

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 8/6/10 4:02 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Arizona Board of Regents for and on behalf of Arizona State University -- Mary Lou Farmer Teachers College, (S385A100077)

Reader #1: *****

Points Possible Points Scored

Questions

Evaluation Criteria

Absolute Priority 1

1. Absolute Priority 1	0	0
------------------------	---	---

Absolute Priority 2

1. Absolute Priority 2	0	0
------------------------	---	---

Sub Total	0	0
------------------	----------	----------

Evaluation Criteria

Absolute Priority 3

1. Absolute Priority 3	0	0
------------------------	---	---

Sub Total	0	0
------------------	----------	----------

Requirement

Requirement

1. Requirement	0	0
----------------	---	---

Sub Total	0	0
------------------	----------	----------

Evaluation Criteria

Core Element 1

1. Core Element 1	0	0
-------------------	---	---

Core Element 2

1. Core Element 2	0	0
-------------------	---	---

Core Element 3

1. Core Element 3	0	0
-------------------	---	---

Core Element 4

1. Core Element 4	0	0
-------------------	---	---

Core Element 5

1. Core Element 5	0	0
-------------------	---	---

High Quality Professional Development

1. Professional Development	0	0
-----------------------------	---	---

Sub Total	0	0
------------------	----------	----------

Selection Criteria

Need for the Project

1. Need for Project	10	7
---------------------	----	---

Project Design

1.Project Design	60	56
Adequacy of Support for the Proposed Project		
1.Adequacy of Support	25	25
Quality of Local Evaluation		
1.Quality of Local Eval.	5	5
Sub Total	100	93

Priority Questions

Priority Preference

Competitive Preference Priority 1

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

Competitive Preference Priority 2

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

Sub Total	10	10
------------------	----	----

Total	110	103
--------------	-----	-----

Technical Review Form

Panel #6 - Panel - 6: 84.385A

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: Arizona Board of Regents for and on behalf of Arizona State University -- Mary Lou Farmer Teachers College, (S385A100077)

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 adequately meets the Absolute Priority 1 criteria by including provision of significant weight to the student achievement growth component, multiple observations of teachers and principals, use of other measures and justification of substantial incentive awards.

The applicant has spent much time and energy into developing a thoughtful plan for the implementation of their PBCS. This includes the use of the Colorado Growth Percentiles Model (CGM) as their value-added methodology. Fifty percent of the basis for judging teacher effectiveness will come from the calculations. This system uses standardized test data to measure change in student achievement over time and to make predictions about future growth, p. 29.

Another strong component is the use of multiple observations. The applicant states that the observations will include 4-6 observations of teachers performance over the school year by members of the leadership team who have been trained as certified evaluators on

the TAP instructional rubric p, 30.

An additional basis for determining the performance-based compensation of teachers is the consideration of their extra responsibilities and the extent of their individual contributions to TAP school functioning. This occurs through peer evaluations using a responsibility survey which carries different weights in the calculation of performance pay for teachers at three levels of TAP school leadership (career, mentor, and master), pp. 31-32.

The PBCS for principals and assistant principals at TAP schools is also well designed. Fifty percent will be based on school-wide student achievement growth as determined through value-added methodology using the Colorado Growth Percentiles Model, 25% will come from 2-3 observations by trained personnel of his/her fidelity of TAP implementation leadership, and 25% on a comprehensive survey assessment. An additional 25% of principals effectiveness will come from a comprehensive survey assessment of his/her school leadership effectiveness, p. 32.

The applicant involved many stakeholders in the decision-making process for incentive awards which allows the opportunity for significant input and buy-in. The applicant reports that the PBCS bonuses were collectively discussed and calculated by the applicant partners as well as the partner districts based on current salaries in the state. With much input and collaboration during the deliberations, the applicant believes that the proposed PBCS is substantive enough to promote change while reasonable enough to be sustainable across time after funding ends. It is noted that the highest performing teachers could learn well over 20% of their annual salaries, pp. 33-35.

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 adequately meets the Absolute Priority 2 criteria by including projected costs associated with the PBCS and by increasing the amount of non-TIF funds for PBCS compensation over the course of the grant period.

The applicant assures partner districts, barring complete financial calamity, are committed to provide from non-TIF the following share of the PBCS: Year One 10%, Year Two 25%, Year Three 50%, Year Four 75%, and Year Five and beyond 100%, p. 36. The Ready-for-Rigor Support Center will provide partner district leadership with a district budget specialist who, from the very beginning of the TIF grant implementation, will work with partner districts to strategically reallocate existing federal, state, and local funds to support sustainability, p. 37. The presence and support of the district budget specialist who can focus time and energy to the reallocation of the TIF grant implementation is a

significant strength in this application.

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 minimumally meets the Absolute Priority 3 criteria by including the use of data and evaluation of the PBCS for professional development purposes. The applicant did not discuss the use of the PBCS for retention and tenure decisions.

The applicant presents the following collaborations as part of their comprehensive approaches to PBCS: the anchor partners of this grant through the Ready-for-Rigor Support center will provide partner districts with teacher and principal effectiveness data from the Colorado Growth Percentile Model, multiple teacher and bi-annual principal observations and other indicators to make professional personnel decisions. The Arizona Department of Education (ADE) will be the storehouse for the data and help districts with their Standards Assessment Inventory data and ESEA plans. Arizona State University will use the same data to help drive professional development offerings for the districts as well as help determine what course offering are needed for certificate from the University, pp 38-43. These collaborations and supports will strength the implementation of this comprehensive PBCS.

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 adequately meets the Requirement of this grant criteria by providing a clearly detailed description of how the PBCS will provide incentives for educators to assume additional responsibilities and leadership roles.

The applicant presents a PBCS system that includes a component that considers the additional responsibilities of teachers and the extent of their individual contributions to school functioning. All teachers are evaluated on an attitudinal survey completed by their peers. The survey carries different weights in the calculation of performance pay at the three levels of school roles: Career, Mentor or Master Teacher. In addition, Master and Mentor Teachers are paid for additional days beyond the school year, p. 31.

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 adequately meets the Core Element 1 criteria by providing a plan for communication to teachers, administrators, and other school personnel the components of its PBCS.

The applicant developed a skillful plan for educators for obtaining input and articulating the components of the PBCS. After potential school sites were identified by an exploratory committee in each district, representatives met with site teachers and staff on two occasions. Then a group of teachers from the candidate school made site visits to an existing TAP school for observation and discussion. These teachers reported back to their school site colleagues. A vote was then taken, with the requirement that at least 75% must vote for participation, p. 44. This input and study of teachers from the selected sites allows opportunities for buy-in and ownership. The use of quarterly newsletters was discussed, 56, but the method of communicating with the community-at-large needs more specificity.

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:

The applicant adequately meets the Core Element 2 criteria for involvement and support of teachers, principals, other personnel, and unions.

The applicant specifies that a number of teachers and principals from across partner districts were involved in the deliberations on the amount of the base performance awards. The agreement of 75% of the school staff were required, p. 44. Teacher unions were also included and written support was obtained, pp. 44.

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 adequately meets the Core Element 3 criteria by including an objective, evidence-based rubric aligned with professional teaching or leadership standards, multiple observations for teachers and principals, the collection of additional evidence, and the assurance of inter-rater reliability.

The use of 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 was not discussed.

The applicant offers a transparent, unbiased PBCS system with multiple measures of determining effectiveness of teachers and principals. Teachers/principals are evaluated for PBCS using 50% for student growth using the Colorado Growth Percentiles Model, the remaining balance using an objective, evidence based observation rubric aligned with professional standards that includes 4-5 observations for teachers and 2-3 observations for principals. These observations are conducted by trained evaluators.

While the applicant reports that the second 50% basis for judging teacher effectiveness will be based largely on 4-6 classroom observations of teaching performance over the school year by members of the leadership team, it does not include additional forms of evidence, p. 30.

The applicant provided detailed information about inter-rater reliability. The TAP school leadership team compares inter-rater reliability of scoring and works to develop increased effectiveness and consistency at evaluating and shaping effective classroom instruction, p. 26. Certification training on the TAP rubric and ongoing checks for inter-rater reliability across the TAP school leadership team will be used to help to ensure that TAP evaluations are rigorous, fair, and reliable, p. 30.

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 adequately meets the Core Element 4 criteria by including a plan to implement, a data-management system that can link student achievement data to teacher and principal payroll and human resources systems.

These systems will be able to provide an array of data-driven information to use for the PBCS, p. 47. The applicant details the plan to call for using a board approved intergovernmental agreement concerning linkages of the data system to educator payroll and for data sharing so that partners can analyze data trends to make decisions about needed programming and services for students, teachers and administrators, p. 44. The applicant is working closely with the Arizona Department of Education who will be the repository of partner district data. A complimentary effort is being conducted by the Arizona Department Education and Arizona State University (partners with the applicant)

to build an operational teacher-tracking system in partner district to use the CGM (student growth) value-added data system.

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 adequately meets the Core Element 5 criteria by providing details that ensure 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.

All of these efforts will have the sites use their data to improve their practice. The applicant is in the process of developing a system called Data Wise, initially supported by Teacher Quality Program funding, to ensure that teachers and principals understand the value-added data and how to use formative data to guide instruction. This WEB 2.0 systems will make both the data and the professional development services available, p. 45. The professional development plan, currently in the development phase, begins with a Ready-for Rigor-Support Center with a director and 12 regional master teacher leaders funded by the TQP grant. Each of these teachers will support a number of TAP schools. They are being intensively trained in the TAP rubric and the Data Wise data tracking program. Additional plans include training for first year TAP leadership teams, on-site technical assistance and formal TAP school inspections, p. 47.

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 applicant adequately meets the Evaluation Criteria of High Quality Professional Development.

The PBCS thoroughly described the PBCS and is based on the needs of the high-needs schools. The applicant will work with partner districts to provide targeted, customized, down to the teacher professional development support for teachers and principals that fail to meet performance standards as well as those that excel and wish to grow in leadership, p. 39.

The applicant will provide data-driven, targeted professional development to assist struggling teachers and principals with particular effort offered to those in hard-to-staff schools, subjects, and areas and also provide enrichment and advancement professional development support to highly successful teachers/principals, p. 58.

In combination with high levels of student data access through the WEB 2.0 data portal, TAP school teachers and administrators are trained in Data Wise to enable them to better use formative data to guide day-to-day teaching for student mastery, p. 58.

They use data formatively to improve implementation and impact while collaborating with Mathematica to ensure the strength of design and analysis, p. 60.

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:

While only 2% of teachers were reported teaching out of subject in the district, these data understate the shortage of teachers in hard-to-staff subjects like middle school and science. A number of partner districts reported that their middle school grades are being taught as self-contained classrooms because they are unable to find highly qualified teachers in the appropriate subject areas, p. 5.

The 59 targeted schools report a collective annual teacher turnover of 19%, p. 5. This is a high annual turnover and shows the need.

The High Needs Documentation spreadsheet used to identify the potential district partners in this grant indicates lack of academic success. Most are in Tier III Restructuring under NCLB. These schools are among the lowest performing schools in the state, p. 5.

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not offer comparable schools for comparisons.

The applicant does not offer a definition of comparable.

Reader's Score: 7

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 applicant describes a well designed process and significant input from the stakeholders in the deliberation of the PBCS bonuses. The applicant reports that the PBCS bonuses were collectively discussed and calculated by the applicant partners as well as the partner districts based on current salaries in the state. With much input and collaboration during the deliberations, the applicant believes that the proposed PBCS is substantive enough to promote change while reasonable enough to be sustainable across time after funding ends pp. 33-35. In the TAP system, 50% of the basis for judging teacher effectiveness will come from the calculation of the value-added impact of teachers on student academic growth. The Colorado Growth Percentiles Model (CGM) is the value-added methodology. The CGM uses standardized test data to measure change in student achievement over time and to make predictions about future growth. An individual student's progress, expressed as a percentile, is compared to peers throughout the state who have similar testing histories in the same subject areas tested. In the Ready-for-Rigor TAP schools, the other 50% basis for judging teacher effectiveness will be based largely on 4-6 classroom observations of teaching performance over the school year by members of the leadership team. The final basis for determining teachers performance based compensation is the consideration of their extra responsibilities and the extent of their individual contributions to TAP school functioning. All teachers in a TAP school are evaluated on an attitudinal survey completed by peers. The survey carries different weights in the calculation of performance pay for teachers at the three levels of TAP school leadership.

The applicant explained the plan for obtaining input and articulating the components of the PBCS. After potential school sites were identified by exploratory committee in each district, representatives met with site teachers and staff on two occasions. Then a group of teachers from the candidate school made site visits to an existing TAP school for observation and discussion. These teachers reported back to their school site colleagues. p. 44.

The applicant reports that a number of teachers and principals from across partner districts were involved in the deliberations on the amount of the base performance awards. Teacher unions were also included and written support was obtained, p. 44.

The applicant offers a description of a transparent, unbiased PBCS system with multiple measures of determining effectiveness of teachers and principals. Teachers/principals are evaluated for PBCS using 50% for student growth using the Colorado Growth Percentiles Model, the remaining balance using an objective, evidence based observation rubrics aligned with professional standards that includes 4-5 observations for teachers and 2-3 observations for principals. These observations are conducted by trained evaluators, p. 28.

The plan calls linkages of the data system to educator payroll and for data sharing so that partners can analyze data trends to make decisions about needed programming and services for students, teachers and administrators, p. 44. The applicant is working closely with the Arizona Department of Education who will be the repository of partner district data. These systems will be able to provide an array of data-driven information to use for the PBCS, p. 47.

The applicant details the professional development plan to begin with a Ready for Rigor Support Center with a director and 12 regional master teacher leaders funded by the TQP grant. Each of these teachers will support a number of TAP schools. Additional plans include training for first year TAP leadership teams, on-site technical assistance and formal TAP school inspections p. 47. All of these efforts will have the sites use their data to improve their practice.

Weaknesses:

Additional information about professional development to increase the content knowledge of the educator is needed to clarify this discussion, pp. 21-27.

Reader's Score: 56

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 (called work plan by the applicant) is detailed and thorough outlining the responsibilities (called activities), timelines, milestones and responsible personnel. Many components are already in place with the assistance of Teacher Quality Program funding, pp. 55-60.

The project director has had experience in carrying out another statewide TAP initiative and was recommended by one of the anchor partners. Other key personnel have expertise in their area of responsibilities, web management, budget, and value-added data systems. The master teachers went through a thorough selection process and were endorsed by district partner leadership.

The applicant provides for funding already in hand from the TQP grant and from cost sharing of partner districts (which will cost up to 52% of the total PBCS costs) over the grant period.

The applicant is offering a budget that is sufficient and reasonable as performance awards comprise 71% of the budget while 29% includes all other expenditures including professional development, support center costs, web data tracking system and program evaluation, pp. 53-54.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 25

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 applicant displays clearly measurable performance objects related to the goals of the project for Objective 1: raising student performance (1 1/2 year of growth per year), increasing effectiveness of teachers (to at least a TAP index of 3.5 by the third year), and increasing principal effectiveness (to a rating of Exceeds as measured by student achievement, observational and survey indicators by the third year). For Objective 2: the applicant will use targeted, higher than average pay for performance bonuses; targeted technology-enabled, and district-based principal/teacher preparation programs to recruit, and retain highly effective principals and teachers in the hard-to-staff schools and areas, thus eliminating key educator shortages, pp 11, 14.

The data will be quantitative (student growth percentiles, attendance, etc.) and qualitative (observations, surveys, reports), pp. 11-14. This was clearly noted by the applicant.

These include adequate evaluation procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

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 will use the Colorado Growth Percentiles Model (CGM) as their value-added methodology to measure the impact of student growth as a significant factor in calculation differentiated levels of compensation provide to teachers, principals and other personnel. The CGM uses standardized test data to measure change in student achievement over time and to make predictions about future growth, p. 29.

The plan calls for providing an array of data-driven information to use for the PBCS. A board approved intergovernmental agreement concerning linkages of the data system to educator payroll and for data sharing so that partners can analyze data trends to make decisions about needed programming and services for students, teachers and administrators, p. 44. The applicant is working closely with the Arizona Department of Education who will be the respository of partner district data. A complimentary effort is being conducted by the ADE and Arizona State University (partners with the applicant) to build an operational teacher-tracking system in partner district to use the CGM value-added data system, p. 47.

The applicant is in the process of developing a system called Data Wise, initially supported by Teacher Quality Program funding, to ensure that teachers and principals understand the value-added data and how to use formative data to guide instruction. This WEB 2.0 system will make both the data and the professional development services available, p. 45. The professional development plan begins with a Support Center with a director and 12 regional master teacher leaders funded by the TQP grant. Each of these teachers will support a number of TAP schools. They are being intensively trained in the TAP rubric and the Data Wise data tracking program. Additional plans include training for first year TAP leadership teams, on-site technical assistance and formal TAP school inspections p. 47. All of these efforts will have the sites use their data to improve their practice.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were found.

Reader's Score: 5

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:

All of these students are in high needs schools. Most of which are in tier 3 of school improvement. These students live in poverty, are predominately Hispanic or American Indian. Many are English Language Learners. High dropout rates and low graduation rates are an on-going issue, p. 4.

The applicant hopes to retain or fill vacancies with teachers of those subject or specialty areas who are effective. The applicant will offer a targeted performance bonus that is 67% higher than the base performance bonus for all other teachers, p. 42. The applicant will offer grow-your-own teacher and principal certification programs that are being implemented in collaboration with Arizona State University, an anchor partner, p. 42

In planning for the teacher needs for the PBCS, the applicant efficiently used a survey tool to pinpoint areas of need. This survey data from partner district leaders indicated that the current areas of need are for highly qualified teachers in the middle and high school math and science. A second area of need was for special education teachers. The applicant will continue to survey district leaders during the course of the grant to determine current areas of need, pp 35-36.

The applicant will use the WEB 2.0 data system to provide partner and district educators with information about hard to staff areas and schools that provide higher performance incentives, p. 43.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 5

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 8/6/10 4:02 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 8/6/10 4:02 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Arizona Board of Regents for and on behalf of Arizona State University -- Mary Lou Farmer Teachers College, (S385A100077)

Reader #2: *****

Points Possible Points Scored

Questions

Evaluation Criteria

Absolute Priority 1

1. Absolute Priority 1	0	0
------------------------	---	---

Absolute Priority 2

1. Absolute Priority 2	0	0
------------------------	---	---

Sub Total	0	0
------------------	----------	----------

Evaluaton Criteria

Absolute Priority 3

1. Absolute Priority 3	0	0
------------------------	---	---

Sub Total	0	0
------------------	----------	----------

Requirement

Requirement

1. Requirement	0	0
----------------	---	---

Sub Total	0	0
------------------	----------	----------

Evaluation Criteria

Core Element 1

1. Core Element 1	0	0
-------------------	---	---

Core Element 2

1. Core Element 2	0	0
-------------------	---	---

Core Element 3

1. Core Element 3	0	0
-------------------	---	---

Core Element 4

1. Core Element 4	0	0
-------------------	---	---

Core Element 5

1. Core Element 5	0	0
-------------------	---	---

High Quality Professional Development

1. Professional Development	0	0
-----------------------------	---	---

Sub Total	0	0
------------------	----------	----------

Selection Criteria

Need for the Project

1. Need for Project	10	8
---------------------	----	---

Project Design

1.Project Design	60	54
Adequacy of Support for the Proposed Project		
1.Adequacy of Support	25	21
Quality of Local Evaluation		
1.Quality of Local Eval.	5	4
Sub Total	100	87

Priority Questions

Priority Preference

Competitive Preference Priority 1

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

Competitive Preference Priority 2

1.Competitive Priority 2	5	4
--------------------------	---	---

Sub Total	10	7
------------------	----	---

Total	110	94
--------------	-----	----

Technical Review Form

Panel #6 - Panel - 6: 84.385A

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: Arizona Board of Regents for and on behalf of Arizona State University -- Mary Lou Farmer Teachers College, (S385A100077)

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 demonstrates adequate evidence to meet this Absolute Priority. The applicant discusses the use of the TAP system of evaluating teacher and principal effectiveness through the use of several different measures including student achievement, observations, and peer ratings (p. 32). Half of the performance based compensation is dependent upon teacher contributions to academic growth in students, which gives significant weight to student growth. The chart on page 33 provides evidence that the incentive amounts are substantial and a reasonable explanation of the purpose of establishing these amounts is included. It is primarily based upon the academic performance of students in past years along with other risk factors identified by the applicant.

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 meets the minimum requirements for addressing this Absolute Priority. The applicant has provided an estimate of the costs associated with the project and illustrates information regarding cost-sharing with partner districts in future years (p. 54). On page 36, the applicant provides a schedule of the percentages of non-TIF funds to be paid by the partner districts. Further descriptions of how these costs will be absorbed by the partner districts would be beneficial and guarantee non-TIF funds would be used to provide an increasing share of performance-based compensation to teachers.

Reader's Score: 0

Evaluation 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 minimally meets this priority, however, tenure was not discussed. The proposed PBCS demonstrates an effort to increase teacher effectiveness through connections to teacher and administrator preparation programs, an emphasis on data analysis and data-driven decision making, and multiple avenues of gauging teacher effectiveness (p. 30, 41).

Specific details regarding data use to analyze and provide professional development would strengthen this section (p. 39-41). Likewise, a concrete plan of how the applicant plans to carry out decisions regarding retention and tenure would also be beneficial in addressing this priority.

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. An explanation of the role of Master Teachers is provided on page 36. Further, the applicant discusses the inclusion of a peer survey in determining financial awards, part of which indicates the contributions of teachers to effective school functioning (p. 31). The responsibility survey carries different weights in the calculation of performance pay depending on the teacher level (p. 32). Further details of how such responsibilities are available to all teachers and leaders would strengthen this component.

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 demonstrates adequate evidence to meet this Core Element. The applicant plans to use a variety of mechanisms to communicate the components of the performance based compensation system including the online portal system, committee meetings, and quarterly newsletters (p. 43, p. 56). Multiple communication avenues increase the likelihood of staff and community awareness and understanding of the compensation system. Details regarding the use of Web 2.0 and quarterly newsletters to facilitate such communication could be further developed to provide compelling evidence of effective communication strategies.

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:

The applicant adequately addresses the criteria for Core Element 2. The applicant describes the process by which sites decided to participate in the TAP (p. 43-44). Further evidence of support for the performance awards can be seen on page 44 as the applicant explains how written support was secured through both local teacher associations and participating district leadership.

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:

Core Element 3 is adequately addressed. The applicant plans to use data from multiple sources including a rubric and four to six observations per year performed by leaders trained in identifying effective teaching practices (p. 30). The applicant indicates that checks for inter-rater reliability will be performed, but provides little specific details on how such procedures will take place (p. 30). Measures of student performance on statewide tests along with classroom observations and peer ratings demonstrate the plan for collecting and evaluating multiple forms of evidence (p. 32).

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 adequately demonstrates evidence to meet this Core Element. The applicant plans to incorporate a longitudinal data system to link student achievement with specific teachers over time. On page 44, the applicant indicates the presence of a board-approved intergovernmental agreement concerning linkages of the data system to educator payroll to encourage data sharing and joint trend analysis between the organizations and partner district. Such opportunities encourage collaboration and sharing of relevant data to analyze issues related to student performance.

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 appropriately addresses the criteria for Core Element 5, although the proposed components are still in the planning process. The applicant has not yet developed a comprehensive plan for ensuring that teachers and principals understand the specific measures of effectiveness included in the PBCS and will receive relevant professional development. As noted on page 45, such a plan is currently being crafted to make both the data and professional development services accessible.

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 applicant adequately addresses this requirement. The applicant suggests that plans are in progress to connect professional development needs and opportunities with specific data collected (p. 45). Such processes will enable the applicant to discern areas of need and target interventions to support the critical areas identified for each staff member.

Plans to address already identified needs, such as those in middle school math and science, are not clearly articulated.

The applicant proposes to use both face to face meetings and Web 2.0 to establish channels for disseminating professional development to teachers and leaders (p. 45).

Using multiple mechanisms to provide professional development increases accessibility to high quality training for all staff.

More specific details outlining how support will be provided to teachers not receiving compensation under the PBCS and how professional development will be assessed are lacking.

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:

On page 5, the applicant addresses the issue of staffing in hard-to-staff subjects in explaining that while data show only two percent of teachers reported as teaching out of their subject areas. However, many teachers in middle grades are teaching in self-contained classrooms because the availability of highly qualified teachers in each subject is limited. This presents a challenge in terms of subject matter expertise and speaks to the issue of recruiting teachers in areas such as math and science in the middle school.

Overall indicators of low student performance across the state are included in the form of references to NAEP (p. 1). The collective teacher turnover rate of 19% across the 59 targeted schools also speaks to the need in terms of retaining high quality teachers (p. 5).

The applicant provides evidence of need in terms of student achievement beginning on page 4. The data demonstrates that the targeted schools have experienced challenges in raising student achievement as many are in restructuring. Additionally, the applicant provides data to show the poverty levels within each of the regions to further illustrate the economic situation within the proposed schools (p. 4).

The included survey responses add additional perspective to the issue of teacher quality as the self-report reveals that both teacher and principal effectiveness are seen as low. Key indicators of effectiveness are lacking in terms of professional development, quality leadership, and consistency in motivation (p. 6-7). Further evidence of challenges the target schools have experienced in attracting and retaining teachers can be seen as the applicant explains that lack of access to high quality professional development due to the remote locations of many of the schools prohibits many teachers and administrators from accessing the tools that are necessary to improve (p. 5).

Weaknesses:

The survey provides additional insight into some of the challenges surrounding teacher and leader effectiveness, but it is somewhat unclear how the responses were obtained or the summaries were crafted given the large number of schools participating in the survey (p. 6-7).

The applicant does not provide an explicit definition of a comparable school for the purpose of comparing aspects of student achievement. While the applicant provides overall information regarding school improvement status, content specific student achievement data on the state assessment would further enhance this section and provide evidence to support a need in hard-to-staff or specialty areas.

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:

The applicant proposes a value-added model to use standardized test data to measure change in student achievement over time and make predictions about future growth and connect student scores with teachers through a longitudinal teacher tracking data system (p. 29).

On page 37, the applicant indicates plans over time to use a teacher evaluation system. Within this system, 50 percent of the indicators are based on measuring the value-added contribution of the teacher to student achievement growth.

On page 30, the applicant provides information regarding the components of assessing teacher effectiveness. With both student achievement data and information obtained through several classroom observations throughout the course of the year, multiple data sources will be considered in assessing effectiveness, which increases the opportunities to accurately gauge the impact of the teacher in the classroom (p. 30). The use of the TAP rubric increases the likelihood of implementing a fair evaluation system with expectations and levels of performance standardized for all teachers (p. 32).

The applicant provides information to suggest that teachers and principals from across the districts were included in the development process and will likely be motivated by the proposed bonus structure (p. 33). With the potential to earn over 20 percent of an annual salary, it is unreasonable to suggest that the bonus structure will motivate teachers to remain working in the participating districts (p. 35).

The applicant plans to use data to identify needs in terms of professional development and utilize various delivery mechanisms to provide such opportunities for teachers (p. 39). The data portal system will support various aspects of the project including enhancing teacher knowledge necessary for data-driven decision making (p. 41).

Weaknesses:

The applicant references a longitudinal data tracking system, but does not specifically connect this system to payroll and human resource systems, so it is unclear how the data generated will be used to calculate differentiated pay among staff.

While the use of a peer survey incorporates multiple perspectives in terms of teacher effectiveness, the extent to which this particular component represents a fair and impartial analysis of teacher attitudes and behaviors is not certain (p. 31). Since consideration is given to the extra responsibilities of teachers and their individual contributions to school functioning, it may be helpful to define how those responsibilities are delineated and how contribution to school functioning under this component will be measured (p. 31).

The applicant mentions plans to connect data and decisions regarding professional development (p. 38). However, given the identified need of staffing middle and high school math and science classrooms, the applicant does not provide detailed information to support sustained professional development in these areas that would allow teachers to gain knowledge and skills necessary to excel in the classroom and increase effectiveness as determined by the evaluation rubrics.

Reader's Score: 54

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 provides a detailed work plan with clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and major milestones for accomplishing project tasks which indicates evidence of thorough planning and attention to details necessary to result in effective implementation (p. 55-60).

Relevant experience of the Executive Director of the project is included indicating the ability to carry out all necessary responsibilities (p. 52). The rigorous process by which the twelve Regional Executive Master Teacher Leaders were selected is referenced which also supports adequate leadership necessary to carry out the project (p. 52-53).

Plans for cost sharing by partner districts are included, and connections to the previously awarded TQP grant are included which increases the likelihood of sustainability (p. 54). The applicant plans to provide service to fifty-nine schools and connect project components with another grant to reduce overhead experiences in the current project (p. 54).

The requested grant amount and project costs are sufficient to attain project goals given the assumption that districts will be able to absorb costs over time (p. 54). The included schedule of cost internalization provides some evidence of effective financial planning (p. 54).

Weaknesses:

While the applicant indicates cost-sharing by partner districts, concrete evidence of how such funding will be secured by each partner district is not provided (p. 54).

Connections to outside organizations and potential in-kind contributions would strengthen this section.

Reader's Score: 21

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 applicant includes a thorough description of the objectives and corresponding outcomes with a plan for measuring and collecting related data demonstrating measurable performance objectives in increasing student achievement and teacher effectiveness (p. 11-15).

The applicant provides information on selecting control sites based on similar demographics and scores to help isolate components that may lead to improvement as determined by the desired outcomes stated by the applicant (p. 15).

The applicant provides information related to the use of a variety of tools in order to collect data (p. 18). Qualitative and quantitative data collection will aid the process of analyzing data to determine program effectiveness (p. 18). Specific examples of tests analyses that will be performed to evaluate the program help clarify how the data will be used and how the evaluation procedures will provide feedback for future improvement (p. 20).

The inclusion of research questions and methods to address each of them helps illustrate the adequacy of the evaluation procedures for ensuring feedback related to specific components in the project (p. 19-20).

Weaknesses:

How the proposed evaluation procedures will ensure continuous improvement during the life of the project is unclear. That is, more specificity related to how the quantitative and qualitative data collected will ensure feedback and continuous improvement throughout the project is needed.

Reader's Score: 4

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 explains the complex data system that has been used and will be expanded to support the value-added model proposed in the application (p. 29). Reference is made to research that supports the use of the Colorado Growth Percentiles Model (CGM) along with a need to continue evaluation and refinement of the system (p. 29). The longitudinal teacher tracking data system allows for the possibility of comparing student performance across intervals of time and generating data that could be used to improve classroom practices.

Weaknesses:

The applicant mentions a longitudinal tracking system within the CGM, but does not provide a thorough explanation of how this information will result in the proposed value-added model measuring student growth over time and thus, being used to calculate differentiated levels of compensation to teachers, principals, and other personnel (p. 29). A detailed discussion of how the teachers will be trained to use the data generated to improve classroom performance was not included. Some mention of this is provided on page 41, but a more comprehensive account of specific examples would help clarify the implementation plans.

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 applicant indicates that middle and high school math and science have been particularly hard to staff as evidenced by the number of secondary teachers teaching in self-contained classrooms (p. 5). To address this need the applicant includes a proposed bonus amount of \$5000 solely for this purpose (p. 33). The PBCS is designed to serve high need students as indicated in the descriptions of the student populations and past academic performance in the partner districts. Coordination with teacher and principal preparation programs increases opportunities to develop effective teachers and leaders, and performance bonuses reflect increases in student achievement (p. 21).

Weaknesses:

The applicant could elaborate more on the extent to which there is a process for determining that a teacher filling a vacancy is effective.

Reader's Score: 4

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 8/6/10 4:02 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 8/6/10 4:02 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Arizona Board of Regents for and on behalf of Arizona State University -- Mary Lou Farmer Teachers College, (S385A100077)

Reader #3: *****

Points Possible Points Scored

Questions

Evaluation Criteria

Absolute Priority 1

1. Absolute Priority 1	0	0
------------------------	---	---

Absolute Priority 2

1. Absolute Priority 2	0	0
------------------------	---	---

Sub Total	0	0
------------------	----------	----------

Evaluaton Criteria

Absolute Priority 3

1. Absolute Priority 3	0	0
------------------------	---	---

Sub Total	0	0
------------------	----------	----------

Requirement

Requirement

1. Requirement	0	0
----------------	---	---

Sub Total	0	0
------------------	----------	----------

Evaluation Criteria

Core Element 1

1. Core Element 1	0	0
-------------------	---	---

Core Element 2

1. Core Element 2	0	0
-------------------	---	---

Core Element 3

1. Core Element 3	0	0
-------------------	---	---

Core Element 4

1. Core Element 4	0	0
-------------------	---	---

Core Element 5

1. Core Element 5	0	0
-------------------	---	---

High Quality Professional Development

1. Professional Development	0	0
-----------------------------	---	---

Sub Total	0	0
------------------	----------	----------

Selection Criteria

Need for the Project

1. Need for Project	10	8
---------------------	----	---

Project Design

1.Project Design	60	55
Adequacy of Support for the Proposed Project		
1.Adequacy of Support	25	21
Quality of Local Evaluation		
1.Quality of Local Eval.	5	3
Sub Total	100	87

Priority Questions

Priority Preference

Competitive Preference Priority 1

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

Competitive Preference Priority 2

1.Competitive Priority 2	5	4
--------------------------	---	---

Sub Total	10	8
------------------	----	---

Total	110	95
--------------	-----	----

Technical Review Form

Panel #6 - Panel - 6: 84.385A

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: Arizona Board of Regents for and on behalf of Arizona State University -- Mary Lou Farmer Teachers College, (S385A100077)

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:

This priority has been met. Differentiated levels of compensation are included in the application (p.33) and appear to be sufficiently justified. Half of the compensation is based on teacher contributions to student academic growth and half is based on other variables including observations, peer ratings and contributions to school functioning (p. 30). Teachers in non-tested grades and subjects are accounted for 50% of overall school growth (p.32). Principals and assistant principals will be awarded based on school achievement, observations and survey data (p.32).

Additional details are needed related to the description (p.35) regarding "The Ready-for-Rigor Project leaders might elect to distribute these unpaid award amounts to teachers." Details regarding the financial situation were lacking specificity.

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 adequately meets the requirements of this priority. Costs are projected and use of non-TIF funds has been described. The percents of funding to come from local or other grant sources are described on page 36. The use of the phrase, "barring complete financial calamity" is open to a wide range of possibilities. Specific details about what will occur to the proposed program in the event of reduced funding would have clarified this section.

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 minimally met this priority. A data warehouse will provide ready, FERPA-compliant access to data for use in instructional improvement. Professional development activities will be provided by the participating anchor institutions based on the needs identified (p.40).

There is a lack of concrete planning for using the data for retention and tenure decisions.

Of interest is the notion that if the PD efforts do not bring teachers up to the desired level, the teachers will be replaced (p.42). However, there is no attention given to analysis of the delivery and impact of the PD to hold the PD delivery system accountable for its output.

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 in that there is a monetary incentive for educators to take on additional responsibilities and leadership roles (p.33). For example, Master Teachers proposed amount is \$7000 compared to teachers of \$3000. However, the master teachers are to work an additional 20 days. This is 1 month of work for \$4000. In addition, the Master Teachers are to serve on the leadership team. For mentor teachers, the difference in award from teachers is just \$1000 yet the mentor teachers must work an additional 10 days. Although numerous references are made to the rates being established by multiple stakeholders, it is unclear that these rates of award are sufficient to account for payment for the extra days worked and an incentive award (p.33).

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:

Core element 1 is met. By including teachers, administrators and school staff in the planning of the system, the initial phase of a communication system have been established. Methods of communicating the plan to the public at large are not clearly established. For example, newsletters are mentioned on page 56 but it is unclear if the documents are for staff or the community at large.

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:

Core element 2 has been met. Agreement by at least 75% of the staff was required (p.44). This means that at the schools to be involved in the project, staff agreement has been obtained.

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:

This core element has been met. The evaluation system for teachers and principals is clearly stated and includes classroom observations at multiple points throughout the year. Rubrics will be used for the observations and inter-rater reliability will be sought through training and calibration. (p.30)

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:

Core element 4 is met in that the linkage between the payroll data and student data is attested to on page 44. Greater specificity related to the actual details of this linkage would enhance this section.

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:

Core element 5 is adequately addressed. The applicant states that PD programs and services are being developed to ensure teacher and principal understanding of data use (p. 45).

Through the information provided in this application, it is possible to say that the applicant recognizes the need for staff development in the use of data. Additional details regarding the professional development plan would have provided additional clarity as to what specifically will occur.

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:

This criteria has been met in that professional development is to be based on assessed needs, targeted to individuals and is to provide tools for use by those not qualifying to receive incentive pay.

The applicant has proposed a multi-level support structure to ensure full fidelity of implementation (p.45). Plans are to implement "grow your own" teacher and principal certification. The staffing of a support center has been established and includes Regional Master Teacher Leaders who have already been employed through a different grant (TQP). These individuals will be assigned schools in particular regions of the state. A menu of training will be provided that will include training for school leadership teams, on-site technical assistance and formal TAP school inspections (p.47). Training will include structured fiscal management support to districts, one-on-one budgetary expertise and assistance in transitioning to national common core standards. These strategies will will train sites to independently manage projects (p.48).

Specificity about what professional development will be provided to increase teachers' content knowledge would have provided additional clarification within this application. Details concerning the specific professional development that would occur were not provided and that detracted from the overall emphasis on what would occur in this area.

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 applicant has clearly communicated the need for the project. Data are presented regarding demographics, economics, educational funding, and school AYP status (pp. 1-4). These data attest to the high needs status of the schools. A spreadsheet containing individual school data is presented in the appendix and the information provided was helpful. The applicant was forward thinking in administering a survey to target districts regarding the schools' status on the components of school effectiveness.

Weaknesses:

Within the school effectiveness component survey, results marked as "high variation in responses across district leaders" need more explanation. These statements appear unclear and do not support "high variation".

No details were provided regarding potential consideration of re-administering this same survey in future years. Using the instrument in the future could provide helpful comparisons to the baseline information.

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:

The project design is well thought out and clearly communicated (pp. 21-49). It covers the major required elements of TIF.

The design addresses three (3) broad objectives in a clear and concise manner. The program design adds multiple elements to the PBCS in addition to the Colorado Growth Model. The added elements allow the proposed design to qualify as value added. The proposed program leverages resources.

Throughout the application, the applicant states that they have obtained agreement forms from the participating schools and districts for a variety of responsibilities including the obligation to establish scheduled time for teachers to plan together.

Weaknesses:

The meaning of the acronym "TAP" was not provided in the application.

While professional development activities are described, additional information about programs to increase teacher content knowledge would help to provide additional details to clarify the professional development within the overall plan for TIF programming.

Reader's Score: 55

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:

Support for the project has been indicated by the 59 proposed schools. In addition, financial support has been pledged by all but one district (that district will participate in the national evaluation). The pledge of financial support increases the share of the financial burden for districts from 10% in year 1 to 75% in year 4 and 100% in year 5 and beyond.

The applicant indicates having been inclusive in the planning process and including the recommendations of various stakeholders in the proposed plan (p.24-25).

As mentioned throughout the application, school staff members were required to approve participation in the project at a level of 75% or higher (p.24).

Weaknesses:

It is unclear, from the information presented in this application, that the applicant has given consideration to maintaining support in the event of future staff changes at the district and/or school levels. This section would be enhanced by including that provision.

Detailed information concerning the number of teachers, principals and district staff included on the planning team were lacking.

Reader's Score: 21

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 evaluation design is thorough in the elements to be measured. The establishment of timelines and responsibilities is adequate.

Weaknesses:

The design would benefit from additional specificity to assure that certain elements do not get lost. For example, for Objective 1, part a, one measure is that "All 59 schools receive teacher induction support and targeted teacher and administrator professional development (including data usage training and tools)." The "when" is "quarterly review." With this particular measurement, the upfront identification of items to be reviewed were lacking. For example, sign-in sheets from PD sessions, session evaluation forms, etc. This reviewer questions what the quarterly review will consist of and whether quarterly review will be adequate to meet the proposed program goals.

The local evaluation is to be conducted by a department at the applicant's university. In the absence of an external evaluator, an external review board comprised of experts in evaluation is recommended. The board could review all aspects of the evaluation thereby lessening the possible perception of bias.

Reader's Score: 3

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:

Throughout the application the applicant proposes using a State growth model in combination with other factors such as observations and other school activities to create a system that can be considered value added.

Weaknesses:

Further information detailing the State's system would be of assistance in determining what is meant by "value added" in this application (p.29).

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:

There will be extra incentive for effective teachers in both hard to staff locations and hard to staff subjects (p.35). Various stakeholders from districts were involved in establishing the effective incentive rates.

Weaknesses:

Because subjects in high demand include high school and middle school math and science (p. 35) it would be helpful to know how the content knowledge of teachers will be increased to the point at which they are considered highly qualified to teach these subjects.

Reader's Score: 4

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 8/6/10 4:02 PM