

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 8/6/10 4:20 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: ARISE High School -- , (S385A100145)

Reader #1: \*\*\*\*\*

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Evaluation Criteria</b>		
<b>Absolute Priority 1</b>		
1.Absolute Priority 1	0	0
<b>Absolute Priority 2</b>		
1.Absolute Priority 2	0	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Evaluaton Criteria</b>		
<b>Absolute Priority 3</b>		
1.Absolute Priority 3	0	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Requirement</b>		
<b>Requirement</b>		
1.Requirement	0	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Evaluation Criteria</b>		
<b>Core Element 1</b>		
1.Core Element 1	0	0
<b>Core Element 2</b>		
1.Core Element 2	0	0
<b>Core Element 3</b>		
1.Core Element 3	0	0
<b>Core Element 4</b>		
1.Core Element 4	0	0
<b>Core Element 5</b>		
1.Core Element 5	0	0
<b>High Quality Professional Development</b>		
1.Professional Development	0	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Need for the Project</b>		
1.Need for Project	10	9
<b>Project Design</b>		

1.Project Design	60	50
<b>Adequacy of Support for the Proposed Project</b>		
1.Adequacy of Support	25	20
<b>Quality of Local Evaluation</b>		
1.Quality of Local Eval.	5	5
<b>Sub Total</b>	100	84

**Priority Questions**

**Priority Preference**

**Competitive Preference Priority 1**

1.Competitive Priority 1	5	3
--------------------------	---	---

**Competitive Preference Priority 2**

1.Competitive Priority 2	5	2
--------------------------	---	---

<b>Sub Total</b>	10	5
------------------	----	---

<b>Total</b>	110	89
--------------	-----	----

## Technical Review Form

Panel #17 - Panel - 17: 84.385A

Reader #1: \*\*\*\*\*

Applicant: ARISE High School -- , (S385A100145)

### Questions

#### Evaluation Criteria - Absolute Priority 1

##### 1. Priority 1: Differentiated Levels of Compensation for Effective Teachers and Principals:

Comment on how well the applicant demonstrates that --

It will develop and implement a PBCS that rewards, at differentiated levels, teachers and principals who demonstrate their effectiveness by improving student achievement (as defined in the Federal Register notice) as part of the coherent and integrated approach of the local educational agency (LEA) to strengthening the educator workforce.

In determining teacher and principal effectiveness as part of the PBCS, the LEA - -

- (a) Must give significant weight to student growth (as defined in the Federal Register notice), based on objective data on student performance;
- (b) Must include observation-based assessments of teacher and principal performance at multiple points in the year, carried out by evaluators trained in using objective evidence-based rubrics for observation, aligned with professional teaching standards; and, if applicable, as part of the LEA's coherent and integrated approach to strengthening the educator workforce; and
- (c) May include other measures, such as evidence of leadership roles (as defined in the Federal Register notice), that increase the effectiveness of other teachers in the school or LEA.

In determining principal effectiveness as part of a PBCS, the LEA must give significant weight to student growth (as defined in the Federal Register notice) and may include supplemental measures such as high school graduation and college enrollment rates. In addition, the applicant must demonstrate that the differentiated effectiveness incentive payments will provide incentive amounts that are substantial and provide justification for the level of incentive amounts chosen. While the Department does not propose a minimum incentive amount, the Department encourages applicants to be thorough in their explanation of why the selected incentive amounts are likely high enough to create change in the behavior of current and prospective teachers and principals in order to ultimately improve student outcomes.

#### General:

Reach PBCS is a group of 5 pools (page 6) each of which teachers and other school personnel can draw from based on their position. 1. Individual Goals for Student Performance: up to \$1000- \$4000 per teacher, 2. Effective Teaching: up to \$1500-2000 per teacher/instructional leader, 3. School Goals for Student Performance: up to \$1000-\$3,500 per staff member depending on position, and up to \$17,000 for principals, 4. School Goals for Effective Teaching: up to \$1500-\$3000 per staff member depending on position 5. Base Salary Increases: up to \$1000-\$2000 per teacher depending on position. The method of selection (page 9) is dynamic and avoids scores. Measures are California State Standards test, NWEA MAP and Developmental Reading Assessment, local measures. Figures 2.2 (page 10) and 2.3 (page 12) are examples of how much of a bonus a teacher might receive for varying degrees of student achievement on assessments. Teachers also have an opportunity to take a formative assessment (page 15) in area. Teachers are evaluated three times annually (page 24), beginning of the year, midyear, and end of the year. Taking all of the above statements together, it appears that ARISE has met all of the parts of this priority. The incentives are based on student growth to varying degrees,

evaluations are more frequent than required, give significant weight to student growth, and the amounts of the incentives are according to the studies substantial enough to promote change.

Reader's Score: 0

#### Evaluation Criteria - Absolute Priority 2

##### 1. Priority 2: Fiscal Sustainability of the Performance-Based Compensation System (PBCS):

Comment on how well the applicant demonstrates that - -

(a) The applicant has projected costs associated with the development and implementation of the PBCS, during the project period and beyond, and has accepted the responsibility to provide such performance-based compensation to teachers, principals, and other personnel (in those sites in which the grantee wishes to expand the PBCS to additional staff in its schools) who earn it under the system; and

(b) The applicant will provide from non-TIF funds over the course of the five-year project period an increasing share of performance-based compensation paid to teachers, principals, and other personnel (in those sites in which the grantee wishes to expand the PBCS to additional staff in its schools) in those project years in which the LEA provides such payments as part of its PBCS.

#### General:

The Reach Consortium has requested \$8,272,851 and proposes to supplement with \$1,203,324 in order to implement and sustain a PBCS according to the abstract. The budget sheet states that the complete budgeted expenditures for the project total \$9,835,068 with the requested federal funds at \$9,117,611 and other funds at \$717,457. These numbers differ from the proposal narrative. The investment is heavy with the hope that the original members of the consortium can sustain the PBCS from site based funds after the grant ends. During the life of the grant the requested amounts will cover the awards, however, after the grant ends the statement that the hope the the original members can sustain the PBCS from their own site based finds leads one to believe that there may not be sufficient sustainability for the PBCS after the grant ends. To the extent that this is true, ARISE has not met this priority.

Reader's Score: 0

#### Evaluaton Criteria - Absolute Priority 3

##### 1. Priority 3: Comprehensive Approaches to the Performance-Based Compensation System:

Comment on how well the applicant demonstrates that - -

The proposed PBCS is aligned with a coherent and integrated strategy for strengthening the educator workforce, including in the use of data and evaluations for professional development and retention and tenure decisions in the LEA or LEAs participating in the project during and after the end of the TIF project period.

#### General:

The consortium includes three high schools and one K-8 school, serving approximately 1000 students in total. The PBCS while complex appears fair and includes sufficient data and evaluation and professional development activities to allow for a coherent and integrated staff development plan.

Reader's Score: 0

**Requirement - Requirement**

- 1. REQUIREMENT:** Comment on the quality of the applicant's description of how its proposed PBCS will provide educators with incentives to take on additional responsibilities and leadership roles (as defined in the Federal Register notice).

**General:**

There is a built in incentive in the PBCS to take on additional responsibilities such as mentor programs and additional certifications along with instructional coach activities at approximately \$1000 per activity. (table Figure 2.10 page 20-21) The table provides an adequate description of the incentive for taking on additional responsibilities. This requirement has been met.

Reader's Score: 0

**Evaluation Criteria - Core Element 1**

**1. Core Element 1:**

Comment on the quality of the applicant's plan for effectively communicating to teachers, administrators, other school personnel, and the community at-large the components of its performance based compensation system.

**General:**

Communication of the plan appears to have already happened as evidenced by the documentation from each of the schools (Page e8 and following of the Other attachments section). No evidence of communication to the community at large is evident. Therefore ARISE has not met this core element.

Reader's Score: 0

**Evaluation Criteria - Core Element 2**

**1. Core Element 2:**

Comment on the quality of the applicant's involvement and support of teachers, principals, and other personnel (including input from teachers, principals, and other personnel in the schools and LEAs to be served by the grant) and the involvement and support of unions in participating LEAs (where they are the designated exclusive representatives for the purpose of collective bargaining) that is needed to carry out the grant.

**General:**

Excellent teacher involvement as evidenced by the log sheets supplied as ancillaries and the MOUs from each school. There was no evidence of support in the Union support section or in the narrative stating that the collective bargaining unit has agreed to the proposal. If there is no union representation, then ARISE should have stated so for the purposes of proper evaluation. Since there was no statement concerning teacher unions, there is an omission in the plan and ARISE has not met core element 2.

Reader's Score: 0

Evaluation Criteria - Core Element 3

1. Core Element 3:

Comment on the quality of the applicant's implementation, or plan to implement, a rigorous, transparent, and fair evaluation systems for teachers and principals that differentiate effectiveness using multiple rating categories that take into account student growth (as defined in the Federal Register notice) as a significant factor, as well as classroom observations conducted at least twice during the school year. The evaluation process must: (1) use an objective, evidence-based rubric aligned with professional teaching or leadership standards and the LEA's coherent and integrated approach to strengthening the educator workforce; (2) provide for observations of each teacher or principal at least twice during the school year by individuals (who may include peer reviewers) who are provided specialized training; (3) incorporate the collection and evaluation of additional forms of evidence; and (4) ensure a high degree of inter-rater reliability (i.e., agreement among two or more raters who score approximately the same).

General:

Starting on page 22 the section on rigorous, transparent, and fair evaluation system has an extensive plan involving not only the PBCS monetary system, but the tie to PF and formative assessment, and observations. There is an excellent rubric connecting the various elements with both qualitative and quantitative data, several additional forms of evidence, opportunities for leadership through mentoring both peer and teacher, and specialized training. The only thing lacking is the inter-rater aspect.

Reader's Score: 0

Evaluation Criteria - Core Element 4

1. Core Element 4:

Comment on the quality of the applicant's implementation or plan to implement, a data-management system that can link student achievement (as defined in the Federal Register notice) data to teacher and principal payroll and human resources systems.

General:

The only elements not currently integrated into the data management systems of the individual schools are the NWEA assessments (page 27). These are planned to be integrated in the fall of 2010. The rest of the requirements to link data to teacher and principal payroll and human resources systems are already in place.

Reader's Score: 0

Evaluation Criteria - Core Element 5

1. Core Element 5:

Comment on the quality of the applicant's plan for ensuring that teachers and principals understand the specific measures of teacher and principal effectiveness included in the PBCS, and receive professional development that enables them to use data generated by these measures to improve their practice.

**General:**

The PBCS system will require data reporting to the project coordinator's office from the schools and then data reporting back to the site administrators and human resources/payroll offices of each school. Each school has indicated that they are committed to the development of these processes and provisions to ensure these processes have been included in the MOU executed by each school. This is sufficient information to be able to say that they met this core element.

Reader's Score: 0

**Evaluation Criteria - High Quality Professional Development**

**1. High Quality Professional Development:**

Comment on the applicant's demonstration that ---

Its proposed PBCS will include a high-quality professional development component for teachers and principals consistent with the definition of the term professional development in section 9101(34) of the ESEA. The applicant must demonstrate that its PBCS has a professional development component in place, or a specific plan for developing one, that is directly linked to the specific measures of teacher and principal effectiveness included in the PBCS. The professional development component of the PBCS must - -

(1) Be based on needs assessed either at the high-need schools (as defined in the Federal Register notice) participating in the applicant's proposed PBCS or LEA-wide;

(2) Be targeted to individual teacher's and principal's needs as identified in the evaluation process;

(3) Provide --

(a) Those teachers and principals in participating TIF schools who do not receive differentiated compensation based on effectiveness under the PBCS with the tools and skills they need to improve their effectiveness in the classroom or school and be able to raise student achievement (as defined in the Federal Register notice); and

(b) Those teachers and principals who are deemed to be effective and who, therefore, receive differentiated compensation under the PBCS, with the tools and skills they need to (1) continue effective practices in the classroom or school and raise student achievement (as defined in the Federal Register notice), and (2) successfully assume additional responsibilities and leadership roles (as defined in the Federal Register notice);

(4) Support teachers and principals to better understand and use the measures of effectiveness in the PBCS to improve practice and student achievement (as defined in the Federal Register notice); and

(5) Include a process for regularly assessing the effectiveness of this professional development in improving teacher and leadership practice to increase student achievement (as defined in the Federal Register notice) and making modifications necessary to improve its effectiveness.

**General:**

The HQPD section on page 28 and following gives what should be done and not really what is going to be done.

There is no evidence that a high quality professional development component that is directly linked to the measures presented above is in place or that there is a plan to put it in place. This is a must present for the PBCS and must be based on needs assessed at the high needs schools. It must be targeted to individual teacher or principal needs. It must provide the tools to improve their effectiveness, continue effective practices, assume additional responsibilities, better understand and use the measures of effectiveness. Finally the professional development must assess its own effectiveness. None of the above must have elements of high quality professional development has been addressed in the proposal. ARISE has not met this requirement.

Reader's Score: 0

**Selection Criteria - Need for the Project**

**1.(A): Need for the project (10 points):**

In determining the need for the proposed project, the Secretary will consider the extent to which the applicant establishes that--

1) The high-need schools (as defined in the Federal Register notice) whose educators would be part of the PBCS have difficulty--

(i) Recruiting highly qualified or effective teachers, particularly in hard-to-staff subjects or specialty areas, such as mathematics, science, English language acquisition, and special education; and

(ii) Retaining highly qualified or effective teachers and principals.

(2) Student achievement (as defined in the Federal Register notice) in each of the schools whose educators would be part of the PBCS is lower than in what the applicant determines are comparable schools in the LEA, or another LEA in its State, in terms of key factors such as size, grade levels, and poverty levels; and

(3) A definition of what it considers a "comparable" school for the purposes of paragraph (2) of this selection criterion is established.

**Strengths:**

Needs for the TIF are addressed with supportive data at the onset of the application To the extent that there is no doubt the schools in the consortium match the criteria in the notice.

Student achievement is addressed (page 3-4) with performance levels in the identified need area. The identified need area is Language Arts. Poverty level and ethnicity are addressed in paragraph 1 of the proposal.

A definition of "Comparable" schools is clearly defined on page 4 with the establishment of the top quartile being selected. Reach considers "comparable" schools to be those whose graduates are eligible for the CSU and UC systems by rates of 85%. CA considers the top 33% of graduates to be eligible for the CSU system and the top 12.5% to be eligible for the UC system. Reach's selection of top quartile places it at the upper portion of the range and makes this a strength.

**Weaknesses:**

The argument that "urban schools are traditionally hard to staff" does not make the statement true. There is no support for this statement such as identifying initiatives to recruit that have had little success. Some empirical evidence should support such a statement. ARISE has not met this component of the need for the project. They have assumed this statement to be true without presenting evidence to support the statement.

Reader's Score: 9

**Selection Criteria - Project Design**

**1.(B): Project design (60 points)**

In determining the quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary will

consider the extent to which the proposed PBCS--

(1) Is part of a proposed LEA or statewide strategy, as appropriate, for improving the process by which each participating LEA rewards teachers, principals, and other personnel (in those sites in which the grantee wishes to expand the PBCS to additional staff in its schools) in high-need schools (as defined in the Federal Register notice) based upon their effectiveness as determined in significant part by student growth (as defined in the Federal Register notice). With regard to the effectiveness of teachers, principals, and other personnel, the Secretary will consider whether--

(i) The methodology the LEA or SEA proposes to use in its PBCS to determine the effectiveness of a school's teachers, principals, and other personnel (in those sites in which the grantee wishes to expand the PBCS to additional staff in its schools) includes valid and reliable measures of student growth (as defined in the Federal Register notice);

(ii) The participating LEA would use the proposed PBCS to provide performance awards to teachers, principals, and other personnel (in those sites in which the grantee wishes to expand the PBCS to additional staff in its schools) that are of sufficient size to affect the behaviors of teachers, principals, and other personnel and their decisions as to whether to go to, or remain working in, the high-need school; and

(iii) The applicant provides a clear explanation of how teachers, principals, and other personnel (in those sites in which the grantee wishes to expand the PBCS to additional staff in its schools) are determined to be "effective" for the purposes of the proposed PBCS.

(2) Has the involvement and support of teachers, principals, and other personnel (in those sites in which the grantee wishes to expand the PBCS to additional staff in its schools), including input from teachers, and principals, and other personnel in the schools and LEAs to be served by the grant, and the involvement and support of unions in participating LEAs where they are the designated exclusive representatives for the purpose of collective bargaining that is needed to carry out the grant;

(3) Includes rigorous, transparent, and fair evaluation systems for teachers and principals that differentiate levels of effectiveness using multiple rating categories that take into account data on student growth (as defined in the Federal Register notice) as a significant factor, as well as classroom observations conducted at least twice during the school year;

(4) Includes a data-management system, consistent with the LEA's proposed PBCS, that can link student achievement (as defined in the Federal Register notice) data to teacher and principal payroll and human resources systems; and

(5) Incorporates high-quality professional development activities that increase the capacity of teachers and principals to raise student achievement (as defined in the Federal Register notice) and are directly linked to the specific measures of teacher and principal effectiveness included in the PBCS.

**Strengths:**

The Reach TIF proposal contains an elaborate yet clear and logical compensation matrix that is extremely strong.

The narrative claims unanimous support for the project at each school.

If all of the parts of the evaluation system are executed, teachers and principals will have a rigorous, transparent, and extremely fair evaluation system in place.

Each school has a comprehensive data system linked to personnel payroll systems. These are going to be analyzed to merge the systems for the consortium.

The awards for the various activities and performances may be of sufficient size to affect behavior, but there are so many ways to attain partial awards, that it is difficult to ascertain how large an award a teacher can receive from the PBCS. This is a strength in so far as there are a number of ways to qualify for awards, but not a sufficient strength if the size of the award is too small due to the fractionalization of the awards. Taking the proposal as a whole, it appears that the intent is to provide as many ways as possible to receive awards and not to fracture these awards to be cost efficient.

**Weaknesses:**

The complexity (see page 8) of the PBCS may cause problems in the implementation phase. There are so many pieces to the system that it will be extremely easy to confuse the 1/9ths, 1/6ths, 1/3rds, and the several add on value added awards. Inter-rater reliability among schools needs to be evaluated along with the methodology for calibrating the evaluators.

"Unanimous support" and "no teachers opposed the project" are not equivalent statements. The high quality professional development section mostly was literature review. What the Reach Institute offers was not specific. While this is a weakness it is not necessarily a negative.

The management team does not have clear responsibilities identified as other parts of the program do.

**Reader's Score: 50**

**Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Support for the Proposed Project**

**1.(C): Adequacy of Support for the Proposed Project (25 points):**

In determining the adequacy of the support for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the extent to which--

(1) The management plan is likely to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, and includes clearly defined responsibilities and detailed timelines and milestones for accomplishing project tasks;

(2) The project director and other key personnel are qualified to carry out their responsibilities, and their time commitments are appropriate and adequate to implement the project effectively;

(3) The applicant will support the proposed project with funds provided under other Federal or State programs and local financial or in-kind resources; and

(4) The requested grant amount and project costs are sufficient to attain project goals and reasonable in relation to the objectives and design of the project.

**Strengths:**

The management plan (page 30) is extremely well done and is likely to be effective for accomplishing the project tasks.

The project director and other key personnel have experience in their positions including a previous TIF directorship. (Reach TIF Consortium resume section)

The requested funds appear to be sufficient to attain project goals.(budget sheet ED form No 524)

**Weaknesses:**

There is more than enough support for the project provided by state, federal, and local funds. However, this support is future and may not be there when the time arises. No non-federal funds have been identified and there is the assumption that the state will be providing significant funding.

**Reader's Score: 20**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of Local Evaluation**

**1.(D) Quality of Local Evaluation (5 points):**

In determining the quality of the local project evaluation, the Secretary considers the extent to which the applicant's evaluation plan--

(1) Includes the use of strong and measurable performance objectives (that are clearly related to the goals of the project) for raising student achievement (as defined in the Federal Register notice), increasing the effectiveness of teachers, principals, and other personnel (in those sites in which the grantee wishes to expand the PBCS to additional staff in its schools), and retaining and recruiting effective teachers, principals, and other personnel;

(2) Will produce evaluation data that are quantitative and qualitative; and

(3) Includes adequate evaluation procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project.

**Strengths:**

The table starting on page 38 contains measurable objectives and evaluation methods separated by quantitative and qualitative aspects. The third section identifies how success is measured. There is a three column table identified as figure 4.1 identifying the grant objectives and evaluation methods and measure of success. For example an objective states that it is "To measurably improve student achievement in Reach Consortium partner schools based on valid, reliable, and value-added performance measures. The method of evaluation is divided into two sections the quantitative and the qualitative. The corresponding quantitative evaluation method states " The project will be evaluated using the same measures for student achievement described in the incentive fund awards description (see figure 2.1 above This figure includes the incentive awards however, a better reference would have been to figure 2.2 because this table illustrates the value added measure assessment components. The table lists valid and reliable well established tests like NWEA MAP, a description of the test, and the percentages of student achievement that would generate a portion of the bonus like 1/9th for a move of students an average of 10 points.) incorporating both the measures used to determine individual teacher performance and school-wide performance. Evaluators will also examine correlations, if any, between student achievement on the various measures to determine if the different measures create internal validity or whether they lack consistency. Additionally, survey data will be used to determine teacher and school personnel attitudes towards the efficacy of these measures and the degree to which school personnel believe that the goals and resources of the program are connected to improve student achievement. Evaluators will conduct comparative value-added analysis of participantsâ student performance on the California Standards Test to matched data sets using the method created by David Stern, Professor of Policy, Organization, Measurement, and Evaluation at the University of California Berkeley. As to the qualitative part of the second column ARISE states "Based on the quantitative data, evaluators will collect additional qualitative data to explain and understand the relationship between student achievement gains (or lack of gains) and the Reach Consortium project. Data collection methods may include interviews, focus groups, and observations." This would be like doing a cognitive lab on test items prior to implementing the test. The third section identifies how success is measured. There are three measures of success identified: Schools will demonstrate average achievement gains equivalent to the first tier of awards over the first three years of the project, and will average achievement gains equivalent to the second tier of awards over the final two years of the project. â€ Participants (teachers and instructional leaders) will demonstrate more value added student achievement than comparison groups of teachers based on results on the California Standards Tests. â€ Participants will report a correlation between the project and increased student achievement gains.

Continuous improvement and feedback has been addressed significantly in the PBCS design.

**Weaknesses:**

No identified weakness has been discerned in this area.

**Reader's Score: 5**

**Priority Questions****Priority Preference - Competitive Preference Priority 1****1. Competitive Preference Priority: Use of Value-Added Measures of Student Achievement. (Up to 5 points):**

To meet this competitive preference priority, the applicant must demonstrate, in its application, that the proposed PBCS for teachers, principals, and other personnel (in those sites in which the grantee wishes to expand the PBCS to additional staff in its schools) will use a value-added measure of the impact on student growth (as defined in the Federal Register notice) as a significant factor in calculating differentiated levels of compensation provided to teachers, principals, and other personnel (in those sites in which the grantee wishes to expand the PBCS to additional staff in its schools).

Under this priority, the applicant must also demonstrate that it has a plan to ensure that, as part of the PBCS, it has the capacity to (1) implement the proposed value-added model (e.g., through robust data systems that collect the necessary data and ensure data quality), and (2) clearly explain the chosen value-added model to teachers to enable them to use the data generated through the model to improve classroom practices.

**Strengths:**

While the over all project addresses value added, see comment under weaknesses.

**Weaknesses:**

The value added system identified in the bonus pay awards on page 8 defines the system as additions from other domains. As mostly high schools, teachers are specialists in their domains. This system adds awards for how students do in other domains. While this is fine for group awards, the mixture in this manner seems somewhat inappropriate. As an example a mathematics teacher and a science teacher are both valued initially at \$11,000. Disregarding how the dollar value was arrived at, the justification of placing mathematics and science equal to each other at \$11,000 and ELA \$1000 less at \$10000 was not presented, the additional "value-added amounts do not seem justifiable. The value-add on for a math teacher for VA math is \$2500 while the science teacher gets \$750, but the Value add on for the science teacher for science is \$1500 with no add on for the math teacher. If there is a relationship between these two in the value added system then there logically should be a commutative relationship. But this does not seem to hold. This problem only appears in the orange section at the top. This relates to the priority in so far as a non-standard value-added system needs to be logically presented.

**Reader's Score: 3**

**Priority Preference - Competitive Preference Priority 2****1. Competitive Preference Priority: Increased Recruitment and Retention of Effective Teachers to Serve High-Need Students and in Hard-to-Staff Subjects and Specialty Areas in High-Need Schools. (Up to 5 points):**

To meet this competitive preference priority, the applicant must demonstrate in its application that its proposed PBCS is designed to assist high-need schools (as defined in

the Federal Register notice) to (1) serve high-need students (as defined in the Federal Register notice), (2) retain effective teachers in teaching positions in hard-to-staff subjects and specialty areas, such as mathematics, science, special education, and English language acquisition, and (3) fill vacancies with teachers of those subjects or specialty areas who are effective or likely to be effective. The applicant must provide an explanation for how it will determine that a teacher filling a vacancy is effective or likely to be effective. In addition, applicants must demonstrate, in their applications, the extent to which the subjects or specialty areas they propose to target are hard-to-staff. Lastly, applicants must demonstrate, in their applications that they will implement a process for effectively communicating to teachers which of the LEA's schools are high-need and which subjects and specialty areas are considered hard-to-staff.

**Strengths:**

ARISE has identified the problem of inability to recruit and retain, which is the first step to working towards a solution.

**Weaknesses:**

The section on recruitment and retention is extremely sparse and does not adequately describe this area short of some additional money being added. There is no real solution to this problem identified by the proposal.

The proposal does not address how the recruitment program (an added \$1000 for math and science teachers was included in the award PBCS) will assist high need students. The bonus is paid to math and science yet the data is provided for language arts. This does not make sense. The need was not stated, but is implied in the payment schedule, but the award is in another area. This is not addressed in the narrative. Also not addressed is the plan to fill vacancies in the area of need. It seems interesting that the need is implicitly identified for ELA and the bonus is paid in math and science. It does not appear that ARISE has met the sub criteria for the above reasons.

**Reader's Score: 2**

---

**Status:** Submitted

**Last Updated:** 8/6/10 4:20 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 8/6/10 4:20 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: ARISE High School -- , (S385A100145)

Reader #2: \*\*\*\*\*

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Evaluation Criteria</b>		
<b>Absolute Priority 1</b>		
1.Absolute Priority 1	0	0
<b>Absolute Priority 2</b>		
1.Absolute Priority 2	0	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Evaluaton Criteria</b>		
<b>Absolute Priority 3</b>		
1.Absolute Priority 3	0	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Requirement</b>		
<b>Requirement</b>		
1.Requirement	0	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Evaluation Criteria</b>		
<b>Core Element 1</b>		
1.Core Element 1	0	0
<b>Core Element 2</b>		
1.Core Element 2	0	0
<b>Core Element 3</b>		
1.Core Element 3	0	0
<b>Core Element 4</b>		
1.Core Element 4	0	0
<b>Core Element 5</b>		
1.Core Element 5	0	0
<b>High Quality Professional Development</b>		
1.Professional Development	0	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Need for the Project</b>		
1.Need for Project	10	8
<b>Project Design</b>		

1.Project Design	60	50
<b>Adequacy of Support for the Proposed Project</b>		
1.Adequacy of Support	25	20
<b>Quality of Local Evaluation</b>		
1.Quality of Local Eval.	5	5
<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>83</b>

**Priority Questions**

**Priority Preference**

**Competitive Preference Priority 1**

1.Competitive Priority 1	5	3
--------------------------	---	---

**Competitive Preference Priority 2**

1.Competitive Priority 2	5	3
--------------------------	---	---

<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>6</b>
------------------	-----------	----------

<b>Total</b>	<b>110</b>	<b>89</b>
--------------	------------	-----------

## Technical Review Form

Panel #17 - Panel - 17: 84.385A

Reader #2: \*\*\*\*\*

Applicant: ARISE High School -- , (S385A100145)

### Questions

#### Evaluation Criteria - Absolute Priority 1

##### 1. Priority 1: Differentiated Levels of Compensation for Effective Teachers and Principals:

Comment on how well the applicant demonstrates that --

It will develop and implement a PBCS that rewards, at differentiated levels, teachers and principals who demonstrate their effectiveness by improving student achievement (as defined in the Federal Register notice) as part of the coherent and integrated approach of the local educational agency (LEA) to strengthening the educator workforce.

In determining teacher and principal effectiveness as part of the PBCS, the LEA - -

- (a) Must give significant weight to student growth (as defined in the Federal Register notice), based on objective data on student performance;
- (b) Must include observation-based assessments of teacher and principal performance at multiple points in the year, carried out by evaluators trained in using objective evidence-based rubrics for observation, aligned with professional teaching standards; and, if applicable, as part of the LEA's coherent and integrated approach to strengthening the educator workforce; and
- (c) May include other measures, such as evidence of leadership roles (as defined in the Federal Register notice), that increase the effectiveness of other teachers in the school or LEA.

In determining principal effectiveness as part of a PBCS, the LEA must give significant weight to student growth (as defined in the Federal Register notice) and may include supplemental measures such as high school graduation and college enrollment rates. In addition, the applicant must demonstrate that the differentiated effectiveness incentive payments will provide incentive amounts that are substantial and provide justification for the level of incentive amounts chosen. While the Department does not propose a minimum incentive amount, the Department encourages applicants to be thorough in their explanation of why the selected incentive amounts are likely high enough to create change in the behavior of current and prospective teachers and principals in order to ultimately improve student outcomes.

#### General:

##### Strengths

The proposal presents a strong performance system that is based on student performance and effective teaching. Incentives are awarded for individual classroom growth and school-wide growth. Student performance is measured in a number of ways and incentives are awarded as determined by performance on all assessments. (page e6) Teacher effectiveness is based on observation based assessments, multiple times each year, using objective evidence based rubrics aligned with professional teaching standards. (page e41) The fact that administrators are required to participate in practice and calibration activities to ensure that the tools are being used effectively is evidence that they are trained to effectively evaluate teacher observations. (page e25) Attendance rates, matriculation rates and college readiness are also used to evaluate the effectiveness of principals. (page e18) Teachers in leadership roles can receive additional incentives for serving the role of Instructional coach, new teacher mentor or project coordinator. (page e20-21)

##### Weaknesses

Incentives range from \$1000- \$3500 for teachers up to \$17,000 for principals. Compared to the amount proposed for principals, the incentive for teachers appears insufficient. Based on the chart provided, it appears that additional amounts may be available for teachers, but the plan is unclear. (page e8)

Using numerous assessments and awarding different incentive amounts for each assessment will require a huge amount of data entry and a very robust system to manage it.

It is unclear in the proposal who will oversee and review the formative assessment portion of the effective teaching measure.

**Reader's Score: 0**

#### **Evaluation Criteria - Absolute Priority 2**

##### **1. Priority 2: Fiscal Sustainability of the Performance-Based Compensation System (PBCS):**

**Comment on how well the applicant demonstrates that - -**

(a) The applicant has projected costs associated with the development and implementation of the PBCS, during the project period and beyond, and has accepted the responsibility to provide such performance-based compensation to teachers, principals, and other personnel (in those sites in which the grantee wishes to expand the PBCS to additional staff in its schools) who earn it under the system; and

(b) The applicant will provide from non-TIF funds over the course of the five-year project period an increasing share of performance-based compensation paid to teachers, principals, and other personnel (in those sites in which the grantee wishes to expand the PBCS to additional staff in its schools) in those project years in which the LEA provides such payments as part of its PBCS.

#### **General:**

##### **Strengths**

The proposal presents evidence that the school will contribute increasing portions of the incentive awards each year of the grant. (page e34) The school will contribute \$5,000 more each year to the incentive fund for their site for each \$100,000 in the incentive fund. This will average to a \$10,000 contribution for every \$100,000 in the incentive fund over the life of the grant, or a 10% match. (page e34)

##### **Weaknesses**

There are many levels of incentive awards proposed in this plan. (page e8) The incentives are determined based on measures in each content area. i.e. \$3500 for English Language Arts, \$11,000 for Math or Science. It is unclear from the evidence provided that the teacher incentives can be effectively implemented. There is no estimated average of what a teacher might qualify for in the plan. The non-federal budget form is incomplete and the budget narrative does not document the source of funds. (page e0)

**Reader's Score: 0**

#### **Evaluaton Criteria - Absolute Priority 3**

##### **1. Priority 3: Comprehensive Approaches to the Performance-Based Compensation System:**

**Comment on how well the applicant demonstrates that - -**

The proposed PBCS is aligned with a coherent and integrated strategy for strengthening the educator workforce, including in the use of data and evaluations for professional development and retention and tenure decisions in the LEA or LEAs participating in the project during and after the end of the TIF project period.

**General:**

Strengths

The proposal presents an adequate plan in which Reach Institute will work with each school individually to determine a professional development plan. This plan will target areas such as instructional leadership for administrators, instructional coaching, and teaching in specific content areas. (page e28) The plan will also include new teacher mentoring and support. (page e30) Teacher evaluation data that determines areas of weakness will be used to inform the teachers' goals for improvement and to provide focal points for professional development. (page e24)

Weaknesses

The proposal does not address the use of PBCS data and evaluation to drive retention and tenure decisions.

**Reader's Score: 0**

**Requirement - Requirement**

- 1. REQUIREMENT: Comment on the quality of the applicant's description of how its proposed PBCS will provide educators with incentives to take on additional responsibilities and leadership roles (as defined in the Federal Register notice.**

**General:**

Strengths

There is a clear plan for the additional leadership duties as instructional coaches and the amounts that they will be awarded. These duties, as instructional coaches in content areas, instructional coaches for new teachers and project coordinators, are described in the proposal. (page e20-21)

Weaknesses

None noted

**Reader's Score: 0**

**Evaluation Criteria - Core Element 1**

- 1. Core Element 1:**

**Comment on the quality of the applicant's plan for effectively communicating to teachers, administrators, other school personnel, and the community at-large the components of its performance based compensation system.**

**General:**

Strengths

An adequate plan for communication is proposed providing a steering committee that will provide a regular forum for communication about and feedback on the program. (page e2)

Weaknesses

There is no documentation of where the above mentioned forum will occur or be publicized.

Reader's Score: 0

## Evaluation Criteria - Core Element 2

### 1. Core Element 2:

Comment on the quality of the applicant's involvement and support of teachers, principals, and other personnel (including input from teachers, principals, and other personnel in the schools and LEAs to be served by the grant) and the involvement and support of unions in participating LEAs (where they are the designated exclusive representatives for the purpose of collective bargaining) that is needed to carry out the grant.

#### General:

##### Strengths

There is evidence that representative teachers and principals were involved in the planning of this proposal and the principals will continue to be involved with the implementation. This involvement of principals will include regular steering committee and project planning meetings. (page e1)

##### Weaknesses

Even though the above group was involved up front, there is no evidence that the involvement and input of teachers will continue during the project.

Reader's Score: 0

## Evaluation Criteria - Core Element 3

### 1. Core Element 3:

Comment on the quality of the applicant's implementation, or plan to implement, a rigorous, transparent, and fair evaluation systems for teachers and principals that differentiate effectiveness using multiple rating categories that take into account student growth (as defined in the Federal Register notice) as a significant factor, as well as classroom observations conducted at least twice during the school year. The evaluation process must: (1) use an objective, evidence-based rubric aligned with professional teaching or leadership standards and the LEA's coherent and integrated approach to strengthening the educator workforce; (2) provide for observations of each teacher or principal at least twice during the school year by individuals (who may include peer reviewers) who are provided specialized training; (3) incorporate the collection and evaluation of additional forms of evidence; and (4) ensure a high degree of inter-rater reliability (i.e., agreement among two or more raters who score approximately the same).

#### General:

##### Strengths

An adequate plan is presented in which the performance system is based on student performance and effective teaching. Incentives are awarded for individual classroom growth and school-wide growth. Student performance is measured in a number of ways and incentives are awarded as determined by performance on all assessments. (page e6) They have proposed a detailed list of student achievement objectives in many subject areas. (page e10-e13) Another strong quality of the plan is that attendance rates, matriculation rates and college readiness are also used to evaluate the effectiveness of

principals. (page e18)

Weaknesses

The number of teacher observations each year is not documented and there is no evidence that the teacher observation assessment will ensure a high degree of inter-rater reliability.

**Reader's Score: 0**

**Evaluation Criteria - Core Element 4**

**1. Core Element 4:**

**Comment on the quality of the applicant's implementation or plan to implement, a data-management system that can link student achievement (as defined in the Federal Register notice) data to teacher and principal payroll and human resources systems.**

**General:**

Strengths

There is evidence that this team has worked collaboratively on other projects and their implementations show success. (page e30) They have successfully managed a cross site collaborative for teacher development and credentialing for four years, and in that time has successfully implemented, monitored, and reported on accreditation and grant requirements to the State of California as well as multiple private funders. The proposal provides evidence that two of the individual schools already have a data management system that links student achievement with teacher performance. The proposal states that, The steering committee, under the direction of the project coordinator, will analyze each school's current system and create a unified data-management system in which student achievement indicators are collected centrally. (page e27)

Weaknesses

The management plan is lacking in detail and does not address roles and responsibilities.

**Reader's Score: 0**

**Evaluation Criteria - Core Element 5**

**1. Core Element 5:**

**Comment on the quality of the applicant's plan for ensuring that teachers and principals understand the specific measures of teacher and principal effectiveness included in the PBCS, and receive professional development that enables them to use data generated by these measures to improve their practice.**

**General:**

Strengths

Teachers were surveyed for support prior to the submission of this grant and it is documented that they were in favor. (page e22) The staff was surveyed and there was unanimous support for this project at each of the partner schools, based on public announcements, electronic surveys, and petitions. No teachers opposed the project as is evidenced by the letters of support in the appendix. There is evidence that representative teachers and principals were involved in the planning of this proposal and the principals will continue to be involved with the implementation. This involvement of principals will include regular steering committee and project planning meetings. (page e1)

## Weaknesses

The specific measures of teacher effectiveness may be unclear to teachers. There was insufficient support for the comprehensive plan because it will require much documentation and communication.

Reader's Score: 0

## Evaluation Criteria - High Quality Professional Development

### 1. High Quality Professional Development:

Comment on the applicant's demonstration that ---

Its proposed PBCS will include a high-quality professional development component for teachers and principals consistent with the definition of the term professional development in section 9101(34) of the ESEA. The applicant must demonstrate that its PBCS has a professional development component in place, or a specific plan for developing one, that is directly linked to the specific measures of teacher and principal effectiveness included in the PBCS. The professional development component of the PBCS must - -

(1) Be based on needs assessed either at the high-need schools (as defined in the Federal Register notice) participating in the applicant's proposed PBCS or LEA-wide;

(2) Be targeted to individual teacher's and principal's needs as identified in the evaluation process;

(3) Provide --

(a) Those teachers and principals in participating TIF schools who do not receive differentiated compensation based on effectiveness under the PBCS with the tools and skills they need to improve their effectiveness in the classroom or school and be able to raise student achievement (as defined in the Federal Register notice); and

(b) Those teachers and principals who are deemed to be effective and who, therefore, receive differentiated compensation under the PBCS, with the tools and skills they need to (1) continue effective practices in the classroom or school and raise student achievement (as defined in the Federal Register notice), and (2) successfully assume additional responsibilities and leadership roles (as defined in the Federal Register notice);

(4) Support teachers and principals to better understand and use the measures of effectiveness in the PBCS to improve practice and student achievement (as defined in the Federal Register notice); and

(5) Include a process for regularly assessing the effectiveness of this professional development in improving teacher and leadership practice to increase student achievement (as defined in the Federal Register notice) and making modifications necessary to improve its effectiveness.

### General:

#### Strengths

Details of a strong professional development plan that will be implemented for each school to address areas of need are provided. Specific topics and details of these sessions are included in the proposal. (page e28-30) The proposal presents a plan in which Reach Institute will work with each school individually to determine a professional development plan. This plan will target areas such as instructional leadership for administrators, instructional coaching, and teaching in specific content areas. (page e28) The plan will also include new teacher mentoring and support. (page e30) Teacher evaluation data will be used to inform the teachers goals for improvement and to provide focal points for professional development that will impact student achievement. (page e24) The proposal also supports continuous improvement by providing additional opportunities for informal training, ongoing inquiry, and opportunities to discuss challenges and obstacles in professional learning teams. (page e28) This support system will impact teaching which will result in stronger student performance.

**Weaknesses**

There is no evidence that the effectiveness of the professional development will be assessed to determine effectiveness.

**Reader's Score: 0**

**Selection Criteria - Need for the Project**

**1.(A): Need for the project (10 points):**

In determining the need for the proposed project, the Secretary will consider the extent to which the applicant establishes that--

1) The high-need schools (as defined in the Federal Register notice) whose educators would be part of the PBCS have difficulty--

(i) Recruiting highly qualified or effective teachers, particularly in hard-to-staff subjects or specialty areas, such as mathematics, science, English language acquisition, and special education; and

(ii) Retaining highly qualified or effective teachers and principals.

(2) Student achievement (as defined in the Federal Register notice) in each of the schools whose educators would be part of the PBCS is lower than in what the applicant determines are comparable schools in the LEA, or another LEA in its State, in terms of key factors such as size, grade levels, and poverty levels; and

(3) A definition of what it considers a "comparable" school for the purposes of paragraph (2) of this selection criterion is established.

**Strengths:**

There is much evidence that these schools are serving high need students. (page e4-e5) The free and reduced lunch averages range from 55 to 89%. The ethnic make up of the students is that 85% of the students are African-American or Latino. The proposal provides adequate data that student achievement in all areas is of high need and incentives will be based on improvement in these measures. (page e34) The plan will target increased recruitment and retention of teachers in hard-to-staff subjects with specific incentives in the form of base salary increases. (page e43) Retention of teachers will be impacted with flexible retention bonuses, and incentives for advanced certifications. (page e2) These advanced certifications will include Reach credentials/certificates. The plan provides a definition that they propose to be a comparable school. ( page e4)

**Weaknesses:**

There is a high Latino population documented in the proposal but this group is not addressed as a target area. (page e3)

**Reader's Score: 8**

**Selection Criteria - Project Design**

**1.(B): Project design (60 points)**

In determining the quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary will consider the extent to which the proposed PBCS--

(1) Is part of a proposed LEA or statewide strategy, as appropriate, for improving the process by which each participating LEA rewards teachers, principals, and other personnel (in those sites in which the grantee wishes to expand the PBCS to additional staff in its schools) in high-need schools (as defined in the Federal Register notice) based upon their effectiveness as determined in significant part by student growth (as defined in the Federal Register notice). With regard to the effectiveness of teachers, principals, and other personnel, the Secretary will consider whether--

(i) The methodology the LEA or SEA proposes to use in its PBCS to determine the effectiveness of a school's teachers, principals, and other personnel (in those sites in which the grantee wishes to expand the PBCS to additional staff in its schools) includes valid and reliable measures of student growth (as defined in the Federal Register notice);

(ii) The participating LEA would use the proposed PBCS to provide performance awards to teachers, principals, and other personnel (in those sites in which the grantee wishes to expand the PBCS to additional staff in its schools) that are of sufficient size to affect the behaviors of teachers, principals, and other personnel and their decisions as to whether to go to, or remain working in, the high-need school; and

(iii) The applicant provides a clear explanation of how teachers, principals, and other personnel (in those sites in which the grantee wishes to expand the PBCS to additional staff in its schools) are determined to be "effective" for the purposes of the proposed PBCS.

(2) Has the involvement and support of teachers, principals, and other personnel (in those sites in which the grantee wishes to expand the PBCS to additional staff in its schools), including input from teachers, and principals, and other personnel in the schools and LEAs to be served by the grant, and the involvement and support of unions in participating LEAs where they are the designated exclusive representatives for the purpose of collective bargaining that is needed to carry out the grant;

(3) Includes rigorous, transparent, and fair evaluation systems for teachers and principals that differentiate levels of effectiveness using multiple rating categories that take into account data on student growth (as defined in the Federal Register notice) as a significant factor, as well as classroom observations conducted at least twice during the school year;

(4) Includes a data-management system, consistent with the LEA's proposed PBCS, that can link student achievement (as defined in the Federal Register notice) data to teacher and principal payroll and human resources systems; and

(5) Incorporates high-quality professional development activities that increase the capacity of teachers and principals to raise student achievement (as defined in the Federal Register notice) and are directly linked to the specific measures of teacher and principal effectiveness included in the PBCS.

**Strengths:**

This proposal proposes a very thorough plan for incentive awards based on student performance and teaching practices. (page e6) The student performance will be evaluated based on state assessments and other assessment systems. (page e9) The evaluation of effective teaching will be based on observations and formative assessment. (page e39) The awards being offered for teachers and principals are awarded at many different levels. (page e8) A professional development plan will be implemented for each school to cover several areas of need. Specific topics and details of these topics are provided. (page e28) The proposal provides evidence that two of the individual schools already have a data management system that links student achievement with teacher performance. The proposal states that, The steering committee, under the direction of the project coordinator, will analyze each school's current system and create a unified data-management system in which student achievement indicators are collected centrally. (page e27)

**Weaknesses:**

It is unclear who will manage all of the data that this plan will require and there is little evidence that administrators will be trained in the assessment of teachers to implement this system. The awards from this system are based on many different measures and it will take a very robust system to manage the data. (page e8) A plan for a data system is in place but the management of all of the required data will be immense and there is no evidence that enough personnel will be in place to handle it. The proposal includes a letter of support from the consortium, but there is no evidence that teachers will have input into the plan once it is implemented. There is only mention of principal participation in regular steering committee meetings. (page e1) It is unclear if the local union is involved.

**Reader's Score: 50**

**Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Support for the Proposed Project**

**1.(C): Adequacy of Support for the Proposed Project (25 points):**

In determining the adequacy of the support for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the extent to which--

- (1) The management plan is likely to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, and includes clearly defined responsibilities and detailed timelines and milestones for accomplishing project tasks;
- (2) The project director and other key personnel are qualified to carry out their responsibilities, and their time commitments are appropriate and adequate to implement the project effectively;
- (3) The applicant will support the proposed project with funds provided under other Federal or State programs and local financial or in-kind resources; and
- (4) The requested grant amount and project costs are sufficient to attain project goals and reasonable in relation to the objectives and design of the project.

**Strengths:**

A strong implementation plan based on the qualifications and past successes of the management team who have secured funding from additional sources in the past exhibits successful management capabilities. (page e31-e32) Through this experienced management team the project appears to be feasible and can occur within budget.

**Weaknesses:**

The role and responsibilities of the management team are not clear, such as a table of activities and responsible parties or a detailed timeline for implementation with milestones for success. Even though a budget narrative is included, there are many levels of incentives and there is no projection that supports that the resources will cover all of the many incentive options.

**Reader's Score: 20**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of Local Evaluation**

1.(D) Quality of Local Evaluation (5 points):

In determining the quality of the local project evaluation, the Secretary considers the extent to which the applicant's evaluation plan--

(1) Includes the use of strong and measurable performance objectives (that are clearly related to the goals of the project) for raising student achievement (as defined in the Federal Register notice), increasing the effectiveness of teachers, principals, and other personnel (in those sites in which the grantee wishes to expand the PBCS to additional staff in its schools), and retaining and recruiting effective teachers, principals, and other personnel;

(2) Will produce evaluation data that are quantitative and qualitative; and

(3) Includes adequate evaluation procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project.

**Strengths:**

The proposal is supported with a thorough plan for evaluation with objectives and measures presented. (page e38-40) This plan includes both quantitative and qualitative data derived from teacher observations. Qualitative data and continuous feedback will occur through interviews, focus groups, and observations. (page e39) There is a focus on developing value added incentives. There is a plan to evaluate project implementation and results for the purposes of ongoing improvement and dissemination of promising practices. (page e40)

**Weaknesses:**

None noted

Reader's Score: 5

**Priority Questions**

Priority Preference - Competitive Preference Priority 1

1.Competitive Preference Priority: Use of Value-Added Measures of Student Achievement. (Up to 5 points):

To meet this competitive preference priority, the applicant must demonstrate, in its application, that the proposed PBCS for teachers, principals, and other personnel (in those sites in which the grantee wishes to expand the PBCS to additional staff in its schools) will use a value-added measure of the impact on student growth (as defined in the Federal Register notice) as a significant factor in calculating differentiated levels of compensation provided to teachers, principals, and other personnel (in those sites in which the grantee wishes to expand the PBCS to additional staff in its schools).

Under this priority, the applicant must also demonstrate that it has a plan to ensure that, as part of the PBCS, it has the capacity to (1) implement the proposed value-added model (e.g., through robust data systems that collect the necessary data and ensure data quality), and (2) clearly explain the chosen value-added model to teachers to enable them to use the data generated through the model to improve classroom practices.

**Strengths:**

The project has a detailed plan for awarding incentives based on student achievement. (page e6) This plan includes value-added measures of student achievement used to determine individual teacher bonuses as well as the bonuses to groups of school personnel. It also includes measures of effective practice to determine both school-wide

collaborative incentives as well as individual incentives. Measures of effective practice combine a variety of evaluative measures, such as satisfactory supervisory evaluations based on the California Standards for the Teaching Profession. This successful implementation of an integrated system will enhance this value-added model by taking many factors into consideration when awarding incentives.

**Weaknesses:**

There is no evidence that the plan will be clearly explained to the teachers or that professional development will be provided that will enable teachers to use the data to improve classroom practice.

**Reader's Score: 3**

**Priority Preference - Competitive Preference Priority 2**

**1. Competitive Preference Priority: Increased Recruitment and Retention of Effective Teachers to Serve High-Need Students and in Hard-to-Staff Subjects and Specialty Areas in High-Need Schools. (Up to 5 points):**

To meet this competitive preference priority, the applicant must demonstrate in its application that its proposed PBCS is designed to assist high-need schools (as defined in the Federal Register notice) to (1) serve high-need students (as defined in the Federal Register notice), (2) retain effective teachers in teaching positions in hard-to-staff subjects and specialty areas, such as mathematics, science, special education, and English language acquisition, and (3) fill vacancies with teachers of those subjects or specialty areas who are effective or likely to be effective. The applicant must provide an explanation for how it will determine that a teacher filling a vacancy is effective or likely to be effective. In addition, applicants must demonstrate, in their applications, the extent to which the subjects or specialty areas they propose to target are hard-to-staff. Lastly, applicants must demonstrate, in their applications that they will implement a process for effectively communicating to teachers which of the LEA's schools are high-need and which subjects and specialty areas are considered hard-to-staff.

**Strengths:**

The plan includes an incentive for certification and assignment in hard to staff positions. (page e6) The plan will target increased recruitment and retention of teachers in hard-to-staff subjects with specific incentives in the form of base salary increases. (page e43) The schedule includes a \$1000 for certification and assignment to hard to staff positions. (page e21) Hard to-staff positions are identified as being in the following fields - mathematics, Science, Spanish, and Special Education. (page e21)

**Weaknesses:**

The incentive mentioned above may not be of sufficient amount to entice teachers. The proposal states that there will be a \$1000 incentive for certification and assignment in hard to staff positions to include Math, Science, Spanish, and Special Education. (page e21) There is no evidence that positions will be filled with teachers who are effective or likely to be effective. There is also no evidence that they will effectively communicate to teachers which of the schools are high-need and which subject areas are considered hard-to-staff.

**Reader's Score: 3**

---

**Status:** Submitted

**Last Updated:** 8/6/10 4:20 PM



Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 8/6/10 4:20 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: ARISE High School -- , (S385A100145)

Reader #3: \*\*\*\*\*

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Evaluation Criteria</b>		
<b>Absolute Priority 1</b>		
1.Absolute Priority 1	0	0
<b>Absolute Priority 2</b>		
1.Absolute Priority 2	0	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Evaluaton Criteria</b>		
<b>Absolute Priority 3</b>		
1.Absolute Priority 3	0	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Requirement</b>		
<b>Requirement</b>		
1.Requirement	0	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Evaluation Criteria</b>		
<b>Core Element 1</b>		
1.Core Element 1	0	0
<b>Core Element 2</b>		
1.Core Element 2	0	0
<b>Core Element 3</b>		
1.Core Element 3	0	0
<b>Core Element 4</b>		
1.Core Element 4	0	0
<b>Core Element 5</b>		
1.Core Element 5	0	0
<b>High Quality Professional Development</b>		
1.Professional Development	0	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Need for the Project</b>		
1.Need for Project	10	8
<b>Project Design</b>		

1.Project Design	60	48
<b>Adequacy of Support for the Proposed Project</b>		
1.Adequacy of Support	25	22
<b>Quality of Local Evaluation</b>		
1.Quality of Local Eval.	5	5
<b>Sub Total</b>	100	83

**Priority Questions**

**Priority Preference**

**Competitive Preference Priority 1**

1.Competitive Priority 1	5	4
--------------------------	---	---

**Competitive Preference Priority 2**

1.Competitive Priority 2	5	3
--------------------------	---	---

<b>Sub Total</b>	10	7
------------------	----	---

<b>Total</b>	110	90
--------------	-----	----

## Technical Review Form

Panel #17 - Panel - 17: 84.385A

Reader #3: \*\*\*\*\*

Applicant: ARISE High School -- , (S385A100145)

### Questions

#### Evaluation Criteria - Absolute Priority 1

##### 1. Priority 1: Differentiated Levels of Compensation for Effective Teachers and Principals:

Comment on how well the applicant demonstrates that --

It will develop and implement a PBCS that rewards, at differentiated levels, teachers and principals who demonstrate their effectiveness by improving student achievement (as defined in the Federal Register notice) as part of the coherent and integrated approach of the local educational agency (LEA) to strengthening the educator workforce.

In determining teacher and principal effectiveness as part of the PBCS, the LEA - -

- (a) Must give significant weight to student growth (as defined in the Federal Register notice), based on objective data on student performance;
- (b) Must include observation-based assessments of teacher and principal performance at multiple points in the year, carried out by evaluators trained in using objective evidence-based rubrics for observation, aligned with professional teaching standards; and, if applicable, as part of the LEA's coherent and integrated approach to strengthening the educator workforce; and
- (c) May include other measures, such as evidence of leadership roles (as defined in the Federal Register notice), that increase the effectiveness of other teachers in the school or LEA.

In determining principal effectiveness as part of a PBCS, the LEA must give significant weight to student growth (as defined in the Federal Register notice) and may include supplemental measures such as high school graduation and college enrollment rates. In addition, the applicant must demonstrate that the differentiated effectiveness incentive payments will provide incentive amounts that are substantial and provide justification for the level of incentive amounts chosen. While the Department does not propose a minimum incentive amount, the Department encourages applicants to be thorough in their explanation of why the selected incentive amounts are likely high enough to create change in the behavior of current and prospective teachers and principals in order to ultimately improve student outcomes.

#### General:

The applicant is an LEA that is an independent charter school that heads a consortium, called the Reach Teacher Incentive Fund Consortium, which was founded in 2006. The Consortium consists of three other charter schools and a non-profit agency. The 1000 students served in Consortium schools are low income students of color.

The first objective of the proposed project is "to measurably improve student achievement ...based on valid, reliable, and value-added performance measures" (p. 20). This objective is followed by others that call for differentiated compensation for teachers, school leaders, support staff and others based on contributions to student learning (p.2). A value added model of measures to be used for teachers in various content areas was provided (pp. 10-14).

Under the proposed plan evaluation for teachers will consist of the assessment of classroom performance, based on professional standards and conducted three times yearly, and on student assessment measures (pp. 25-26). Principals are to be evaluated annually, and their assessment is based on student achievement gains and performance reviews of

effective leadership practice.

Discussion in the size of the incentives for differentiated effective was not fully addressed; the amounts of the awards is listed on Figure 2.10 (pp. 20-21). The amounts listed appear modest. For example, a content area instructional coach would receive \$1000.

The applicant's project not fully consistent with the criteria for this priority.

**Reader's Score: 0**

**Evaluation Criteria - Absolute Priority 2**

**1. Priority 2: Fiscal Sustainability of the Performance-Based Compensation System (PBCS):**

Comment on how well the applicant demonstrates that - -

(a) The applicant has projected costs associated with the development and implementation of the PBCS, during the project period and beyond, and has accepted the responsibility to provide such performance-based compensation to teachers, principals, and other personnel (in those sites in which the grantee wishes to expand the PBCS to additional staff in its schools) who earn it under the system; and

(b) The applicant will provide from non-TIF funds over the course of the five-year project period an increasing share of performance-based compensation paid to teachers, principals, and other personnel (in those sites in which the grantee wishes to expand the PBCS to additional staff in its schools) in those project years in which the LEA provides such payments as part of its PBCS.

**General:**

The applicant outlines a plan that provides for sustainability of their project during the five year funding period and after the funding period. The applicant's partners have committed an allocation of funds and in-kind contributions that will provide increasing portions each year of the grant period. Additional funding will come from a reallocation of state funds received by the consortium. The applicant describes a long term commitment to incorporate salary increases based on the proposed incentive funding formulas.

The applicant has adequately addressed funding for its proposed project consistent with the requirements of this priority.

**Reader's Score: 0**

**Evaluaton Criteria - Absolute Priority 3**

**1. Priority 3: Comprehensive Approaches to the Performance-Based Compensation System:**

Comment on how well the applicant demonstrates that - -

The proposed PBCS is aligned with a coherent and integrated strategy for strengthening the educator workforce, including in the use of data and evaluations for professional development and retention and tenure decisions in the LEA or LEAs participating in the project during and after the end of the TIF project period.

**General:**

The applicant's performance based compensation plan includes multiple measures of value added student achievement based on state standards and tiered award levels for teachers (pp.25-26). The applicant's plan for teachers and school leaders is based on student

achievement measures, observations, and evidence of continuous improvement. Its teacher evaluation system includes a process to provide feedback to be used as focal points for professional development on practices more likely to improve student achievement (p. 15).

The applicant's current data management system has the capacity to link student achievement data to individual teacher, principal, and support staff to the payroll systems of each school in the consortium (p. 27). A plan to develop a unified data management system is proposed. The applicant describes what it calls a "comprehensive approach to school-embedded professional development and capacity building" (p. 30).

However, the applicant's plan was unclear on exactly how it would use data to make retention and tenure decisions. Its plan includes a process for working with each school in the consortium in developing professional development opportunities, which were outlined. Some components of the proposed, performance-based compensation plan appear weak or under-developed.

**Reader's Score: 0**

#### **Requirement - Requirement**

- 1. REQUIREMENT: Comment on the quality of the applicant's description of how its proposed PBCS will provide educators with incentives to take on additional responsibilities and leadership roles (as defined in the Federal Register notice.**

##### **General:**

The applicant meets this requirement. Its plan includes incentives for teacher leadership that would allow a teacher leader to receive either a stipend or release time in order to be a subject specific coach to less experienced classroom teachers (p. 20). Identification of teacher leaders will be based on "exceptional teaching abilities (and) proven expertise in the area of focus" (p. 20).

**Reader's Score: 0**

#### **Evaluation Criteria - Core Element 1**

- 1. Core Element 1:**

**Comment on the quality of the applicant's plan for effectively communicating to teachers, administrators, other school personnel, and the community at-large the components of its performance based compensation system.**

##### **General:**

The applicant describes a plan to involve teachers, principals, and personnel that has already been used to solicit and receive unanimous support for its plan. It is based on public announcements, electronic surveys, and petitions. The applicant was also solicited and received support during the development of its plan from representative teachers and principals. EVERY teacher in the consortium provided written a commitment to the applicant's plan. However, it is unclear whether the applicant has a plan to communicate its plan to the community at large.

The applicant has largely met the requirements of this core element.

Reader's Score: 0

## Evaluation Criteria - Core Element 2

### 1. Core Element 2:

Comment on the quality of the applicant's involvement and support of teachers, principals, and other personnel (including input from teachers, principals, and other personnel in the schools and LEAs to be served by the grant) and the involvement and support of unions in participating LEAs (where they are the designated exclusive representatives for the purpose of collective bargaining) that is needed to carry out the grant.

#### General:

This part of the applicant's plan is strong. Early on, it solicited the active involvement of teachers, principals and other school personnel in crafting its plan (p. 22). It received unanimous support from every teacher in consortium schools. Evidence of support is included (p. e64). MOUs were provided from Arise High School, Bay Area School of Enterprise, Lighthouse Community Charter. and from the Reach Institute, a consortium partner (p. e64). Signatures indicating support from all in consortium schools were included in the application (p. e64).

Consortium schools are not collectively bargained.

Reader's Score: 0

## Evaluation Criteria - Core Element 3

### 1. Core Element 3:

Comment on the quality of the applicant's implementation, or plan to implement, a rigorous, transparent, and fair evaluation systems for teachers and principals that differentiate effectiveness using multiple rating categories that take into account student growth (as defined in the Federal Register notice) as a significant factor, as well as classroom observations conducted at least twice during the school year. The evaluation process must: (1) use an objective, evidence-based rubric aligned with professional teaching or leadership standards and the LEA's coherent and integrated approach to strengthening the educator workforce; (2) provide for observations of each teacher or principal at least twice during the school year by individuals (who may include peer reviewers) who are provided specialized training; (3) incorporate the collection and evaluation of additional forms of evidence; and (4) ensure a high degree of inter-rater reliability (i.e., agreement among two or more raters who score approximately the same).

#### General:

The applicant outlines a comprehensive, collaborative, transparent, multi-level evaluation process that considers measures of student achievement based on valid and multiple measures of value added achievement; performance evaluations based on state standards that are conducted three times annually (p. 9); and evidence of practice based on formative assessment. A rubric is provided (p. 41), and a value added measures are outlined in Figure 2.2 (pp. 10-12).

The plan calls for multiple types of evaluation that supports a high degree of inter-rater reliability. The performance evaluation tool used includes "five standards of effective teaching," and practice can be ranked at one of five levels from "emerging" to "innovative" (p. 24).

A theme of the application is a commitment to involving school staff at every step of implementation of its evaluation plan. The applicant meets or exceeds the requirements of this core element.

Reader's Score: 0

#### Evaluation Criteria - Core Element 4

##### 1. Core Element 4:

Comment on the quality of the applicant's implementation or plan to implement, a data-management system that can link student achievement (as defined in the Federal Register notice) data to teacher and principal payroll and human resources systems.

##### General:

The applicant (lead LEA) describes its plan to develop a unified data management system that collects student achievement data of students in all the schools in its consortium (p. 27). The current system already has the capacity to link student achievement data to individual teachers and principals and then to payroll systems, but these data are collected at the school level. The proposed plan is to provide for one unified system that reports to project staff and back to HR and payroll offices. Each school in the consortium has signed an MOU agreeing to this plan (p. 28) that is included in the application.

The applicant meets the requirements of this core element.

Reader's Score: 0

#### Evaluation Criteria - Core Element 5

##### 1. Core Element 5:

Comment on the quality of the applicant's plan for ensuring that teachers and principals understand the specific measures of teacher and principal effectiveness included in the PBCS, and receive professional development that enables them to use data generated by these measures to improve their practice.

##### General:

The applicant has designed a plan that involved teachers and principals early on (p. 22). It has received the support of every teacher in consortium schools and has communicated its plan to educators through various mediums, such as public announcements, electronic surveys, and petitions (p. 22)

Data generated by the proposed plan will be used as focal points for professional development on practices likely to improve practice and to student achievement (p. 24). Data will come from the California Standard tests; other measures, such as the Developing Reading assessment, and SAT writing assessments and community college exams in mathematics.

The applicant states, "The first evaluation cycle conducted early in the year is intended to establish a baseline and provide feedback that can inform the teachers' goals for improvement, provide focal points for professional development, and allow the teacher to focus on practices that are most likely to improve student achievement" (p. 24). This beginning appears logical and likely to lead to meeting the applicant's objectives.

The applicant has outlined a strong professional development plan.

Evaluation Criteria - High Quality Professional Development

1. High Quality Professional Development:

Comment on the applicant's demonstration that ---

Its proposed PBCS will include a high-quality professional development component for teachers and principals consistent with the definition of the term professional development in section 9101(34) of the ESEA. The applicant must demonstrate that its PBCS has a professional development component in place, or a specific plan for developing one, that is directly linked to the specific measures of teacher and principal effectiveness included in the PBCS. The professional development component of the PBCS must - -

(1) Be based on needs assessed either at the high-need schools (as defined in the Federal Register notice) participating in the applicant's proposed PBCS or LEA-wide;

(2) Be targeted to individual teacher's and principal's needs as identified in the evaluation process;

(3) Provide --

(a) Those teachers and principals in participating TIF schools who do not receive differentiated compensation based on effectiveness under the PBCS with the tools and skills they need to improve their effectiveness in the classroom or school and be able to raise student achievement (as defined in the Federal Register notice); and

(b) Those teachers and principals who are deemed to be effective and who, therefore, receive differentiated compensation under the PBCS, with the tools and skills they need to (1) continue effective practices in the classroom or school and raise student achievement (as defined in the Federal Register notice), and (2) successfully assume additional responsibilities and leadership roles (as defined in the Federal Register notice);

(4) Support teachers and principals to better understand and use the measures of effectiveness in the PBCS to improve practice and student achievement (as defined in the Federal Register notice); and

(5) Include a process for regularly assessing the effectiveness of this professional development in improving teacher and leadership practice to increase student achievement (as defined in the Federal Register notice) and making modifications necessary to improve its effectiveness.

**General:**

The applicant has designed an effective professional development plan designed to improve instruction and student achievement (pp. 15-16). The plan links needs identified through its comprehensive teacher evaluation process to its professional development plan. It provides for incentives for highly effective teachers to coach and support less experienced teachers; an outline of incentives is provided (pp. 6-7).

The multi-tiered evaluation system provides educators with multiple levels of effective practice, multiple observations, various one to one conferences, and self assessment based on state standards (pp. 15-16). The applicant includes a well developed valued added plan (pp. 17-19); data from this plan will be used to inform professional development to improve teacher and leadership practice. Data will come from three different sources. The value added measures in various content areas are described in Figure 2.2 (pp.10-14).

There is a high degree of transparency has been built into its overall plan, which began during the planning stages of the application, and the applicant was able to successfully secure the support of building staff including the unanimous support of teachers in consortium schools (p. 22). At the school and LEA levels, a collaborative spirit appears to be a central feature of the applicant's plan.

Reader's Score: 0

## Selection Criteria - Need for the Project

### 1.(A): Need for the project (10 points):

In determining the need for the proposed project, the Secretary will consider the extent to which the applicant establishes that--

1) The high-need schools (as defined in the Federal Register notice) whose educators would be part of the PBCS have difficulty--

(i) Recruiting highly qualified or effective teachers, particularly in hard-to-staff subjects or specialty areas, such as mathematics, science, English language acquisition, and special education; and

(ii) Retaining highly qualified or effective teachers and principals.

(2) Student achievement (as defined in the Federal Register notice) in each of the schools whose educators would be part of the PBCS is lower than in what the applicant determines are comparable schools in the LEA, or another LEA in its State, in terms of key factors such as size, grade levels, and poverty levels; and

(3) A definition of what it considers a "comparable" school for the purposes of paragraph (2) of this selection criterion is established.

#### Strengths:

The 1000 students served in consortium schools are identified as students "who have been unsuccessful in school, low income students, and students of color." 85% of students are either African American or Latino, and 85% of students in these schools are eligible for free or reduced lunch. Consortium schools have trouble retaining teachers especially in certain content areas as math, science, and foreign languages (p. 3). The applicant clearly documented that the majority of students in consortia schools test perform below proficiency levels on state standards tests.

The applicant's definition of a "comparable school" for the purposes of the selection criteria are "those schools whose graduates are eligible" to attend a state university by rates of 85% or more. According to the applicant these schools are in the top quartile in California's Academic Performance Index (pp. 4-5).

#### Weaknesses:

The applicant provided a somewhat incomplete picture on its challenges in recruiting and retaining effective teachers and teachers in hard to staff content areas.

A fuller discussion and some data would have provided a fuller picture. The probable problems faced by ELL students in consortia schools were not thoroughly discussed. The applicant states that 75% of consortium students perform below proficiency levels in English/language arts (p. e3). The applicant failed to fully address the significant academic needs of this student population in its plan.

Selection Criteria - Project Design

1.(B): Project design (60 points)

In determining the quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary will consider the extent to which the proposed PBCS--

(1) Is part of a proposed LEA or statewide strategy, as appropriate, for improving the process by which each participating LEA rewards teachers, principals, and other personnel (in those sites in which the grantee wishes to expand the PBCS to additional staff in its schools) in high-need schools (as defined in the Federal Register notice) based upon their effectiveness as determined in significant part by student growth (as defined in the Federal Register notice). With regard to the effectiveness of teachers, principals, and other personnel, the Secretary will consider whether--

(i) The methodology the LEA or SEA proposes to use in its PBCS to determine the effectiveness of a school's teachers, principals, and other personnel (in those sites in which the grantee wishes to expand the PBCS to additional staff in its schools) includes valid and reliable measures of student growth (as defined in the Federal Register notice);

(ii) The participating LEA would use the proposed PBCS to provide performance awards to teachers, principals, and other personnel (in those sites in which the grantee wishes to expand the PBCS to additional staff in its schools) that are of sufficient size to affect the behaviors of teachers, principals, and other personnel and their decisions as to whether to go to, or remain working in, the high-need school; and

(iii) The applicant provides a clear explanation of how teachers, principals, and other personnel (in those sites in which the grantee wishes to expand the PBCS to additional staff in its schools) are determined to be "effective" for the purposes of the proposed PBCS.

(2) Has the involvement and support of teachers, principals, and other personnel (in those sites in which the grantee wishes to expand the PBCS to additional staff in its schools), including input from teachers, and principals, and other personnel in the schools and LEAs to be served by the grant, and the involvement and support of unions in participating LEAs where they are the designated exclusive representatives for the purpose of collective bargaining that is needed to carry out the grant;

(3) Includes rigorous, transparent, and fair evaluation systems for teachers and principals that differentiate levels of effectiveness using multiple rating categories that take into account data on student growth (as defined in the Federal Register notice) as a significant factor, as well as classroom observations conducted at least twice during the school year;

(4) Includes a data-management system, consistent with the LEA's proposed PBCS, that can link student achievement (as defined in the Federal Register notice) data to teacher and principal payroll and human resources systems; and

(5) Incorporates high-quality professional development activities that increase the capacity of teachers and principals to raise student achievement (as defined in the Federal Register notice) and are directly linked to the specific measures of teacher and principal effectiveness included in the PBCS.

**Strengths:**

Multiple measures are used to establish educator effectiveness as part of the applicant's comprehensive evaluation plan. A sustainable process of providing performance awards was outlined (pp. 20-21).

The plan as described is rigorous, transparent and fair. The plan includes five different levels of effective assessment practices that will be used during teacher performance evaluations. Each level articulates language that is positive and likely to encourage

even novice teachers; the lowest rank is "emerging" (pp. 24-25). Teachers are to be observed on three different occasions using instruments based on the state's professional standards. The applicant's evaluation plan includes folding in data on student growth, which will be the basis for incentive awards.

The applicant's plan includes the steps it will take to develop a unified data management system for consortium schools that will link student achievement data to teacher and principal payroll and HR. According to the plan, evaluation data will be used to provide "focal points for professional development, and allow the teacher to focus on practices that are most likely to improve student achievement" (p. 24).

The applicant excelled in providing for early buy-in from teachers, principals, and other school staff whose representatives contributed to the development of the proposed plan. The applicant's plan includes a professional development plan to support teachers and principals in raising student achievement.

**Weaknesses:**

Addressing the unique academic needs of Latino students and the challenges faced by teachers of these students was lacking. Although the applicant excelled in the inclusion of teachers, principals, and other school staff in its plan, the voices of the larger community, especially parents, were non-existent.

The size of performance awards (pp. 20-21) appeared overly modest. Little discussion was offered on how these amounts were determined. Considering the low performance of students in English/language arts, it would appear that strong incentives would be offered to teachers in this and other (ESL) content areas.

It was unclear how the applicant would ensure inter-rater reliability in its evaluation plan.

**Reader's Score: 48**

**Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Support for the Proposed Project**

**1.(C): Adequacy of Support for the Proposed Project (25 points):**

In determining the adequacy of the support for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the extent to which--

- (1) The management plan is likely to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, and includes clearly defined responsibilities and detailed timelines and milestones for accomplishing project tasks;
- (2) The project director and other key personnel are qualified to carry out their responsibilities, and their time commitments are appropriate and adequate to implement the project effectively;
- (3) The applicant will support the proposed project with funds provided under other Federal or State programs and local financial or in-kind resources; and
- (4) The requested grant amount and project costs are sufficient to attain project goals and reasonable in relation to the objectives and design of the project.

**Strengths:**

The applicant's plan is realistic and likely to achieve its objectives within budget as provided in the budget (p. e5) and budget summary (p. e105).

The plan is also sustainable. The evaluation plan includes clearly worded, measurable grant objectives. The project director and other key personnel have sufficient experience to effectively implement the provided plan. The responsibilities of key staff were described (pp. 31-34), and resumes of all key staff were provided (pp. e1-23).

The applicant has been attentive and successful in obtaining additional funding to sustain the project during and after the grant period. The attached budget (p. e5) and budget narrative (p. 105) appear reasonable and designed to support the project's goals.

**Weaknesses:**

A detailed time-line was not included. An addition to the key personnel team might include a professional with a background in cultural literacy, multicultural education, and/or critical theory combined with significant classroom experience and/or work in previous outreach efforts to meet low performance in English/language arts (p. 5).

It was sometimes unclear whether the applicant understood the unique needs of the student populations in participating schools, or the challenges faced by their teachers in meeting students' academic needs.

**Reader's Score: 22**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of Local Evaluation****1.(D) Quality of Local Evaluation (5 points):**

In determining the quality of the local project evaluation, the Secretary considers the extent to which the applicant's evaluation plan--

(1) Includes the use of strong and measurable performance objectives (that are clearly related to the goals of the project) for raising student achievement (as defined in the Federal Register notice), increasing the effectiveness of teachers, principals, and other personnel (in those sites in which the grantee wishes to expand the PBCS to additional staff in its schools), and retaining and recruiting effective teachers, principals, and other personnel;

(2) Will produce evaluation data that are quantitative and qualitative; and

(3) Includes adequate evaluation procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project.

**Strengths:**

The focus of the applicant's plan was on developing and implementing a performance based compensation system for teachers, principals, and other school personnel for the purposes of increasing their effectiveness and student achievement. The applicant proposes a value added, incentive formula giving weight to student achievement to increase educator effectiveness (pp. 10-14). The applicant outlines measures of growth that includes students' academic performance, attendance rates, high school graduation rates, and college readiness.

Data produced includes both quantitative data (students' academic performance data, for example) and qualitative data (teacher observations data, for example). The applicant's evaluation procedures are designed to ensure feedback, such as, pre/post evaluation observation meetings are planned, and continuous improvement as seen in various practice levels developed for teacher evaluations (p. 25). A detailed table listing objectives and measures of success were provided (p. 38).

Applicant's plan meets the requirements of this criterion.

**Weaknesses:**

None noted

**Reader's Score: 5**

**Priority Questions**

**Priority Preference - Competitive Preference Priority 1**

**1. Competitive Preference Priority: Use of Value-Added Measures of Student Achievement. (Up to 5 points):**

To meet this competitive preference priority, the applicant must demonstrate, in its application, that the proposed PBCS for teachers, principals, and other personnel (in those sites in which the grantee wishes to expand the PBCS to additional staff in its schools) will use a value-added measure of the impact on student growth (as defined in the Federal Register notice) as a significant factor in calculating differentiated levels of compensation provided to teachers, principals, and other personnel (in those sites in which the grantee wishes to expand the PBCS to additional staff in its schools).

Under this priority, the applicant must also demonstrate that it has a plan to ensure that, as part of the PBCS, it has the capacity to (1) implement the proposed value-added model (e.g., through robust data systems that collect the necessary data and ensure data quality), and (2) clearly explain the chosen value-added model to teachers to enable them to use the data generated through the model to improve classroom practices.

**Strengths:**

The applicant's plan includes a value added evaluation model that used student growth as a significant factor (p. 22). The applicant has demonstrated that it has the capacity as outlined in the application to implement the proposed value added model once it expands the current data management system. The applicant demonstrated success in building early buy in from teachers and has a plan to use current avenues to communicate its plan to all school staff as needed. Under its plan, data generated will be used to inform professional development with the goal of improving classroom practice since a variety of student and educator data will be considered (p. e0, p. 2, p. 13).

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant does not provide sufficient detail on its plan that clearly explains its value-added model to teachers. It was also unclear how teachers would be informed and trained on using the generated data to improve practice and to raise student performance.

**Reader's Score: 4**

Priority Preference - Competitive Preference Priority 2

1. Competitive Preference Priority: Increased Recruitment and Retention of Effective Teachers to Serve High-Need Students and in Hard-to-Staff Subjects and Specialty Areas in High-Need Schools. (Up to 5 points):

To meet this competitive preference priority, the applicant must demonstrate in its application that its proposed PBCS is designed to assist high-need schools (as defined in the Federal Register notice) to (1) serve high-need students (as defined in the Federal Register notice), (2) retain effective teachers in teaching positions in hard-to-staff subjects and specialty areas, such as mathematics, science, special education, and English language acquisition, and (3) fill vacancies with teachers of those subjects or specialty areas who are effective or likely to be effective. The applicant must provide an explanation for how it will determine that a teacher filling a vacancy is effective or likely to be effective. In addition, applicants must demonstrate, in their applications, the extent to which the subjects or specialty areas they propose to target are hard-to-staff. Lastly, applicants must demonstrate, in their applications that they will implement a process for effectively communicating to teachers which of the LEA's schools are high-need and which subjects and specialty areas are considered hard-to-staff.

**Strengths:**

The applicant states that like many urban schools, the consortium has difficulty in recruiting and retaining teachers especially in hard to staff content areas because of "demanding circumstances" (p. 3). The performance based compensation plan proposed is likely to lead to higher retention of teachers and principals based on the proposed differentiated compensation system and support, and the professional development activities are likely to improve instruction in consortium schools. The open communication that the applicant has established with all staff in consortium schools is likely to include the open flow of information on which schools have subjects and specialty areas that are hard to staff.

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant did not fully address the recruitment and retention of effective and highly effective teachers especially those in hard to staff content areas. The applicant's plan in outlining the size of incentive awards to teachers (\$1500-4000) may be too modest to recruit or retain effective or highly effective teachers in high need schools (p. 6).

Reader's Score: 3

---

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 8/6/10 4:20 PM