities for Communications and Development of Timelines

Each member of the group agrees to the following joint responsibilities—

1) Each member of the group will appoint a key contact person for the TIF grant.
2) These key contacts will maintain frequent communication to facilitate cooperation under this MOU.
3) These key contacts will work together to determine appropriate timelines for project updates and status reports throughout the whole grant project period.
VIII. Working Relationship Among Group Members

Hillside Public Schools will immediately inform Rutgers University, if for any reason they are unable to implement any aspect of the project goals and requirements so that alternative arrangements may be made to fulfill the project goals at the district.

IX. Assurances

Each member of the group hereby assures and represents that it:
1) Agrees to be bound to every statement and assurance made by the lead applicant in the application;
2) Has all requisite power and authority to execute this MOU;
3) Is familiar with the group's TIF application and is committed to working collaboratively to meet the responsibilities specified in this MOU in order to ensure the TIF project's success;
4) Will comply with all the terms of the Grant and all applicable Federal and State laws and regulations, including laws and regulations applicable to the Program, and the applicable provisions of EDGAR.

X. Modifications

(1) Consistent with the group's responsibility to implement the approved TIF application, this MOU may be amended only by written agreement signed by each of the group members. Modifications of this MOU do not relieve members of the group from implementing the content of the approved TIF application; therefore any modification that would require a change in the approved application must be approved by the US Department of Education.

(2) Moreover, in no case will a modification of this MOU relieve any member of the group of its responsibility to ensure that the MOU details the activities that each member of the group is to perform, or release any member of the group from every statement and assurance made by the group applicant in the application. See section 75.128(b) of EDGAR (34 C.F.R. 75.128(b)).

XI. Effective Date/Duration/Termination

This MOU shall take effect upon the lead applicant's receipt of a notice of grant award of TIF funds from the US Department of Education.

This MOU shall be effective beginning with the date of the last signature hereon, and, if a TIF grant is received, ending upon the expiration of the grant project period. Because any award of TIF funds by ED to support the group application is contingent upon the execution of this MOU by each party to the group application, the members of the group also agree that they will not terminate this MOU prior to the end of the grant project period without ED approval.
XII. Signatures

1) LEA Superintendent (or designee) -- required

Signature/Date

Kenneth R. Weinheimer, School Business Administrator/Board Secretary of the Hillside Public Schools
Print Name/Title/Name of LEA

2) Nonprofit organization CEO (or designee) -- required

Signature/Date

Linda A. Reddy, Ph.D., Associate Professor, Rutgers University
Print Name/Title/Name of organization
School System Improvement Project (SSIP):
A Grant Proposal to the U.S. Department of Education
Teacher Incentive Fund (TIF) Grant Program

Lakewood Public School District and Rutgers University

Memorandum of Understanding (MOU)

This Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) is entered into by and between the following entities: Lakewood Public Schools, and Rutgers University.

These entities are applying to the U.S. Department of Education (ED) as group applicants for a grant award under the fiscal year (FY) 2012 Teacher Incentive Fund (TIF) General TIF Competition (or TIF Competition with a Focus on STEM). The purpose of this MOU is to establish the framework through which, if the US Department of Education approves their application, the group applicants will collaborate and to articulate the specific roles and responsibilities of each applicant in implementing the approved TIF project.

I. Scope of Work

Each group applicant agrees to participate in the proposed TIF project that is set forth in this group application for the FY 2012 TIF competition and conduct activities and carry out responsibilities as may be identified in that application.

II. If Funded, Each Applicant Understands That It Will Be a Grantee of the US Department of Education

Each group applicant understands that, if the group application is funded, it will be, and assume the legal responsibilities of, a grantee.

III. Lead Applicant and Fiscal Agent

Rutgers University will serve as the lead applicant. As the lead applicant, Rutgers University will apply for the grant on behalf of the group and will serve as the fiscal agent for the group in the event a grant is awarded. As fiscal agent, Rutgers University understands that it is responsible for the receipt and distribution of all grant funds; for ensuring that the project is carried out by the group in accordance with Federal requirements.

IV. Use of Funds

Each group applicant that is not the lead applicant agrees to use the funds it will receive from the lead applicant under the MOU agreement in accordance with all Federal requirements that apply to the grant, including any restrictions on the use of TIF funds set forth in the Notice Inviting Applications (NIA), provisions of the approved TIF application, and applicable provisions of the
Education Department General Administrative Regulations (EDGAR), including provisions governing allowable costs in section 74.27 (applicable to non-profit organizations) and section 80.22 (applicable to SEAs and LEAs). (See 34 C.F.R.74.27 and 80.22.)

Each group member may charge indirect costs to TIF funds awarded by the US Department of Education based on the grant funds that it receives and obligates, and its own approved indirect cost rate.

V. Participating LEA Responsibilities

Each participating LEA agrees to—

1) Collaborate with Rutgers University to develop and refine a HCMS specific to the school district's needs.
2) Implement with full fidelity the human capital management system (HCMS), as it pertains to the educator evaluation system, hiring practices, placement procedures, professional development, and retention/dismissal policies.
3) Implement with full fidelity the educator evaluation system as is designed in coordination with Rutgers University and New Jersey Department of Education guidelines.
4) Implement with full fidelity the performance-based compensation system (PBCS) based on results from the educator evaluation system and in accordance with guidelines in the TIF application.
5) Participate, as requested, in any evaluations of this grant conducted by ED or by evaluators working at the request of the group.
6) Provide full access to project data for the purposes of designing an effective HCMS.
7) To exclusively utilize subcontract funds for expenses associated with the design and implementation of the HCMS and its components.

VI. Other Members' Responsibilities

Participate in project meetings (phone and/or in person) for district-wide development and implementation of the educator and principal evaluation system, professional development, and PBCS.

VII. Joint Responsibilities for Communications and Development of Timelines

Each member of the group agrees to the following joint responsibilities—

1) Each member of the group will appoint a key contact person for the TIF grant.
2) These key contacts will maintain frequent communication to facilitate cooperation under this MOU.
3) These key contacts will work together to determine appropriate timelines for project updates and status reports throughout the whole grant project period.
VIII. Working Relationship Among Group Members

Lakewood Public Schools will immediately inform Rutgers University, if for any reason they are unable to implement any aspect of the project goals and requirements so that alternative arrangements may be made to fulfill the project goals at the district.

IX. Assurances

Each member of the group hereby assures and represents that it:
1) Agrees to be bound to every statement and assurance made by the lead applicant in the application;
2) Has all requisite power and authority to execute this MOU;
3) Is familiar with the group's TIF application and is committed to working collaboratively to meet the responsibilities specified in this MOU in order to ensure the TIF project's success;
4) Will comply with all the terms of the Grant and all applicable Federal and State laws and regulations, including laws and regulations applicable to the Program, and the applicable provisions of EDGAR.

X. Modifications

(1) Consistent with the group's responsibility to implement the approved TIF application, this MOU may be amended only by written agreement signed by each of the group members. Modifications of this MOU do not relieve members of the group from implementing the content of the approved TIF application; therefore any modification that would require a change in the approved application must be approved by the US Department of Education.
(2) Moreover, in no case will a modification of this MOU relieve any member of the group of its responsibility to ensure that the MOU details the activities that each member of the group is to perform, or release any member of the group from every statement and assurance made by the group applicant in the application. See section 75.128(b) of EDGAR (34 C.F.R. 75.128(b)).

XI. Effective Date/Duration/Termination

This MOU shall take effect upon the lead applicant's receipt of a notice of grant award of TIF funds from the US Department of Education.

This MOU shall be effective beginning with the date of the last signature hereon, and, if a TIF grant is received, ending upon the expiration of the grant project period. Because any award of TIF funds by ED to support the group application is contingent upon the execution of this MOU by each party to the group application, the members of the group also agree that they will not terminate this MOU prior to the end of the grant project period without ED approval.
XII. Signatures

1) LEA Superintendent (or designee) -- required

Laura Winters, Superintendent, Lakewood Public Schools
Print Name/Title/Name of LEA

2) Nonprofit organization CEO (or designee) -- required

Linda A. Reddy Ph.D., Associate Professor, Rutgers University
Print Name/Title/Name of organization
School System Improvement Project (SSIP):  
A Grant Proposal to the U.S. Department of Education  
Teacher Incentive Fund (TIF) Grant Program  

North Plainfield Public School District and Rutgers University

Memorandum of Understanding (MOU)

This Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) is entered into by and between the following entities: North Plainfield Public Schools, and Rutgers University.

These entities are applying to the U.S. Department of Education (ED) as group applicants for a grant award under the fiscal year (FY) 2012 Teacher Incentive Fund (TIF) General TIF Competition (or TIF Competition with a Focus on STEM). The purpose of this MOU is to establish the framework through which, if the US Department of Education approves their application, the group applicants will collaborate and to articulate the specific roles and responsibilities of each applicant in implementing the approved TIF project.

I. Scope of Work

Each group applicant agrees to participate in the proposed TIF project that is set forth in this group application for the FY 2012 TIF competition and conduct activities and carry out responsibilities as may be identified in that application.

II. If Funded, Each Applicant Understands That It Will Be a Grantee of the US Department of Education

Each group applicant understands that, if the group application is funded, it will be, and assume the legal responsibilities of, a grantee.

III. Lead Applicant and Fiscal Agent

Rutgers University will serve as the lead applicant. As the lead applicant, Rutgers University will apply for the grant on behalf of the group and will serve as the fiscal agent for the group in the event a grant is awarded. As fiscal agent, Rutgers University understands that it is responsible for the receipt and distribution of all grant funds; for ensuring that the project is carried out by the group in accordance with Federal requirements.

IV. Use of Funds

Each group applicant that is not the lead applicant agrees to use the funds it will receive from the lead applicant under the MOU agreement in accordance with all Federal requirements that apply to the grant, including any restrictions on the use of TIF funds set forth in the Notice Inviting Applications (NIA), provisions of the approved TIF application, and applicable provisions of the
Education Department General Administrative Regulations (EDGAR), including provisions governing allowable costs in section 74.27 (applicable to non-profit organizations) and section 80.22 (applicable to SEAs and LEAs). (See 34 C.F.R. 74.27 and 80.22.)

Each group member may charge indirect costs to TIF funds awarded by the US Department of Education based on the grant funds that it receives and obligates, and its own approved indirect cost rate.

V. Participating LEA Responsibilities

Each participating LEA agrees to—

1) Collaborate with Rutgers University to develop and refine a HCMS specific to the school district’s needs.
2) Implement with full fidelity the human capital management system (HCMS), as it pertains to the educator evaluation system, hiring practices, placement procedures, professional development, and retention/dismissal policies.
3) Implement with full fidelity the educator evaluation system as is designed in coordination with Rutgers University and New Jersey Department of Education guidelines.
4) Implement with full fidelity the performance-based compensation system (PBCS) based on results from the educator evaluation system and in accordance with guidelines in the TIF application.
5) Participate, as requested, in any evaluations of this grant conducted by ED or by evaluators working at the request of the group.
6) Provide full access to project data for the purposes of designing an effective HCMS.
7) To exclusively utilize subcontract funds for expenses associated with the design and implementation of the HCMS and its components.

VI. Other Members’ Responsibilities

Participate in project meetings (phone and/or in person) for district-wide development and implementation of the educator and principal evaluation system, professional development, and PBCS.

VII. Joint Responsibilities for Communications and Development of Timelines

Each member of the group agrees to the following joint responsibilities--

1) Each member of the group will appoint a key contact person for the TIF grant.
2) These key contacts will maintain frequent communication to facilitate cooperation under this MOU.
3) These key contacts will work together to determine appropriate timelines for project updates and status reports throughout the whole grant project period.
VIII. Working Relationship Among Group Members

North Plainfield Public Schools will immediately inform Rutgers University, if for any reason they are unable to implement any aspect of the project goals and requirements so that alternative arrangements may be made to fulfill the project goals at the district.

IX. Assurances

Each member of the group hereby assures and represents that it:
1) Agrees to be bound to every statement and assurance made by the lead applicant in the application;
2) Has all requisite power and authority to execute this MOU;
3) Is familiar with the group's TIF application and is committed to working collaboratively to meet the responsibilities specified in this MOU in order to ensure the TIF project's success;
4) Will comply with all the terms of the Grant and all applicable Federal and State laws and regulations, including laws and regulations applicable to the Program, and the applicable provisions of EDGAR.

X. Modifications

(1) Consistent with the group's responsibility to implement the approved TIF application, this MOU may be amended only by written agreement signed by each of the group members. Modifications of this MOU do not relieve members of the group from implementing the content of the approved TIF application; therefore any modification that would require a change in the approved application must be approved by the US Department of Education.

(2) Moreover, in no case will a modification of this MOU relieve any member of the group of its responsibility to ensure that the MOU details the activities that each member of the group is to perform, or release any member of the group from every statement and assurance made by the group applicant in the application. See section 75.128(b) of EDGAR (34 C.F.R. 75.128(b)).

XI. Effective Date/Duration/Termination

This MOU shall take effect upon the lead applicant's receipt of a notice of grant award of TIF funds from the US Department of Education.

This MOU shall be effective beginning with the date of the last signature hereon, and, if a TIF grant is received, ending upon the expiration of the grant project period. Because any award of TIF funds by ED to support the group application is contingent upon the execution of this MOU by each party to the group application, the members of the group also agree that they will not terminate this MOU prior to the end of the grant project period without ED approval.
XII. Signatures

1) LEA Superintendent (or designee) -- required

Marilyn E. Birnbaum Ed.D., Superintendent, North Plainfield Public Schools
Print Name/Title/Name of LEA

Signature/Date

2) Nonprofit organization CEO (or designee) -- required

(b)(6)

Linda A. Reddy Ph.D., Associate Professor, Rutgers University
Print Name/Title/Name of organization

Signature/Date

7/19/12
4. Commitment Letters

Participating Local Educational Agencies:

Asbury Park School District
Hillside School District
Lakewood School District
North Plainfield School District

Participating Institutions:

Richards L. Edwards, Ph.D.
President of Rutgers University, State University of New Jersey

Stanley Messer, Ph.D.
Dean of Graduate School of Applied and Professional Psychology

Charlotte Danielson
Author of the Danielson Framework of Teaching

SSI Project Consultants:

Steve Elliott, Ph.D.
Lynn Holdeide, M.S.
Louis Hsu, Ph.D.
Maria Adelaida Restrepo, Ph.D.
Daniel Reschly, Ph.D.
Frank Worrell, Ph.D.
Asbury Park Board of Education
603 Mattison Avenue, 3rd Floor
Asbury Park, New Jersey 07712
(732) 776-2606 Ext. 2423

Dr. Denise M. Lowe, Superintendent

William J. Shannon
Director of Special Services

Andrea Bates
Interim Director of Personnel

Geoffrey Hastings
Business Administrator/Board Secretary

Dr. Martin Dickerson
Director of Curriculum & Instruction

July 13, 2012

Miriam Lund, Ph.D.
U.S. Department of Education
400 Maryland Avenue, SW. Room 3E245
LBJ Building
Washington, DC. 20202-6200

Dear Dr. Lund,

The School System Improvement (SSI) Project that is applying for the Teacher Incentive Fund (TIF) Program [CFDA 84.374A] is fully endorsed by Asbury Park Public Schools. TIF presents a tremendous opportunity to refine our district’s quality of education by developing effective systems of educator evaluation, as well as the implementation of an effective human capital management system. Asbury Park Public Schools qualifies for the TIF program as we contain five schools with “high poverty” levels exceeding 85% of students receiving free or reduced lunch subsidies. Our district would benefit greatly from the support provided through the TIF Program.

Asbury Park Public Schools supports the goals of the SSI Project and the TIF program’s absolute priorities 1 and 2. We fully endorse the implementation of a human capital management system with an educator evaluation system significantly linked to student growth components as its centerpiece. The development of such systems will increase the competency of our teachers and principals by providing rigorous evaluation measures linked to specific professional development supports. The addition of pay based compensation that is linked to the educator evaluation system will further enhance and promote our talented educators’ development. The systemic nature of these systems will improve educator and student achievement throughout our district. Asbury Park Public Schools is excited to engage in the TIF program’s goals and to promote high quality education!
Asbury Park's partnership with Dr. Linda Reddy and her team at Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey, is a strong choice. By collaborating together, we will be able to achieve the responsibilities associated with this project and implement the aforementioned human capital management, educator evaluation, and pay based compensation systems. The partnership between Asbury Park Public Schools and Rutgers University will lead to long lasting improvements in our school district and we look forward to working with Rutgers University to enhance student and teacher achievement.

Respectfully submitted,

Denise M. Lowe, Ed.D.
Superintendent
July 4, 2012

Miriam Lund, Ph.D.
U.S. Department of Education
400 Maryland Avenue, SW. Room 3E245
LBJ Building
Washington, DC. 20202-6200

Dear Dr. Lund,

Hillside Public Schools fully supports the aims of the School System Improvement [SSI] Project that is applying for the Teacher Incentive Fund (TIF) Program [CFDA 84.374A]. This is a tremendous opportunity to improve our district’s quality of education by enhancing our systems of educator evaluation and implementing an effective human capital management system that includes pay based compensation components. Hillside Public Schools qualifies for the TIF program as we contain six schools with “high poverty” levels exceeding 65% of students receiving free or reduced lunch subsidies. We would benefit greatly from the support provided through the TIF Program.

The district supports the goals of the SSIP to implement the TIF program’s absolute priorities 1 and 2. We fully endorse the implementation of a human capital management system that contains an educator evaluation system as its centerpiece and uses student growth as a significant component. The implementation of these systems will increase the number of effective teachers and principals by providing rigorous evaluation measures, empirically informed professional development supports, and differentiated incentives. Ultimately, these systems will improve student achievement and attract the most talented teachers and leaders to our school district. Hillside Public Schools is excited to be engaged in the TIF program’s aims to develop high quality education systems.

We have full confidence in our partnership with Dr. Linda Reddy and her team at Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey. As collaborators on the SSI Project, we strongly believe we will be able to execute the main responsibilities associated with this project and implement the aforementioned human capital management, educator evaluation, and pay based compensation systems. The partnership between Hillside Public Schools and Rutgers University will lead to long lasting improvements in the quality of education we provide our students. Hillside Public Schools looks forward to working with Rutgers University and enhancing student and teacher achievement alike.

Sincerely,

Frank Deo, Ed.D.
Superintendent of Schools
July 13, 2012

Miriam Lund, Ph.D.
U.S. Department of Education
400 Maryland Avenue, SW. Room 3E245
LBJ Building
Washington, DC. 20202-6200

Dear Dr. Lund,

Lakewood Public Schools fully supports the School System Improvement (SSI) Project that is applying to the Teacher Incentive Fund (TIF) Program [CFDA 84.374A]. The TIF program holds tremendous value for improving our management of human capital and evaluation systems. Lakewood contains six public schools that meet the “high-poverty” high-needs definition, as the students receiving free and reduced lunch subsidies ranges from 71% to 93% across schools. Our six schools will tremendously benefit from the TIF program’s emphasis on human capital management for increasing effective educator and school system capacity.

Lakewood Public Schools strongly endorses the TIF program’s absolute priorities 1 and 2. The implementation of a human capital management system, based on an evaluation system grounded in student growth, is necessary to improve the quality of education our students receive. By enhancing our evaluation systems and establishing a pay based compensation system, Lakewood Public Schools will attract talented educators who can provide high quality education and leadership in our school district. As collaborators on this project, we are excited to engage in revising our management systems and improving the ways in which we evaluate and support teachers. Ultimately, this will benefit current and future students in our district!

We look forward to collaborating with Dr. Linda Reddy and her team at Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey. Rutgers University is a strong partner for this opportunity as they possess not only the knowledgeable and expertise to conduct this project, but also the resources to see its completion. Together, Lakewood Public Schools and Rutgers University will be able to implement a human capital management system that will guide educator and student growth alike and improve the overall quality of education in our school district.

Sincerely,

Laura Winters, Ed.D.
Interim Superintendent
Miriam Lund, Ph.D.
U.S. Department of Education
400 Maryland Avenue, SW. Room 3E245
LBJ Building
Washington, DC. 20202-6200

Dear Dr. Lund,

I am writing on behalf of the North Plainfield Public School District to express full support as a collaborator on the School System Improvement [SSI] Project that will be submitted to the Teacher Incentive Fund (TIF) Program [CFDA 84.374A]. We have reviewed the proposal and believe this to be a great opportunity to modernize our systems of human capital management, educator evaluation, and performance-based compensation, and by doing so, improve the overall effectiveness of teachers and principals in our school district. Our district qualifies for TIF as “high poverty” with approximately 60% of our students qualifying for either free or reduced lunch subsidies, and would benefit greatly from the support provided by the TIF Program.

North Plainfield Public School District recognizes effective teachers and principals are the core of a successful school district, and that the subsequent systems responsible for supporting and enhancing effective educators are equally important. We embrace the goals of the TIF program to implement an LEA-wide human capital management system with a rigorous educator evaluation system at its center, and to place a significant emphasis on student growth in achievement. As a collaborator, we look forward to implementing a fair and balanced evaluation system for teachers and principals that will enhance the attractiveness of working in our district and ultimately improve the quality of education services that our students receive. The district supports the SSI Project’s efforts to achieve the goals and absolute priorities of the TIF program.

We are confident that we will be able to execute the responsibilities associated with this project, with the collaboration of Dr. Linda Reddy and her team at Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey. Our strong partnership will lead to successful implementation of the aforementioned systems to identify and reward effective educators, and manage the awarded funds to accomplish the goals of the project in North Plainfield Public School District.

Respectfully submitted,

Marilyn Birnbaum, Ed.D.
Superintendent of Schools

Proud Schools for a Proud Community
July 16, 2012

Miriam Lund, Ph.D.
U.S. Department of Education
400 Maryland Avenue, SW. Room 3E245
LBJ Building
Washington, DC.  20202-6200

Dear Dr. Lund:

I am writing to convey that Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey strongly supports the School System Improvement Project proposal to the U.S. Department of Education – Teacher Incentive Fund Program. I understand that several high needs school districts and Rutgers University have joined together to enhance the organizational capacity of schools in New Jersey.

This proposal is in line with Rutgers University’s long standing initiatives to serve disadvantaged and culturally diverse populations. The School System Improvement Project is a comprehensive school reform project focused on increasing teacher and principal effectiveness and student achievement and growth. This is an important project for New Jersey public schools, and it is closely aligned with the 2011 New Jersey Educator Evaluation Task Force recommendations.

I am pleased to hear that the project team will implement a comprehensive human capital management system that includes fair and balanced educator evaluation, data driven professional development, and compensation based on merit for effective teachers and principals. The project team headed by Dr. Linda Reddy has extensive experience with developing and implementing school-wide assessments and interventions for improving instructional effectiveness and student academic growth. Rutgers’s team has a long history of working with high needs school districts in New Jersey. Thus, the School System Improvement Project is a natural extension of work conducted by this exceptional team.

In sum, Rutgers University is strongly committed to supporting innovative assessment and intervention approaches that improve educator and student success. I strongly recommend that the reviewers support this outstanding proposal.

Respectfully submitted,

Richard Edwards, Ph.D.
Interim Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs
July 18, 2012

Dr. Miriam Lund, Ph.D.
U.S. Department of Education
400 Maryland Avenue, SW. Room 3E245
LBJ Building
Washington, DC. 20202-6200

Dear Dr. Lund:

RE: U.S. Department of Education Teacher Incentive Fund (TIF)
   School System Improvement Project

On behalf of the faculty, staff, and students at Rutgers Graduate School of Applied and Professional Psychology, I am writing to confirm my strong support of the School System Improvement (SSI) Project submitted by several New Jersey high needs school districts and Rutgers University. The SSI Project proposes to implement a comprehensive human capital management system with a rigorous, yet balanced and fair, educator evaluation system that includes assessment of teacher best practices and student success. The system will identify effective teachers, guide professional development, and compensate educators based on their effectiveness to improve student growth in achievement. The SSI Project will closely follow the recommendations outlined in Governor Christie’s 2011 New Jersey Educator Effectiveness Task Force Report.

Right now, Rutgers and New Jersey Public Schools have before them the opportunity and expertise to make real change for our children and families by enhancing school reform through the SSI Project for high poverty schools in New Jersey. The participating school districts in this proposal and the State of New Jersey has yet to receive any TIF funding for comprehensive school reform that includes a quality and comprehensive human capital management system (e.g., recruitment, hiring, placement, retention, promotion).
At Rutgers Graduate School of Applied and Professional Psychology, we have a solid history of securing multi-million dollar federal and state grants and contracts focused on implementing evidence-based prevention and intervention programs to improve teacher performance and student outcomes in schools. We also have over twenty years of demonstrated ability to create and sustain relationships with school administrators, teachers, parents, and other staff, working with over 1,100 New Jersey schools in all 21 state counties. We educate and train doctoral level psychologists, in a rigorous five-year program, who are committed to enhancing the lives of children, adolescents, adults, and families—especially the underserved—in schools and communities in New Jersey, the United States, and around the world. Our graduates are well-trained professionals who are leaders in their field and in their practice, often launching new initiatives capable of wide-scale impact in schools and communities, creating national visibility and whole system change through replicable models of prevention and intervention that have been adapted across the country.

Rutgers University is strongly committed to supporting innovative assessment and intervention approaches that improve teacher, principal and student achievement in New Jersey School Districts. Our faculty and staff in the Graduate School together have over 30 years of developing and implementing school-based assessments and research programs, particularly in the areas of improving instruction and student academic growth. The SSI Project Team, headed by Dr. Linda Reddy, has considerable experience in working directly with educators, students, parents, and other school professionals in high needs and underserved school districts throughout New Jersey.

A grant from the U.S. Department of Education Teacher Incentive Fund would initiate positive transformation for our New Jersey public school students, their teachers, and schools. Thank you for your time and consideration. Should you have any questions or comments regarding this initiative, please feel free to contact me at smesser@rci.rutgers.edu.

Respectfully submitted,

Stanley B. Messer, Ph.D.
Dean and Professor II
June 27, 2012

Miriam Lund, Ph.D.
U.S. Department of Education
400 Maryland Avenue, SW. Room 3E245
LBJ Building
Washington, DC. 20202-6200

Dear Dr. Lund:

I am writing to enthusiastically endorse and assist in the School System Improvement Project to be submitted by Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey to the U.S. Department of Education – Teacher Incentive Fund Program. This proposed project includes an outstanding team of school personnel and researchers. I am delighted to support this important project by assisting the team in training school personnel on the Danielson Framework for Teaching and increasing the overall professional capacity of teachers and administrators in the participating high needs schools.

I have devoted my entire career to enhancing the evaluation of educators and the collaborative process between principals and teachers for improving instructional effectiveness and student learning across the world. Drs. Reddy, Kettler, and Kurz’s proposal outlines several unique and important goals that are urgently needed for the field of education. I understand that the Project team plans to implement a human capital management system for increasing the recruitment, development, and retention of highly effective teachers and principals. The school districts and Rutgers University will together implement rigorous educator evaluation, provide empirically-supported professional development, and compensate effective teachers and principals. I applaud the project team efforts!

I enthusiastically and unequivocally recommend that the Teacher Incentive Fund support this proposal and I look forward to working with Rutgers University and their partner school districts soon!

Sincerely,

Charlotte Danielson
June 26, 2012

Dr. Linda Reddy
TIP Project Director
Rutgers University
152 Frelinghuysen Road
Piscataway, NJ 08854-8085

Dear Dr. Reddy,

I have reviewed your proposed TIF proposal and believe you and your team at Rutgers, and school partners in New Jersey, has developed an excellent system improvement project. Your proposed 5-year School System Improvement Project (SSIP) is characterized by a strong theory of action that will be operationalized with excellent measurement of principal and teacher effectiveness measures. I am knowledgeable of several of the measures you will be using and have been actively engaged in other states with school improvement projects, as well as serve large scale multi-state improvement projects. As a result, I would be pleased to serve as a mentor consultant to you and your co-PIs. I can commit 3 days per year during the period October 1, 2012 - Sept. 30, 2017 to this project and find the daily rate of $1,500 acceptable.

I look forward to working with you and others to ensure this project is highly successful. I am sure I too will learn some value new lessons regarding school improvement!

Sincerely,

(b)(6)

Stephen N. Elliott, PhD
Mickelson Foundation Professor of Education
Director
July 16, 2012

Miriam Lund, Ph.D.
U.S. Department of Education
400 Maryland Avenue, SW. Room 3E245
LBJ Building
Washington, DC. 20202-6200

Dear Dr. Lund:

I am pleased to support the School System Improvement Project to be submitted by Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey to the U.S. Department of Education – Teacher Incentive Fund Program and am delighted to serve as part of the pool of national experts. I understand my knowledge of state and district approaches to measuring growth in non-tested subjects and grades will be called upon to contribute to the discussion and decision making process.

In review of the proposal, I am impressed with the commitment to address teacher evaluation as a systems approach to human capital management and not in isolation. Such a comprehensive approach has greater potential to lead to improved teacher capacity and student growth. Equally impressive is the range of national experts recruited to assist in this endeavor. I am delighted to support and collaborate on this project.

Over the last 5 years in my position at the National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality, I have had the opportunity to work with a range of State Education Agencies to help facilitate the decision making process in designing comprehensive teacher and leader evaluation systems. Determining appropriate measures of student growth in non-tested subjects and grades continues to be a challenge. States have taken various approaches, all of which have areas of strengths and weakness; however states that consider measures that can be used to inform instruction are more likely to build stakeholder commitment.

I believe that the team leading this work is particularly strong, and if funded, look forward to collaborating with Rutgers University.

Sincerely,

Lynn Holdheide
July 17, 2012

Dr. Linda A. Reddy  
TIF Project Director  
Graduate School of Applied and Professional Psychology  
Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey  
152 Frelinghuysen Road  
Piscataway, NJ 08854. USA

Dear Dr. Reddy:

I am delighted to confirm my interest and availability to serve as measurement and statistical consultant for the proposed **School System Improvement (SSI) Project**. I have carefully reviewed the project proposal. I am confident that I can commit the expected time to assist in this important school improvement project.

I have reviewed your proposed TIF proposal and believe you and your team at Rutgers, and the five school district partners in New Jersey, have developed a comprehensive human capital management system (HCMS) which includes rigorous teacher and principal evaluation systems that identify and reward effectiveness through performance-based compensation system. I understand the proposed educator evaluation system will inform HCMS decision making, differentiated incentives, and targeted professional development. As you know, I am knowledgeable of several of the measures you will be using and have successfully worked with you on large multi-state and school measurement projects.

I look forward to working with you again and collaborating with the local education agencies of Asbury Park, Hillside, Lakewood, and North Plainfield School Districts. Please let me know if I can assist you in anyway.

Sincerely,

(b)(6)

Louis Hsu, Ph.D.  
Professor Emeritus – Fairleigh Dickinson University  
Senior Analyst at FutureWorkSystems
July 12, 2012

Miriam Lund, Ph.D.
U.S. Department of Education
400 Maryland Avenue, SW. Room 3E245
LBJ Building
Washington, DC. 20202-6200

Dear Dr. Lund:

I am writing to enthusiastically endorse and assist in the *School System Improvement Project* to be submitted by Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey to the U.S. Department of Education – Teacher Incentive Fund Program. This proposed project includes an outstanding team of school personnel and researchers. I am delighted to support this important project by assisting the team in training school personnel on the Danielson Framework for Teaching and increasing the overall professional capacity of teachers and administrators in the participating high needs schools.

I have dedicated my career to enhancing the evaluation and intervention of language minority children, specifically those who speak Spanish as a native language and are learning English as a second language. In addition, I have worked in professional development helping teachers maximize language learning opportunities in these children and in making appropriate referrals when their development is not what is expected for a bilingual child through professional development contracts and grants through the US Department of Education and Head Star. Drs. Reddy, Kettler, and Kurz’s proposal outlines several unique and important goals that are urgently needed for the field of education. I understand that the Project team plans to implement a human capital management system for increasing the recruitment, development, and retention of highly effective teachers and principals. The school districts and Rutgers University will together implement rigorous educator evaluation, provide empirically-supported professional development, and compensate effective teachers and principals. I applaud the project team efforts!

I enthusiastically and unequivocally recommend that the Teacher Incentive Fund support this proposal and I look forward to working with Rutgers University and their partner school districts soon!

Sincerely,

Maria Adelaida Restrepo, Ph.D.
Associate Professor
July 16, 2012

Dr. Linda A. Reddy  
TIF Project Director  
Graduate School of Applied and Professional Psychology  
Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey  
152 Frelinghuysen Road  
Piscataway, NJ 08854, USA

Dear Dr. Reddy:

I am writing to confirm my interest and availability to serve as the independent evaluator for the proposed School System Improvement (SSI) Project. I have carefully reviewed the project proposal and view very positively the importance and potential impact of this work in improving outcomes for children. I am confident that I can commit the expected time (5 days per year in Years 1 through 5), fulfill the attendant responsibilities, and complete the evaluation activities and reports in a timely manner as prescribed.

I look forward to working with you, the collaborating with local education agencies, and the participating staff should the project be approved. Please do not hesitate to contact me should you need additional information.

Sincerely,

[b][6](b)

Daniel J. Reschly, PhD  
Professor of Education and Psychology  
Box 228 Peabody  
Vanderbilt University  
Nashville, TN 37203-5701
July 2, 2012

Miriam Lund, Ph.D.
U.S. Department of Education
400 Maryland Avenue, SW. Room 3E245
LBJ Building
Washington, DC. 20202-6200

Dear Dr. Lund,

I am writing to indicate my interest in working on the proposed project, entitled the “School System Improvement Project” to be submitted by Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey and several high poverty school districts to the U.S. Department of Education – Teacher Incentive Fund Program. The leadership team on this project are competent academics with well-established track records of working collaboratively with school systems.

I have a considerable amount of experience consulting with school systems serving low-income and minority populations and conducting research focused on program evaluation and scale development. Because I also have interests in the psychosocial adjustment and educational functioning in of youth of color, I am enthusiastic about the possibility of collaborating on this important project.

Finally, being based at a land-grant institution with a longstanding tradition of research projects aimed at enhancing educational outcomes of students from low-income backgrounds, I am particularly thrilled at the commitment that this grant represents to the process of university-community school reform.

Yours sincerely,

(b)(6)

Frank C. Worrell, Ph.D.
Certified School Psychologist
Licensed Psychologist (PS-008390-L)
## 5. Other Evidence Demonstrating Educator Support

**SCHOOL SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT (SSI) PROJECT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Committee Approval</th>
<th>Membership</th>
<th>Approval Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asbury Park</td>
<td>Educator Evaluation Team</td>
<td>9 principals, 6 teachers, &amp; 1 union representative</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Curriculum &amp; Professional Development Council</td>
<td>Assistant Superintendent and 6 teachers</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillside</td>
<td>District-Wide Teacher Assessment Committee</td>
<td>13 teachers, 1 union representative, 1 board member, &amp; 1 parent</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional Development Committee</td>
<td>4 teachers, 2 administrators, &amp; 1 director</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakewood</td>
<td>School Climate Evaluation Committee</td>
<td>1 school psychologist, 1 social worker, 1 principal, 4 teachers, and 1 union representative</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interim Assessment Committee</td>
<td>8 teachers, 2 principals, 2 district supervisors, &amp; 1 union representative</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parental Involvement Committee</td>
<td>6 parents and 2 teachers</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Plainfield</td>
<td>Instructional Council</td>
<td>8 teachers, 2 principals, 2 district supervisors, &amp; superintendents</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>District Professional Development Committee</td>
<td>6 teachers &amp; 2 administrators</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. All four LEAs’ Boards of Education voted on the SSI Project in June 2012 – unanimous support was received.
6. Indirect Rate Cost Agreement
March 29, 2011

Mr. Stephen J. DiPaolo  
University Controller  
Rutgers University  
3 Rutgers Plaza, Admin.SV.Bldg. 3, 2nd Fl.  
New Brunswick, New Jersey 08901-3325

Dear Mr. DiPaolo:

A negotiation agreement is being faxed to you for signature. This agreement reflects an understanding reached between your institution and a member of my staff concerning the rates or amounts that may be used to support your claim for costs on grants and contracts with the Federal Government. The agreement must be signed by a duly authorized representative of your institution and faxed to me; retain a copy for your file. Our fax number is (212) 264-5478. We will reproduce and distribute the agreement to awarding agencies of the Federal Government for their use.

Requirements for adjustments to costs claimed under Federal Grants and Contracts resulting from this negotiation are dependent upon the type of rate contained in the negotiation agreement. Information relating to these requirements is enclosed.

In consideration of this negotiation agreement:

1. The carry-forward under-recovery of $394,000 resulting from the settlement of the fringe benefit rate for fiscal year ended June 30, 2009 was considered in establishing a fixed rate for the year ending June 30, 2011. The under-recovery must be included in your fringe benefit rate proposal based on actual expenses for fiscal year ending June 30, 2011.

2. The fringe benefit rate proposal for fiscal year ended June 30, 2010 is currently on extension.

A proposal encompassing all activities of your institution together with the required supporting information must be submitted to my office at the address on page 2 for each fiscal year your institution claims costs under grants and contracts awarded by the Federal Government. This proposal is due within six months after the close of your fiscal year. Therefore, a proposal for fiscal year ending June 30, 2012 will be due in my office not later than December 31, 2012. The proposal will be used to establish rates/amounts for the fiscal year subsequent to the last period covered by an approved final, fixed, or predetermined rate(s). Failure to submit a timely proposal will be interpreted as a forfeiture of reimbursement for indirect costs.
Therefore, unless a proposal is received by December 31, 2012, future awards made by the Department of Health and Human Services will be for direct costs only and will not permit a funded recovery of costs contained in this agreement. In addition, the costs claimed against awards already made may be subject to disallowances.

If you are unable to submit your proposal by the prescribed date, you may request an extension. This request must be submitted prior to the due date of the proposal and must contain a justification for the extension and the date the proposal will be submitted.

Your proposal and relevant correspondence should be addressed to:

Department of Health and Human Services
Division of Cost Allocation
26 Federal Plaza, Room 41-122
New York, New York 10278
(212) 264-1823

In addition, please acknowledge your concurrence with the comments and conditions cited above by signing this letter in the space provided below and FAX (212-264-5478) it to me with the enclosed negotiation agreement.

Sincerely,

(b)(6)

Robert I. Aaronson
Director, Division of Cost Allocation

Enclosures

Concurrence: (b)(6)
Name: (b)(6)
Title: (b)(6)
Date: (b)(6)
COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES RATE AGREEMENT

EIN: 1226001086A1

DATE: 03/29/2011

ORGANIZATION: Rutgers University

FILING REP.: The preceding agreement was dated 01/26/2010

3 Rutgers Plaza, Admin.Sv.Blg.3, 2 Fl
New Brunswick, NJ 08901-3325

The rates approved in this agreement are for use on grants, contracts and other agreements with the Federal Government, subject to the conditions in Section III.

SECTION I: INDIRECT COST RATES

RATE TYPES: FIXED FINAL PROV. (PROVISIONAL) PRED. (PREDETERMINED)

EFFECTIVE PERIOD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>FROM</th>
<th>TO</th>
<th>RATE(%) LOCATION</th>
<th>APPLICABLE TO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRED.</td>
<td>07/01/2010</td>
<td>06/30/2012</td>
<td>54.00 On-Campus</td>
<td>Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRED.</td>
<td>07/01/2012</td>
<td>06/30/2013</td>
<td>55.00 On-Campus</td>
<td>Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRED.</td>
<td>07/01/2010</td>
<td>06/30/2013</td>
<td>26.00 Off-Campus</td>
<td>Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRED.</td>
<td>07/01/2010</td>
<td>06/30/2013</td>
<td>53.00 On-Campus</td>
<td>Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRED.</td>
<td>07/01/2010</td>
<td>06/30/2013</td>
<td>26.00 Off-Campus</td>
<td>Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRED.</td>
<td>07/01/2010</td>
<td>06/30/2013</td>
<td>37.20 On-Campus</td>
<td>Other Sponsored Prog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRED.</td>
<td>07/01/2010</td>
<td>06/30/2013</td>
<td>26.00 Off-Campus</td>
<td>Other Sponsored Prog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRED.</td>
<td>07/01/2010</td>
<td>06/30/2013</td>
<td>14.00 Off-Campus</td>
<td>Special Instruction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>FROM</th>
<th>TO</th>
<th>RATE(S)</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>APPLICABLE TO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PROV.</td>
<td>07/01/2013</td>
<td>Until</td>
<td>Amended</td>
<td></td>
<td>Use same rates and conditions as those cited for fiscal year ending June 30, 2013.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BASE**

Total direct costs excluding capital expenditures (buildings, individual items of equipment; alterations and renovations), that portion of each subaward in excess of $25,000; hospitalization and other fees associated with patient care whether the services are obtained from an owned, related or third party hospital or other medical facility; rental/maintenance of off-site activities; student tuition remission and student support costs (e.g., student aid, stipends, dependency allowances, scholarships, fellowships).
ORGANIZATION: Rutgers University  
AGREEMENT DATE: 03/29/2011

SECTION I: FRINGE BENEFIT RATES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>FROM</th>
<th>TO</th>
<th>RATE(%)</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FIXED</td>
<td>7/1/2010</td>
<td>6/30/2011</td>
<td>35.40</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIXED</td>
<td>7/1/2010</td>
<td>6/30/2011</td>
<td>29.00</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIXED</td>
<td>7/1/2010</td>
<td>6/30/2011</td>
<td>23.20</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIXED</td>
<td>7/1/2010</td>
<td>6/30/2011</td>
<td>7.40</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROV.</td>
<td>7/1/2011</td>
<td>Until</td>
<td>amended</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** DESCRIPTION OF FRINGE BENEFITS RATE BASE:  
Salaries and wages.
SECTION II: SPECIAL REMARKS

TREATMENT OF FRINGE BENEFITS:
The fringe benefits are charged using the rate(s) listed in the Fringe Benefits Section of this Agreement. The fringe benefits included in the rate(s) are listed below.

TREATMENT OF PAID ABSENCE:
Vacation, holiday, sick leave pay and other paid absences are included in salaries and wages and are claimed on grants, contracts and other agreements as part of the normal cost for salaries and wages. Separate claims are not made for the cost of these paid absences.
1. Off-Campus definition: All activities conducted in facilities not owned by the organization and all activities conducted at field locations where no permanent facilities are used are considered off-site and not apportioned between their on-site and off-site components. If 50% or more of the indirect cost rate base cost of the project are determined to be on-site, the entire project is considered on-site. If less than 50% of the indirect cost rate base are determined to be on-site, the entire project is considered off-site.

2. The rates in this agreement have been negotiated or revised, as appropriate, to reflect the administrative cap provisions of the revision to OMB Circular A-21 published by the Office of Management and Budget on May 8, 1996. No rate affecting the institution's fiscal periods beginning on or after October 1, 1991 contains total administrative cost components in excess of that 26 percent cap.

3. Effective beginning fiscal year ended June 30, 1977, a New Jersey State-Wide Fringe Benefit rate was negotiated that is applicable to Rutgers. The negotiated rate applicable to all programs excluding the JTPA Programs provided for this and the balance of the items to make an all encompassing rate as it pertains to Rutgers. The fringe benefit cost covered are as follows:

- Pensions
- Health Benefits (incl., Prescription Drug, Dental Care Program, and Vision Care)
- Unemployment Insurance
- Temporary Disability Insurance
- Unused Sick Leave
- Social Security Taxes (FICA)
- Workmen's Compensation
- Tuition Remission
- Early Retirement Incentive

4. Equipment means an article of nonexpendable, tangible personal property having a useful life of more than one year, and an acquisition cost of $5,000 or more per unit.

This rate agreement updates fringe benefit rates only.
ORGANIZATION: Rutgers University  
AGREEMENT DATE: 03/29/2011  

SECTION III: GENERAL  

A. LIMITATIONS:  
The rates in this Agreement are subject to any statutory or administrative limitations and apply to a given grant, contract or other agreement only to the extent that funds are available. Acceptance of the rates is subject to the following conditions: (1) Only costs incurred by the organization were included in its facilities and administrative cost pools as finally accepted; such costs are legal obligations of the organization and are allowable under the governing cost principles; (2) The same costs that have been treated as facilities and administrative costs are not claimed as direct costs; (3) Similar types of costs have been accepted consistent accounting treatment; and (4) The information provided by the organization which was used to establish the rates is not later found to be materially incomplete or inaccurate by the Federal Government. In such situations the rate(s) would be subject to renegotiation at the discretion of the Federal Government.  

B. ACCOUNTING CHANGES:  
This Agreement is based on the accounting system purposed by the organization to be in effect during the Agreement period. Changes to the method of accounting for costs which affect the amount of reimbursement resulting from the use of this Agreement require prior approval of the authorized representative of the cognizant agency. Such changes include, but are not limited to, changes in the charging of a particular type of cost from facilities and administrative to direct. Failure to obtain approval may result in cost disallowances.  

C. FIXED RATES:  
If a fixed rate is in this Agreement, it is based on an estimate of the costs for the period covered by the rate. When the actual costs for this period are determined, an adjustment will be made on a rate of a future year(s) to compensate for the difference between the costs used to establish the fixed rate and actual costs.  

D. USE BY OTHER FEDERAL AGENCIES:  
The rates in this Agreement were approved in accordance with the authority in Office of Management and Budget Circular A-11 Circular, and should be applied to grants, contracts and other agreements covered by this Circular, subject to any limitations in A above. The organization may provide copies of the Agreement to other Federal Agencies to give them early notification of the Agreement.  

E. OTHER:  
If any Federal contract, grant or other agreement is reimbursing facilities and administrative costs by a means other than the approved rate(s) in this Agreement, the organization should (1) credit such costs to the affected programs, and (2) apply the approved rate(s) to the appropriate base to identify the proper amount of facilities and administrative costs allocable to these programs.  

BY THE INSTITUTION:  

Rutgers University  

ON BEHALF OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT:  

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES  

Robert I. Aaronson  

Director, Northeastern Field Office  

(DESCRIPTION)  

1/29/2011  

(DATE)  

NHS REPRESENTATIVE: Jeffrey Warren  

Telephone: (212) 264-3069  
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7. Individual Resumes for Project Directors and Key Personnel

SSI Project Directors:
Linda A. Reddy, Ph.D. – Principal Investigator
Ryan Kettler, Ph.D. – Co Investigator
Alexander Kurz, Ph.D. – Co Investigator

SSI Project Consultants:
Steve Elliot, Ph.D.
Lynn Holdeide, M.S.
Louis Hsu, Ph.D.
Maria Adelaida Restrepo, Ph.D.
Daniel Reschly, Ph.D.
Frank Worrell, Ph.D.
BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

NAME
Linda A. Reddy, Ph.D.

POSITION TITLE
Associate Professor

EDUCATION/TRAINING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSTITUTION AND LOCATION</th>
<th>DEGREE</th>
<th>YEAR(s)</th>
<th>FIELD OF STUDY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boston University</td>
<td>B.A.</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Arizona</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>Measurement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Fernando Valley Child Guidance Clinics (APA Accredited)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Arizona (APA Accredited)</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Predoctoral Internship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devereux Foundation, Institute of Clinical Training and Research (APA Accredited)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Postdoctoral Child Clinical Fellowship</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A. Positions and Honors

Positions

1996- 2002 Assistant Professor, Fairleigh Dickinson University, Department of Psychology, Teaneck, NJ.

2000 – 2004 Director of the Center for Psychological Services and Research, Fairleigh Dickinson University, NJ.

1997- 2007 Founder/Director of the Child and Adolescent ADHD Clinic, Fairleigh Dickinson University’s Center for Psychological Services, NJ

2002- 2007 Associate Professor, Fairleigh Dickinson University, Department of Psychology, Teaneck, NJ.

1996- Present Research Associate, Institute of Clinical Training and Research, Devereux Foundation, PA.

2007- Present Associate Professor & Founder/Director of the Child and Adolescent ADHD Clinic, Rutgers University, Piscataway, NJ.

2012 Interim Chair of the Applied Psychology Department and Interim Director of the Psy.D. School Psychology Program, Rutgers University, Graduate School of Applied and Professional Psychology, Piscataway, NJ.

Honors (partial list)

1996 Research and Service Recognition Award, The Devereux Foundation

2003 Emerging Researcher Award for Significant Contributions to Research in Psychology, the New Jersey State Psychological Association

2004 Distinguished Faculty Research Award, Fairleigh Dickinson University

2005 Testified at the Proposed Reauthorization of IDEA, New York

2009 Research Article of the Year Award, Journal of School Psychology – Society for the Study of School Psychology

2010 Fellow Status, APA Division 16 (School Psychology)

2012 President-Elect, APA Division 16 (School Psychology)

**National Committees (partial list)**
2012 APA Chair, School Improvement Task Force
2010-Present APA Division 16 Translation of Science to Practice Task Force
2008-Present APA Task Force on Violence Directed at Teachers

**Licensure and Certification**
Practice of Psychology: NJ #SI03655; NY #013387-1; PA # PS-008347
Nationally Certified School Psychologist #30934

**Consultant to several test development companies (e.g., Pearson, Harcourt, Riverside Publishing, ProEd)**

**B. Publications**

**Reviewer for over 10 journals** (e.g., Assessment, Child Neuropsychology, Journal of Psychoeducational Assessment, Journal of School Psychology) as well as American Psychological Association Press, John Wiley & Sons, & Guilford Press

**Articles (partial list; published over 60 articles and book chapters)**


Child and Adolescent Psychiatry. 36 (5), 58 1-588.

Books

Test (Co-author) used in Head Start Programs across the Country

Classroom Strategies Scale – Observer and Teacher Forms. Rutgers University, Piscataway, NJ.

MAPS Developmental Observation Assessment Scales Level Preschool through Third Grade. Assessment Technology Inc. Child Development Center, Tucson, AZ.

C. Research and Development Funding (awarded 17 grants/contracts)

**CURRENT**
2008-2013 Development and Validation of a Teacher Progress Monitoring Scale, U.S. Dept. of Education, Institute of Educational Sciences (Reddy PI $1,486,000)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Project Commitments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Title, Client, Grant/Contract Number/End Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development and Validation of a Teacher Progress Monitoring Scale. (2008-2013). IES, Social and Behavioral context for Academic Learning, CFDA 84.305A (Role PI)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OVERLAP: There is no scientific or budgetary overlap between the application being considered and the above grants.

COMMITMENT OVERLAP: Potential commitment overlap does not exist at this time.
RYAN J. KETTLER, PHD, NCSP

Psychology A347
152 Frelinghuysen Road
Piscataway, NJ 08854

Phone: 848-445-3960
Fax: 732-445-4888
r.j.kettler@rutgers.edu

EDUCATION

University of Wisconsin-Madison
PhD in Educational Psychology
Specialization in School Psychology (APA-accredited program) 2005

Dissertation
Identifying students who need help early: Validation of the Brief Academic Competence Evaluation Screening System

University of Wisconsin-Madison
MS in Educational Psychology
Specialization in School Psychology (NASP-approved program) 2003

Thesis
Teacher and student ratings of academic competence: An examination of cross-informant agreement and classification accuracy

University of Michigan
BA, with distinction, in Literature, Science, and Arts
Specialization in Psychology 1998

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey
Graduate School of Applied and Professional Psychology
Assistant Professor 2011-present

Peabody College of Vanderbilt University
Department of Special Education
Research Assistant Professor 2007-2011

Learning Sciences Institute
Coordinator of Data Services 2008-2009

California State University, Los Angeles
Division of Special Education and Counseling
Assistant Professor 2005-2007

Ethan Allen School
Intern in Professional Psychology (APA-accredited program) 2004-2005
COMPETITIVE GRANT ACTIVITY

Peabody College of Vanderbilt University

*Modified Alternate Assessment Participation Screening (MAAPS) Consortium*
( Elliott, S.N., Kettler, R.J., & Zigmond, N.)
U.S. Department of Education $1,815,700
Co-Principal Investigator 2009-2012

*Consortium for Modified Alternate Assessment Development and Implementation (CMAADI)*
( Elliott, S.N., Rodriguez, M.C., Roach, A.T., & Kettler, R.J.)
U.S. Department of Education $1,999,875
Co-Principal Investigator and Project Director 2008-2011

*Operationalizing Alternate Assessment for Science Inquiry Skills (OAASIS)*
(Foster, C.J.)
U.S. Department of Education $1,168,706
Investigator 2008-2010

*Early Identification of Students with Learning Difficulties: A Comparison of Methods*
( Kettler, R.J., & Albers, C.A.)
Society for the Study of School Psychology $14,900
Principal Investigator 2008-2009

*Consortium for Alternate Assessment Validity and Experimental Studies (CAAVES)*
( Elliott, S.N. & Compton, E.C.)
U.S. Department of Education $1,535,473
Investigator 2007-2009

*Predicting Academic Achievement: Screening Social and Academic Enablers*
( Elliott, S.N., Griffin, P., Davies, M., & Kettler, R.J.)
Vanderbilt International Office $12,000
Co-Principal Investigator 2007-2008

California State University, Los Angeles
(Kettler, R.J.)
*Evaluation of the BACCESS: Predictive Validity and Generalization to an Urban Population*
Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity $5,000
Principal Investigator 2005-2006
SELECT PEER-REVIEWED PUBLICATIONS

In press


2012


2011


2010

EDITED BOOKS


MEASUREMENT INSTRUMENTS


WEBINAR PRESENTATIONS


Beddow, P.A., & Kettler, R.J. (2010, May/June). Guiding the development and evaluation of accessible test items using the TAMI. Webinar presented to representatives from the departments of education in South Carolina, South Dakota, and Wyoming.

CONSULTING

University of Pittsburgh
Restructuring and Improving Special Education (RISE) 2012-present

College Board
Services for Students with Disabilities (SSD) 2007-present

Wisconsin Center for Education Research (WCER)
Alternate Access for English Language Learners 2010-2011

Ryan J. Kettler/Curriculum Vitae/2012
Effort on Funded and Proposed Projects October 2012 through September 2017

Ryan J. Kettler

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funded Projects</th>
<th>Current Effort</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor in the Graduate School of Applied and Professional Psychology</td>
<td>100%* during the academic year, 0 summer months *Changes to 59% upon SSI Project funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent position</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Projects</th>
<th>Proposed Effort</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School System Improvement (SSI) Project</td>
<td>41% during the academic year, 2.5 summer months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal to the U.S. Department of Education CDFA 84.374A Teacher Incentive Fund (TIF) Program, 10/1/2012 – 9/30/2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ALEXANDER KURZ, Ph.D., BCBA
Learning Sciences Institute • Mary Lou Fulton Teachers College
Arizona State University • P.O. Box 872111 • Tempe, AZ 85287 • 480.727.5695
alexander.kurz@asu.edu

EDUCATION

Ph.D.  Peabody College of Vanderbilt University, 2011  Nashville, TN
Advisors: Dr. Stephen N. Elliott and Dr. Daniel J. Reschly
Special Education: High Incidence
Interdisciplinary Program in Educational Psychology
Dissertation: Opportunity to learn the intended curriculum: Measuring
key instructional indicators and examining relations to achievement for
students with disabilities

M.Ed.  Peabody College of Vanderbilt University, 2007  Nashville, TN
Advisors: Dr. Joseph H. Wehby and Dr. Stephen N. Elliott
Special Education: Behavior Disorders
Applied Behavior Analysis Certification Program
Thesis: Alignment of the intended, planned, and enacted curriculum in
general and special education and its relation to student achievement

B.S.  Middle Tennessee State University, 2003  Murfreesboro, TN
Philosophy

B.A.  Middle Tennessee State University, 2001  Murfreesboro, TN
Special Education

Pädagogische Hochschule Ludwigsburg  Ludwigsburg, Germany
Special Education

PROFESSIONAL AND GRADUATE RESEARCH EXPERIENCES

2011 - Present  Assistant Research Professor  Tempe, AZ
Learning Sciences Institute, Arizona State University

2011 - Present  Affiliated Adjunct Faculty  Tempe, AZ
Mary Lou Fulton Teachers College, Arizona State University

2008 - 2011  Research Assistant  Nashville, TN
Center for Assessment and Intervention Research
Dr. Stephen N. Elliott, Peabody College of Vanderbilt University

2007 - 2010  Educational Consultant & Psychometric Research Analyst  Nashville, TN
Discovery Education Assessment, LLC

2007 - 2008  Board Certified Behavior Analyst (BCBA)  Nashville, TN
Scarab Behavioral Health Services, LLC

2005 - 2007  Research Assistant  Nashville, TN
Vanderbilt Behavior Research Center
Dr. Joseph H. Wehby, Peabody College of Vanderbilt University

2003 - 2005  Special Education Teacher & Reading Intervention Specialist  San Diego, CA
Learning Center, Kearny Educational Complex
2001 - 2002  **Special Education Teacher**  
Blackman High School  
Murfreesboro, TN

1995 - 1997  **Educational Assistant**  
Staatliche Heimonderschule für Körperbehinderte  
Markgröningen, Germany

**REFERRED JOURNAL PUBLICATIONS**


**BOOK CHAPTERS**


Kurz, A. (2011). Access to what should be taught and will be tested: Students’ opportunity to learn the intended curriculum. In S. N. Elliott, R. J. Kettler, P. A. Beddow, & A. Kurz (Eds.), *Handbook of accessible achievement tests for all students: Bridging the gaps between research, practice, and policy* (pp. 99-129). New York: Springer.


**Presentations and Symposia**


Kurz, A., & Elliott, S. N. (2010, September). MyiLOGS: A measure of students' opportunity to learn the intended curriculum. In B. Jupp (Chair), Evaluating and rewarding educator effectiveness: Innovations and lessons from the field. Symposium conducted at the national meeting of the National Center for Performance Incentives, Nashville, TN.

Elliott, S. N., & Kurz, A. (2010, July). Measuring student access to the intended and assessed curriculum: Constructs, tactics, and tools. Presentation at the annual meeting of the Office of Special Education Programs Project Directors, Washington, DC.

Kurz, A. (2010, July). Access to what should be taught and will be tested: Students' opportunity to learn the intended curriculum. In C. Lemons (Chair), Reading instruction and assessment for children in special education. Symposium conducted at the annual meeting of the Society for the Scientific Study of Reading, Berlin, Germany.


**Research Grants and Other External Funding**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submitted, 2012</th>
<th>A Technology-based Professional Development Intervention for Improving Instructional Progress Management (Project IPM)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Under Review</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principal Investigators: Elliott, S. N., &amp; Kurz, A.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2011 - 2012</th>
<th>Opportunity to Learn the Arizona Alternate State Standards for Students with Significant Cognitive Disabilities (ADE 1% OTL)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Arizona Department of Education</em> - $75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principal Investigators: Kurz, A., &amp; Williams, L.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2011 - Present</th>
<th>Enhancing the Large-scale Application of MyiLOGS: Educational Technology for Instructional Progress Management (EdTech-IPM)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Arizona State University Venture Catalyst</em> - $50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principal Investigators: Elliott, S. N., &amp; Kurz, A.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other Research Grant Affiliations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2011 - Present</th>
<th>National Center on Assessment and Accountability for Special Education (NCAASE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Institute of Education Sciences Center Grant, U.S. Department of Education</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principal Investigators: Tindal, G., Stevens, J., Schulte, A., &amp; Elliott, S. N.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Role: Co-Investigator</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2009 - Present</th>
<th>Modified Alternate Assessment Participation Screening (MAAPS)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Enhanced Assessment Grant, U.S. Department of Education</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principal Investigators: Elliott, S. N., Kettler, R. J., &amp; Zigmond, N.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Role: Co-Investigator</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2008 - 2011</th>
<th>Consortium for Modified Alternate Assessment Development and Implementation (CMAADI)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Enhanced Assessment Grant, U.S. Department of Education</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principal Investigators: Elliott, S. N., Rodriguez, M. C., Roach, A. T., &amp; Kettler, R. J.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Role: Graduate Research Assistant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2008 - 2010</th>
<th>Operationalizing Alternate Assessment for Sciences Inquiry Skills (OAASIS)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Enhanced Assessment Grant, U.S. Department of Education</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principal Investigator: Foster, C. J.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Role: Graduate Research Assistant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2008 - 2009</th>
<th>Consortium for Alternate Assessment Validity and Experimental Studies (CAAVES)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Enhanced Assessment Grant, U.S. Department of Education</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principal Investigators: Elliott, S. N., &amp; Compton, E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Role: Graduate Research Assistant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Effort on Funded and Proposed Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funded Projects</th>
<th>Annual Percent Effort</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National Center on Assessment and Accountability for Special Education (NCAASE)</td>
<td>95.0% *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IES Special Education Centers Award R324C110004</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant Period: 7/1/11 to 6/30/2016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*: Adjusted to 35% contingent on funding of Project IPM and SSI Project or to 75% contingent on funding of SSI Project only.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Projects</th>
<th>Proposed Effort</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Technology-based Professional Development Intervention for Improving Instructional Progress Management (Project IPM)</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IES Special Education Research Grant Goal 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant Period: 7/1/13 to 12/31/16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School System Improvement (SSI Project)</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Incentive Fund (TIF)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant Period: 10/1/12 to 9/30/17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STEPHEN NELSON ELLIOTT
Mickelson Foundation Professor of Education
Learning Sciences Institute
Arizona State University
Tempe, AZ 85287-7805

CONTACT INFORMATION
Office Address: 108 Payne Hall East
Office Phone: 480-965-3292
Cell Phone: (b)(6)
E-Mail: steve_elliott@asu.edu

EDUCATION
PhD Arizona State University, Educational Psychology,
Subspeciality: School Psychology, 1980
MA Ed Arizona State University, Educational Psychology, 1977
MA Michigan State University, Educational Psychology, 1976
BS Michigan State University, Psychology (Honors College), 1974

RECENT HONORS
2009 Senior Scientist Award, American Psychological Association, Division 16
2009 Fellow, American Educational Research Association

RECENT PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE
2010-present DIRECTOR OF THE LEARNING SCIENCES INSTITUTE AND THE
MICKELSON FOUNDATION PROFESSOR OF EDUCATION,
Arizona State University. Responsible for leading the development and
operation of a trans-university research institute focusing on the scientific
study of learning and innovations to improve learning across the age span.

2006-2009 DIRECTOR, Learning Sciences Institute, Vanderbilt University
1990-2004 PROFESSOR, University of Wisconsin-Madison, Department of Educational
Psychology and School Psychology Program (APA accredited).

SELECTED RECENT PUBLICATIONS

Elliott, S.N. (2009). Understanding the construct being measured by alternate assessments. In R.
Lissitz & W. Schafer (Eds.), Assessment for Alternate Achievement Standards: Current


**RECENT GRANTS (External and Competitive)**


Lynn Holdheide

EDUCATION: Eastern Illinois University, Charleston, Illinois
M.S. Special Education
Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio
B.S. Special Education

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE:

Vanderbilt University/National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality
July 2007 – present
Special Education Research Associate
- Consult with Regional Comprehensive Centers and State Education Agencies on several projects related to the evaluation and identification of high effective teachers and leaders.
- Serve as a facilitator/consultant for the Nevada Teacher and Leader Council.
- Work as a consultant for the American Institute for Research supporting states in designing and implementing new teacher and leader evaluation systems
- Work on several projects related to improving the preparation of teachers for students with at-risk characteristics and disabilities.
- Coordinate the TQ Connection, an online resource designed to serve both general and special education teacher preparation.
- Serve as a special education consultant to Regional Comprehensive Centers and State Education Agencies.

Vanderbilt University, Nashville, TN
January 2007-July 2007
Independent Education Consultant
- Served as a research associate. Assisted with research design and implementation related to the development of tools designed to evaluate teacher preparation practices in the areas of scientifically-based reading, inclusive services, and classroom organization and behavioral management.

Indiana Department of Education, Division of Special Education, Indianapolis, IN
January 1999 – May 2007
Independent Education Consultant
- Project Director for the Indiana Post-School Follow Up Study. This statewide study collects data on students after they exit high school. Data is used to modify curriculum and direct policy pertaining to transition services.
• Committee member on the Employability Skills Work Group charged with developing a statewide system to measure students’ employability skills.
• Member of the SB 290 Work Group, consisting of Department of Education, Vocational Rehabilitation, Workforce Development, Division of Mental Health and various University personnel. This group advises state directors and policymakers regarding transition practices.

**Indiana Department of Education, Division of Special Education, Indianapolis, IN**
*September 1996 - January 1999*

Education Consultant

• Served as the school-to-work transition consultant.
• Assisted in the development of language for Article 7, Indiana’s Special Education law.
• Spearheaded Indiana Statute regarding transition services among the Department of Education and Vocational Rehabilitation.

**Crossroads Rehabilitation Center, Indianapolis, IN**
*February 1994 - September 1996*

Transition Specialist/Employment Services Representative

• Project Coordinator, School to Community Transition Grant.
• Presented training sessions to parents, teachers and administrators on effective transition planning for students from school to adult life in the community.
• Acted as a liaison between school and community based programs.
• Developed training and employment in the community for persons with disabilities.

**PROFESSIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE ACTIVITIES**

Reviewer, Elementary and Secondary Education Act Flexibility Waiver, 2012
Technical Assistance Member, Promoting Teacher Effectiveness in Adult Education Project, Present
Member, Religious Education Co-Coordinator, Church of Nativity, 2010- present
Member: Council for Exceptional Children (CEC) 1990- present
Volunteer, PADS, Homeless Shelter, Mattoon, IL. 2004 – 2007
Member: Indiana Association of Persons in Supported Employment. 1994-1999
Committee Member: Indiana Governor’s Association of Residential Facilities. 1996-99

**PUBLICATIONS/TECHNICAL WRITING**


**SELECTED CONFERENCES/WORKSHOP PRESENTATIONS**


BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>POSITION TITLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Louis M. Hsu</td>
<td>Professor Emeritus, Senior Analyst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research Professor, Rutgers University</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EDUCATION/TRAINING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSTITUTION AND LOCATION</th>
<th>DEGREE</th>
<th>YEAR(s)</th>
<th>FIELD OF STUDY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fordham University</td>
<td>B.A.</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>Psychometrics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fordham University</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A. Positions

**Rutgers University: Research Professor in Psychology** [investigator and/or consultant on grants and studies].

**Fairleigh Dickinson University Ph.D. Program in Clinical Psychology:** [Courses Taught within the Past 10 years]: Statistics, Research Design and Analysis I and II, Clinical Research Methods, Psychometrics, Assessment I, Statistical Inference, Issues and Techniques in Research, Test and Measurement. [Statistical/psychometrics advisor on hundreds of Ph.D. dissertations].

**Future Work Systems: [Executed Tasks – Past 4 Years]:**
1. Development of cost-effective sampling plans for surveys of customer satisfaction with Jobseeker Services provided by New York City Workforce Career Centers.
2. Development and evaluation of forecasting models (simultaneous, hierarchical, and stepwise multiple regression models, simultaneous, hierarchical, and stepwise logistic regression models, and simultaneous, hierarchical, and stepwise linear and quadratic discriminant function models) to predict (from exit-based indicators) performance outcomes (employment status, placement wage, placement hours/week) of recipients of WIA-funded services (WIA: Workforce Investment Act).
3. Evaluation of the statistical criteria used by the federal government’s Department of Labor to set regional, state and local WIA performance targets.
4. Execution of cross-validation studies of forecasting models using replicated split-sample sampling, and jackknife resampling methods.
5. Development of new models to identify metric-scaled characteristics of recipients of WIA-funded services that are related to their WIA performance measures.
6. Construction of “Value Added Performance Improvement System” models to measure effectiveness of services provided by 14 Workforce Career Centers (WCC) in Missouri.
7. Evaluation of proposed performance regression models of the Washington State Workforce Training and Education Coordination Board.
8. Investigations (using general linear models) of the incremental predictive validity of previously ignored potential predictors of performance outcomes: e.g., the within-quarter-month-of-exit (i.e., 1\textsuperscript{st}, 2\textsuperscript{nd} or 3\textsuperscript{rd}) of clients enrolled in Workforce Career Center programs.
9. Statistical challenges of Region 1 WIA administrators’ performance targets for Puerto Rico.

B. Publications


34. Hsu, L. M. (1989). Random sampling, randomization, and equivalence of contrasted groups in


NAME  
Maria Adelaida Restrepo  

POSITION TITLE  
Associate Professor

EDUCATION/TRAINING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSTITUTION AND LOCATION</th>
<th>DEGREE</th>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>FIELD OF STUDY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Florida, Gainesville</td>
<td>B.A.</td>
<td>1981-1983</td>
<td>Communication Sciences and Disorders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Massachusetts, Amherst</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>1983-1986</td>
<td>Communication Disorders in Speech-Language Pathology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Arizona, Tucson</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>1989-1995</td>
<td>NIH Doctoral Fellow SLP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Positions and Honors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Period</th>
<th>Institution/Location</th>
<th>City/Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July 2004 - present</td>
<td>Arizona State University</td>
<td>Tempe, AZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>Department of Speech and Hearing Science</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2001 - May 2004</td>
<td>The University of Georgia</td>
<td>Athens, GA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>Dep. of Communication Sciences and Disorders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 2001 – 2009</td>
<td>Universidad de Antioquia</td>
<td>Medellín, Colombia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct Faculty</td>
<td>Faculty of Education, Neurodevelopment Doctoral Program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 1995 – April 2001</td>
<td>The University of Georgia</td>
<td>Athens, GA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>Dep. of Communication Sciences and Disorders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

National positions since 2005

- Fulbright Specialist Roster Member (February, 2012-present)
- Mentor, Clinical Practice Research Institute – ASHA. July 2009-July 2010
- Member, Roundtable on supporting positive outcomes in language and literacy in language minority children. OPPRE-HHS-NIH April 16-17, 2008
- Member, ASHA Publications Board, June 2002-December 2005

Research Support in the Last 3 years


Bilingual English Spanish Screener for language impairment (submitted). Restrepo, M.A. (PI), Gorin, J. and Gray, s. (CoPI). Not funded
Vocabulary and Abstract Language Enhancement (VALE) to Improve Reading Comprehension in Bilingual Children (2005-2008). Institute of Educational Sciences. Restrepo, M.A. PI. – Funded $1,498,791.00

**Selected Peer-reviewed and Invited Publications since 2000**


Success: A prekindergarten literacy program with implication for enhancing the preliteracy skill of children who are deaf. Odyssey. 6-13.


Kamphaus, R.W., Jiménez, M.E., Pineda, D., Fleckenstein, E.W.R.L., Restrepo, M.A., Puerta,


**Chapters and Books**


Brief Vita
(45 page version available)
DANIEL J. RESCHLY

Biographical Summary
Dan Reschly is Professor of Education and Psychology in Peabody College, Vanderbilt University where he chaired the Department of Special Education from 1998-2006. From 1975 to 1998 Reschly directed the Iowa State University School Psychology Program where he achieved the rank of Distinguished Professor of Psychology and Education. Reschly earned graduate degrees at the University of Iowa and the University of Oregon, served as a school psychologist in Iowa, Oregon, and Arizona, and is a Nationally Certified School Psychologist. Reschly has published on the topics of educator preparation in evidence-based principles, response to intervention, disproportionate representation, identification of disabilities (high incidence, minority issues). He was co-director of the National Research Center on Learning Disabilities and currently is a PI in the National Comprehensive Center on Teacher Quality. Reschly has trained teachers and related services personnel in 47 states regarding implementation of evidence-based practices.

In 1999 Reschly was listed in the top 5 in school psychology career service contributions and in 2004 he was identified as the most widely cited author in school psychology books and journals over 2002-2004 period. He has been active in state and national leadership roles including President of the National Association of School Psychologists, Editor of the School Psychology Review, Chair of NASP Graduate Program Approval, President of the Society for the Study of School Psychology, and Chair of the Council of Directors of School Psychology Programs. Reschly served on the National Academy of Sciences Panels on Standards-based Reform and the Education of Students with Disabilities and Minority Overrepresentation in Special Education. He chaired the National Academy Panel on Disability Determination in Mental Retardation. He has received the NASP Lifetime Achievement Award (2000) and Legend Award (2007), three NASP Distinguished Service Awards, the Stroud Award, appointment to Fellow of the American Psychological Association and the American Psychological Society, and 1996 Outstanding Alumnus, College of Education, University of Oregon.

Personal Data
Address: Box 228 Peabody College, Vanderbilt University, Nashville TN 37203-5701
Telephone: Office (615) 322-8169; Home (615) 790-7262; e-mail dan.reschly@vanderbilt.edu

Educational Background
BS 1966 Iowa State University, Honors Program Graduate
MA 1968 University of Iowa, NDEA Fellowship, School Psychology and Special Education
Ph.D. 1971 University of Oregon, EPDA Fellowship, School Psychology and Special Education

Professional Employment History
1969: Director of Summer Head Start Program, Louisa County, IA
1971-1975: Assistant Professor, University of Arizona, Tucson, AZ
1975-1998: Associate Professor/Professor/Distinguished Professor and Director of the School Psychology Program, Iowa State University (Promotions: to Professor in 1980; to Distinguished Professor of Liberal Arts and Sciences in 1991)

1996-1998: Interim Associate Dean, College of Education, Iowa State University and Director of Research Institute for Studies in Education

1998- Professor of Education and Psychology, Chair Department of Special Education 1998-2006, Peabody College, Vanderbilt University

**Sample Recent Publications**


Other Professional Activities

- Principal Investigator, National Comprehensive Center on Teacher Quality (TQ Center), USDE., VU contract is $1.75 million, 2005-2012.
- Co-Director, National Research Center on Learning Disabilities, OSEP funded. $3.5 million, 2002-2007.
- President Division for Research, Council for Exceptional Children, 2003-2005).
- President (1998-1999) and Board Member (1996-1999) Council of Directors of School Psychology Programs
- Leadership Council, State of New York, Department of Education, Division of Vocational Education and Special Education, 1997-2004
- Member, National Academy of Sciences Panel on Goals 2000 and the Education of Students with Disabilities 1995-1996
- Member, National Academy of Sciences Panel on Overrepresentation of Minorities in Special Education, 1999-2002
- Chair, National Academy of Sciences Panel on Disability Determination in Mental Retardation, 2000-2002
- Member, Researcher Panel, LD Summit Follow-up, November 2001
- Fellow, Division 16 (School Psychology) and 15 (Educational Psychology), “In recognition of outstanding contributions to the science and profession of psychology,” American Psychological Association (Elected in 1985, 1990, respectively)
- Consultant, (Pro bono) European Roma Rights Center, Budapest, 1999- (Evaluations and consultation regarding Roma children placed in special education programs in Ostrava, Czech Republic.
- Consultant, U. S. DE Office of Special Education Programs and U.S. DE Office for Civil Rights, Task Force on Over-representation of Minority Students in Special Education Programs, 1993-1995
- State of Missouri Department of Education, Division of Special Education, Criteria for Disability Determination, 2002-2003
- Expert Witness in 8 Federal District Court Cases and 5 state cases
- Chair, NASP Program Approval, 1989-1992
- Editor, School Psychology Review, 1979-1981
- Testimony, President’s Commission on Excellence in Special Education re: Overrepresentation of Minority Students in Special Education and Outcomes Criteria to Drive Reform
- Keynote addresses and continuing education presentations in 46 states for school psychologists and general and special educators
- Invited colloquia to faculty and students at 28 universities
- Evaluation of LEA and SEA projects in 15 states
FRANK C. WORRELL

Director, School Psychology Program
Faculty Director, Academic Talent Development Program
Faculty Director, California College Preparatory Academy

Email: frankc@berkeley.edu
Ph: (510) 643-4891
ERL: http://www-gse.berkeley.edu/faculty/FCWorrell/FCWorrell.html
Fax: (510) 642-3555

Education
B.A. (Hons), Psychology, University of Western Ontario, London, Ontario, Canada, 1985
M.A., Psychology, University of Western Ontario, London, Ontario, Canada, 1987
California School Psychology Credential, University of California, Berkeley, 1993 – present
Ph.D., Education (Educational & School Psychology), University of California, Berkeley, 1994
Licensed Psychologist (PA Lic #PS-008390-L), 1996 – present

Professional Experience
Assistant Professor (School Psychology), The Pennsylvania State University, 1994 – 2000
Associate Professor (School Psychology), The Pennsylvania State University, 2000 – 2003
Associate Professor (Cognition and Development), University of California, Berkeley 2003 – 2007
Professor (Cognition and Development), University of California, Berkeley 2007 – present

Research Interests
Academic talent development; African American education; Education in the English-Speaking Caribbean; Education of at-risk youth; Ethnic and racial identity; Psychological functioning and educational attainment; Scale development and validation; Teaching effectiveness

Awards
Outstanding Doctoral Dissertation Award, Graduate School of Education, UC Berkeley, 1995
Fellow, Division 16 (School Psychology), American Psychological Association (APA), 2007
Fellow, Division 5 (Evaluation, Measurement, & Statistics), APA, 2010
Chancellor’s Award for Advancing Institutional Excellence, UC Berkeley, 2011
Fellow, Association for Psychological Science, 2011
Fellow, Division 52 (International Psychology), APA, 2011
Fellow, Division 45 (Society for the Psychological Study of Ethnic Minority Issues), APA, 2012

Selected Professional Service
Vice President, Education, Training, and Scientific Affairs, Division 16, APA, 2002 – 2004
Member, Pew Rural Early Education Commission, Frederick D. Patterson Research Institute of the United Negro College Fund, 2004 – 2007
Chair, Committee on Division/APA Relations, APA, 2006
President, Division 16 (School Psychology), APA, 2007
Member, Committee on Psychological Tests and Assessments (CPTA), APA, 2007 – 2009
APA Representative, Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation, 2008 – 2010
Respondent, National Association for Teacher Education (NCATE) National Expert Panel, 2009
Member, Joint Committee for the Revision of the Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing,
Member, Board of Educational Affairs, APA, 2010-2012
Co-Editor, Review of Educational Research, 2012-2014
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Educational Consulting
Evaluator, Penn State Educational Partnership Program (PEPP), College of Education, 1995 – 1997
Principal Investigator & Norming Project Coordinator, Central Guidance Unit, Ministry of Education, Trinidad and Tobago, September 2001 – December 2002
Consultant, School Leadership Center of Trinidad and Tobago, 2002 – 2008

Selected Publications

Selected Presentations
Worrell, F. C. (2008, August). Evaluating and intervening with at-risk youth in schools. Keynote address at the annual institute of the School Leadership Center of Trinidad and Tobago, Port of Spain, Trinidad.

Selected Funded Projects
Organization of American States (2001). (Fund # TT/AE/138101941). Diagnosis and Intervention: Promoting Educational Success in Trinidad and Tobago. Grant to the Trinidad and Tobago Ministry of Education ($105,000). Frank C. Worrell (Lead Consultant).

Selected Professional Memberships
8. Proposal Supplementary Tables and Figures

Table A. Distribution of Student Achievement on Standardized Testing for 2010 to 2011

Table B. Projected Distribution of Teacher and Principal Effectiveness

Table C. SSI Project TES Alignment to InTASC Standards

Table D. Retention Rates by Performance Levels (percentages) for the PES.

Table E. SSI Project Alignment to Core Features of Effective PD

Figure A. Classroom Strategies Scales (CSS) Factor Structure for the Proposed TES and PD System.

Figure B. Screenshot of the MyiLOGS Instructional Calendar.

Figure C. Screenshot of MyiLOGS Matrices.

Figure D. Examples Charts from the MyiLOGS Report
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Language Arts</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Mathematics</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Partial</td>
<td>Proficient</td>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td></td>
<td>Partial</td>
<td>Proficient</td>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asbury Park</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asbury Park</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asbury Park</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asbury Park</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asbury Park</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asbury Park</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asbury Park</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillside</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillside</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillside</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillside</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillside</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillside</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillside</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakewood</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakewood</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakewood</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakewood</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakewood</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakewood</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakewood</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Plainfield</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Plainfield</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Plainfield</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Plainfield</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Plainfield</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
North Plainfield  
8  26%  66%  8%  44%  44%  12%
North Plainfield  
11  18%  73%  9%  39%  47%  13%

*Note.* Grades 3 through 8 are tested by the NJ ASK, a state unique measure. Grade 11 is tested by the HSPA, a national measure of student achievement.

**Table B. Projected Distribution of Teacher and Principal Effectiveness**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EES Performance Levels</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
<th>Year 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highly Effective</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Effective</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table C. SSI Project TES Alignment to InTASC Standards**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>InTASC Standard</th>
<th>Danielson</th>
<th>CSS</th>
<th>MyiLOGS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>The Learner and Learning</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Learner Development</td>
<td>Domain 1: Planning &amp; Preparation</td>
<td>CSS Stage 1 (Classroom Observation) – 8 Teacher Behaviors CSS Stage 2 – PIS Rating Scales</td>
<td>Based on student outcomes and their own instructional data, teachers develop an Instructional Growth Plan that is appropriate and challenging.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Learning Differences</td>
<td>Domain 1: Planning &amp; Preparation</td>
<td>CSS Stage 2 – PIS Rating Scales</td>
<td>MyiLOGS Report provides detailed data on instructional differentiation based on OTL indices of time, content, and instructional quality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Learning Environments</td>
<td>Domain 2: Classroom Environment</td>
<td>CSS Stage 1 – 8 Teacher Behaviors CSS Stage 2 – PIS and BMS Rating Scales CSS Stage 3 – Classroom Checklist</td>
<td>The Instructional Growth Plan (IGP) meetings are led by instructional coaches and engage teachers in group discussion and collaboration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Content Knowledge</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Content Knowledge</td>
<td>Domain 1: Planning &amp; Preparation</td>
<td></td>
<td>MyiLOGS requires teachers to monitor content coverage of Common Core Standards and any other relevant custom skills on an ongoing basis and develop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Application of Content</td>
<td>Domain 3: Instruction</td>
<td>CSS Stage 1 – 8 Teacher Behaviors</td>
<td>MyiLOGS requires teachers to monitor how their instruction is implemented along cognitive processes, evidence-based practices, and grouping formats.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CSS Stage 2 – PIS Rating Scale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Instructional Practice**

| 6. Assessment            | Domain 1: Planning & Preparation
                          | Domain 3: Instruction | CSS Stage 1 – 8 Teacher Behaviors
                          | CSS Stage 2 – PIS Rating Scale | Progress monitoring along goal attainment scale for teacher’s instructional growth objectives. |

| 7. Planning for Instruction | Domain 1: Planning & Preparation |                                  | MyiLOGS is specifically designed to assist in the planning and implementation of intended curricula at the class and student levels. |

| 8. Instructional          | Domain 1: Instruction | CSS Stage 1 – 8 Teacher Behaviors | Instructional indices for cognitive processes, |

|                           |                       |                                  |                                                                 |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>CSS Stage 2 – PIS Rating Scale</th>
<th>evidence-based instructional practices, and grouping formats.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professional Responsibility</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Professional Learning and Ethical Practice</td>
<td>Domain 4: Professional Responsibilities</td>
<td>Progress monitoring along goal attainment scale for teacher’s instructional growth objectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Leadership and Collaboration</td>
<td>Domain 4: Professional Responsibilities</td>
<td>Progress monitoring along goal attainment scale for teacher’s instructional growth objectives.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table D. Retention Rates by Performance Levels (percentages for the PES)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Level</th>
<th>Percent Retained*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highly</td>
<td>95% to 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above Average</td>
<td>80% to 94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Average</td>
<td>60% to 79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>0% to 59%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Partial percentages will be rounded upward.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core</th>
<th>Danielson</th>
<th>CSS</th>
<th>MyiLOGS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Features of Effective PD</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content focus</td>
<td>The Danielson Framework via Teachescape provides a comprehensive set of online lessons that are specific to the elements identified during the EES observation. Teachers are guided through self-paced lessons that provide subject-specific knowledge and skills across all four domains.</td>
<td>The CSS Observer and Teacher Forms assess the use of evidence-based instructional and behavioral management practices to improve effective instruction. Teachers are asked to focus on their own instructional inputs, processes, and (student) outcomes through self-recording, self-monitoring, and instructional growth meetings with coaches. These data are based on content coverage, time use, and related instructional practices.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active learning</td>
<td>The online lessons include video models of effective teaching practices, a range of assessments, and in-class</td>
<td>Principals or coaches evaluate teachers using the CSS Observer Form, which measures their usage of instructional</td>
<td>The MyiLOGS User PD provides worked examples, models, and active discussion of cognitive process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coherence</strong></td>
<td>Consistent with LEA’s constructivist learning paradigms for effective teaching.</td>
<td>Consistent with recommended empirical instructional and behavioral management practices and aligned with NCLB (2001) and IDEA (2004).</td>
<td>Consistent with federal policies related to access to general curriculum, OTL, and alignment (NCLB, 2001; IDEA, 2004).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Duration</strong></td>
<td>The Danielson Workshop (3 hrs), job-</td>
<td>Workshop (8 hrs),</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>trainings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collective participation</td>
<td>The online forums allow teachers of same school, grade, or department to discuss their PD experiences and share relevant knowledge and skills.</td>
<td>Using the CSS Observer and Teacher Forms, principals (or coaches) and teachers collaboratively identify specific changes in classroom practices. The CSS can be used in professional learning communities to improve collaboration and growth.</td>
<td>Instructional growth plan sessions with coaches feature small groups of teachers from the same school site to foster professional learning communities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure A. Classroom Strategies Scales (CSS) Factor Structure for the Proposed TES and PD System.
Figure B. Screenshot of the MyiLOGS Instructional Calendar.

Figure C. Screenshot of MyiLOGS Matrices.

Estimated Time Allocation Across Cognitive Process Dimensions for: CCSS Grade 4 RE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skill</th>
<th>Attend</th>
<th>Remember</th>
<th>Understand/Apply</th>
<th>Analyze/Evaluate</th>
<th>Create</th>
<th>Sum</th>
<th>Calendar Minutes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R12 Explain events</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R12 Main idea and details</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time not available for instruction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Update Totals: Total = 55

Estimated Time Allocation Across Instructional Practices for: CCSS Grade 4 RE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher Actions</th>
<th>Individual</th>
<th>Small Group</th>
<th>Whole Class</th>
<th>Sum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provided Direct Instruction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provided Visual Representations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asked Questions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elicited Think Aloud</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used Independent Practice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provided Guided Feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provided Reinforcement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessed Student Knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Instructional Practices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Not Available</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Update Totals: Calendar Total = 55
Figure D. Examples Charts from the MyiLOGS Report
9. Union Representation

1. Teachers in the State of New Jersey are represented exclusively by the New Jersey Education Association (NJEA). The proposed TIF project’s TES is in accordance with the New Jersey Dept. of Education’s evaluation requirements, the Educator Effectiveness Task Force Recommendations (March, 2011), and subsequently, the NJEA regulations for educator evaluations.

2. Principals in the State of New Jersey are represented exclusively by the New Jersey Principals and Supervisors Association (NJPSA). The proposed TIF project’s PES is in accordance with the New Jersey Dept. of Education’s evaluation requirements, the Educator Effectiveness Task Force Recommendations (March, 2011), and subsequently, the NJPSA regulations for principal evaluations.
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# TIF Grant Funds Budget Narrative

## Project Year 1
October 1<sup>st</sup> 2012 to September 30<sup>th</sup> 2013

### 1. Personnel:

The following requested personnel will all be hired as employees of the project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rutgers University (RU) Contract</th>
<th>% FTE</th>
<th>Base Salary</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Director (Principal Investigator) (1): Dr. Linda Reddy</strong> will be responsible for overall project leadership, budget oversight, practical, and methodological issues related to implementation of the HCMS, EES, PD, and PBCS. Her qualifications are described in section E Management Plan. In Project Year 1, she will dedicate 25% of her effort during the 9.5 academic month year, and 100% effort in the summer months.</td>
<td>0.25 FTE x 9.5 months</td>
<td>$100,244</td>
<td>$25,061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Co Investigator (1): Dr. Ryan Kettler</strong> will be responsible for overall project leadership, practical and methodological issues related to implementation of the teacher and principal evaluation systems and student growth. His qualifications are described in section E Management Plan. In Project Year 1, he will dedicate 25% of his effort during the 9.5 academic month year, and 100% in the summer months.</td>
<td>0.25 FTE x 9.5 months</td>
<td>$81,000</td>
<td>$20,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assistant Project Director (1): The Project Assistant Director</strong> will be responsible for daily supervision and implementation of the project as well as coordinating communication with each LEA and its constituents (administrative and teaching staff, and teacher unions). They will be hired on a full time 12-month contract to assist in the daily management of the SSI Project. Salaries were calculated based on the median salary for similar positions.</td>
<td>1.0 FTE</td>
<td>$98,680</td>
<td>$98,680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Business Manager (1): The Business Manager</strong> will manage the human resource components and financial aspects of the RU Team. They will serve as a liaison and coordinate with the human resource (HR) departments in each of the LEAs in regards to HCMS implementation. They train each LEAs on how the EES will impact human capital decision making and assist in making HR decisions including but not limited to: recruitment, placement, PD, compensation, promotion, and dismissal.</td>
<td>1.0 FTE</td>
<td>$63,016</td>
<td>$63,016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Information Technology (IT) Specialist (1): The IT specialist</strong> will assist in the development of the</td>
<td>1.0 FTE</td>
<td>$57,667</td>
<td>$57,667</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Software applications necessary to implement and manage the HCMS, PBCS, and EES. They will coordinate activities with the contracted programming consultants on the development web-based portal for each LEA and collaborate with each LEA’s IT department on implementing the new HCMS, EES, and PBCS applications.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>FTE</th>
<th>Salary 1</th>
<th>Salary 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Data and Growth Modeling (DGM) Specialist (1): A Data and Growth Modeling Specialist will be hired to manage all data collection, analysis, and interpretation of teacher, principal and student growth data in the EES and internally evaluate the EES and the HCMS in relation to their effects on student outcome.</td>
<td>1.0 FTE</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Manager (1): The Evaluation Manager will assist the DGM Specialist in the internal evaluation of the project. They will also coordinate HCMS data analysis and decision making with the PI’s, DGM, and External Evaluator.</td>
<td>1.0 FTE</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Principals (3): Three Leadership Principals will be hired for the purposes of coordinating with each LEAs school-based principals on the implementation of the HCMS. The Leadership Principals will supervise the 43 school based principals leadership activities during the project. They will be responsible for overseeing the implementation of the PES in each school district, train LEA constituents on the VAL-ED system, and provide PD to 43 school based principals.</td>
<td>3 x 1.0 FTE</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>$225,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Teachers (6): Six Leadership Teachers will be hired to assist in the implementation of the EES for all 1,211 teacher constituents and the PD and PBCS for all 1,211 teachers in TIF qualified schools. Leadership Teachers will primarily oversee the 51 school-based Master Mentor Teachers across the four LEAs. They will train and supervise Master Mentor Teachers on the components of the EES, how it relates to PD, and how to deliver PD.</td>
<td>6 x 1.0 FTE</td>
<td>$64,887</td>
<td>$389,322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Coordinator: The Program Coordinator will be hired to directly assist the Project Director, Assistant Project Director, Co-PIs, and all SSI Project staff. The Program Coordinator will be responsible for all communications and correspondences between Rutgers SSI Project staff and LEA staff. The Program Coordinator will manage communications between the Rutgers Foundations and Development staff and LEA development officers on possible grant opportunities.</td>
<td>1.0 FTE</td>
<td>$38,098</td>
<td>$38098</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Also, this person will prioritize and purchase office supplies and project materials for the entire project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Entry Clerk:</th>
<th>19 hours per week x 46 weeks of the year.</th>
<th>$17.16 per hour</th>
<th>$15,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Arizona State University (ASU) Subcontract**

| Co Investigator (1): Dr. Alexander Kurz will be responsible for overall project leadership for implementation of educator and principal instructional improvement PD and practical issues related to implementation of the EES and its components. His qualifications are described in section E Management Plan. In Project Year 1, he will dedicate 25% of his effort annually. | .25 FTE x 12-months | $70,940 | $17,735 |

**LEAs Subcontracts**

No costs associated with Personnel in Project Year 1 for all LEAs.

**Total Personnel Cost**

$1,113,049

2. **Fringe Benefits:**

The following personnel all have fringe benefit rates applied to their salaries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RU Contract</th>
<th>Fringe Rate</th>
<th>Base Salary</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fringe Benefit rates apply to the RU Team. For Faculty, during the 9.5 months academic year, a Fringe Benefits rate of 38.2% will be applied. During the 2.5 summer months, a Fringe Benefit rate of 7.3% is applied.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Project Director (PI) Dr. Linda Reddy serves in a faculty capacity. Fringe Benefit rate is only calculated for the 9.5 months academic year. No summer months apply in Year 1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Co Investigator Ryan Kettler serves in a faculty capacity. Fringe Benefit rate is calculated for the 9.5 months academic year and for 2.5 summer months.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.2%</td>
<td>$25,061</td>
<td>$9,573</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.2%</td>
<td>$20,250</td>
<td>$7,736</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>$23,220</td>
<td>$1,695</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fringe Benefit rates apply to the RU Team. For Staff positions, a Fringe Benefits rate of 38.2% is applied annually.

- Project Assistant Director will serve in a staff capacity. 38.2% $98,680 $37,696
- Business Manager will serve in a staff capacity 38.2% $63,016 $24,072
- Information Technology (IT) Specialist will serve in a staff capacity. 38.2% $57,677 $22,029
- Data and Growth Modeling Specialist will serve in a staff capacity. 38.2% $80,000 $30,560
- Evaluation Manager will serve in a staff capacity. 38.2% $60,000 $22,920
- Leadership Principals (3) will serve in a staff capacity. 38.2% $75,000 $85,950
- Leadership Teachers (6) will serve in a staff capacity. 38.2% $64,887 $148,721
- Program Coordinator 38.2% $38,098 $14,553
- Part time Data Entry Clerk 7.3% $15,000 $1,095

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASU Subcontract</th>
<th>Fringe Rate</th>
<th>Base Salary</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Co Investigator Alexander Kurz is employed at Arizona State University (ASU). Fringe Benefit rates apply to ASU at a rate of 30% of the base salary.</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>$17,735</td>
<td>$5,285</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEAs Subcontracts</th>
<th>Fringe Rate</th>
<th>Base Salary</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No costs associated with Fringe Benefits in Project Year 1 for all LEAs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Fringe Benefits Cost $411,885

3. Travel:

Expenses include the average airfare of $400 each, in addition to a hotel room at $150/night for two nights, local transportation of $50, and per diem of $40.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RU Contract</th>
<th># of Trips</th>
<th>$ per Trip</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TIF Grantee Meeting: This 1.5 day meeting will provide participants with key information needed to manage and implement a discretionary grant</td>
<td>3 (1 Project Director &amp; 2)</td>
<td>$1,250</td>
<td>$3,750</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
awarded by ED and technical assistance from experts. Meetings are held annually. As per TIF guidelines, this meeting will require 3 participants. As per TIF guidelines, lodging is based on a four night stay in a major U.S. city and per diem expenses for up to five days.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIF Topical Meeting: This 1.5 Day meeting will provide participants with in depth information on a topic related to implementing PBCSs. Meetings are held annually. As per TIF guidelines, this meeting will require 2 participants. As per TIF guidelines, lodging is based on a four night stay in a major U.S. city and per diem expenses for up to five days.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 (1 Project Director &amp; 2 key personnel)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PI &amp; CO-PI's Local Travel to LEAs: Project leaders will meet with LEA constituents on a weekly basis during the first year of implementation planning. Asbury Park is located 54 miles from the Rutgers University, Lakewood 35 miles, Hillside 33 miles, North Plainfield 10 miles (265 miles round trip).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>46 trips (2 people)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project staff will meet with LEA constituents on a weekly basis during the first year of implementation planning. Asbury Park is located 54 miles from the university, Lakewood 35 miles, Hillside 33 miles, North Plainfield 10 miles (265 miles round trip).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>46 trips (2 people)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>External Evaluator Dr. Dan Reschly will visit with project leaders at least 1 time per year to discuss project activities and provide oversight. As per TIF guidelines, lodging is based on a five night stay and per diem expenses for up to six days. Dr. Dan Reschly may be required to incur local travel costs when visiting each LEA.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 trip (1 person)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASU Subcontract</th>
<th># of Trips</th>
<th>$ per Trip</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Co-PI Travel from Arizona to NJ: Co-PI Dr. Alexander Kurz will travel to NJ to meet with PI Dr. Linda Reddy and Co-PI Dr. Ryan Kettler at RU. It is estimated that Dr. Alexander Kurz will make 5 trips a year, for a period of 5 days each trip.</td>
<td>5 (1 person)</td>
<td>$1500</td>
<td>$7,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEAs Subcontract</th>
<th># of Trips</th>
<th>$ per Trip</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No travel expenses are anticipated for the LEAs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Equipment:

Equipment: Consistent with our organization’s policy, equipment is defined as tangible, non-expendable, personal property, having a useful life of more than one year and an acquisition cost of $1,000 or more per unit.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RU Contract</th>
<th>Cost of Item</th>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Computers (20):</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>Laptop computer including local work station</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computers (20):</td>
<td></td>
<td>Computer equipment will be needed to accommodate the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>computing and data transfer needs of the entire RU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>team (20+ persons). Due to the out of office frequency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>of the Leadership Principals and Teachers, it is</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>anticipated that these persons will share</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>workstations. Computer equipment will be purchased</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>in Year 1 used until the end of Year 5.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printers (10):</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>Multifunction printer, scanner, and fax</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printers (10):</td>
<td></td>
<td>Printers will be needed to accommodate the needs of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the RU Team (20+ persons). Training materials, reports,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and analyses will be generated throughout the project.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Due to the out of office frequency of the Leadership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Principals and Teachers, it is anticipated that these</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>persons will share workstations. Printers will be</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>purchased in Year 1 used until the end of Year 5.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Server Hardware:</td>
<td>$45,458</td>
<td>Web Server, Database Server, Firewall Protection</td>
<td>$45,458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Server Hardware:</td>
<td></td>
<td>To support the development of a web based portal for</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the LEAs to use and manage HCMS data, server based</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>hardware will be needed to store relevant information.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A database server and web server will be purchased to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>house the relevant files. Firewalls will be purchased</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>to protect confidentiality of each LEA that logs into</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the system. Cost for server hardware applies to Year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 only.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smart Phones (3):</td>
<td>$199</td>
<td>Smart Phone capable of internet, email, data</td>
<td>$600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smart Phones (3):</td>
<td></td>
<td>applications</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To assist with project communications via phone and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>grant mobile access to email, internet, and data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>applications, smart phones will be purchased for lead</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>investigators and staff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASU Subcontract</th>
<th>Cost of Item</th>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Equipment costs</td>
<td></td>
<td>associated with the ASU subcontract.</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| LEAs Subcontracts    | Cost of Item | Item Total                                           |
|----------------------|--------------|------------------------------------------------------|-----------|
Computers (32): Computer equipment will be needed to accommodate the needs of the 51 new Master Mentor Teachers across all LEAs. For the four LEAs, it estimated a total of 32 new computer systems will be needed. Computer equipment will be purchased in the Year 1 summer months so that it can be setup prior to the Master Mentor Teachers’ use in Year 2.

- **Asbury Park**: Seven desktop computers (7) will be needed to accommodate and supply the needs of the 10 new Master Mentor Teachers. One computer will be at each the three elementary schools, two computers at the middle school, and two computers at the high school.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Desktop Computer</td>
<td>Desktop Computer including monitor and printer</td>
<td>$14,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Hillside**: Nine desktop computers (9) will be needed to accommodate and supply the needs of the 12 new Master Mentor Teachers. One computer will be at each the three elementary schools, two computers at the two middle schools, and two computers at the high school.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Desktop Computer</td>
<td>Desktop Computer including monitor and printer</td>
<td>$18,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Lakewood**: Nine desktop computers (9) will be needed to accommodate and supply the needs of the 17 new Master Mentor Teachers. One computer will be at each the three elementary schools, two computers at the two middle schools, and two computers at the high school.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Desktop Computer</td>
<td>Desktop Computer including monitor and printer</td>
<td>$18,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **North Plainfield**: Seven desktop computers (7) will be needed to accommodate and supply the needs of the 12 new Master Mentor Teachers. One computer will be at each the three elementary schools, two computers at the middle school, and two computers at the high school.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Desktop Computer</td>
<td>Desktop Computer including monitor and printer</td>
<td>$14,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Equipment**  $155,058
5. Supplies:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supplies include all tangible and expendable property that are of a low unit cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>RU Contract</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Software:</strong> Licenses will be purchased for additional software not provided with PC set up. These include such programs as Adobe Acrobat Professional, Adobe Photoshop, SPSS, AMOS, DreamWeaver. Software will assist with data analysis, web design, and document preparation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of Item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Office Supplies:</strong> Basic stationary and printing supplies will be needed to manage the day to day affairs of SSI project. This includes: chairs, desks, toner for each printer, printing paper, writing instruments, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of Item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Observer Reliability Assessment Software (20):</strong> To ensure observer reliability and accuracy of the RU Leadership Teachers when using the Danielson Framework, successful completion of a proficiency assessment will be required each year Years 1 through 5. Vendors have been explored that provide an online system and proficiency test for users of the Danielson Framework and is required as an assessment component of the Danielson Framework Turnkey Training. A total of 20 RU Leadership Teachers and project staff need to be certified. The system provides training components, diagnostic support, and a reliability test on the Danielson Framework. The test will be used to calibrate observers for reliability and accuracy, which will ensure the Rutgers Leadership Teachers and staff are using the Danielson Framework correctly to evaluate teachers and provide the correct PD. The cost is estimated at $399 per observer and grants access to the on-line system for 1 year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of Item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$399 per observer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>ASU Subcontract</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Office Supplies:</strong> Basic stationary and printing supplies will be needed to manage the day to day affairs of SSI project. This includes: chairs, desks, toner for each printer, printing paper, writing instruments, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of Item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>LEAs Subcontracts</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost of Item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Observer Reliability Assessment Software (94 observers):** To ensure observer reliability and accuracy of the school-based Principals and Master Mentor Teachers when using the Danielson Framework, successful completion of a proficiency assessment will be required each year for Years 1 through 5. Vendors have been explored that provide an online system and proficiency test for users of the Danielson Framework. A total of 94 Principals and Master Mentor Teachers across all four LEAs need to be certified. The system software will provide training components, diagnostic support, and a reliability test on the Danielson Framework. The test will be used to calibrate observers for reliability and accuracy, which will ensure the Principals and Master Mentor Teachers in each district are using the Danielson Framework correctly to evaluate teachers and provide the correct PD. The cost is estimated $399 per observer and grants access to the system for 1 year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher Introduction to Danielson Framework Software (1211 teachers):</th>
<th>An online system for teachers to be introduce the Danielson Framework to teachers will be needed. Vendors have been explored that provide an online system with video demonstrations and planning components for Danielson Framework for teachers. A total of 1211 teachers across all four LEAs will need access. The online system instructs teachers about the Danielson Framework’s evaluation components and how to implement empirically guided strategies from each of the four domains to their classroom. The cost is $45 per teacher and includes access to the system for 1 year.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$399 per observer (94 principals and Master Mentor Teachers across all four LEAs)</td>
<td>1 year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$45 per teacher (1211 teachers across all four LEAs)</td>
<td>1 year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Supplies** | **$109,181**

### 6. Contractual

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contractual</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Days of Service/Time</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RU Contract</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Consultants:** Expert consultants in areas related to the HCMS will be contracted to serve on the SSI project. The consultants will provide key expertise and represent culturally diverse backgrounds.

- Dr. Steve Elliot, will act as a supervising...
mentor to Dr. Linda Reddy for the SSI Project. He will offer consultation for the implementation of VAL-ED system, provide criterion feedback for principal effectiveness, and train the Leadership Principals to provide feedback to their constituents. He will commit three days per year on the project.

- Dr. Louis Hsu, will serve as a statistical and measurement expert and will be responsible for conceptualizing all data analytic methods. He will coordinate activities and goals with the DGM Specialist. He will commit seven days per year on the project.

- Dr. Frank Worrell, will serve as a student minority assessment expert and will be responsible for conceptualizing assessment and analysis of student achievement for minority populations. He will serve one day per year on the project.

- Dr. Maria Adelaida Restrepo, will serve as an ELL expert and will be responsible for conceptualizing assessment and analysis of ELL teacher effectiveness and ELL student data. She will support the development of a PD system for ELL teachers. She will commit one day per year on the project.

- Ms. Lynn Holdheide, will serve as a teacher quality expert for non-test subjects (e.g., Art, Music). She will be responsible for developing measures of teacher effectiveness assessment and student achievement for non-tested subjects. She will serve one day per year on the project.

- Dr. Daniel Reschly, will serve as an external evaluator to the SSI Project. He will coordinate with the PI’s on the projects’ activities and provide objective oversight. He will commit 5 days per year to the project.

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Application Development Contract: RU will explore application/software developers for the creation of a web based interface for the SSI project and its LEA constituents. The web based interface will act as a portal for teachers to log in daily and enter respective data. The portal will generate information related to the teachers' instructional practices, content, and PD. For administrators, the portal will serve as a data entry</td>
<td>$150 per hour</td>
<td>1223 hours</td>
<td>$183,458</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
point and provide templates for report generation. No vendor has been identified at this time and a range of estimates have been obtained. Estimates were calculated by multiplying an average rate of $150 per hour for programming by an estimated total hours of 1223 for job completion. Based on the estimates, Year 1 will require the most intensive work, with years 2 through 5 requiring basic maintenance.

**Test Development Contract:** RU will explore test development vendors to develop and score student state-wide testing for non-tested grades (grades K, 1, 2, 9, 10, and 12) that are similar to the current NJ ASK standardized state assessment (grades 3 through 8). No vendor has been established and a range of estimates have been obtained.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Days of Service/Time</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$275,536</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>$275,536</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ASU Subcontract**

No contractual work associated with the ASU budget.

**LEAs Subcontracts**

No contractual work associated with the LEAs budgets.

**Total Contractual**

$484,494

7. **Construction:** Not applicable.

8. **Other**

Other includes all direct costs not covered in previous sections, including pay based compensation, training costs, and fees.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RU Contract</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Web Server Host:</strong> A project website will require the support of webhosting company to store and monitor the upload/download of website data. No vendor has been identified at this point in time. Several estimates have been received based on the amount of anticipated data and website design. Webhosting fees are based on yearly contracts.</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mobile Phone Service Provider:</strong> Three smartphones will be purchased to assist project leaders with communications. No vendors have been identified at this point in time. Several estimates have been</td>
<td>3 phones</td>
<td>$80 per plan per month x 12-</td>
<td>$2,880</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
received. 12-month contracts are required with a host company.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASU Subcontract</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Other costs associated with the ASU subcontract.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEAs Subcontracts</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Danielson Framework Turnkey Training (4 cohorts of 20): All four LEAs will explore vendors that support training of the Danielson Framework for Teaching, to ensure correct implementation and accurate usage of the framework. No vendor has been established and a range of estimates have been obtained. Training will be a Train the Trainer model, which will allow school personnel to train future users during and after the project term and only incur a training cost once. The training takes 6 days and includes 1 cohort of up to 20 people. The cost is a per day rate, and requires a total of 6 days for successful.</td>
<td>$22,500 per district (includes up to 20 people)</td>
<td>48 hours per district</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* MyiLogs Train the Trainer (4 cohorts of 30): All four LEAs will explore vendors that provide training for the MyiLogs online system to ensure correct implementation and accurate usage when monitoring teachers’ instructional content and professional development goals. No vendor has been established and a range of estimates have been obtained. MyiLogs will provide direct training services of the Master Mentor Teachers and administrators in each LEA. The training will be a Train the Trainer model, which will allow each LEA to train future users during the project’s lifetime and after. This will save on training costs for each LEA in the future after the project’s completion. The training includes 15 hours of didactic instruction and additional supervision per participant following training.</td>
<td>$17,476.5 per district (includes up to 30 people)</td>
<td>15 hours per district</td>
<td>$69,906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal Non Contracted Hours (43): All four LEAs have agreed to conduct training for the 43 Principals on the EES during non-contracted hours to ensure successful implementation. School districts are required by local union regulations to compensate employees for attending training outside of contracted hours. To successfully implement the EES infrastructure before Year 2, training must occur during non-contracted hours in the summer months of Year 1. Principals are contracted on a 12-month basis and can attend the weekday trainings over the summer.</td>
<td>$45 per hour</td>
<td>8 hours for each principal</td>
<td>$15,480</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Because the Danielson Framework training requires 6 full days, we will be asking Principals to attend one Saturday training of 8 hours length. Fringe benefits do not apply to these hours.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Master Mentor Teacher Non Contracted Hours (51):</th>
<th>$30 per hour</th>
<th>88 hours for each Master Mentor Teacher</th>
<th>$134,640</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All four LEAs have agreed to conduct training for the 51 Master Mentor Teachers on the EES during non-contracted hours to ensure successful implementation. School districts are required by local union regulations to compensate employees for attending training outside of contracted hours. NJ LEAs only have 3 contracted service days that occur before the school year begins, which are already filled with important within LEA trainings and programs. To successfully implement the EES infrastructure before Year 2, training must occur during non-contracted hours in the summer months of Year 1. We estimate a total of 88 hours is needed to train Master Mentor Teachers on the EES components of the Danielson Framework (48 hours), MyiLogs (16 hours), and CSS (16 hours), as well as pass the required certification and reliability assessments associated with each. Fringe benefits do not apply to these hours.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher Non Contracted Hours (1211):</th>
<th>$30 per hour</th>
<th>40 hours for each Teacher</th>
<th>$1,453,200</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All four LEAs have agreed to conduct training for the 1211 teachers on the EES during non-contracted hours to ensure successful implementation. School districts are required by local union regulations to compensate employees for attending training outside of contracted hours. School districts in NJ only have 3 contracted service days that occur before the school year begins, which are already filled with important within district training and programs. To successfully implement the EES infrastructure before Year 2, training must occur during non-contracted hours in the summer months of Year 1. We estimate a total of 40 hours is needed for 1211 non-career ladder teachers to become familiar with the EES components of the Danielson Framework (16 hours), MyiLOGSs (8 hours), and CSS (16 hours), as well as pass the required certification and reliability assessments associated with each. Fringe benefits do not apply to these hours.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Other** | $1,767,606 |

*Dr. Alexander Kurz, Co-PI, will receive no financial gain from any MyiLogs training, software, and on-going maintenance services. All MyiLogs estimates have been reduced to adhere to this COI plan. A Rutgers University appointed fiscal manager will ensure all invoicing and payments*
associated with the project adhere to the elimination of financial benefit to Dr. Kruz. The fiscal manager will report directly to the senior PI.

9. **Total Direct Costs for Year 1: $4,071,639**

10. **Total Indirect Costs: $592,127**
The approved indirect rate agreement for RU is the 26%. For ASU, the approved indirect rate agreement is 26%. For Year 1, indirect costs for RU are $584,140 and for ASU the indirect costs are $7,987.

11. **Training Stipends:** Not applicable.

12. **Total Costs for Year 1: $4,663,766**

---

**Project Year 2**

**October 1\(^{st}\) 2013 to September 30\(^{th}\) 2014**

---

**1. Personnel:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RU Contract</th>
<th>%FTE</th>
<th>Base Salary</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Director (Principal Investigator) (1): Dr. Linda Reddy will be responsible for overall project leadership, budget oversight, practical, and methodological issues related to implementation of the HCMS, EES, PD, and PBCS. Her qualifications are described in section E Management Plan. In Project Year 2, she will dedicate 25% of her effort during the 9.5 academic month year, and 100% effort in the summer months.</td>
<td>.25 FTE x 9.5 months</td>
<td>$104,256</td>
<td>$26,064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co Investigator (1): Dr. Ryan Kettler will be responsible for overall project leadership, practical and methodological issues related to implementation of the teacher and principal evaluation systems and student growth. His qualifications are described in section E Management Plan. In Project Year 2, he will dedicate 25% of his effort during the 9.5 academic month year, and 100% effort in the summer months.</td>
<td>.25 FTE x 9.5 months</td>
<td>$84,240</td>
<td>$21,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Project Director (1): The Project Assistant Director will be responsible for daily supervision and implementation of the project as well as coordinating communication with each LEA and its constituents (administrative and teaching staff, and teacher unions). They will assist in the daily management of the SSI Project. Salaries were calculated based on the median</td>
<td>1.0 FTE x 2.5 months</td>
<td>$101,640</td>
<td>$101,640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>FTE</td>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Business Manager (1):</strong> The Business Manager will manage the human resource components and financial aspects of the RU Team. They will serve as a liaison and coordinate with the human resource (HR) departments in each of the LEAs in regards to HCMS implementation. They train each LEA on how the EES will impact human capital decision making and assist in making HR decisions including but not limited to: recruitment, placement, PD, compensation, promotion, and dismissal. Salaries were calculated based on the median salary for similar positions at RU and in collaboration with the HR department.</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>$64,906</td>
<td>$64,906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Information Technology (IT) Specialist (1):</strong> The IT specialist will assist in the development of the software applications necessary to implement and manage the HCMS, PBCS, and EES. They will coordinate activities with the contracted programming consultants on the development a web-based portal for each LEA and collaborate with each LEA’s IT department on implementing the new HCMS, EES, and PBCS applications. Salaries were calculated based on the median salary for similar positions at RU and in collaboration with the HR department.</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>$59,397</td>
<td>$59,397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data and Growth Modeling (DGM) Specialist (1):</strong> A Data and Growth Modeling Specialist will be hired to manage all data collection, analysis, and interpretation of teacher, principal and student growth data in the EES and internally evaluate the EES and the HCMS in relation to their effects on student outcome.</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>$82,400</td>
<td>$82,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evaluation Manager (1):</strong> The Evaluation Manager will assist the DGM Specialist in the internal evaluation of the project. They will also coordinate HCMS data analysis and decision making with the PI’s, DGM, and External Evaluator.</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>$61,800</td>
<td>$61,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leadership Principals (3):</strong> Three Leadership Principals will be hired for the purposes of coordinating with each LEAs school-based principals on the implementation of the HCMS. The Leadership Principals will supervise the 43 school based principals leadership activities during the project. They will be responsible for overseeing the implementation of the PES in each school district, train LEA constituents on the VAL-ED system, and provide PD to 43 school based principals.</td>
<td>3 x 1.0</td>
<td>$77,250</td>
<td>$231,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leadership Teachers (6):</strong> Six Leadership Teachers will</td>
<td>7 x 1.0</td>
<td>$66,833</td>
<td>$ 401,002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
be hired to assist in the implementation of the EES for all 1,211 teacher constituents and the PD and PBCS for all 1,211 teachers in TIF qualified schools. Leadership Teachers will primarily oversee the 51 school-based Master Mentor Teachers across the four LEAs. They will train and supervise Master Mentor Teachers on the components of the EES, how it relates to PD, and how to deliver PD.

| Program Coordinator: The Program Coordinator will be hired to directly assist the Project Director, Assistant Project Director, Co-PIs, and all SSI Project staff. The Program Coordinator will be responsible for all communications and correspondences between Rutgers SSI Project staff and LEA staff. The Program Coordinator will manage communications between the Rutgers Foundations and Development staff and LEA development officers on possible grant opportunities. Also, this person will prioritize and purchase office supplies and project materials for the entire project. | 1.0 FTE | $39,241 | $39,241 |

| Data Entry Clerk: To assist with data entry needs related to LEA, HCMS, EES, PD and PBCS systems, a data entry clerk will be hired on a part time basis for Year 1 to 5. The Data Entry Clerk will assist the DGM Specialist and Evaluation Manager with data entry and analysis. They will also assist the Project Assistant Director and Business Specialist with data entry needs. They will serve for approximately 46 weeks of the year. | 19 hours per week x 46 weeks of the year. | $17.67 per hour | $15,450 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>ASU Subcontract</strong></th>
<th><strong>%FTE</strong></th>
<th><strong>Base Salary</strong></th>
<th><strong>Total</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Co Investigator (1): Dr. Alexander Kurz will be responsible for overall project leadership for implementation of educator and principal instructional improvement PD and practical issues related to implementation of the EES and its components. His qualifications are described in section E Management Plan. In Project Year 2, he will dedicate 25% of his effort annually.</td>
<td>.25 FTE x 12-months</td>
<td>$73,068</td>
<td>$18,267</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>LEAs Subcontracts</strong></th>
<th><strong>%FTE</strong></th>
<th><strong>Base Salary</strong></th>
<th><strong>Total</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Career Ladder Master Mentor Teachers (51): All four LEAs will adopt Master Mentor Teachers to assume leadership roles within the district. A total of 51 Master Mentor Teacher positions will created across all four LEAs. The TIF program sponsors career ladder positions at a rate of 1 position for every 12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
teachers who are not in a career ladder position (1:12 ratio). There are a total of 1211 teachers in the TIF qualifying schools. For the purposes of LEA sustainability, this project opted to use a ratio of 1:24 instead. Master Mentor Teachers will share responsibility for implementing the EES alongside each building’s Principal. Master Mentor Teachers will use the Danielson Framework, CSS, and MyiLogs to track teachers’ instructional content, instructional competency and strategy use, and PD related activities. They will provide direct PD services to teachers in the form of 1 on 1 tailored coaching/modeling and targeted group sessions.

Previous research reviews and past TIF submissions have suggested that it is necessary for the Master Mentor Positions to be full time effort in order to carry out the numerous observation, analysis, and intervention procedures. Master Mentor Salaries are calculated by adding a 5% to the median teacher salary for all teachers in each school district. Non career ladder teachers’ salaries increase with each year of experience, thus the median is a better estimate than using an average. Master Mentor Teacher salaries will be adjusted each subsequent year to accommodate NJ State and NJ teacher union contract regulations, which equates to a 5% increase each subsequent year.

- Asbury Park contains 236 teachers. A total of 10 Master Mentor Teachers will be hired in this district. The median salary for all teachers in this district in Year 2 is estimated at $71,950. Master Mentor Teachers’ base salaries will begin 5% higher than this value.

  10 x 1.0 FTE  $75,547.71 x 10  $755,477

- Hillside contains 285 teachers. A total of 12 Master Mentor Teachers will be hired in this district. The median salary for all teachers in this district in Year 2 is estimated at $68,481. Master Mentor Teachers’ base salaries will begin 5% higher than this value.

  12 x 1.0 FTE  $71,905.05 x 12  $862,861

- Lakewood contains 410 teachers. A total of 17 Master Mentor Teachers will be hired in this district. The median salary for all teachers in this district in Year 2 is estimated at $53,279. Master Mentor Teachers’ base salaries will begin 5% higher than this value.

  17 x 1.0 FTE  $55,943.06 x 17  $951,032
North Plainfield contains 280 teachers. A total of 12 Master Mentor Teachers will be hired in this district. The median salary for all teachers in this district in Year 2 is estimated at $62,149. Master Mentor Teachers’ base salaries will begin 5% higher than this value.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Personnel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$4,531,980</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2. Fringe Benefits:

The following personnel all have fringe benefit rates applied to their salaries:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RU Contract</th>
<th>Fringe Rate</th>
<th>Base Salary</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fringe Benefit rates apply to the RU Team. For Faculty, during the 9.5 months academic year, a Fringe Benefits rate of 38.2% will be applied. During the 2.5 summer months, a Fringe Benefit rate of 7.3% is applied.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Project Director (PI) Dr. Linda Reddy serves in a faculty capacity. Fringe Benefit rate is only calculated for the 9.5 months academic year. Fringe Benefit rate is calculated for the 9.5 months academic year and for 2.5 summer months.</td>
<td>38.2%</td>
<td>$104,256</td>
<td>$9,957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Co Investigator Ryan Kettler serves in a faculty capacity. Fringe Benefit rate is calculated for the 9.5 months academic year and for 2.5 summer months.</td>
<td>38.2%</td>
<td>$84,240</td>
<td>$8,045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,845</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fringe Benefit rates apply to the RU Team. For Staff positions, a Fringe Benefits rate of 38.2% is applied annually.

- Project Assistant Director will serve in a staff capacity. 38.2% $101,40 $38,826
- Business Manager will serve in a staff capacity. 38.2% $64,906 $24,794
- Information Technology (IT) Specialist will serve in a staff capacity. 38.2% $59,397 $22,690
- Data and Growth Modeling Specialist will serve in a staff capacity. 38.2% $82,400 $31,477
- Evaluation Manager will serve in a staff 38.2% $61,800 $22,920
capacity.

- Leadership Principals (3) will serve in a staff capacity: 38.2% $77,250 $88,529
- Leadership Teachers (6) will serve in a staff capacity: 38.2% $66,834 $153,183
- Program Coordinator: 38.2% $14,990 $14,990
- Part time Data Entry Clerk: 7.3% $1,126 $1,126

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASU Subcontract</th>
<th>Fringe Rate</th>
<th>Base Salary</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Co Investigator Alexander Kurz is employed at Arizona State University (ASU). Fringe Benefit rates apply to ASU at a rate of 30% of the base salary.</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>$73,068</td>
<td>$5,608</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEAs Subcontracts</th>
<th>Fringe Rate</th>
<th>Base Salary</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Career Ladder Master Mentor Teachers (51): Fringe Benefit rates apply to the 51 Master Mentor Teachers across all four LEAs. Each LEA utilizes a different Fringe Benefit rate.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Asbury Park will create 10 Master Mentor Teacher positions during Years 2 through 5: 20% $75,547.71 x 10 $151,095
- Hillside will create 12 Master Mentor Teacher positions during Years 2 through 5: 14% $71,905.5 x 12 $120,800
- Lakewood will create 17 Master Mentor Teacher positions during Years 2 through 5: 25% $55,943.06 x 12 $237,758
- North Plainfield will create 12 Master Mentor Teacher positions during Years 2 through 5: 30% $65,256.98 x 12 $234,925

**Total Fringe Benefits:** $1,171,540

3. **Travel:**

**Travel:** Expenses include the average airfare of $500 each, in addition to a hotel room at $150/night for two nights, local transportation of $50, and per diem of $50.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>RU Contract</strong></th>
<th><strong># of Trips</strong></th>
<th><strong>$ per Trip</strong></th>
<th><strong>Total</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TIF Grantee Meeting: This 1.5 day meeting will provide participants with key information needed to manage and implement a discretionary grant awarded by ED and technical assistance from experts. Meetings are held annually.</td>
<td>3 (1 Project Director &amp; 2 key personnel)</td>
<td>$1250</td>
<td>$3750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIF Topical Meeting: This 1.5 Day meeting will provide participants with in depth information on a topic related to implementing PBCSs. Meetings are held annually.</td>
<td>2 (1 Project Director &amp; 2 key personnel)</td>
<td>$1250</td>
<td>$2500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI &amp; CO-PI's Local Travel to LEAs: Project leaders will meet with LEA constituents on a weekly basis during the first year of implementation planning. Asbury Park is located 54 miles from the university, Lakewood 35 miles, Hillside 33 miles, North Plainfield 10 miles (265 miles round trip).</td>
<td>46 trips (2 people)</td>
<td>$0.31 Federal Reimbursement Rate</td>
<td>$7,558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Local Travel to LEAs: Three Leadership Principals and six Leadership teachers will meet with LEA constituents on a weekly basis during the first year of implementation planning. Asbury Park is located 54 miles from the university, Lakewood 35 miles, Hillside 33 miles, North Plainfield 10 miles (265 miles round trip). 9 persons will be traveling to the LEAs on a weekly</td>
<td>39 trips (9 people)</td>
<td>$0.31 Federal Reimbursement Rate</td>
<td>$26,617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Evaluator Dr. Dan Reschly will visit with project leaders at least 1 time per year to discuss project activities and provide oversight. As per TIF guidelines, lodging is based on a five night stay in a major and per diem expenses for up to six days. Dan Reschly may be required to incur local travel costs when visiting each LEA.</td>
<td>1 trip (1 person)</td>
<td>$1500</td>
<td>$1500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>ASU Subcontract</strong></th>
<th><strong># of Trips</strong></th>
<th><strong>$ per Trip</strong></th>
<th><strong>Total</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Co-PI Travel from Arizona to NJ: Co-PI Dr. Alexander Kurz will travel to NJ to meet with PI Dr. Linda Reddy and Co-PI Dr. Ryan Kettler at RU. It is estimated that Dr. Alexander Kurz will make 5 trips a year, for a period of 5 days each trip.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$1500</td>
<td>$7,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>LEAs Subcontract</strong></th>
<th><strong># of Trips</strong></th>
<th><strong>$ per Trip</strong></th>
<th><strong>Total</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No travel expenses are anticipated for the LEAs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Total Travel: $49,425

4. Equipment:

Equipment: Consistent with our organization’s policy, equipment is defined as tangible, non-expendable, personal property, having a useful life of more than one year and an acquisition cost of $1,000 or more per unit.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RU Contract</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost of Item</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No costs for Equipment in Year 2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASU Subcontract</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost of Item</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Equipment costs associated with the ASU subcontract.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEA Subcontracts</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost of Item</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Equipment costs associated with the LEA subcontracts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Equipment $0

5. Supplies:

Supplies include all tangible and expendable property that are of a low unit cost

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RU Contract</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Software: Licenses will be purchased for additional software not provided with PC set up. These include such programs as Adobe Acrobat Professional, Adobe Photoshop, SPSS, AMOS, DreamWeaver. Software will assist with data analysis, web design, and document preparation.</td>
<td>$2000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Observer Reliability Assessment Software (20):To ensure observer reliability and accuracy of the RU Leadership Teachers when using the Danielson Framework, successful completion of a proficiency assessment will be required each year Years 1 through 5. Vendors have been explored that provide an online system and proficiency test for users of the Danielson Framework and is required as an assessment component of the Danielson Framework Turnkey Training. A total of 20 RU Leadership Teachers and project staff need to be certified. The system provides training components, diagnostic support, and a reliability test on the Danielson Framework. The test will be used to calibrate observers for reliability and accuracy, which will ensure the Rutgers Leadership | $399 per observer | 1 year | $7,980 |
Teachers and staff are using the Danielson Framework correctly to evaluate teachers and provide the correct PD. The cost is estimated at $399 per observer and grants access to the on-line system for 1 year.

| RU Office Supplies: Basic stationary and printing supplies will be needed to manage the day to day affairs of SSI project. This includes: chairs, desks, toner for each printer, printing paper, writing instruments, etc. | $7,000 | $7,000 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>ASU Subcontract</strong></th>
<th><strong>Cost</strong></th>
<th><strong>Quantity</strong></th>
<th><strong>Total</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Office Supplies: Basic stationary and printing supplies will be needed to manage the day to day affairs of SSI project. This includes: chairs, desks, toner for each printer, printing paper, writing instruments, etc.</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td></td>
<td>$200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>LEAs Subcontracts</strong></th>
<th><strong>Cost</strong></th>
<th><strong>Quantity</strong></th>
<th><strong>Total</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Observer Reliability Assessment Software (94 observers): To ensure observer reliability and accuracy of the school based Principals and Master Mentor Teachers when using the Danielson Framework, successful completion of a proficiency assessment will be required each year Years 1 through 5. Vendors have been explored that provide an online system and proficiency test for users of the Danielson Framework. A total of 94 Principals and Master Mentor Teachers across all four LEAs need to be certified. The system software will provide training components, diagnostic support, and a reliability test on the Danielson Framework. The test will be used to calibrate observers for reliability and accuracy, which will ensure the Principals and Master Mentor Teachers in each district are using the Danielson Framework correctly to evaluate teachers and provide the correct PD. The cost is estimated $399 per observer and grants access to the system for 1 year.</td>
<td>$399 per observer (94 principals and Master Mentor Teachers across all four LEAs)</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>$37,506</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*MyiLogs Software for Teacher Evaluation (1211): All four LEAs have agreed to use the MyiLogs online system and software for tracking teachers’ instructional content and PD goals each year for Years 2 through 5. The online system tracks teachers’ daily instructional activities and maps these activities to core curriculum standards. MyiLogs also tracks teachers’ progress towards PD goals and district specific goals. A total of 1211 teachers across all four LEAs.*
LEAs will be using the MyiLogs system. License pricing is based upon the number of teachers in each district. Additional cost includes district specific customization to the MyiLogs software platform during Year 2 Implementation. License time span is for year duration.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEA</th>
<th>License Cost</th>
<th>Time Span</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asbury Park contains 236 Teachers and is priced according to MyiLogs 150 to 300 teacher quantity pricing scale</td>
<td>$11,897</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>$11,897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillside contains 285 Teachers and is priced according to MyiLogs 150 to 299 teacher quantity pricing scale</td>
<td>$11,897</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>$11,897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakewood contains 410 Teachers and is priced according to MyiLogs 300 to 499 teacher quantity pricing scale</td>
<td>$15,555</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>$15,555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Plainfield contains 280 Teachers and is priced according to MyiLogs 150 to 299 teacher quantity pricing scale</td>
<td>$11,897</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>$11,897</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**VAL-ED Software for Principal Evaluation:** All four LEA’s have agreed to use VAL-ED, an online system for assessing Principal effectiveness and leadership competencies each year for Years 2 through 5. VAL-ED is a 360 feedback system which incorporates ratings from the teachers, principal self-report, and administrator ratings on the principal’s leadership skills and effectiveness. No vendor has been identified and a range of estimates have been obtained. License pricing is based upon the number of principals in each district. License time span is for 1 year duration.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEA</th>
<th>License Cost</th>
<th>Time Span</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asbury Park contains 9 Principals and Assistant Principals across its 5 schools.</td>
<td>$324 per principal</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>$2,916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillside contains 10 Principals and Assistant Principals across its 6 schools.</td>
<td>$3240</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakewood contains 16 Principals and Assistant Principals across its 6 schools.</td>
<td>$5,184</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Plainfield contains 8 Principals and Assistant Principals across its 5 schools.</td>
<td>$2,592</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Total Supplies:** $119,863

*In regard to the MyiLogs system, see the COI plan on page 13 of this document.

### 6. Contractual:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contractual</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Days of Service/Time</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RU Contract</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Consultants:</strong> Expert consultants in areas related to the HCMS will be contracted to serve on the SSI project. The consultants will provide key expertise and represent culturally diverse backgrounds.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Dr. Steve Elliot, will act as a supervising mentor to Dr. Linda Reddy for the SSI Project. He will offer consultation for the implementation of VAL-ED system, provide criterion feedback for principal effectiveness, and train the Leadership Principals to provide feedback to their constituents. He will commit three days per year on the project.</td>
<td>$1,500 per day</td>
<td>3 days</td>
<td>$4,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Dr. Louis Hsu, will serve as a statistical and measurement expert and will be responsible for conceptualizing all data analytic methods. He will coordinate activities and goals with the DGM Specialist. He will commit seven days per year on the project.</td>
<td>$1,500 per day</td>
<td>7 days</td>
<td>$10,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Dr. Frank Worrell, will serve as a student minority assessment expert and will be responsible for conceptualizing assessment and analysis of student achievement for minority populations. He will serve one day per year on the project.</td>
<td>$1,000 per day</td>
<td>1 day</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Dr. Maria Adelaida Restrepo, will serve as an ELL expert and will be responsible for conceptualizing assessment and analysis of ELL teacher effectiveness and ELL student data. She will support the development of a PD system for ELL teachers. She will commit one day per year on the project.</td>
<td>$1,000 per day</td>
<td>1 day</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ms. Lynn Holdheide, will serve as a teacher quality expert for non-test subjects (e.g., Art, Music). She will be responsible for developing measures of teacher effectiveness assessment and student achievement for non-tested</td>
<td>$1,000 per day</td>
<td>1 day</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
subjects. She will serve one day per year on the project.
- Dr. Daniel Reschly, will serve as an external evaluator to the SSI Project. He will coordinate with the PI’s on the projects’ activities and provide objective oversight. He will commit 5 days per year to the project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Days of Service/Time</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Test Development Contract:</strong> RU will explore test development vendors to develop and score student state-wide testing for non-tested grades (grades K, 1, 2, 9, 10, and 12) that are similar to the current NJ ASK standardized state assessment (grades 3 through 8). No vendor has been established and a range of estimates have been obtained.</td>
<td>$752,136</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>$752,136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Application Development Contract:</strong> RU will explore application/software developers for the continued maintenance of a web based interface for the SSI project and its LEA constituents. The web based interface will act as a portal for teachers to log in daily and enter respective data. The portal will generate information related to the teachers' instructional practices, content, and PD. For administrators, the portal will serve as a data entry point and report generation template. No vendor has been indentified at this time and a wide range of estimates have been obtained. Estimates were calculated by multiplying an average rate of $150 per hour for programming by an estimated total hours of 205 for job completion. Based on the estimates, Year 1 will require the most intensive work, with years 2 through 5 requiring basic maintenance.</td>
<td>$150 per hour</td>
<td>205 hours</td>
<td>$30,800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subcontract</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Days of Service/Time</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ASU Subcontract</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No contractual work associated with the ASU budget.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subcontract</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Days of Service/Time</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>LEAs Subcontract</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No contractual work associated with the LEAs budgets.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Contractual:** $808,436
7. Construction: Not applicable.

8. Other

Other includes all direct costs not covered in previous sections, including pay based compensation, training costs, and fees.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RU Contract</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Web Server Host: A project website will require the support of webhosting company to store and monitor the upload/download of website data. No vendor has been identified at this point in time. Several estimates have been received based on the amount of anticipated data and website design. Webhosting fees are based on yearly contracts.</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Phone Service Provider: Three smart phones will be purchased to assist project leaders with communications. No vendors have been identified at this point in time. Several estimates have been received. 12-month contracts are required with a host company.</td>
<td>3 phones</td>
<td>$80 per plan per month x 12-months</td>
<td>$2,880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAL-ED Train the Trainer (1 cohort of 20): RU will explore vendors that provide training for the VAL-ED online system to ensure correct implementation and accurate usage when monitoring teachers’ instructional content and professional development goals. No vendor has been established and a range of estimates have been obtained. VAL-ED will provide direct training services to the Leadership Principals and school based in each LEA. The training will be a Train the Trainer model, which will allow RU to train future users during the project’s lifetime and after. This will save on training costs for each LEA. The training includes 15 hours of didactic instruction and additional supervision per participant following training.</td>
<td>$11,250 per day for 20 persons</td>
<td>2 days</td>
<td>$22,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASU Subcontract</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Other cost associated with the ASU budget.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEA Subcontracts</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>* MyiLogs Train the Trainer (4 cohorts of 30): All four LEAs will explore vendors that provide ongoing support for Master Mentor Teachers using the MyiLogs online system to ensure correct implementation and accurate usage of instructional content and professional development goals. Ongoing support will be needed for Years 2 through 5 for the</td>
<td>$10,568 per district (includes up to 30 people)</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>$42,272</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Master Mentor Teachers. No vendor has been established and a range of estimates have been obtained. Support services will be provided for the initial 30 Master Mentor Teachers and administrators trained as MyiLogs trainers. Services will include evaluation of trainers’ competency, report generation and interpretation, observation training, and continued access to administrative accounts for each school district. Support will be provided for 1 full year.

| Total Other: | $69,153 |

*In regard to the MyiLogs system, see the COI plan on page 13 of this document.

9. Total Direct Costs for Year 2: $6,750,397

10. Indirect Costs: $652,187
The approved indirect rate agreement for RU is the 26%. For ASU, the approved indirect rate agreement is 26%. For Year 2, indirect costs for RU are $643,977 and for ASU the indirect costs are $8,210.

11. Training Stipends: Not applicable.

12. Total Costs for Year 2: $7,402,584

---

Project Year 3
October 1st 2014 to September 30th 2015

1. Personnel:
Personnel: the following requested personnel will all be hired as employees of the project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RU Contract</th>
<th>% FTE</th>
<th>Base Salary</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Director (Principal Investigator) (1); Dr. Linda Reddy will be responsible for overall project leadership, budget oversight, practical, and methodological issues related to implementation of the HCMS, EES, PD, and PBCS. Her qualifications are described in section E Management Plan. In Project Year 3, she will dedicate 25% of her effort during the 9.5 academic month year, and 100% effort in the summer months.</td>
<td>.25 FTE x 9.5 months</td>
<td>$114,684</td>
<td>$28,671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co Investigator (1); Dr. Ryan Kettler will be responsible for overall project leadership, practical and methodological issues related to implementation of the teacher and principal evaluation systems and student growth. His qualifications are described in</td>
<td>.25 FTE x 9.5 months</td>
<td>$92,644</td>
<td>$23,166</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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section E Management Plan. In Project Year 3, he will dedicate 25% of his effort during the 9.5 academic month year, and 100% effort in the summer months.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position and Description</th>
<th>FTE</th>
<th>Salary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Project Director (1): The Project Assistant Director will be responsible for daily supervision and implementation of the project as well as coordinating communication with each LEA and its constituents (administrative and teaching staff, and teacher unions). They will assist in the daily management of the SSI Project. Salaries were calculated based on the median salary for similar positions.</td>
<td>1.0 FTE</td>
<td>$104,689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Manager (1): The Business Manager will manage the human resource components and financial aspects of the RU Team. They will serve as a liaison and coordinate with the human resource (HR) departments in each of the LEAs in regards to HCMS implementation. They train each LEAs on how the EES will impact human capital decision making and assist in making HR decisions including but not limited to: recruitment, placement, PD, compensation, promotion, and dismissal. Salaries were calculated based on the median salary for similar positions.</td>
<td>1.0 FTE</td>
<td>$66,853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Technology (IT) Specialist (1): The IT specialist will assist in the development of the software applications necessary to implement and manage the HCMS, PBCS, and EES. They will coordinate activities with the contracted programming consultants on the development a web-based portal for each LEA and collaborate with each LEA’s IT department on implementing the new HCMS, EES, and PBCS applications. Salaries were calculated based on the median salary for similar positions.</td>
<td>1.0 FTE</td>
<td>$61,179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data and Growth Modeling (DGM) Specialist (1): A Data and Growth Modeling Specialist will be hired to manage all data collection, analysis, and interpretation of teacher, principal and student growth data in the EES and internally evaluate the EES and the HCMS in relation to their effects on student outcome. They will serve on a 12-month contract.</td>
<td>1.0 FTE</td>
<td>$84,872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Manager (1): The Evaluation Manager will assist the DGM Specialist in the internal evaluation of the project. They will also coordinate HCMS data analysis and decision making with the PI’s, DGM, and External Evaluator.</td>
<td>1.0 FTE</td>
<td>$63,654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Principals (3): Three Leadership Principals will be hired for the purposes of coordinating with</td>
<td>3 x 1.0 FTE</td>
<td>$79,567</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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each LEAs school-based principals on the implementation of the HCMS. The Leadership Principals will supervise the 43 school based principals leadership activities during the project. They will be responsible for overseeing the implementation of the PES in each school district, train LEA constituents on the VAL-ED system, and provide PD to 43 school based principals. They will be hired on a fulltime 12-month contract.

| Leadership Teachers (6) | 6 x 1.0 FTE | $68,838 | $413,032 |

Leadership Teachers (6): Six Leadership Teachers will be hired to assist in the implementation of the EES for all 1,211 teacher constituents and the PD and PBCS for all 1,211 teachers in TIF qualified schools. Leadership Teachers will primarily oversee the 51 school-based Master Mentor Teachers across the four LEAs. They will train and supervise Master Mentor Teachers on the components of the EES, how it relates to PD, and how to deliver PD. They will be hired on a fulltime 12-month contract.

| Program Coordinator | 1.0 FTE | $40,418 | $40,418 |

Program Coordinator: The Program Coordinator will be hired to directly assist the Project Director, Assistant Project Director, Co-PIs, and all SSI Project staff. The Program Coordinator will be responsible for all communications and correspondences between Rutgers SSI Project staff and LEA staff. The Program Coordinator will manage communications between the Rutgers Foundations and Development staff and LEA development officers on possible grant opportunities. Also, this person will prioritize and purchase office supplies and project materials for the entire project.

| Data Entry Clerk | 19 hours per week x 46 weeks of the year | $18.20 per hour | $15,914 |

Data Entry Clerk: To assist with data entry needs related to LEA, HCMS, EES, PD and PBCS systems, a data entry clerk will be hired on a part time basis for Year 1 to 5. The Data Entry Clerk will assist the DGM Specialist and Evaluation Manager with data entry and analysis. They will also assist the Project Assistant Director and Business Specialist with data entry needs. They will serve for approximately 46 weeks of the year.

| Part Time Development Officer | 19 hours per week x 40 weeks per year | $39.47 per hour | $30,000 |

Part Time Development Officer: To assist each LEA with sustainability and transitioning from the TIF program, a Development Officer will be hired to work with each LEA for years three through 5. They will work with each lea and SSI Project staff to secure future funding for the support of the PBCS system. The Development Officer will instruct each LEA on
the grant application process and work with each LEA to establish a grants office/officer. They will assist each LEA in applying for future grants to support further systems level development and instructional improvement. They will serve for approximately 40 weeks of the year to align with each LEAs 9.5 academic month calendar.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASU Subcontract</th>
<th>% FTE</th>
<th>Base Salary</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Co Investigator (1): Dr. Alexander Kurz will be responsible for overall project leadership for implementation of educator and principal instructional improvement PD and practical issues related to implementation of the EES and its components. His qualifications are described in section E Management Plan. In Project Year 3, he will dedicate 25% of his effort annually.</td>
<td>.25 FTE x 12-months</td>
<td>$75,260</td>
<td>$18,815</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEAs Subcontracts</th>
<th>% FTE</th>
<th>Base Salary</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Career Ladder Master Mentor Teachers (51): All four LEAs will adopt Master Mentor Teachers to assume leadership roles within the district. A total of 51 Master Mentor Teacher positions were created across all four LEAs. Master Mentor Teacher salaries were adjusted to accommodate NJ State and NJ teacher union contract regulations, which equates to a 5% increase from Year 2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Asbury Park contains 236 teachers. A total of 10 Master Mentor Teachers will be hired in this district. Master Mentor Teachers’ base salaries were adjusted 5% higher than the previous year.</td>
<td>10 x 1.0 FTE</td>
<td>$79,325.10</td>
<td>$793,251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Hillside contains 285 teachers. A total of 12 Master Mentor Teachers will be hired in this district. Master Mentor Teachers’ base salaries were adjusted 5% higher than the previous year.</td>
<td>12 x 1.0 FTE</td>
<td>$75,500.30</td>
<td>$906,004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Lakewood contains 410 teachers. A total of 17 Master Mentor Teachers will be hired in this district. Master Mentor Teachers’ base salaries were adjusted 5% higher than the previous year.</td>
<td>17 x 1.0 FTE</td>
<td>$58,740.21</td>
<td>$998,584</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- North Plainfield contains 280 teachers. A total of 12 Master Mentor Teachers will be hired in this district Master Mentor Teachers’ base salaries were adjusted 5% higher than the previous year.

| Total Personnel: | $4,769,481 |

2. Fringe Benefits:
The following personnel all have fringe benefit rates applied to their salaries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RU Contract</th>
<th>Fringe Rate</th>
<th>Base Salary</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fringe Benefit rates apply to the RU Team. For Faculty, during the 9.5 months academic year, a Fringe Benefits rate of 38.2% will be applied. During the 2.5 summer months, a Fringe Benefit rate of 7.3% is applied.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Director (PI) Dr. Linda Reddy serves in a faculty capacity. Fringe Benefit rate is calculated for the 9.5 months academic year and for 2.5 summer months.</td>
<td>38.2%</td>
<td>$114,684</td>
<td>$10,952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co Investigator Ryan Kettler serves in a faculty capacity. Fringe Benefit rate is calculated for the 9.5 months academic year and for 2.5 summer months.</td>
<td>38.2%</td>
<td>$92,644</td>
<td>$8,849</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fringe Benefit rates apply to the RU Team. For Staff positions, a Fringe Benefits rate of 38.2% is applied annually.

- Project Assistant Director will serve in a staff capacity. | 38.2% | $104,689 | $39,991 |

- Business Manager will serve in a staff capacity. | 38.2% | $66,853 | $25,538 |

- Information Technology (IT) Specialist will serve in a staff capacity. | 38.2% | $61,179 | $23,370 |

- Data and Growth Modeling Specialist will serve in a staff capacity. | 38.2% | $84,872 | $32,421 |

- Evaluation Manager will serve in a staff capacity. | 38.2% | $63,654 | $24,316 |
- Leadership Principals (3) will serve in a staff capacity.  
  38.2% $79,567 $91,185
- Leadership Teachers (6) will serve in a staff capacity.  
  38.2% $68,838 $157,778
- Program Coordinator  
  38.2% $40,418 $15,440
- Part time Data Entry Clerk  
  7.3% $15,914 $1,162
- Part Time Development Officer  
  7.3% $30,000 $2,190

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASU Subcontract</th>
<th>Fringe Rate</th>
<th>Base Salary</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Co Investigator Alexander Kurz is employed at Arizona State University (ASU). Fringe Benefit rates apply to ASU at a rate of 30% of the base salary.</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>$75,260</td>
<td>$5,959</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEAs Subcontracts</th>
<th>Fringe Rate</th>
<th>Base Salary</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Career Ladder Master Mentor Teachers (51): Fringe Benefit rates apply to the 51 Master Mentor Teachers across all four LEAs. Each LEA utilizes a different Fringe Benefit rate.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
  - Asbury Park will create 10 Master Mentor Teacher positions during Years 2 through 5.  
    20% $79,325.10 x 10 $151,095
  - Hillside will create 12 Master Mentor Teacher positions during Years 2 through 5.  
    14% $75,500.30 x 12 $126,841
  - Lakewood will create 17 Master Mentor Teacher positions during Years 2 through 5.  
    25% $58,740.21 x 17 $249,646
  - North Plainfield will create 12 Master Mentor Teacher positions during Years 2 through 5.  
    30% $68,519.82 x 12 $246,671

**Total Fringe Benefits:** $1,225,288
3. **Travel:**

**Travel Expenses** include the average airfare of $500 each, in addition to a hotel room at $150/night for two nights, local transportation of $50, and per diem of $50.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>RU Contract</strong></th>
<th><strong># of Trips</strong></th>
<th><strong>$ per Trip</strong></th>
<th><strong>Total</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TIF Grantee Meeting: This 1.5 day meeting will provide participants with key information needed to manage and implement a discretionary grant awarded by ED and technical assistance from experts. Meetings are held annually.</td>
<td>3 (1 Project Director &amp; 2 key personnel)</td>
<td>$1250</td>
<td>$3750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIF Topical Meeting: This 1.5 Day meeting will provide participants with in depth information on a topic related to implementing PBCSs. Meetings are held annually.</td>
<td>2 (1 Project Director &amp; 2 key personnel)</td>
<td>$1250</td>
<td>$2500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI &amp; CO-PI’s Local Travel to LEAs: Project leaders will meet with LEA constituents on a weekly basis during the first year of implementation planning. Asbury Park is located 54 miles from the university, Lakewood 35 miles, Hillside 33 miles, North Plainfield 10 miles (265 miles round trip).</td>
<td>2 people x 46 trips</td>
<td>$0.31 Federal Reimbursement Rate</td>
<td>$7,558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Local Travel to LEAs: Three Leadership Principals and six Leadership teachers will meet with LEA constituents on a weekly basis during the first year of implementation planning. Asbury Park is located 54 miles from the university, Lakewood 35 miles, Hillside 33 miles, North Plainfield 10 miles (265 miles round trip). 9 persons will be traveling to the LEAs on a weekly for 9.5 academic school months.</td>
<td>9 people x 39 trips</td>
<td>$0.31 Federal Reimbursement Rate</td>
<td>$26,617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Evaluator Dr. Dan Reschly will visit with project leaders at least 1 time per year to discuss project activities and provide oversight. As per TIF guidelines, lodging is based on a five night stay in a major and per diem expenses for up to six days. Dr. Dan Reschly may be required to incur local travel costs when visiting each LEA.</td>
<td>1 person X 1 Trip</td>
<td>$1500</td>
<td>$1500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>ASU Subcontract</strong></th>
<th><strong># of Trips</strong></th>
<th><strong>$ per Trip</strong></th>
<th><strong>Total</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Co-PI Travel from Arizona to NJ: Co-PI Alexander Kurz will travel to NJ to meet with PI Dr. Linda Reddy and Co-PI Dr. Ryan Kettler at RU. It is estimated that Dr. Alexander Kurz will make 5 trips a year, for a period of 5 days each trip.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$1500</td>
<td>$7,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>LEAs Subcontracts</strong></th>
<th><strong># of Trips</strong></th>
<th><strong>$ per Trip</strong></th>
<th><strong>Total</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Travel costs associated with the LEAs budgets.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Total Travel: $49,425

4. Equipment:

Equipment: Consistent with our organization’s policy, equipment is defined as tangible, non-expendable, personal property, having a useful life of more than one year and an acquisition cost of $1,000 or more per unit.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RU Contract</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost of Item</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phone/Computer/Server Upgrade &amp; Repair Cost: It is anticipated that after 2 years of use, computer repairs and upgrades will be needed. These upgrades and repairs will allow the lifespan of the computer hardware purchased to continue until the end of Year 5. Smartphone contracts are expected to be terminated and renewed during Year 3, thus 3 phones will need to be upgraded.</td>
<td>Computer &amp; Server Upgrade</td>
<td>$20,600</td>
<td>$20,600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ASU Subcontract

No Equipment costs associated with the ASU budget. $0

LEA Subcontracts

No equipment costs associated with the LEAs Budgets. $0

Total Equipment: $20,600

5. Supplies:

Supplies include all tangible and expendable property that are of a low unit cost

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RU Contract</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Software: Licenses will be purchased for additional software not provided with PC set up. These include such programs as Adobe Acrobat Professional, Adobe Photoshop, SPSS, AMOS, DreamWeaver. Software will assist with data analysis, web design, and document preparation.</td>
<td>$2000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observer Reliability Assessment Software (20): To ensure observer reliability and accuracy of the RU Leadership Teachers when using the Danielson Framework, successful completion of a proficiency assessment will be required each year Years 1 through 5. Vendors have been explored that provide an online system and proficiency test for users of the Danielson Framework and is required as an assessment component of the Danielson Framework Turnkey Training. A total of 20 RU Leadership Teachers and</td>
<td>$399 per observer</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>$7980</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
project staff need to be certified. The system provides training components, diagnostic support, and a reliability test on the Danielson Framework. The test will be used to calibrate observers for reliability and accuracy, which will ensure the Rutgers Leadership Teachers and staff are using the Danielson Framework correctly to evaluate teachers and provide the correct PD. The cost is estimated at $399 per observer and grants access to the on-line system for 1 year.

**RU Office Supplies:** Basic stationary and printing supplies will be needed to manage the day to day affairs of SSI project. This includes: chairs, desks, toner for each printer, printing paper, writing instruments, etc.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASU Subcontract</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ASU Office Supplies:</strong> Basic stationary and printing supplies will be needed to manage the day to day affairs of SSI project. This includes: chairs, desks, toner for each printer, printing paper, writing instruments, etc.</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td></td>
<td>$200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LEA Subcontracts**

| Observer Reliability Assessment Software (94 observers): To ensure observer reliability and accuracy of the school based Principals and Master Mentor Teachers when using the Danielson Framework, successful completion of a proficiency assessment will be required each year Years 1 through 5. Vendors have been explored that provide an online system and proficiency test for users of the Danielson Framework. A total of 94 Principals and Master Mentor Teachers across all four LEAs need to be certified. The system software will provide training components, diagnostic support, and a reliability test on the Danielson Framework. The test will be used to calibrate observers for reliability and accuracy, which will ensure the Principals and Master Mentor Teachers in each district are using the Danielson Framework correctly to evaluate teachers and provide the correct PD. The cost is estimated $399 per observer and grants access to the system for 1 year. |
|-----------------|------|----------|-------|
| *** MyiLogs Software for Teacher Evaluation (1211): All four LEAs have agreed to use the MyiLogs online system and software for tracking teachers’ instructional content and PD goals. The online system | $399 per observer (94 principals and Master Mentor Teachers across all four LEAs) | 1 year | $37,506 |
tracks teachers’ daily instructional activities and maps these activities to core curriculum standards. MyiLogs also tracks teachers’ progress towards PD goals and district specific goals. A total of 1211 teachers across all four LEAs will be using the MyiLogs system. License pricing is based upon the number of teachers in each district. License time span is for year duration.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Price</th>
<th>Time Span</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asbury Park</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>$8,693</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>$8,693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillside</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>$8,693</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>$8,693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakewood</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>$12,353</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>$12,353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Plainfield</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>$8,693</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>$8,693</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**VAL-ED Software for Principal Evaluation:** All four LEA’s have agreed to use VAL-ED, an online system for assessing Principal effectiveness and leadership competencies. VAL-ED is a 360 feedback system which incorporates ratings from the teachers, principal self-report, and administrator ratings on the principal’s leadership skills and effectiveness. No vendor has been identified and a range of estimates have been obtained. License pricing is based upon the number of principals in each district. License time span is for 1 year duration.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Principals</th>
<th>Price</th>
<th>Time Span</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asbury Park</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>$324 per principal</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>$2916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillside</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$3240</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakewood</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>$5,184</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Plainfield</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$2,592</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Assistant Principals across its 5 schools.

**Total Supplies:** $107,051

*In regard to the MyiLogs system, see the COI plan on page 13 of this document.

### 6. Contractual:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consultant</th>
<th>RU Contract</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Days of Service</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Steve Elliot</td>
<td>Expert consultants will be contracted to serve on the SSI project. The consultants will provide key expertise and represent culturally diverse backgrounds.</td>
<td>$1,500 per day</td>
<td>3 days</td>
<td>$4,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Louis Hsu</td>
<td>Dr. Louis Hsu will serve as a statistical and measurement expert and will be responsible for conceptualizing all data analytic methods. He will coordinate activities and goals with the DGM Specialist. He will commit seven days per year on the project.</td>
<td>$1,500 per day</td>
<td>7 days</td>
<td>$10,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Frank Worrell</td>
<td>Dr. Frank Worrell will serve as a student minority assessment expert and will be responsible for conceptualizing assessment and analysis of student achievement for minority populations. He will serve one day per year on the project.</td>
<td>$1,000 per day</td>
<td>1 day</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Maria Adelaida Restrepo</td>
<td>Dr. Maria Adelaida Restrepo will serve as an ELL expert and will be responsible for conceptualizing assessment and analysis of ELL teacher effectiveness and ELL student data. She will support the development of a PD system for ELL teachers. She will commit one day per year on the project.</td>
<td>$1,000 per day</td>
<td>1 day</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Lynn Holdheide M.S.</td>
<td>Ms. Lynn Holdheide M.S. will serve as a teacher quality expert for non-test subjects (e.g., Art, Music). She will be responsible for developing measures of teacher effectiveness assessment and student achievement for non-</td>
<td>$1,000 per day</td>
<td>1 day</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
tested subjects. She will serve one day per year on the project.
- Dr. Daniel Reschly, will serve as an external evaluator to the SSI Project. He will coordinate with the PI’s on the projects’ activities and provide objective oversight. He will commit 5 days per year to the project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Development Contract: RU will explore test development vendors to develop and score student state-wide testing for non-tested grades (grades K, 1, 2, 9, 10, and 12) that are similar to the current NJ ASK standardized state assessment (grades 3 through 8). No vendor has been established and a range of estimates have been obtained.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$797,264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$797,264</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application Development Contract: RU will explore application/software developers for the continued maintenance of a web based interface for the SSI project and its LEA constituents. The web based interface will act as a portal for teachers to log in daily and enter respective data. The portal will generate information related to the teachers' instructional practices, content, and PD. For administrators, the portal will serve as a data entry point and report generation template. No vendor has been identified at this time and a wide range of estimates have been obtained. Estimates were calculated by multiplying an average rate of $150 per hour for programming by an estimated total hours of 205 for job completion. Based on the estimates, Year 1 will require the most intensive work, with years 2 through 5 requiring basic maintenance.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$150 per hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30,800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASU Subcontract</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Days of Service</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Contractual costs associated with the ASU Budget.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEAs Subcontracts</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Days of Service</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Contractual costs associated with the ASU budget</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total Contractual: |       |                 | $853,564 |

7. Construction: Not applicable.
### 8. Other

Other includes all direct costs not covered in previous sections, including pay based compensation, training costs, and fees.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RU Contract</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Web Server Host: A project website will require the support of a webhosting company to store and monitor the upload/download of website data. No vendor has been identified at this point in time. Several estimates have been received based on the amount of anticipated data and website design. Webhosting fees are based on yearly contracts.</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Phone Service Provider: Three smartphones will be purchased to assist project leaders with communications. No vendors have been identified at this point in time. Several estimates have been received. 12-month contracts are required with a host company.</td>
<td>3 phones</td>
<td>$80 per plan per month x 12-months</td>
<td>$2,880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAL-ED (1 cohort of 20): RU will explore vendors that provide ongoing support for the VAL-ED online system to ensure correct implementation and accurate usage when monitoring principal's professional development goals. Ongoing support will be needed for Years 2 through 5. No vendor has been established and a range of estimates have been obtained. Services will include evaluation of trainers’ competency, report generation and interpretation, observation training, and continued access to administrative accounts for each school district. Support will be provided for 1 full year.</td>
<td>$10,000 per cohort of 20</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASU Subcontract</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Other cost associated with the ASU budget.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEAs Subcontracts</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*MyiLogs Trainer Support (4 cohorts of 30): All four LEAs will explore vendors that provide ongoing support for Master Mentor Teachers using the MyiLogs online system to ensure correct implementation and accurate usage of instructional content and professional development goals. Ongoing support will be needed for Years 2 through 5 for the Master Mentor Teachers. No vendor has been established and a range of estimates have been obtained. Support services will be provided for the initial 30 Master Mentor Teachers and administrators trained as MyiLogs trainers. Services will include.</td>
<td>$4,392 per district (includes up to 30 people)</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>$17,558</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
evaluation of trainers’ competency, report generation and interpretation, observation training, and continued access to administrative accounts for each school district. Support will be provided for 1 full year.

Pay Based Compensation for Teachers: All four LEA’s will begin providing PBC in Year 3 and continue through Year 5. PBC will be rewarded to teachers who are determined to be Effective and Highly Effective under the new EES in each LEA. Teachers who are deemed Effective will receive a 3% bonus on top of their base salary and teachers who are deemed Highly Effective will receive a 5% bonus on top of their base salary. Estimates for the total amount of PBC needed per district were created based on the projected median teacher salary in each district and a theorized distribution of the EES ratings for all teachers in a district. In year 3, the EES distribution estimates 65% of teachers will be labeled Effective and 16% of teachers will be labeled Highly Effective. These values were then multiplied by the total number of teachers in each district to determine how many teachers would receive PBC. PBC will not be subject to the Fringe Benefit rate at each district.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Median Salary (3%)</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>PBC Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asbury Park</td>
<td>$2,266.43</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>$349,030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillside</td>
<td>$2,157.15</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>$401,230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakewood</td>
<td>$1,678.29</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>$448,104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$3,595.25</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>$165,382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(5%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$2,797.15</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>$184,612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(5%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Asbury Park contains 236 teachers. The median salary for all teachers in this district in Year 3 is estimated at $75,547. Based on the EES ratings distribution, we anticipate 154 teachers will be labeled Effective and 38 teachers Highly Effective.

- Hillside contains 285 teachers. The median salary for all teachers in this district for Year 3 is estimated at $71,905. Based on the EES ratings distribution, we anticipate 186 teachers will be labeled Effective and 46 teachers Highly Effective.

- Lakewood contains 410 teachers. The median salary for all teachers in this district for Year 3 is estimated at $55,943. Based on the EES ratings distribution, we anticipate 267 teachers will be labeled Effective and 66 teachers Highly Effective.
- North Plainfield contains 280 teachers. The median salary for all teachers in this district for Year 3 is estimated at $65,256. Based on the EES ratings distribution, we anticipate 182 teachers will be labeled Effective and 45 teachers Highly Effective.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>182 Effective Teachers</th>
<th>$356,303</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$1,957.71</td>
<td>(3%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$3,262.85</td>
<td>(5%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pay Based Compensation for Principals: All four LEA’s will begin providing PBC in Year 3 and continue through Year 5. PBC will be rewarded to principals who are determined to be Effective and Highly Effective under the new EES in each LEA. Principals who are deemed Effective will receive a 3% bonus on top of their base salary and principals who are deemed Highly Effective will receive a 5% bonus on top of their base salary. Estimates for the total amount of PBC needed per district were created based on the projected median principal salary in each district and a theorized distribution of the EES ratings for all principals in a district. In year 3, the EES distribution estimates 65% of principals will be labeled Effective and 16% of principals will be labeled Highly Effective. These values were then multiplied by the total number of principals in each district to determine how many teachers would receive PBC. PBC will not be subject to the Fringe Benefit rate at each district.

- Asbury Park contains 9 Principals and Assistant Principals. The median salary for all principals in this district for Year 3 is estimated at $132,440. Based on the EES ratings distribution we estimate 6 principals will be Effective and 1 principal will be Highly Effective.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>6 Effective Principals</th>
<th>$23,839</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$3,973.20</td>
<td>(3%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$6,622.00</td>
<td>(5%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Hillside contains 10 Principals and Assistant Principals. The median salary for all principals in this district for Year 3 is estimated at $130,626. Based on the EES ratings distribution we estimate 7 principals will be Effective and 2 principal will be Highly Effective.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>7 Effective Principals</th>
<th>$27,432</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$3918.79</td>
<td>(3%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$6,531.32</td>
<td>(5%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>2 Highly Effective Principal</th>
<th>$13,063</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
- Lakewood contains 16 Principals and Assistant Principals. The median salary for all principals in this district for Year 3 is estimated at $129,469. Based on the EES ratings distribution we estimate 10 principals will be Effective and 3 principal will be Highly Effective.

- North Plainfield contains 8 Principals and Assistant Principals. The median salary for all principals in this district in Year 3 is estimated at $155,395. Based on the EES ratings distribution we estimate 5 principals will be Effective and 3 principal will be Highly Effective.

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lakewood</td>
<td>$3,884.10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$38,841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Effective</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakewood</td>
<td>$6,473.49</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$19,420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Highly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakewood</td>
<td>$4,661.86</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$23,309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Effective</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakewood</td>
<td>7,769.76</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$15,540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Highly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Other:** $2,395,044

*In regard to the MyiLogs system, see the COI plan on page 13 of this document.

9. **Total Direct Costs for Year 3:** $9,420,453

10. **Indirect Costs:** $688,490

The approved indirect rate agreement for RU is the 26%. For ASU, the approved indirect rate agreement is 26%. For Year 3, indirect costs for RU are $680,049 and for ASU the indirect costs are $8,441.

11. **Training Stipends:** Not applicable.

12. **Total Costs for Year 3:** $10,108,943

---

**Project Year 4**  
**October 1st 2015 to September 30th 2016**

1. **Personnel:**

The following requested personnel will all be hired as employees of the project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RU Contract</th>
<th>% FTE</th>
<th>Base Salary</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Director (Principal Investigator) (1): Dr. Linda Reddy will be responsible for overall project leadership, budget oversight, practical, and methodological issues related to implementation of the HCMS, EES, PD, and PBCS. Her qualifications</td>
<td>.25 FTE x 9.5 months</td>
<td>$119,268</td>
<td>$29,817</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
are described in section E Management Plan. In Project Year 4, she will dedicate 25% of her effort during the 9.5 academic month year, and 100% effort in the summer months.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>FTE</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Salary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Co Investigator (1): Dr. Ryan Kettler will be responsible for overall project leadership, practical and methodological issues related to implementation of the teacher and principal evaluation systems and student growth. His qualifications are described in section E Management Plan. In Project Year 4, he will dedicate 25% of his effort during the 9.5 academic month year, and 100% effort in the summer months.</td>
<td>0.25 FTE</td>
<td>9.5 months</td>
<td>$96,364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Project Director (1): The Project Assistant Director will be responsible for daily supervision and implementation of the project as well as coordinating communication with each LEA and its constituents (administrative and teaching staff, and teacher unions). They will be hired on a full time 12-month contract to assist in the daily management of the SSI Project. Salaries were calculated based on the median salary for similar positions.</td>
<td>1.0 FTE</td>
<td></td>
<td>$107,830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Manager (1): The Business Manager will manage the human resource components and financial aspects of the RU Team. They will serve as a liaison and coordinate with the human resource (HR) departments in each of the LEAs in regards to HCMS implementation. They train each LEAs on how the EES will impact human capital decision making and assist in making HR decisions including but not limited to: recruitment, placement, PD, compensation, promotion, and dismissal. They will serve on a 12-month fulltime contract. Salaries were calculated based on the median salary for similar positions.</td>
<td>1.0 FTE</td>
<td></td>
<td>$68,859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Technology (IT) Specialist (1): The IT specialist will assist in the development of the software applications necessary to implement and manage the HCMS, PBCS, and EES. They will coordinate activities with the contracted programming consultants on the development a web-based portal for each LEA and collaborate with each LEA’s IT department on implementing the new HCMS, EES, and PBCS applications. They will be hired on a 12-month contract. Salaries were calculated based on the median salary for similar positions.</td>
<td>1.0 FTE</td>
<td></td>
<td>$63,014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data and Growth Modeling (DGM) Specialist (1): A Data and Growth Modeling Specialist will be hired to</td>
<td>1.0 FTE</td>
<td></td>
<td>$87,418</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
manage all data collection, analysis, and interpretation of teacher, principal and student growth data in the EES and internally evaluate the EES and the HCMS in relation to their effects on student outcome. They will serve on a 12-month contract.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Title</th>
<th>FTE</th>
<th>Salary</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Manager (1):</td>
<td>1.0 FTE</td>
<td>$65,564</td>
<td>$65,564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Evaluation Manager will assist the DGM Specialist in the internal evaluation of the project. They will also coordinate HCMS data analysis and decision making with the PI’s, DGM, and External Evaluator.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Title</th>
<th>FTE</th>
<th>Salary</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Principals (3):</td>
<td>3 x 1.0 FTE</td>
<td>$81,954</td>
<td>$245,864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three Leadership Principals will be hired for the purposes of coordinating with each LEAs school-based principals on the implementation of the HCMS. The Leadership Principals will supervise the 43 school based principals leadership activities during the project. They will be responsible for overseeing the implementation of the PES in each school district, train LEA constituents on the VAL-ED system, and provide PD to 43 school based principals. They will be hired on a fulltime 12-month contract.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Title</th>
<th>FTE</th>
<th>Salary</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Teachers (6):</td>
<td>6 x 1.0 FTE</td>
<td>$70,903</td>
<td>$425,423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six Leadership Teachers will be hired to assist in the implementation of the EES for all 1,211 teacher constituents and the PD and PBCS for all teachers in TIF qualified schools. Leadership Teachers will primarily oversee the 51 school-based Master Mentor Teachers across the four LEAs. They will train and supervise Master Mentor Teachers on the components of the EES, how it relates to PD, and how to deliver PD. They will be hired on a fulltime 12-month contract.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Title</th>
<th>FTE</th>
<th>Salary</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program Coordinator: The Program Coordinator will be hired to directly assist the Project Director, Assistant Project Director, Co-PIs, and all SSI Project staff. The Program Coordinator will be responsible for all communications and correspondences between Rutgers SSI Project staff and LEA staff. The Program Coordinator will manage communications between the Rutgers Foundations and Development staff and LEA development officers on possible grant opportunities. Also, this person will prioritize and purchase office supplies and project materials for the entire project. They will serve on a 12-month contract.</td>
<td>1.0 FTE</td>
<td>$41,631</td>
<td>$41,631</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Title</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Salary</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Data Entry Clerk: To assist with data entry needs related to LEA, HCMS, EES, PD and PBCS systems, a data entry clerk will be hired on a part time basis for</td>
<td>19 hours per week x 46</td>
<td>$18.75</td>
<td>$16,391</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Year 1 to 5. The Data Entry Clerk will assist the DGM Specialist and Evaluation Manager with data entry and analysis. They will also assist the Project Assistant Director and Business Specialist with data entry needs. They will serve for approximately 46 weeks of the year.

| Part Time Development Officer: To assist each LEA with sustainability and transitioning from the TIF program, a Development Officer will be hired to work with each LEA for years three through 5. They will work with each lea and SSI Project staff to secure future funding for the support of the PBCS system. The Development Officer will instruct each LEA on the grant application process and work with each LEA to establish a grants office/officer. They will assist each LEA in applying for future grants to support further systems level development and instructional improvement. They will serve for approximately 40 weeks of year to align with each LEAs 9.5 academic month calendar. |
|---|---|---|
| weeks of the year. | 19 hours per week x 40 weeks per year | $39.47 per hour | $30,000 |

### ASU Subcontract

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASU Subcontract</th>
<th>% FTE</th>
<th>Base Salary</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Co Investigator (1): Dr. Alexander Kurz will be responsible for overall project leadership for implementation of educator and principal instructional improvement PD and practical issues related to implementation of the EES and its components. His qualifications are described in section E Management Plan. In Project Year 4, he will dedicate 25% of his effort annually.</td>
<td>.25 FTE x 12-months</td>
<td>$77,516</td>
<td>$19,379</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### LEAs Subcontracts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEAs Subcontracts</th>
<th>% FTE</th>
<th>Base Salary</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Career Ladder Master Mentor Teachers (51): All four LEAs will adopt Master Mentor Teachers to assume leadership roles within the district. A total of 51 Master Mentor Teacher positions were created across all four LEAs. Master Mentor Teacher salaries were adjusted to accommodate NJ State and NJ teacher union contract regulations, which equates to a 5% increase from Year 3.  
- Asbury Park contains 236 teachers. A total of 10 Master Mentor Teachers will be hired in this district. Master Mentor Teachers’ base salaries were adjusted 5% higher than the | 10 x 1.0 FTE | $83,291.35 | $832,914 |
previous year.

- Hillside contains 285 teachers. A total of 12 Master Mentor Teachers will be hired in this district. Master Mentor Teachers’ base salaries were adjusted 5% higher than the previous year.
  
  $12 \times 1.0 \text{ FTE}$  
  $\text{FTE}$  
  $79,275.32$  
  $951,304$

- Lakewood contains 410 teachers. A total of 17 Master Mentor Teachers will be hired in this district. Master Mentor Teachers’ base salaries were adjusted 5% higher than the previous year.
  
  $17 \times 1.0 \text{ FTE}$  
  $\text{FTE}$  
  $61,677.22$  
  $1,048,513$

- North Plainfield contains 280 teachers. A total of 12 Master Mentor Teachers will be hired in this district. Master Mentor Teachers’ base salaries were adjusted 5% higher than the previous year.
  
  $12 \times 1.0 \text{ FTE}$  
  $\text{FTE}$  
  $71,945.81$  
  $863,350$

**Total Personnel:**  
$4,983,177$

### 2. Fringe Benefits:

**The following personnel all have fringe benefit rates applied to their salaries:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RU Contract</th>
<th>Fringe Rate</th>
<th>Base Salary</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Director</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fringe Benefit rates apply to the RU Team. For Faculty, during the 9.5 months academic year, a Fringe Benefits rate of 38.2% will be applied. During the 2.5 summer months, a Fringe Benefit rate of 7.3% is applied.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Project Director (PI) Dr. Linda Reddy serves in a faculty capacity. Fringe Benefit rate is calculated for the 9.5 months academic year and for 2.5 summer months.</td>
<td>38.2% 7.3%</td>
<td>$119,268 $2,596</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Co Investigator Ryan Kettler serves in a faculty capacity. Fringe Benefit rate is calculated for the 9.5 months academic year and for 2.5 summer months.</td>
<td>38.2% 7.3%</td>
<td>$96,364 $2,017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Fringe Benefit rates apply to the RU Team. For Staff positions, a Fringe Benefits rate of 38.2% is applied annually.
  
  - Project Assistant Director will serve in a staff capacity.

  $38.2\%$  
  $107,830$  
  $41,191$
- Business Manager will serve in a staff capacity. 38.2% $68,859 $36,304
- Information Technology (IT) Specialist will serve in a staff capacity. 38.2% $63,014 $24,071
- Data and Growth Modeling Specialist will serve in a staff capacity. 38.2% $87,418 $33,394
- Evaluation Manager will serve in a staff capacity. 38.2% $65,654 $25,045
- Leadership Principals (3) will serve in a staff capacity. 38.2% $81,954 $93,920
- Leadership Teachers (6) will serve in a staff capacity. 38.2% $70,903 $162,512
- Program Coordinator 38.2% $41,531 $15,903
- Part time Data Entry Clerk 7.3% $16,391 $1232
- Part Time Development Officer 7.3% $30,000 $1,197

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASU Subcontract</th>
<th>Fringe Rate</th>
<th>Base Salary</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Co Investigator Alexander Kurz is employed at Arizona State University (ASU). Fringe Benefit rates apply to ASU at a rate of 30% of the base salary.</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>$77,516</td>
<td>$6,312</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEAs Subcontracts</th>
<th>Fringe Rate</th>
<th>Base Salary</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Career Ladder Master Mentor Teachers (51): Fringe Benefit rates apply to the 51 Master Mentor Teachers across all four LEAs. Each LEA utilizes a different Fringe Benefit rate.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asbury Park will create 10 Master Mentor Teacher positions during Years 2 through 5. 20% $83,291.35 x 10</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>$166,583</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillside will create 12 Master Mentor Teacher positions during Years 2 through 5. 14% $79,275.32 x 12</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>$133,183</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakewood will create 17 Master Mentor 25% $61,677.22 x 17</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>$262,128</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Teacher positions during Years 2 through 5.
- North Plainfield will create 12 Master Mentor
Teacher positions during Years 2 through 5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>$71,945.81</td>
<td>$259,005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>x 12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Fringe Benefits:** $1,278,043

### 3. Travel:

Expenses include the average airfare of $500 each, in addition to a hotel room at $150/night for two nights, local transportation of $50, and per diem of $50.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RU Subcontract</th>
<th># of Trips</th>
<th>$ per Trip</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TIF Grantee Meeting:</strong> This 1.5 day meeting will provide participants with key information needed to manage and implement a discretionary grant awarded by ED and technical assistance from experts. Meetings are held annually.</td>
<td>3 (1 Project Director &amp; 2 key personnel)</td>
<td>$1250</td>
<td>$3750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TIF Topical Meeting:</strong> This 1.5 Day meeting will provide participants with in depth information on a topic related to implementing PBCSs. Meetings are held annually.</td>
<td>2 (1 Project Director &amp; 2 key personnel)</td>
<td>$1250</td>
<td>$2500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PI &amp; CO-PI's Local Travel to LEAs:</strong> Project leaders will meet with LEA constituents on a weekly basis during the first year of implementation planning. Asbury Park is located 54 miles from the university, Lakewood 35 miles, Hillside 33 miles, North Plainfield 10 miles (265 miles round trip).</td>
<td>2 people x 46 trips</td>
<td>$0.31 Federal Reimbursement Rate</td>
<td>$7,558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staff Local Travel to LEAs:</strong> Three Leadership Principals and six Leadership teachers will meet with LEA constituents on a weekly basis during the first year of implementation planning. Asbury Park is located 54 miles from the university, Lakewood 35 miles, Hillside 33 miles, North Plainfield 10 miles (265 miles round trip). 9 persons will be traveling to the LEAs on a weekly for 9.5 academic school months.</td>
<td>9 people x 39 weeks</td>
<td>$0.31 Federal Reimbursement Rate</td>
<td>$26,617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>External Evaluator Dr. Dan Reschly</strong> will visit with project leaders at least 1 time per year to discuss project activities and provide oversight. As per TIF guidelines, lodging is based on a five night stay in a major and per diem expenses for up to six days. Dr. Dan Reschly may be required to incur local travel costs when visiting each LEA.</td>
<td>1 person X 1 Trip</td>
<td>$1500</td>
<td>$1500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASU Subcontract</th>
<th># of Trips</th>
<th>$ per Trip</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Co-PI Travel from Arizona to NJ: Co-PI Alexander Kurz will travel to NJ to meet with PI Dr. Linda Reddy and Co-PI Dr. Ryan Kettler at RU. It is estimated that Dr. Alexander Kurz will make 5 trips a year, for a period of 5 days each trip.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEAs Subcontracts</th>
<th># of Trips</th>
<th>$ per Trip</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Travel costs associated with the LEAs budgets.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Travel:** $49,425

### 4. Equipment:

Consistent with our organization’s policy, equipment is defined as tangible, non-expendable, personal property, having a useful life of more than one year and an acquisition cost of $1,000 or more per unit.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RU Contract</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost of Item</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Equipment cost is associated with the RU budget.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASU Subcontract</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost of Item</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Equipment cost is associated with the ASU budget.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEA Contracts</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost of Item</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Equipment cost is associated with the LEAs budgets.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Equipment** $0

### 5. Supplies:

Supplies include all tangible and expendable property that are of a low unit cost

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RU Contract</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Software: Licenses will be purchased for additional software not provided with PC set up. These include such programs as Adobe Acrobat Professional, Adobe Photoshop, SPSS, AMOS, DreamWeaver. Software will assist with data analysis, web design, and document preparation.</td>
<td>$2000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Observer Reliability Assessment Software (20): To ensure observer reliability and accuracy of the RU Leadership Teachers when using the Danielson Framework, successful completion of a proficiency assessment will be required each year Years 1 through 5. Vendors have been explored that provide an online system and proficiency test for users of the Danielson | $399 per observer | 1 year | $7,980 |
Framework and is required as an assessment component of the Danielson Framework Turnkey Training. A total of 20 RU Leadership Teachers and project staff need to be certified. The system provides training components, diagnostic support, and a reliability test on the Danielson Framework. The test will be used to calibrate observers for reliability and accuracy, which will ensure the Rutgers Leadership Teachers and staff are using the Danielson Framework correctly to evaluate teachers and provide the correct PD. The cost is estimated at $399 per observer and grants access to the on-line system for 1 year.

| **RU Office Supplies:** Basic stationary and printing supplies will be needed to manage the day to day affairs of SSI project. This includes: chairs, desks, toner for each printer, printing paper, writing instruments, etc. | $7,000 | $7,000 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>ASU Subcontract</strong></th>
<th><strong>Cost</strong></th>
<th><strong>Quantity</strong></th>
<th><strong>Total</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ASU Office Supplies:</strong> Basic stationary and printing supplies will be needed to manage the day to day affairs of SSI project. This includes: chairs, desks, toner for each printer, printing paper, writing instruments, etc.</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td></td>
<td>$200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>LEA Subcontracts</strong></th>
<th><strong>Cost</strong></th>
<th><strong>Quantity</strong></th>
<th><strong>Total</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Observer Reliability Assessment Software (94 observers):</strong> To ensure observer reliability and accuracy of the school based Principals and Master Mentor Teachers when using the Danielson Framework, successful completion of a proficiency assessment will be required each year Years 1 through 5. Vendors have been explored that provide an online system and proficiency test for users of the Danielson Framework. A total of 94 Principals and Master Mentor Teachers across all four LEAs need to be certified. The system software will provide training components, diagnostic support, and a reliability test on the Danielson Framework. The test will be used to calibrate observers for reliability and accuracy, which will ensure the Principals and Master Mentor Teachers in each district are using the Danielson Framework correctly to evaluate teachers and provide the correct PD. The cost is estimated $399 per observer and grants access to the system for 1 year.</td>
<td>$399 per observer (94 principals and Master Mentor Teachers across all four LEAs)</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>$37,506</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*MyiLogs Software for Teacher Evaluation (1211):*
All four LEAs have agreed to use the MyiLogs online system and software for tracking teachers’ instructional content and PD goals. The online system tracks teachers’ daily instructional activities and maps these activities to core curriculum standards. MyiLogs also tracks teachers’ progress towards PD goals and district specific goals. A total of 1211 teachers across all four LEAs will be using the MyiLogs system. License pricing is based upon the number of teachers in each district. License time span is for year duration.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEA</th>
<th>Number of Teachers</th>
<th>Pricing Scale</th>
<th>Price 1 Year</th>
<th>Total 1 Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asbury Park</td>
<td>236 Teachers</td>
<td>150 to 300</td>
<td>$8,693</td>
<td>$8,693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillside</td>
<td>285 Teachers</td>
<td>150 to 299</td>
<td>$8,693</td>
<td>$8,693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakewood</td>
<td>410 Teachers</td>
<td>30 to 499</td>
<td>$12,353</td>
<td>$12,353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Plainfield</td>
<td>280 Teachers</td>
<td>150 to 299</td>
<td>$8,693</td>
<td>$8,693</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**VAL-ED Software for Principal Evaluation:** All four LEA’s have agreed to use VAL-ED, an online system for assessing Principal effectiveness and leadership competencies. VAL-ED is a 360 feedback system which incorporates ratings from the teachers, principal self-report, and administrator ratings on the principal’s leadership skills and effectiveness. No vendor has been identified and a range of assessments have been obtained. License pricing is based upon the number of principals in each district. License time span is for 1 year duration.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEA</th>
<th>Number of Principals</th>
<th>Principal Pricing</th>
<th>Price 1 Year</th>
<th>Total 1 Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asbury Park</td>
<td>9 Principals</td>
<td>$324 per principal</td>
<td>$2916</td>
<td>$2916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillside</td>
<td>10 Principals</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3240</td>
<td>$3240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakewood</td>
<td>16 Principals</td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,184</td>
<td>$5,184</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• North Plainfield contains 8 Principals and Assistant Principals across its 5 schools. $2,592

**Total Supplies:** $107,051

*In regard to the MyiLogs system, see the COI plan on page 13 of this document.*

### 6. Contractual:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RU Contract</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Days of Service/Time</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consultants: Expert consultants in areas related to the HCMS will be contracted to serve on the SSI project. The consultants will provide key expertise and represent culturally diverse backgrounds.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Steve Elliot, will act as a supervising mentor to Dr. Linda Reddy for the SSI Project. He will offer consultation for the implementation of VAL-ED system, provide criterion feedback for principal effectiveness, and train the Leadership Principals to provide feedback to their constituents. He will commit three days per year on the project.</td>
<td>$1,500 per day</td>
<td>3 days</td>
<td>$4,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Louis Hsu, will serve as a statistical and measurement expert and will be responsible for conceptualizing all data analytic methods. He will coordinate activities and goals with the DGM Specialist. He will commit seven days per year on the project.</td>
<td>$1,500 per day</td>
<td>7 days</td>
<td>$10,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Frank Worrell, will serve as a student minority assessment expert and will be responsible for conceptualizing assessment and analysis of student achievement for minority populations. He will serve one day per year on the project.</td>
<td>$1,000 per day</td>
<td>1 day</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Maria Adelaida Restrepo, will serve as an ELL expert and will be responsible for conceptualizing assessment and analysis of ELL teacher effectiveness and ELL student data. She will support the development of a PD system for ELL teachers. She will commit one day per year on the project.</td>
<td>$1,000 per day</td>
<td>1 day</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Ms. Lynn Holdheide, will serve as a teacher quality expert for non-test subjects (e.g., Art, Music). She will be responsible for developing measures of teacher effectiveness assessment and student achievement for non-tested subjects. She will serve one day per year on the project.
- Dr. Daniel Reschly, will serve as an external evaluator to the SSI Project. He will coordinate with the PI’s on the projects’ activities and provide objective oversight. He will commit 5 days per year to the project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contract Type</th>
<th>Cost (USD)</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Total Cost (USD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Lynn Holdheide</td>
<td>$1,000 per day</td>
<td>1 day</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Daniel Reschly</td>
<td>$1,500 per day</td>
<td>5 days</td>
<td>$7,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Test Development Contract:** RU will explore test development vendors to develop and score student state-wide testing for non-tested grades (grades K, 1, 2, 9, 10, and 12) that are similar to the current NJ ASK standardized state assessment (grades 3 through 8). No vendor has been established and a range of estimates have been obtained.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contract Type</th>
<th>Cost (USD)</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Total Cost (USD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Test Development Contract</td>
<td>$823,954</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>$823,954</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Application Development Contract:** RU will explore application/software developers for the continued maintenance of a web based interface for the SSI project and its LEA constituents. The web based interface will act as a portal for teachers to log in daily and enter respective data. The portal will generate information related to the teachers' instructional practices, content, and PD. For administrators, the portal will serve as a data entry point and report generation template. No vendor has been identified at this time and a wide range of estimates have been obtained. Estimates were calculated by multiplying an average rate of $150 per hour for programming by an estimated total hours of 205 for job completion. Based on the estimates, Year 1 will require the most intensive work, with years 2 through 5 requiring basic maintenance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contract Type</th>
<th>Cost (USD)</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Total Cost (USD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Application Development Contract</td>
<td>$150 per hour</td>
<td>205 hours</td>
<td>$30,800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ASU Subcontract**

No Contractual cost associated with the ASU budget.

**LEAs Subcontract**

No Contractual cost associated with the LEAs budgets.

**Total Contractual:**

$880,254
7. Construction: Not applicable.

8. Other

Other includes all direct costs not covered in previous sections, including pay based compensation, training costs, and fees.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RU Contract</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Web Server Host: A project website will require the support of webhosting company to store and monitor the upload/download of website data. No vendor has been identified at this point in time. Several estimates have been received based on the amount of anticipated data and website design. Webhosting fees are based on yearly contracts.</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Phone Service Provider: Three smartphones will be purchased to assist project leaders with communications. No vendors have been identified at this point in time. Several estimates have been received. 12-month contracts are required with a host company.</td>
<td>3 phones</td>
<td>$80 per plan per month x 12-months</td>
<td>$2,880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAL-ED (1 cohort of 20): RU will explore vendors that provide ongoing support for the VAL-ED online system to ensure correct implementation and accurate usage when monitoring principal's professional development goals. Ongoing support will be needed for Years 2 through 5. No vendor has been established and a range of estimates have been obtained. Services will include evaluation of trainers’ competency, report generation and interpretation, observation training, and continued access to administrative accounts for each school district. Support will be provided for 1 full year.</td>
<td>$10,000 per cohort of 20</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASU Subcontract</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Other cost associated with the ASU budget.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEA Subcontracts</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>* MyiLogs Trainer Support (4 cohorts of 30): All four LEAs will explore vendors that provide ongoing support for Master Mentor Teachers using the MyiLogs online system to ensure correct implementation and accurate usage of instructional content and professional development goals. Ongoing support will be needed for Years 2 through 5 for the Master Mentor Teachers. No vendor has been established and a range of estimates have been obtained. Support services will be provided for the</td>
<td>$4,392 per district (includes up to 30 people)</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>$17,558</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
initial 30 Master Mentor Teachers and administrators trained as MyiLogs trainers. Services will include evaluation of trainers’ competency, report generation and interpretation, observation training, and continued access to administrative accounts for each school district. Support will be provided for 1 full year.

**Pay Based Compensation for Teachers:** All four LEA’s will begin providing PBC in Year 3 and continue through Year 5. PBC will be rewarded to teachers who are determined to be Effective and Highly Effective under the new EES in each LEA. Teachers who are deemed Effective will receive a 3% bonus on top of their base salary and teachers who are deemed Highly Effective will receive a 5% bonus on top of their base salary. Estimates for the total amount of PBC needed per district were created based on the projected median teacher salary in each district and a theorized distribution of the EES ratings for all teachers in a district. In year 4, the EES distribution estimates 70% of teachers will be labeled Effective and 18% of teachers will be labeled Highly Effective. These values were then multiplied by the total number of teachers in each district to determine how many teachers would receive PBC. PBC will not be subject to the Fringe Benefit rate at each district.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Effective Teachers</th>
<th>Highly Effective Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asbury Park</td>
<td>$2,379.75 (3%)</td>
<td>$3,966.25 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillside</td>
<td>$2,265.01 (3%)</td>
<td>$3,775.02 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakewood</td>
<td>$1,762.21 (3%)</td>
<td>$3,901.63 (5%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Asbury Park contains 236 teachers. The median salary for all teachers in this district in Year 4 is estimated at $79,325. Based on the EES ratings distribution, we anticipate 166 teachers will be labeled Effective and 43 teachers Highly Effective.

- Hillside contains 285 teachers. The median salary for all teachers in this district for Year 4 is estimated at $75,500. Based on the EES ratings distribution, we anticipate 200 teachers will be labeled Effective and 51 teachers Highly Effective.

- Lakewood contains 410 teachers. The median salary for all teachers in this district for Year 4 is estimated at $58,740. Based on the EES ratings distribution, we anticipate 287 teachers
will be labeled Effective and 74 teachers Highly Effective.

- North Plainfield contains 280 teachers. The median salary for all teachers in this district for Year 4 is estimated at $68,520. Based on the EES ratings distribution, we anticipate 196 teachers will be labeled Effective and 51 teachers Highly Effective.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>74 Highly Effective Teachers</th>
<th>$217,339</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North Plainfield</td>
<td>$2,937.01 (5%)</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$2,055.59 (3%)</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$3,425.99 (5%)</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Pay Based Compensation for Principals:** All four LEA’s will begin providing PBC in Year 3 and continue through Year 5. PBC will be rewarded to principals who are determined to be Effective and Highly Effective under the new EES in each LEA. Principals who are deemed Effective will receive a 3% bonus on top of their base salary and principals who are deemed Highly Effective will receive a 5% bonus on top of their base salary. Estimates for the total amount of PBC needed per district were created based on the projected median principal salary in each district and a theorized distribution of the EES ratings for all principals in a district. In year 3, the EES distribution estimates 70% of principals will be labeled Effective and 18% of principals will be labeled Highly Effective. These values were then multiplied by the total number of principals in each district to determine how many teachers would receive PBC. PBC will not be subject to the Fringe Benefit rate at each district.

- Asbury Park contains 9 Principals and Assistant Principals. The median salary for all principals in this district for Year 4 is estimated at $139,062. Based on the EES ratings distribution we estimate 6 principals will be Effective and 2 principals will be Highly Effective.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>6 Effective Principals</th>
<th>$25,031</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asbury Park</td>
<td>$4,171.86 (3%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$6,953.10 (5%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Hillside contains 10 Principals and Assistant Principals. The median salary for all principals in this district for Year 4 is estimated at $137,158. Based on the EES ratings distribution we estimate 7 principals will be Effective and 2 principals will be Highly Effective.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>7 Effective Principals</th>
<th>$28,803</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hillside</td>
<td>$4,114.73 (3%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$6,857.89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2 Highly Effective Principal</th>
<th>$13,716</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Effective and 2 principals will be Highly Effective.

- Lakewood contains 16 Principals and Assistant Principals. The median salary for all principals in this district for Year 4 is estimated at $135,943. Based on the EES ratings distribution we estimate 11 principals will be Effective and 3 principals will be Highly Effective.

- North Plainfield contains 8 Principals and Assistant Principals. The median salary for all principals in this district in Year 4 is estimated at $163,165. Based on the EES ratings distribution we estimate 6 principals will be Effective and 2 principals will be Highly Effective.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effective Principal</th>
<th>11 Effective Principals</th>
<th>$44,861</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(5%)</td>
<td>$4,078.30 (3%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5%)</td>
<td>$6,797.17 (5%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Highly Effective Principal</td>
<td>$20,392</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Effective Principals</td>
<td>$29,370</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Highly Effective Principal</td>
<td>$16,316</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$4,894.95 (3%)</td>
<td>$8,158.25 (5%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Other: $2,739,948

*In regard to the MyiLogs system, see the COI plan on page 13 of this document.

9. Total Direct Costs for Year 4: $10,037,898

10. Indirect Costs: $703,425
The approved indirect rate agreement for RU is the 26%. For ASU, the approved indirect rate agreement is 26%. For Year 4, indirect costs for RU are $694,743 and for ASU the indirect costs are $8,682.

11. Training Stipends: Not applicable.

12. Total Costs for Year 4: $10,741,323

Project Year 5
October 1st 2016 to September 30th 2017

1. Personnel:
The following requested personnel will all be hired as employees of the project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RU Contract</th>
<th>% FTE</th>
<th>Base Salary</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Director (Principal Investigator) (1); Dr. Linda Reddy will be responsible for overall project leadership, budget oversight, practical, and methodological issues related to implementation of</td>
<td>.25 FTE x 9.5 months</td>
<td>$124,040</td>
<td>$31,010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Hours</td>
<td>Rate</td>
<td>Salary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the HCMS, EES, PD, and PBCS. Her qualifications are described in section E Management Plan. In Project Year 5, she will dedicate 25% of her effort during the 9.5 academic month year, and 100% effort in the summer months.</td>
<td>1.0 FTE x 2.5 months</td>
<td>$35,558</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co Investigator (1): Dr. Ryan Kettler will be responsible for overall project leadership, practical and methodological issues related to implementation of the teacher and principal evaluation systems and student growth. His qualifications are described in section E Management Plan. In Project Year 5, he will dedicate 25% of his effort during the 9.5 academic month year, and 100% effort in the summer months.</td>
<td>.25 FTE x 9.5 months</td>
<td>$100,224 $25,056</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Project Director (1): The Project Assistant Director will be responsible for daily supervision and implementation of the project as well as coordinating communication with each LEA and its constituents (administrative and teaching staff, and teacher unions). They will be hired on a full time 12-month contract to assist in the daily management of the SSI Project. Salaries were calculated based on the median salary for similar positions at RU and in collaboration with the HR department.</td>
<td>1.0 FTE</td>
<td>$111,065 $111,065</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Manager (1): The Business Manager will manage the human resource components and financial aspects of the RU Team. They will serve as a liaison and coordinate with the human resource (HR) departments in each of the LEAs in regards to HCMS implementation. They train each LEAs on how the EES will impact human capital decision making and assist in making HR decisions including but not limited to: recruitment, placement, PD, compensation, promotion, and dismissal. They will serve on a 12-month fulltime contract. Salaries were calculated based on the median salary for similar positions at RU and in collaboration with the HR department.</td>
<td>1.0 FTE</td>
<td>$70,925 $70,925</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Technology (IT) Specialist (1): The IT specialist will assist in the development of the software applications necessary to implement and manage the HCMS, PBCS, and EES. They will coordinate activities with the contracted programming consultants on the development a web-based portal for each LEA and collaborate with each LEA’s IT department on implementing the new HCMS, EES, and PBCS applications. They will be hired on a 12-month contract. Salaries were calculated based on the</td>
<td>1.0 FTE</td>
<td>$64,904 $64,904</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role</td>
<td>FTE</td>
<td>Salary 1</td>
<td>Salary 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data and Growth Modeling (DGM) Specialist (1):</strong> A Data and Growth Modeling Specialist will be hired to manage all data collection, analysis, and interpretation of teacher, principal and student growth data in the EES and internally evaluate the EES and the HCMS in relation to their effects on student outcome. They will serve on a 12-month contract.</td>
<td>1.0 FTE</td>
<td>$90,041</td>
<td>$90,041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evaluation Manager (1):</strong> The Evaluation Manager will assist the DGM Specialist in the internal evaluation of the project. They will also coordinate HCMS data analysis and decision making with the PI’s, DGM, and External Evaluator.</td>
<td>1.0 FTE</td>
<td>$67,531</td>
<td>$67,531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leadership Principals (3):</strong> Three Leadership Principals will be hired for the purposes of coordinating with each LEAs school-based principals on the implementation of the HCMS. The Leadership Principals will supervise the 43 school based principals leadership activities during the project. They will be responsible for overseeing the implementation of the PES in each school district, train LEA constituents on the VAL-ED system, and provide PD to 43 school based principals.</td>
<td>3 x 1.0 FTE</td>
<td>$84,413</td>
<td>$253,240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leadership Teachers (6):</strong> Six Leadership Teachers will be hired to assist in the implementation of the EES for all 1,211 teacher constituents and the PD and PBCS for all 1,211 teachers in TIF qualified schools. Leadership Teachers will primarily oversee the 51 school-based Master Mentor Teachers across the four LEAs. They will train and supervise Master Mentor Teachers on the components of the EES, how it relates to PD, and how to deliver PD.</td>
<td>6 x 1.0 FTE</td>
<td>$73,031</td>
<td>$438,186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program Coordinator:</strong> The Program Coordinator will be hired to directly assist the Project Director, Assistant Project Director, Co-PIs, and all SSI Project staff. The Program Coordinator will be responsible for all communications and correspondences between Rutgers SSI Project staff and LEA staff. The Program Coordinator will manage communications between the Rutgers Foundations and Development staff and LEA development officers on possible grant opportunities. Also, this person will prioritize and purchase office supplies and project materials for the entire project.</td>
<td>1.0 FTE</td>
<td>$42,880</td>
<td>$42,880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data Entry Clerk:</strong> To assist with data entry needs related to LEA, HCMS, EES, PD and PBCS systems.</td>
<td>19 hours per week</td>
<td>$19.31</td>
<td>$16,883</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A data entry clerk will be hired on a part-time basis for Year 1 to 5. The Data Entry Clerk will assist the DGM Specialist and Evaluation Manager with data entry and analysis. They will also assist the Project Assistant Director and Business Specialist with data entry needs. They will serve for approximately 46 weeks of the year.

| Part Time Development Officer: To assist each LEA with sustainability and transitioning from the TIF program, a Development Officer will be hired to work with each LEA for years three through 5. They will work with each lea and SSI Project staff to secure future funding for the support of the PBCS system. The Development Officer will instruct each LEA on the grant application process and work with each LEA to establish a grants office/officer. They will assist each LEA in applying for future grants to support further systems level development and instructional improvement. They will serve for approximately 40 weeks of year to align with each LEAs 9.5 academic month calendar. |
|-----------------------------------------------|----------|
| 19 hours per week x 40 weeks per year         | $39.47   |
| $30,000                                       |

**ASU Subcontract**

Co Investigator (1): Dr. Alexander Kurz will be responsible for overall project leadership for implementation of educator and principal instructional improvement PD and practical issues related to implementation of the EES and its components. His qualifications are described in section E Management Plan. In Project Year 5, he will dedicate 25% of his effort annually.

| Co Investigator (1): Dr. Alexander Kurz will be responsible for overall project leadership for implementation of educator and principal instructional improvement PD and practical issues related to implementation of the EES and its components. His qualifications are described in section E Management Plan. In Project Year 5, he will dedicate 25% of his effort annually. |
|-----------------------------------------------|----------|
| .25 FTE x 12-months                          | $79,840  |
| $19,960                                       |

**LEAs Subcontracts**

Career Ladder Master Mentor Teachers (51): All four LEAs will adopt Master Mentor Teachers to assume leadership roles within the district. A total of 51 Master Mentor Teacher positions were created across all four LEAs. Master Mentor Teacher salaries were adjusted to accommodate NJ State and NJ teacher union contract regulations, which equates to a 5% increase from Year 4.

- Asbury Park contains 236 teachers. A total of 10 Master Mentor Teachers will be hired in this district. Master Mentor Teachers’ base salaries were adjusted 5% higher than the previous year.

| Career Ladder Master Mentor Teachers (51): All four LEAs will adopt Master Mentor Teachers to assume leadership roles within the district. A total of 51 Master Mentor Teacher positions were created across all four LEAs. Master Mentor Teacher salaries were adjusted to accommodate NJ State and NJ teacher union contract regulations, which equates to a 5% increase from Year 4. |
|-----------------------------------------------|----------|
| 10 x 1.0 FTE                                 | $87,455.92 |
| $874,559                                     |
• Hillside contains 285 teachers. A total of 12 Master Mentor Teachers will be hired in this district. Master Mentor Teachers’ base salaries were adjusted 5% higher than the previous year.

| 12 x 1.0 FTE | $83,239.08 | $998,869 |

• Lakewood contains 410 teachers. A total of 17 Master Mentor Teachers will be hired in this district. Master Mentor Teachers’ base salaries were adjusted 5% higher than the previous year.

| 17 x 1.0 FTE | $64,761.22 | $1,100,938 |

• North Plainfield contains 280 teachers. A total of 12 Master Mentor Teachers will be hired in this district Master Mentor Teachers’ base salaries were adjusted 5% higher than the previous year.

| 12 x 1.0 FTE | $75,543.11 | $906,517 |

**Total Personnel:** $5,206,855

2. *Fringe Benefits:*

The following personnel all have fringe benefit rates applied to their salaries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RU Contract</th>
<th>Fringe Rate</th>
<th>Base Salary</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fringe Benefit rates apply to the RU Team. For Faculty, during the 9.5 months academic year, a Fringe Benefits rate of 38.2% will be applied. During the 2.5 summer months, a Fringe Benefit rate of 7.3% is applied.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Director (PI) Dr. Linda Reddy serves in a faculty capacity. Fringe Benefit rate is calculated for the 9.5 months academic year and for 2.5 summer months.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.2%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>$124,040</td>
<td>$11,846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co Investigator Ryan Kettler serves in a faculty capacity. Fringe Benefit rate is calculated for the 9.5 months academic year and for 2.5 summer months.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.2%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>$100,224</td>
<td>$9,203</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fringe Benefit rates apply to the RU Team. For Staff positions, a Fringe Benefits rate of 38.2% is applied annually.

• Project Assistant Director will serve in a staff capacity.

| 38.2% | $111,065 | $41,191 |

• Business Manager will serve in a staff

| 38.2% | $70,925 | $27,093 |
capacity.

- **Information Technology (IT) Specialist** will serve in a staff capacity. 38.2% $69,904 $24,793
- **Data and Growth Modeling Specialist** will serve in a staff capacity. 38.2% $90,041 $34,396
- **Evaluation Manager** will serve in a staff capacity. 38.2% $67,531 $25,797
- **Leadership Principals (3)** will serve in a staff capacity. 38.2% $84,413 $96,738
- **Leadership Teachers (6)** will serve in a staff capacity. 38.2% $73,031 $167,387
- **Program Coordinator** 38.2% $42,880 $16,380
- **Part time Data Entry Clerk** 7.3% 30,000 $1,232
- **Part Time Development Officer** 7.3% $16,883 $2,190

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASU Subcontract</th>
<th>Fringe Rate</th>
<th>Base Salary</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Co Investigator Alexander Kurz is employed at Arizona State University (ASU). Fringe Benefit rates apply to ASU at a rate of 30% of the base salary.</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>$79,840</td>
<td>$6,696</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEAs Subcontracts</th>
<th>Fringe Rate</th>
<th>Base Salary</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Career Ladder Master Mentor Teachers (51): Fringe Benefit rates apply to the 51 Master Mentor Teachers across all four LEAs. Each LEA utilizes a different Fringe Benefit rate.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Asbury Park** will create 10 Master Mentor Teacher positions during Years 2 through 5. 20% $87,455.92 x 10 $174,912
- **Hillside** will create 12 Master Mentor Teacher positions during Years 2 through 5. 14% $83,239.08 x 12 $139,842
- **Lakewood** will create 17 Master Mentor Teacher positions during Years 2 through 5. 25% $64,761.22 x 17 $275,235
- North Plainfield will create 12 Master Mentor Teacher positions during Years 2 through 5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fringe Benefits</th>
<th>30%</th>
<th>$75,543.11</th>
<th>x 12</th>
<th>$271,955</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Fringe Benefits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,333,183</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Travel:

**Travel: Expenses include the average airfare of $500 each, in addition to a hotel room at $150/night for two nights, local transportation of $50, and per diem of $50.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RU Contract</th>
<th># of Trips</th>
<th>$ per Trip</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TIF Grantee Meeting: This 1.5 day meeting will provide participants with key information needed to manage and implement a discretionary grant awarded by ED and technical assistance from experts. Meetings are held annually.</td>
<td>3 (1 Project Director &amp; 2 key personnel)</td>
<td>$1250</td>
<td>$3750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIF Topical Meeting: This 1.5 Day meeting will provide participants with in depth information on a topic related to implementing PBCSs. Meetings are held annually.</td>
<td>2 (1 Project Director &amp; 2 key personnel)</td>
<td>$1250</td>
<td>$2500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI &amp; CO-PI's Local Travel to LEAs: Project leaders will meet with LEA constituents on a weekly basis during the first year of implementation planning. Asbury Park is located 54 miles from the university, Lakewood 35 miles, Hillside 33 miles, North Plainfield 10 miles (265 miles round trip).</td>
<td>2 people x 46 trips</td>
<td>$0.31 Federal Reimbursement Rate</td>
<td>$7,558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Local Travel to LEAs: Three Leadership Principals and six Leadership teachers will meet with LEA constituents on a weekly basis during the first year of implementation planning. Asbury Park is located 54 miles from the university, Lakewood 35 miles, Hillside 33 miles, North Plainfield 10 miles (265 miles round trip). 9 persons will be traveling to the LEAs on a weekly for 9.5 academic school months.</td>
<td>9 people x 39 weeks</td>
<td>$0.31 Federal Reimbursement Rate</td>
<td>$26,617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Evaluator Dr. Dan Reschly will visit with project leaders at least 1 time per year to discuss project activities and provide oversight. As per TIF guidelines, lodging is based on a five night stay in a major and per diem expenses for up to six days. Dan Reschly may be required to incur local travel costs when visiting each LEA.</td>
<td>1 person X 1 Trip</td>
<td>$1500</td>
<td>$1500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASU Subcontract</th>
<th># of Trips</th>
<th>$ per Trip</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Co-PI Travel from Arizona to NJ: Co-PI Alexander Kurz will travel to NJ to meet with PI</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$1500</td>
<td>$7,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dr. Linda Reddy and Co-PI Dr. Ryan Kettler at RU. It is estimated that Dr. Alexander Kurz will make 5 trips a year, for a period of 5 days each trip.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEAs Subcontracts</th>
<th># of Trips</th>
<th>$ per Trip</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Travel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Travel:** $49,425

4. **Equipment:**

Consistent with our organization’s policy, equipment is defined as tangible, non-expendable, personal property, having a useful life of more than one year and an acquisition cost of $1,000 or more per unit.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RU Contract</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Equipment associated with the RU budget.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASU Contract</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Equipment associated with the ASU budget.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEAs Subcontracts</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Equipment associated with the LEAs budgets.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Equipment**

$0

5. **Supplies:**

**Supplies include all tangible and expendable property that are of a low unit cost**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RU Contract</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Software: Licenses will be purchased for additional software not provided with PC set up. These include such programs as Adobe Acrobat Professional, Adobe Photoshop, SPSS, AMOS, DreamWeaver. Software will assist with data analysis, web design, and document preparation.</td>
<td>$2000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Observer Reliability Assessment Software (20): To ensure observer reliability and accuracy of the RU Leadership Teachers when using the Danielson Framework, successful completion of a proficiency assessment will be required each year Years 1 through 5. Vendors have been explored that provide an online system and proficiency test for users of the Danielson Framework and is required as an assessment component of the Danielson Framework Turnkey Training. A total of 20 RU Leadership Teachers and project staff need to be certified. The system provides training components, diagnostic support, and a | $399 per observer | 1 year | $7,980 |
reliability test on the Danielson Framework. The test will be used to calibrate observers for reliability and accuracy, which will ensure the Rutgers Leadership Teachers and staff are using the Danielson Framework correctly to evaluate teachers and provide the correct PD. The cost is estimated at $399 per observer and grants access to the on-line system for 1 year.

| RU Office Supplies: Basic stationary and printing supplies will be needed to manage the day to day affairs of SSI project. This includes: chairs, desks, toner for each printer, printing paper, writing instruments, etc. | $7,000 |  | $7,000 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>ASU Subcontract</strong></th>
<th><strong>Cost</strong></th>
<th><strong>Quantity</strong></th>
<th><strong>Total</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Office Supplies: Basic stationary and printing supplies will be needed to manage the day to day affairs of SSI project. This includes: chairs, desks, toner for each printer, printing paper, writing instruments, etc.</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td></td>
<td>$200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>LEA Subcontracts</strong></th>
<th><strong>Cost</strong></th>
<th><strong>Quantity</strong></th>
<th><strong>Total</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Observer Reliability Assessment Software (94 observers): To ensure observer reliability and accuracy of the school based Principals and Master Mentor Teachers when using the Danielson Framework, successful completion of a proficiency assessment will be required each year Years 1 through 5. Vendors have been explored that provide an online system and proficiency test for users of the Danielson Framework. A total of 94 Principals and Master Mentor Teachers across all four LEAs need to be certified. The system software will provide training components, diagnostic support, and a reliability test on the Danielson Framework. The test will be used to calibrate observers for reliability and accuracy, which will ensure the Principals and Master Mentor Teachers in each district are using the Danielson Framework correctly to evaluate teachers and provide the correct PD. The cost is estimated $399 per observer and grants access to the system for 1 year.</td>
<td>$399 per observer (94 principals and Master Mentor Teachers across all four LEAs)</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>$37,506</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*MyiLogs Software for Teacher Evaluation (1211): All four LEAs have agreed to use the MyiLogs online system and software for tracking teachers’ instructional content and PD goals. The online system tracks teachers’ daily instructional activities and maps these activities to core curriculum standards. MyiLogs
also tracks teachers’ progress towards PD goals and district specific goals. A total of 1211 teachers across all four LEAs will be using the MyiLogs system. License pricing is based upon the number of teachers in each district. License time span is for year duration.

- Asbury Park contains 236 Teachers and is priced according to MyiLogs 150 to 300 teacher quantity pricing scale
  - $8,693 1 year $8,693

- Hillside contains 285 Teachers and is priced according to MyiLogs 150 to 299 teacher quantity pricing scale
  - $8,693 1 year $8,693

- Lakewood contains 410 Teachers and is priced according to MyiLogs 30 to 499 teacher quantity pricing scale
  - $12,353 1 year $12,353

- North Plainfield contains 280 Teachers and is priced according to MyiLogs 150 to 299 teacher quantity pricing scale.
  - $8,693 1 year $8,693

**VAL-ED Software for Principal Evaluation:** All four LEA’s have agreed to use VAL-ED, an online system for assessing Principal effectiveness and leadership competencies. VAL-ED is a 360 feedback system which incorporates ratings from the teachers, principal self-report, and administrator ratings on the principal’s leadership skills and effectiveness. No vendors have been identified at this time and a range of estimates have been obtained. License pricing is based upon the number of principals in each district. License time span is for 1 year duration.

- Asbury Park contains 9 Principals and Assistant Principals across its 5 schools.
  - $324 per principal $2916

- Hillside contains 10 Principals and Assistant Principals across its 6 schools.
  - $3240

- Lakewood contains 16 Principals and Assistant Principals across its 6 schools.
  - $5,184

- North Plainfield contains 8 Principals and Assistant Principals across its 5 schools.
  - $2,592
**Total Supplies** | **$107,051**

*In regard to the MyiLogs system, see the COI plan on page 13 of this document.

### 6. Contractual:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Contractual</strong></th>
<th><strong>RU Contract</strong></th>
<th><strong>Cost</strong></th>
<th><strong>Days of Service</strong></th>
<th><strong>Total</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Consultants</strong>: Expert consultants in areas related to the HCMS will be contracted to serve on the SSI project. The consultants will provide key expertise and represent culturally diverse backgrounds.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Dr. Steve Elliot</strong>, will act as a supervising mentor to Dr. Linda Reddy for the SSI Project. He will offer consultation for the implementation of VAL-ED system, provide criterion feedback for principal effectiveness, and train the Leadership Principals to provide feedback to their constituents. He will commit three days per year on the project.</td>
<td>$1,500 per day</td>
<td>3 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Dr. Louis Hsu</strong>, will serve as a statistical and measurement expert and will be responsible for conceptualizing all data analytic methods. He will coordinate activities and goals with the DGM Specialist. He will commit seven days per year on the project.</td>
<td>$1,500 per day</td>
<td>7 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Dr. Frank Worrell</strong>, will serve as a student minority assessment expert and will be responsible for conceptualizing assessment and analysis of student achievement for minority populations. He will serve one day per year on the project.</td>
<td>$1,000 per day</td>
<td>1 day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Dr. Maria Adelaida Restrepo</strong>, will serve as an ELL expert and will be responsible for conceptualizing assessment and analysis of ELL teacher effectiveness and ELL student data. She will support the development of a PD system for ELL teachers. She will commit one day per year on the project.</td>
<td>$1,000 per day</td>
<td>1 day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Ms. Lynn Holdheide M.S.</strong> will serve as a teacher quality expert for non-test subjects (e.g., Art, Music). She will be responsible for developing measures of teacher effectiveness</td>
<td>$1,000 per day</td>
<td>1 day</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
assessment and student achievement for non-tested subjects. She will serve one day per year on the project.

- Dr. Daniel Reschly, will serve as an external evaluator to the SSI Project. He will coordinate with the PI’s on the projects’ activities and provide objective oversight. He will commit 5 days per year to the project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Days of Service</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Test Development Contract: RU will explore test development vendors to develop and score student state-wide testing for non-tested grades (grades K, 1, 2, 9, 10, and 12) that are similar to the current NJ ASK standardized state assessment (grades 3 through 8). No vendor has been established and a range of estimates have been obtained.</td>
<td>$547,948</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>$547,948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application Development Contract: RU will explore application/software developers for the continued maintenance of a web based interface for the SSI project and its LEA constituents. The web based interface will act as a portal for teachers to log in daily and enter respective data. The portal will generate information related to the teachers' instructional practices, content, and PD. For administrators, the portal will serve as a data entry point and report generation template. No vendor has been identified at this time and a range of estimates have been obtained. Estimates were calculated by multiplying an average rate of $150 per hour for programming by an estimated total hours of 205 for job completion. Based on the estimates, Year 1 will require the most intensive work, with years 2 through 5 requiring basic maintenance.</td>
<td>$150 per hour</td>
<td>205 hours</td>
<td>$30,800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Days of Service</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ASU Subcontract</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Contractual cost associated with the ASU budget.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Days of Service</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LEAs Subcontracts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Contractual cost associated with the LEAs budgets.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total Contractual: | $604,248 |

7. Construction: Not applicable.
8. Other

Other includes all direct costs not covered in previous sections, including pay based compensation, training costs, and fees.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RU Contract</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Web Server Host: A project website will require the support of webhosting company to store and monitor the upload/download of website data. No vendor has been identified at this point in time. Several estimates have been received based on the amount of anticipated data and website design. Webhosting fees are based on yearly contracts.</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Phone Service Provider: Three smartphones will be purchased to assist project leaders with communications. No vendors have been identified at this point in time. Several estimates have been received. 12-month contracts are required with a host company.</td>
<td>3 phones</td>
<td>$80 per plan per month x 12-months</td>
<td>$2,880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAL-ED (1 cohort of 20): RU will explore vendors that provide ongoing support for the VAL-ED online system to ensure correct implementation and accurate usage when monitoring principal’s professional development goals. Ongoing support will be needed for Years 2 through 5. No vendor has been established and a range of estimates have been obtained. Services will include evaluation of trainers’ competency, report generation and interpretation, observation training, and continued access to administrative accounts for each school district. Support will be provided for 1 full year.</td>
<td>$10,000 per cohort of 20</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASU Subcontract</td>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>Quantity</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Other cost associated with the ASU budget.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEAs Subcontracts</td>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>Quantity</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* MyiLogs Trainer Support (4 cohorts of 30): To ensure reliability, accuracy, and successful management of each teachers’ instructional content and PD goals, MyiLogs will provide ongoing support in Years 2 through 5 for the Master Mentor Teachers and administrators in each district. Support services will be provided for the initial 30 Master Mentor Teachers and administrators trained as MyiLogs trainers. Services will include evaluation of trainers’ competency, report generation and interpretation, observation training, and continued access to administrative accounts for each school district.</td>
<td>$4,392 per district (includes up to 30 people)</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>$17,568</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Support will be provided for 1 full year.

Pay Based Compensation for Teachers: All four LEA’s will begin providing PBC in Year 3 and continue through Year 5. PBC will be rewarded to teachers who are determined to be Effective and Highly Effective under the new EES in each LEA. Teachers who are deemed Effective will receive a 3% bonus on top of their base salary and teachers who are deemed Highly Effective will receive a 5% bonus on top of their base salary. Estimates for the total amount of PBC needed per district were created based on the projected median teacher salary in each district and a theorized distribution of the EES ratings for all teachers in a district. In year 5, the EES distribution estimates 75% of teachers will be labeled Effective and 20% of teachers will be labeled Highly Effective. These values were then multiplied by the total number of teachers in each district to determine how many teachers would receive PBC. PBC will not be subject to the Fringe Benefit rate at each district.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Effective Teachers</th>
<th>Highly Effective Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asbury Park</td>
<td>$2,498.74 (3%)</td>
<td>$442,277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>177</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillside</td>
<td>$2,378.26 (3%)</td>
<td>$508,948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>214</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakewood</td>
<td>$1,850.32 (3%)</td>
<td>$569,897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>308</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$3,083.86 (5%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Asbury Park contains 236 teachers. The median salary for all teachers in this district in Year 5 is estimated at $83,291. Based on the EES ratings distribution, we anticipate 177 teachers will be labeled Effective and 48 teachers Highly Effective.

- Hillside contains 285 teachers. The median salary for all teachers in this district for Year 5 is estimated at $79,275. Based on the EES ratings distribution, we anticipate 214 teachers will be labeled Effective and 57 teachers Highly Effective.

- Lakewood contains 410 teachers. The median salary for all teachers in this district for Year 5 is estimated at $61,677. Based on the EES ratings distribution, we anticipate 308 teachers will be labeled Effective and 82 teachers Highly Effective.
• North Plainfield contains 280 teachers. The median salary for all teachers in this district for Year 5 is estimated at $71,946. Based on the EES ratings distribution, we anticipate 210 teachers will be labeled Effective and 56 teachers Highly Effective.

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$2,158.37</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>$453,259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3%)</td>
<td>Effective</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$3,597.29</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(5%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>56 Highly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Effective</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay Based Compensation for Principals: All four LEA’s will begin providing PBC in Year 3 and continue through Year 5. PBC will be rewarded to principals who are determined to be Effective and Highly Effective under the new EES in each LEA. Principals who are deemed Effective will receive a 3% bonus on top of their base salary and principals who are deemed Highly Effective will receive a 5% bonus on top of their base salary. Estimates for the total amount of PBC needed per district were created based on the projected median principal salary in each district and a theorized distribution of the EES ratings for all principals in a district. In year 3, the EES distribution estimates 75% of principals will be labeled Effective and 20% of principals will be labeled Highly Effective. These values were then multiplied by the total number of principals in each district to determine how many teachers would receive PBC. PBC will not be subject to the Fringe Benefit rate at each district.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$4,380.45</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$30,663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3%)</td>
<td>Effective</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$7,300.76</td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(5%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 Highly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Effective</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$4,320.47</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$34,564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3%)</td>
<td>Effective</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$7,200.78</td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(5%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 Highly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Effective</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• Asbury Park contains 9 Principals and Assistant Principals. The median salary for all principals in this district for Year 5 is estimated at $146,015. Based on the EES ratings distribution we estimate 7 principals will be Effective and 2 principals will be Highly Effective.

• Hillside contains 10 Principals and Assistant Principals. The median salary for all principals in this district for Year 5 is estimated at $137,158. Based on the EES ratings distribution we estimate 8 principals will be Effective and 2 principals will be Highly Effective.
- Lakewood contains 16 Principals and Assistant Principals. The median salary for all principals in this district for Year 5 is estimated at $171,323. Based on the EES ratings distribution we estimate 12 principals will be Effective and 4 principals will be Highly Effective.

- North Plainfield contains 8 Principals and Assistant Principals. The median salary for all principals in this district in Year 5 is estimated at $163,165. Based on the EES ratings distribution we estimate 6 principals will be Effective and 2 principals will be Highly Effective.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Effective Principals</th>
<th>Highly Effective Principal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lakewood</td>
<td>$4,282.22 (3%)</td>
<td>$7,137.03 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Plainfield</td>
<td>$5,139.70 (3%)</td>
<td>$8,566.16 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$55,669</td>
<td>$28,548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$30,838</td>
<td>$17,132</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Other** $3,112,905

*In regard to the MyiLogs system, see the COI plan on page 13 of this document.

9. Total Direct Costs for Year 5: $10,413,667

10. Indirect Costs: $645,436
The approved indirect rate agreement for RU is the 26%. For ASU, the approved indirect rate agreement is 26%. For Year 5, indirect costs for RU are $636,503 and for ASU the indirect costs are $8,933.

11. Training Stipends: Not applicable.

12. Total Costs for Year 5: $11,059,103
### Total for Years 1 to 5  
**Oct. 2012 to Oct 2017**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Year 1 Cost</th>
<th>Year 2 Cost</th>
<th>Year 3 Cost</th>
<th>Year 4 Cost</th>
<th>Year 5 Cost</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>$1,113,049</td>
<td>$4,531,980</td>
<td>$4,769,481</td>
<td>$4,983,177</td>
<td>$5,206,855</td>
<td>$20,604,542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fringe Benefits</td>
<td>$411,855</td>
<td>$1,171,540</td>
<td>$1,225,288</td>
<td>$1,278,043</td>
<td>$1,333,183</td>
<td>$5,419,939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>$30,366</td>
<td>$49,425</td>
<td>$49,425</td>
<td>$49,425</td>
<td>$49,425</td>
<td>$228,066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>$155,058</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$20,600</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies</td>
<td>$109,181</td>
<td>$119,863</td>
<td>$107,051</td>
<td>$107,051</td>
<td>$107,051</td>
<td>$550,197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractual</td>
<td>$484,494</td>
<td>$808,436</td>
<td>$853,564</td>
<td>$880,254</td>
<td>$604,248</td>
<td>$3,630,996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>$1,767,606</td>
<td>$69,153</td>
<td>$2,395,044</td>
<td>$2,395,044</td>
<td>$2,739,948</td>
<td>$10,084,656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Costs</td>
<td>$4,071,639</td>
<td>$6,750,397</td>
<td>$9,420,453</td>
<td>$10,037,898</td>
<td>$10,413,667</td>
<td>$40,694,054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Costs</td>
<td>$592,127</td>
<td>$652,187</td>
<td>$688,490</td>
<td>$703,425</td>
<td>$645,436</td>
<td>$3,281,665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Stipends</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Costs</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,663,766</strong></td>
<td><strong>$7,402,584</strong></td>
<td><strong>$10,108,493</strong></td>
<td><strong>$10,741,323</strong></td>
<td><strong>$11,059,103</strong></td>
<td><strong>$43,975,719</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Survey on Ensuring Equal Opportunity For Applicants

OMB No. 1890-0014 Exp. 2/28/2009

Purpose:
The Federal government is committed to ensuring that all qualified applicants, small or large, non-religious or faith-based, have an equal opportunity to compete for Federal funding. In order for us to better understand the population of applicants for Federal funds, we are asking nonprofit private organizations (not including private universities) to fill out this survey.

Upon receipt, the survey will be separated from the application. Information provided on the survey will not be considered in any way in making funding decisions and will not be included in the Federal grants database. While your help in this data collection process is greatly appreciated, completion of this survey is voluntary.

Instructions for Submitting the Survey
If you are applying using a hard copy application, please place the completed survey in an envelope labeled "Applicant Survey.” Seal the envelope and include it along with your application package. If you are applying electronically, please submit this survey along with your application.

Applicant’s (Organization) Name: Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey
Applicant’s DUNS Name: 0019128640000
Federal Program: Office of Elementary and Secondary Education (OESE): Teacher Incentive Fund (TIF)
CFDA Number: 84.374

1. Has the applicant ever received a grant or contract from the Federal government?
   □ Yes □ No

2. Is the applicant a faith-based organization?
   □ Yes □ No

3. Is the applicant a secular organization?
   □ Yes □ No

4. Does the applicant have 501(c)(3) status?
   □ Yes □ No

5. Is the applicant a local affiliate of a national organization?
   □ Yes □ No

6. How many full-time equivalent employees does the applicant have? (Check only one box).
   □ 3 or Fewer □ 4-5 □ 6-14 □ over 100 □ 15-50 □ 51-100

7. What is the size of the applicant’s annual budget? (Check only one box.)
   □ Less Than $150,000 □ $150,000 - $299,999 □ $300,000 - $499,999
   □ $500,000 - $999,999 □ $1,000,000 - $4,999,999 □ $5,000,000 or more
Survey Instructions on Ensuring Equal Opportunity for Applicants

Provide the applicant’s (organization) name and DUNS number and the grant name and CFDA number.

1. Self-explanatory.

2. Self-identify.


4. 501(c)(3) status is a legal designation provided on application to the Internal Revenue Service by eligible organizations. Some grant programs may require nonprofit applicants to have 501(c)(3) status. Other grant programs do not.

5. Self-explanatory.

6. For example, two part-time employees who each work half-time equal one full-time equivalent employee. If the applicant is a local affiliate of a national organization, the responses to survey questions 2 and 3 should reflect the staff and budget size of the local affiliate.

7. Annual budget means the amount of money your organization spends each year on all of its activities.

Paperwork Burden Statement

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless such collection displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is 1890-0014. The time required to complete this information collection is estimated to average five (5) minutes per response, including the time to review instructions, search existing data resources, gather the data needed, and complete and review the information collection.

If you have any comments concerning the accuracy of the time estimate(s) or suggestions for improving this form, please write to: The Agency Contact listed in this grant application package.
### U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

**BUDGET INFORMATION**

**NON-CONSTRUCTION PROGRAMS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Institution/Organization</th>
<th>Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OMB Number: 1894-0008</td>
<td>Expiration Date: 02/28/2011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SECTION A - BUDGET SUMMARY**

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION FUNDS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Categories</th>
<th>Project Year 1 (a)</th>
<th>Project Year 2 (b)</th>
<th>Project Year 3 (c)</th>
<th>Project Year 4 (d)</th>
<th>Project Year 5 (e)</th>
<th>Total (f)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Personnel</td>
<td>1,113,049.00</td>
<td>4,531,980.00</td>
<td>4,769,481.00</td>
<td>4,983,177.00</td>
<td>5,206,855.00</td>
<td>20,604,542.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Fringe Benefits</td>
<td>411,885.00</td>
<td>1,171,540.00</td>
<td>1,225,288.00</td>
<td>1,278,043.00</td>
<td>1,333,183.00</td>
<td>5,419,939.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Travel</td>
<td>30,366.00</td>
<td>49,425.00</td>
<td>49,425.00</td>
<td>49,425.00</td>
<td>49,425.00</td>
<td>228,066.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Equipment</td>
<td>155,058.00</td>
<td>20,600.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>175,658.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Supplies</td>
<td>109,181.00</td>
<td>119,863.00</td>
<td>107,051.00</td>
<td>107,051.00</td>
<td>107,051.00</td>
<td>550,197.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Contractual</td>
<td>484,494.00</td>
<td>808,436.00</td>
<td>853,564.00</td>
<td>880,254.00</td>
<td>604,248.00</td>
<td>3,630,996.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Other</td>
<td>1,767,506.00</td>
<td>69,153.00</td>
<td>2,395,048.00</td>
<td>2,739,948.00</td>
<td>3,112,905.00</td>
<td>10,084,656.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)</td>
<td>4,071,939.00</td>
<td>6,750,397.00</td>
<td>9,429,453.00</td>
<td>10,037,898.00</td>
<td>10,413,667.00</td>
<td>40,694,054.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Indirect Costs*</td>
<td>592,127.00</td>
<td>652,187.00</td>
<td>688,490.00</td>
<td>703,425.00</td>
<td>645,436.00</td>
<td>3,281,665.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Training Stipends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Total Costs (lines 9-11)</td>
<td>4,663,766.00</td>
<td>7,402,584.00</td>
<td>10,108,943.00</td>
<td>10,741,323.00</td>
<td>11,059,103.00</td>
<td>43,975,719.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Indirect Cost Information (To Be Completed by Your Business Office):
If you are requesting reimbursement for indirect costs on line 10, please answer the following questions:

(1) Do you have an Indirect Cost Rate Agreement approved by the Federal government? [ ] Yes  [ ] No

(2) If yes, please provide the following information:
   - Period Covered by the Indirect Cost Rate Agreement: From: 03/29/2011 To: 06/30/2013 (mm/dd/yyyy)
   - Approving Federal agency: [ ] ED  [ ] Other (please specify): Department of Health and Human Services
   - The Indirect Cost Rate is 26.00 %.

(3) For Restricted Rate Programs (check one) -- Are you using a restricted indirect cost rate that:
   - [ ] Is included in your approved Indirect Cost Rate Agreement? or, [ ] Complies with 34 CFR 76.564(c)(2)?
   - The Restricted Indirect Cost Rate is ______ %.
SECTION B - BUDGET SUMMARY
NON-FEDERAL FUNDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Categories</th>
<th>Project Year 1 (a)</th>
<th>Project Year 2 (b)</th>
<th>Project Year 3 (c)</th>
<th>Project Year 4 (d)</th>
<th>Project Year 5 (e)</th>
<th>Total (f)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Personnel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Fringe Benefits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Travel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Supplies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Contractual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Indirect Costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Training Stipends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Total Costs (lines 9-11)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SECTION C - BUDGET NARRATIVE (see instructions)