

Status: Submitted

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

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** Board of Education of Washington County -- Office of System Development,  
(S385A100080)

**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
------------------------	---	---

<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
------------------	----------	----------

#### Evaluation Criteria

##### Absolute Priority 3

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

<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
------------------	----------	----------

### Requirement

#### Requirement

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

<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
------------------	----------	----------

### 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
-----------------------------	---	---

<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
------------------	----------	----------

### Selection Criteria

#### Need for the Project

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

#### Project Design

1.Project Design	60	50
<b>Adequacy of Support for the Proposed Project</b>		
1.Adequacy of Support	25	15
<b>Quality of Local Evaluation</b>		
1.Quality of Local Eval.	5	4
<b>Sub Total</b>	100	77

**Priority Questions**

**Priority Preference**

**Competitive Preference Priority 1**

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

**Competitive Preference Priority 2**

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

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

<b>Total</b>	110	84
--------------	-----	----

## Technical Review Form

Panel #6 - Panel - 6: 84.385A

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

Applicant: Board of Education of Washington County -- Office of System Development,  
(S385A100080)

### 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 partially meets the Absolute Priority 1.

The applicant provides clear details indicating that the PBCS that the district will develop during the first planning year, Performance Outcomes with Effective Rewards (POWER), will be designed to reward effective teachers and school-based administrators at high-need schools who raise levels of, and maintain, high standards for student achievement. The district will contract with a consultant to work with senior school system leadership to develop a performance-based compensation system and a plan for implementation that centers on intensive, distributed professional development for teachers, administrators, supervisors, and curriculum specialists, p. 17. This Performance-Based Compensation System (PBCS) for teachers and administrators will be piloted at five high-need schools to increase educator effectiveness and student achievement as measured by student growth. The pilot schools were selected based on their identification as a high-need school with fifty percent or more of its enrollment from low-income families, based on eligibility for the Free and Reduced Meals Program (FARM),

p. 2. The program will be voluntary for teachers at targeted schools, p. 11.

The applicant creatively uses the new Education Reform Act of 2010 in Maryland to align with their application for this PBCS. The law establishes that changes in student growth will become a significant factor in the evaluation of teachers and principals. The applicant will use this law as a model for the to-be-developed TIF PBCS. The student growth component will be fifty percent of the evaluation for teachers and principals, 7.

The applicant also details that participating teachers and administrators will be assessed, by internal and external assessors, at least two times per year to measure their effectiveness in creating environments which prioritizes student achievement. Also, the applicant notes that participating administrators and their evaluators will participate in specific professional development to build knowledge of, and competence with, each standard evaluated. In addition, the evaluation of teachers will include at least these four components: planning and preparation, classroom environment, instruction, and professional responsibility. For principals, the evaluation will include at least the eight standards for instructional leadership set forth in the Maryland Instructional Leadership Framework, p 27. The applicant clearly states that fifty percent of principal effectiveness will be based on student growth, pp. 7 and 30-31. The applicant states that the levels of effectiveness in the PBCS will be Highly Effective, Effective, or Ineffective, p. 8. The following preliminary incentives are proposed to be awarded to participating educators: \$5,000 annually to Highly Effective or Effective principals, \$5,000 annually to Highly Effective or Effective teachers, and an additional \$5,000 annually to principals and teachers who have been identified as Highly Effective or Effective and continue this leadership role in their targeted high-need schools, pp. 34-35.

The applicant does not provide justification for the level of incentive amounts chosen. The applicant did not discuss additional measures to be used to increase the effectiveness of teachers and principals in the schools.

**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 partially meets the Absolute Priority 2 criteria.

The applicant has detailed the projected costs associated with the project, p. e5-6 (Budget Summary) and based on the success of the POWER program in the 5 year pilot program, the district is committed to expanding the POWER program to schools throughout the district, p 35.

The applicant outlines the reports that the district share of performance-based compensation pay will increase each year up to a 40% match in year five of the grant. The district recognizes the importance of securing multiple, diverse funding streams to support the expansion of the POWER program, and expects to obtain funding through the general operating fund, foundation support, and cost savings realized through efficiencies. The main source of funding beyond the grant years will come from the general operating budget of the district. The Maryland Education Reform Act of 2010 will provide additional resources and tools to expand the POWER program system-wide and sustain the program after the grant project years, p. 35.

Additional details concerning use of funding sources is needed.

**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 partially meets the Absolute Priority 3 criteria.

The applicant details a proposed PBCS that contains the following goals: 1) increase teacher and administrator effectiveness and, thereby improve student achievement, by offering extensive professional development, 2) develop teacher and administrator performance-based compensation systems so that teachers and administrators are rewarded for student growth, 3) increase the number of effective teachers teaching low-income and disadvantaged students in high-need schools and hard-to-staff subjects. Goal 3 would result in the outcome of attracting, developing, and retaining highly qualified, effective teachers and administrators to improve student achievement in high need schools, pp. 9-10.

The applicant does not provide enough details to clearly link the use of data and evaluation to professional development. The use of the PBCS for tenure decisions was not discussed.

**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 partially meets the Absolute Priority 3 criteria.

The applicant presents information detailing that Teacher Mentors will provide services to the five targeted schools. Highly Qualified Teachers with significant experience will be identified at each targeted school to provide an additional level of leadership and

support, p. 18. More specificity on the additional responsibilities and leadership roles are needed.

**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.

The applicant sufficiently presents an plan for dissemination of information about the PBCS. Informational sessions will be held to attract teachers to sign up for the program and to apply to be a part of the planning and development POWER Team. School-based administrators will inform parents through affiliated parent organizations. The community will be educated about the POWER program through a presentation to the Board of Education of Washington County and through media releases, p. 12.

**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.

The applicant provides clear details for this element stating that the POWER Team will be composed of the POWER Project Manager, central office administrators, school-based administrators, union leaders, and eventually up to five teachers from every participating school. Informational sessions will be held to attract teachers to sign up for the program and to apply to be a part of the planning and development POWER Team, p. 12. This management team will be developing the specific components of the PBCS, p. 13. The local union of teachers has endorsed the POWER program. District senior staff and all five targeted school principals support the POWER program at their respective schools, p. 13.

**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.

The applicant sufficiently presents these planning year details concerning this applicant criteria. Following the Maryland Education Reform Act of 2010, the evaluation of teachers (to be developed during the planning year of the grant) will include at least these four components: planning and preparation, classroom environment, instruction, and professional responsibility. For principals, the evaluation will include at least the eight standards for instructional leadership set forth in the Maryland Instructional Leadership Framework, p 27.

The applicant also provides clear details concerning teacher and principal evaluations. Participating teachers and administrators will be assessed by internal and external assessors at least two times per year to measure their effectiveness in creating environments which prioritizes student achievement. Also, the applicant notes that participating administrators and their evaluators will participate in specific professional development to build knowledge of, and competence with, each standard evaluated, p. 27.

The applicant did not discuss additional forms of evidence; however, the Maryland Teacher Evaluator Framework (which the applicant will follow for their PBCS) allows the LEA the option of additional domains of evidence based on local priorities, p. 28.

The applicant provides details to note that model teacher- and principal-evaluation tools and rubrics that meet the needs of principals, executive officers, and schools will ensure a high degree of inter-rater reliability and will be reviewed and finalized by the POWER Team, p. 13. In addition, a question related to gathering data on inter-rater reliability is found in the program evaluation tool, p. 45. The procedures for establishing inter-rater reliability need more details.

**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 partially meets the Core Element 4 criteria.

The applicant provides details that during the planning year of the project, the district will work with their current data management vendor to link pre- and post- data measuring student growth and teacher and principal effectiveness to payroll and human resource

systems. The system will be established and in use by the 2011-2012 school year, pp. 16-17.

Additional specificity concerning the linkage of data to payroll and human resource systems is needed.

**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 partially meets the Core Element 5 criteria.

The applicant clearly states that in addition to in-depth training on program elements and implementation, participants in the POWER program will receive targeted professional development aimed at developing and improving skills to produce substantial improvement in the academic achievement of students in the district. The district will contract with a consultant to work with senior school system leadership to develop a performance-based compensation system and a plan for implementation that centers on intensive, distributed professional development for teachers, administrators, supervisors, and curriculum specialists. The POWER Team will make site visits to school systems that have implemented successful PBCS and incentive programs. Professional development will also include national conferences on leadership and teacher effectiveness, half day in-services, and summer intensive POWER program training workshops, p. 17.

Additional details concerning this professional development is needed.

**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 partially meets the Evaluation Criteria for High Quality Professional Development.

More specificity in the details of the targeted professional development is needed. The applicant notes that participants in the POWER program will receive targeted professional development aimed at developing and improving skills to produce substantial improvement in the learning of the students of the district, p. 16. As the district shifts to a more performance-based certification system for all teachers, veteran teachers will be expected to develop detailed professional development plans linked to specific needs identified in their annual evaluations. As teachers seek recertification every five years, they will need to demonstrate their performance as an Effective Teacher and show how they have met the goals in their targeted professional development plan in order to be re-licensed, pp. 18-19. In addition, the district intends to hire an experienced administrator as the Project Manager with a major responsibility in coaching and supporting school-based administrators in the targeted high-need schools, p. 18.

The applicant did not address the professional development of those educators in participating TIF schools who are not receiving differentiated compensation. The applicant reports that TIF participating administrators and their evaluators will take part in specific professional development to build knowledge of, and competence with, each standard evaluated, p. 26. Highly Qualified Teachers with significant experience will be identified at each targeted school to provide an additional level of leadership and support along with Teacher Mentors, p.18.

The applicant adequately reports that TIF participating teachers and administrators will receive specific professional development to build knowledge of, and competence with, each domain evaluated, p. 26. The applicant also notes TIF participating teachers and administrators will complete formative and summative evaluations to improve the PBCS (including professional development) to assure that they meet the objective of improving student achievement, p. 26. The project will use the result of yearly evaluations to refine the POWER program while maintaining fidelity to its goals, p 27.

**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 notes a higher turnover and less experienced staff in the high-need schools targeted in this proposal than exist overall county-wide, p. 23.

The applicant reports that these five high-need schools are being targeted for this project based on having some of the poorest ratings of the county schools relative to academic achievement, student mobility rates, attendance rates, percentage of teachers with an Advanced Professional Certification (APC), and discipline referrals, p. 2.

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant did not specifically make comparisons of these five schools with other comparable schools in terms key factors such as size, grade levels, and poverty levels.

The applicant did not address the definition of "comparable" school.

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 clearly indicates that they will use the existing measures of student growth of the Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE) as part of the methodology to determine the effectiveness of the participating TIF personnel, p. 20. The applicant states that the levels of effectiveness in the PBCS will be Highly Effective, Effective, and Ineffective, p. 8. A study will be conducted to determine if a fourth level will be needed.

The following preliminary incentives are proposed to be awarded to participating educators: \$5,000 annually to Highly Effective or Effective principals, \$5,000 annually to Highly Effective or Effective teachers, and an additional \$5,000 annually to principals and teachers who have been identified as Highly Effective or Effective and continue this leadership role in their targeted high-need schools, pp. 34-35. It appears that these awards are sufficient to positively affect the behaviors of participating effective educators.

The applicant clearly states that they will construct the components of their PBCS based on work in progress at the Maryland State Department of Education. The applicant will use the MSDE definition of effective: to be rated Effective, a teacher or principal must show appropriate levels of growth among their students to help them successfully transition and progress from grade to grade; to be rated Highly Effective, a teacher or principal must show exceptional talent in increasing student growth well beyond one grade level in one year or exceptional success educating high-poverty, minority, English Language Learners, or other high-needs students, p. 13-14.

The applicant reports that the district Superintendent of Schools will appoint the POWER Team to include: teachers, school-based administrators, union leaders, and central office administrators. The POWER Team will be charged with designing the performance-based compensation system including the incentive program, professional development, and evaluation tools, p. 13. The district will contract with a consultant to work with the POWER Team to complete this work, p. 17. This is an excellent avenue for gaining knowledge, support, and buy-in of the project.

The applicant details that they will develop a PBCS for teachers and principals that differentiates effectiveness using multiple rating categories that take into account student growth as a significant factor, as well as classroom observations conducted at least twice during the school year, p. 11. The Maryland Education Reform Act of 2010 establishes that changes in student growth will become a significant factor in the evaluation of teachers and principals. The applicant will use this law as a model for the to-be-developed TIF PBCS. The student growth component will be fifty percent of the

evaluation for teachers and principals, p. 7.

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant reports that, during the planning year, the district will work with their current data management vendor to link pre- and post- data measuring student growth and teacher and principal effectiveness to payroll and human resource systems. The system will be established and in use by the 2011-2012 school year, pp. 16-17. More specificity is needed concerning the details of this link.

The applicant relates that participants in the POWER program, beginning with the 2011-2012 year, will receive targeted professional development aimed at developing and improving skills to produce substantial improvement in the academic achievement of students of the district. The district will contract with a consultant to work with senior school system leadership to develop a performance-based compensation system and a plan for implementation that centers on intensive, distributed professional development for teachers, administrators, supervisors, and curriculum specialists, p 17. More details concerning the the types of professional development to be offered is needed.

**Reader's Score: 50**

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

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

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

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

**Strengths:**

The management plan includes clearly defined responsibilities and detailed timelines for activities and milestones for accomplishing project tasks, pp. 39-40.

The project administrator has a wide variety of expertise. The project manager will be hired upon receipt of TIF grant funding and will oversee and coordinate all aspects of grant reporting, data management, financial accounting, meetings, events, professional development scheduling, and evaluation support. The other members of the POWER Team

including teachers, union leaders, school-based administrators, and central office administrators will establish administrative procedures governing participation and evaluation components for teachers and administrators. The Team will also develop program evaluation mechanisms based on the State plan and Maryland law.

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant proposes to develop all components of the PBCS during the planning year of 2010-2011. This will require extensive research and development in a short period of time. The applicant intends to overlay (and extend) their plan based on the new Maryland Education Reform Act of 2010 which will not take effect until 2012-2013.

The management plan budget needs more specificity in the explanation of the types of non-federal funds to be used, p. e5-6.

**Reader's Score: 15**

**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 has developed a series of strong, measurable performance objectives related to the goals of the project for raising student achievement, increasing the effectiveness of teachers and principals, and retaining and recruiting effective teachers, principals, and other personnel, pp. 24-27 (Goals and Objectives for the POWER Program).

The applicant clearly states that qualitative data analysis, such as document review of the components of the teacher and school-based administrator evaluation processes or focus groups of the POWER program participating teachers and school-based administrators will be used. Quantitative data analysis will focus on description and analysis of topics like the effect of the POWER program on raising student achievement, pp. 43-44.

The applicant specifies that all participating teachers and administrators will take part in formative and summative evaluation to inform and improve the POWER program to assure it meets the objective of improving student achievement and teacher and principal effectiveness. In addition, internal and external evaluation research will be conducted annually, beginning in 2012-2013, to ascertain the degree to which all program goals are being met, p. 25.

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant does not specifically state that the goals and objectives cited above will be used as part of the program evaluation; instead the applicant notes that some additional research questions are currently in development, pp. 44-47.

**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 sufficiently notes that the district will use the Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE) existing measures of student growth for this project, p. 20. To address the need for objective assessment of student growth not measured by State assessments, the district will work with MSDE and other school systems to select additional student learning measures already in place throughout Maryland that meet the criteria for calculating student growth, p. 22. During the planning year of the project, the district will work with their current data management vendor to link pre- and post-data measuring student growth and teacher and principal effectiveness to payroll and human resource systems. The system will be established and in use by the 2011-2012 school year, pp. 16-17.

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant states TIF participating teachers and administrators will receive specific professional development to build knowledge of, and competence with, each domain evaluated p. 26. The applicant also states that in-depth training on program elements and implementation will be provided, p. 16. More specificity is needed in describing the training the participants will receive in specific professional development areas and the value-added model.

**Reader's Score: 4**

**Priority Preference - Competitive Preference Priority 2**

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

Schools. (Up to 5 points):

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

**Strengths:**

The applicant has selected five schools that meet the high-need student definitions for this project, p. 2. The applicant has established that one of the project outcomes will be that of attracting, developing, and retaining highly qualified, effective teachers and administrators to improve student achievement in high need schools, p 10. Also, the project would include a retention incentive for administrators and participating teachers who have been identified as Highly Effective or Effective and continue this leadership role in their targeted high-need schools, p. 34. This seems to be an effective strategy for obtaining these outcomes.

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant did not provide an explanation for how it will determine that a teacher filling a vacancy is effective or likely to be effective, the extent to which the subjects or specialty areas they propose to target are hard-to-staff, and how they will implement a process for effectively communicating to teachers which of the schools are high-need and which subjects and specialty areas are considered hard-to-staff.

**Reader's Score: 3**

---

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

Status: Submitted

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

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** Board of Education of Washington County -- Office of System Development,  
(S385A100080)

**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
------------------------	---	---

<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
------------------	----------	----------

#### Evaluaton Criteria

##### Absolute Priority 3

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

<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
------------------	----------	----------

#### Requirement

##### Requirement

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

<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
------------------	----------	----------

#### 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
-----------------------------	---	---

<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
------------------	----------	----------

#### Selection Criteria

##### Need for the Project

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

##### Project Design

1.Project Design	60	42
<b>Adequacy of Support for the Proposed Project</b>		
1.Adequacy of Support	25	13
<b>Quality of Local Evaluation</b>		
1.Quality of Local Eval.	5	5
<b>Sub Total</b>	100	67

**Priority Questions**

**Priority Preference**

**Competitive Preference Priority 1**

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

**Competitive Preference Priority 2**

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

<b>Sub Total</b>	10	4
------------------	----	---

<b>Total</b>	110	71
--------------	-----	----

## Technical Review Form

Panel #6 - Panel - 6: 84.385A

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

Applicant: Board of Education of Washington County -- Office of System Development,  
(S385A100080)

### 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 partially addresses the criteria in Absolute Priority 1. The applicant includes the plan submitted by the State for determining teacher effectiveness with 50% attributed to student achievement (p. 29). The extent to which the applicant demonstrates that the differentiated effectiveness incentive payments will provide incentive amounts that are substantial and provides justification for the level of incentive amounts chosen is not entirely clear. This component could use more development to provide clarity related to the differentiated levels of compensation.

The applicant notes that teachers and principals will be observed at least twice per year. Participating administrators will take part in professional development to build competency with each standard in the evaluation (p. 27).

On page 22, the applicant mentions the need for objective assessment of student growth not measured by the State assessment in the form of additional student learning measures already in place throughout the state that meet the criteria for calculating student

growth. A more thorough explanation of these criteria and how they will be incorporated would be advantageous to provide clarity related to the incentives.

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 partially addresses the criteria in Absolute Priority 2. The applicant indicates an understanding of the importance of multiple funding sources in order to continue the project, but does not demonstrate evidence that different options have been explored for this possibility (p. 35) how the applicant will support the proposed project with funds provided under other Federal or State programs and local financial or in-kind resources would strengthen this section. On page 35, the applicant states that beginning in year 2, federal funds will support incentive pay, but there is no other elaboration on this concept, nor is this clearly illustrated in the chart on page 34.

While the applicant includes an overview of associated costs with the project, it is not clear how total costs covered by other resources is calculated (p. 34). The applicant indicates the main source of non-TIF funds will be the general operating budget. At this stage of planning, the applicant indicates sufficient information related to funding, but additional details showing evidence of the availability of funds in the general fund are lacking.

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 partially meets Absolute Priority 3. The applicant includes an overview of the proposed plan broken down into four distinct components (p. 27). Reference is made to a complex data system that enables longitudinal tracking of student performance. It

is unclear how the information gleaned from the teacher observations will be used to make decisions regarding professional development needs or to make decisions regarding retention and tenure, especially since participation in the POWER program will be optional at the onset (p. 14, 27). In goal 3, on pages 9 and 10, the applicant references retaining quality teachers and administrators. The applicant does not discuss decision-making related to tenure.

**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 partially meets this requirement. The inclusion of teacher mentors and a proposed plan for developing administrative leaders represents increased efforts to establish various methods for improving performance and possible effectiveness (p. 18). A more comprehensive explanation of how teachers can become involved in such leadership roles would provide clarity related to incentives for additional responsibilities.

**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 addresses the criteria in Core Element 1. The applicant proposes the POWER program as a voluntary program for teachers at targeted schools to enhance teacher effectiveness through a PBCS (p. 11).

Several efforts of collaborative planning for project implementation are included. The applicant plans to hold information sessions to attract teachers to sign up for the program (p. 11). A leadership team comprised of central office and campus leaders, as well as union representatives, and eventually teachers, indicates a plan to involve multiple stakeholders in the process (p. 11). Letters of support, including that of the union, demonstrate some evidence of community buy-in with the proposed project (Appendix). However, the applicant did not explain a network of communication for 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:**

The applicant adequately addresses Core Element 2. Several efforts of collaborative planning for project implementation are included. The applicant plans to hold information sessions to attract teachers to sign up for the program (p. 11). A leadership team comprised of central office and campus leaders, as well as union representatives, and eventually teachers, indicates a plan to involve multiple stakeholders in the process (p. 11). Letters of support, including that of the union, demonstrate community buy-in with the proposed project (Appendix).

**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 addresses Core Element 3. On page 27, the applicant discusses four components of teacher effectiveness and 8 standards for effective leadership.

On page 14, the applicant includes a model teacher evaluation tool with a rubric to be developed. The procedures for inter-rater reliability need more specificity (p. 45). The applicant indicates that teachers and administrators will be assessed by both internal and external reviewers at least twice per year. The participating evaluators will take part in specific professional development to build understanding of each competency (p. 27).

While the applicant indicates plans to conduct at least two observations of participating teachers each year, the specific criteria by which effectiveness will be determined is not yet available, and so the degree to which the program 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 and multiple observation data is unclear.

The applicant did not discuss additional forms of evidence; however, the state Teacher Evaluator Framework allows LEAs the option to include additional domains based on local priorities.

**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 partially meets the criteria in Core Element 4. The applicant discusses use of Performance Matters, the current data management system that provides an integrated assessment and data management system (p. 15). While not currently linked to payroll and human resources systems, the potential for this cooperation exists according to information provided by the applicant (p. 15). During the planning year, the applicant plans to work with the accepted vendor to link data measuring student growth and teacher and principal effectiveness to payroll and human resource systems. The applicant lacks specificity in the information related to this system and the actual plan for including its use in the 2011-2012 school year.

**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 partially meets the criteria in Core Element 5. The applicant indicates that professional development will include national conferences on leadership and teacher effectiveness, but there are no details about this particular professional development that demonstrate a relationship between the courses and trainings selected and the identified need or connections to the PBCS (p. 16).

In addition, since this is a planning proposal, the applicant notes that there is a plan to link evaluations to professional development; however, the details are lacking in this section.

**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 partially meets the criteria in this requirement. The applicant states that POWER program participants will receive targeted professional development aimed at improving skills (p. 16). The applicant also indicates that professional development will include national conferences on leadership and teacher effectiveness, but there are no details about this professional development that demonstrate a relationship between the courses and trainings selected and the identified need or connections to the PBCS (p. 16). On page 16, the applicant indicates plans to provide training on the overall POWER model, but in the absence of specific details, it is hard to determine how targeted the professional development will be in terms of addressing previously identified needs or helping teachers analyze data to make instructional decisions for the purpose of raising student achievement. More specificity in how the applicant plans to link professional development with the identified needs in the Appendix, such as high mobility rates, achievement of special education students, and high numbers of discipline referrals, is needed.

To support teachers and principals in using the measures of effectiveness in the PBCS, a project manager with experience in coaching and school-based administration will be hired (p. 18).

On page 26, the applicant notes that participating teachers and administrators will complete formative and summative evaluations to improve the PBCS, which includes professional development, as needed to impact student achievement.

**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 provides information related to student achievement along with high mobility rates and fewer teachers with Advanced Professional Certification as compared with other schools in the County (p. 5).

Information about the demographics of the school and community are included in this section and demonstrate evidence of need as more than half of the elementary school-aged children live in poverty, and 42.7% of the student in the district qualify for Free and Reduced Meals (p. 1).

Further, data show that only 14% of the County residents 25 years of age and older hold a college degree or higher (p. 1). With low per pupil spending (p. 1), and lower than expected student achievement in both reading and math for special education students and ELL students, there is not compelling evidence to suggest that this trend may shift upward (p. 4). The applicant notes that three of the five target schools did not make AYP last year, further illustrating a need for improvement in the instructional areas (p. 3).

#### **Weaknesses:**

The applicant references problems finding teachers with Advanced Professional Certification, but there is little elaboration on specific difficulty in 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.

The applicant makes reference to per pupil spending and student achievement as compared with other County schools, but does not provide a clear definition of what it considers a comparable school (p. 5). On page 16, the applicant mentions selecting schools of similar demographics to study and glean best practices, but this concept is not identified when comparing student achievement data or other student concerns.

**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 proposes the POWER program as a voluntary program for teachers at targeted schools to enhance teacher effectiveness through a PBCS (p. 11). For the teachers who choose to participate in this program, the potential to earn additional compensation will likely be a motivating factor as they work toward improved student performance.

Several efforts of collaborative planning for project implementation are included. The applicant plans to hold information sessions to attract teachers to sign up for the program (p. 11). A leadership team comprised of central office and campus leaders, as well as union representatives, and eventually teachers, indicates a plan to involve multiple stakeholders in the process (p. 11). Letters of support, including that of the union, demonstrate community buy-in with the proposed project (Appendix). Such planning and communication techniques represent a collaborative effort to strengthen programs for teachers and students.

The applicant has planned to develop evaluation rubrics for both teachers and administrators, along with a matrix for evaluating specific criteria with respect to measures of effectiveness (p. 14). This practice will help identify elements of successful practice that can be understood by all staff.

The applicant discusses use of Performance Matters, the current data management system that provides an integrated assessment and data management system (p. 15). The incorporation of a data management system increases accessibility of important student and teacher information which can be used to inform practice.

Connections are made between the proposed project and the new teacher induction program (p. 17). Likewise, the applicant makes reference to supporting critical State initiatives as evidenced in the Race to the Top application, the Common Core State

Standards, and the STEM task force (p. 17). Such connections demonstrate that the project is one that is part of a proposed statewide strategy for improving the process for rewarding teachers, principals, and other personnel in high-need schools.

The inclusion of teacher mentors and a proposed plan for developing administrative leaders represents increased efforts to establish multiple pathways for improving performance and possible effectiveness (p. 18).

**Weaknesses:**

While the applicant indicates plans to develop a performance-based compensation system, additional details of how this system will work and exact rewards will be calculated are not readily apparent (p. 16).

The applicant indicates that professional development will include national conferences on leadership and teacher effectiveness, but there are no details about this professional development that demonstrate a relationship between the courses and trainings selected and the identified need or connections to the PBCS (p. 16).

The applicant does not include 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.

While the applicant indicates plans to conduct at least two observations of participating teachers each year, the specific criteria by which effectiveness will be determined is not yet available, so it is difficult to ascertain the degree to which the program 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 and multiple observation data (p. 11).

On pages 33 and 34, the applicant provides an overview of the potential award amounts for both teachers and administrators. In looking at the proposed amounts, it is not clear if the participating LEA would use the proposed PBCS to provide performance awards to teachers, principals, and other personnel 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.

**Reader's Score: 42**

**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 an overview of the project costs on page 34. These costs appear reasonable given the scope of the project. The applicant proposes to use non-TIF funds from the general operating budget within the project.

Within the management plan, some responsibilities are outlined for the Project Manager and Project Administrator, indicating evidence of prior planning with key stakeholders (p. 37).

A general timeline is provided beginning on page 39 to begin to outline major activities associated with the proposed project. The timeline appears to be a useful document in driving project tasks.

Qualifications of key district leaders are summarized, indicating relevant experience necessary to implement a large-scale initiative such as the one proposed (p. 41-42).

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant indicates an understanding of the importance of multiple funding sources in order to continue the project, but does not demonstrate evidence that such sources have been explored for this possibility (p. 35). The applicant explains that funds will be used from the general operating budget (p. 18), but specificity is needed to determine how such funds will be obtained in this manner. Examples of how the applicant will support the proposed project with funds provided under other Federal or State programs and local financial or in-kind resources are lacking. On page 35, the applicant states that, beginning in year 2, federal funds will support incentive pay, but there is no other elaboration on this concept, nor is this clearly illustrated in the chart on page 34.

While the applicant includes an overview of associated costs with the project, it is not clear how total costs covered by other resources are calculated (p. 34).

The included timeline appears vague in parts. For example, one activity is to develop a performance-based compensation system with incentive components (p. 39). The entire POWER team, along with the Project Manager, is listed as responsible parties for completion. The activity seems very general, and there are no specific milestones included to help facilitate completion of such a large task.

**Reader's Score: 13**

**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:**

On page 43, the applicant provides an overview of both qualitative and quantitative evaluation data that will be produced in the evaluation indicating multiple methods of assessing effectiveness. The use of focus groups and internal evaluation, along with the collection of student achievement data, can foster ongoing assessment. Evaluation questions are divided into both impact and implementation categories so as to assess different components of project success (p. 45). This process can help isolate and identify critical factors that the applicant seeks to evaluate.

The applicant includes goals and measurable objectives to facilitate ease of evaluation (p. 24).

The applicant notes that teachers and administrators will participate in formative and summative evaluation efforts to inform and guide the POWER program to ensure it meets the stated objectives. Both internal and external evaluations will take place each year to assess program success (p. 25).

The applicant indicates plans to include the findings and recommendations of the evaluation team in meetings each fiscal year, which will be incorporated into the overall project plan. This process is important in ensuring feedback and working to link results obtained in the evaluation process with changes for future tasks.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses were noted in this section.

**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 plans to model the proposed performance-based compensation system after the plan submitted by the State for Race to the Top (p. 19). Then, the applicant will use the state assessment, and ultimately common assessments used to assess the Common Core State Standards (p. 20). Both practices align with state initiatives and can be used in a collective way to inform program decisions. The applicant plans to allow calculations

that assess individual student growth from a baseline to at least one other point in time. Such practice can be a foundation in determining student achievement beyond a summative test score each year.

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant indicates that for subjects for which there is no current assessment, the criteria for confirming student growth will be based on gains made in the entire school (p. 21). While this data is important to collect, it may result in perceived unfair assessment as well as any resulting compensation since the teachers have no individual opportunity to realize success without reliance on other teachers.

The applicant does not explain how the value-added measure will be a significant factor in calculating differentiated levels of compensation provided to teachers, principals, and other personnel.

**Reader's Score: 2**

**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 references the State list of hard-to-staff subject areas. The applicant plans to recruit teachers in hard-to-staff areas, and teachers who opt into the POWER program will be eligible to receive additional annual compensation (p. 23).

The proposed retention incentive award will likely help the district retain effective teachers in multiple subject areas (p. 23-24).

Providing the above-listed information helped clarify the intent and scope of the project.

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant does not specifically reference a plan to fill vacancies with teachers of those subjects or specialty areas who are effective or likely to be effective, or how it will determine that a teacher filling a vacancy is effective or likely to be effective (p. 23).

Specific communication with teachers on which schools are high-need and which subjects and specialty areas are considered hard-to-staff is not mentioned in the application.

It is not clear how, since the POWER participation is optional, the district will be able to gauge effectiveness among those teachers who opt out of involvement with the program

(p. 23).

**Reader's Score: 2**

---

**Status:** Submitted

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

Status: Submitted

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

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** Board of Education of Washington County -- Office of System Development,  
(S385A100080)

**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
------------------------	---	---

<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
------------------	----------	----------

#### Evaluation Criteria

##### Absolute Priority 3

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

<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
------------------	----------	----------

#### Requirement

##### Requirement

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

<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
------------------	----------	----------

#### 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
-----------------------------	---	---

<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
------------------	----------	----------

#### Selection Criteria

##### Need for the Project

1. Need for Project	10	9
---------------------	----	---

##### Project Design

1.Project Design	60	50
<b>Adequacy of Support for the Proposed Project</b>		
1.Adequacy of Support	25	10
<b>Quality of Local Evaluation</b>		
1.Quality of Local Eval.	5	4
<b>Sub Total</b>	100	73

**Priority Questions**

**Priority Preference**

**Competitive Preference Priority 1**

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

**Competitive Preference Priority 2**

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

<b>Sub Total</b>	10	8
------------------	----	---

<b>Total</b>	110	81
--------------	-----	----

## Technical Review Form

Panel #6 - Panel - 6: 84.385A

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

Applicant: Board of Education of Washington County -- Office of System Development,  
(S385A100080)

### 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 partially met. On page 7, the applicant proposes a system based on the upcoming State system that for teachers will use student growth (50%), planning and preparation, classroom environment, instruction, and professional responsibility. For principals, the 50% student growth will be used along with "meeting the eight standards for instructional leadership set forth in the Maryland Instructional Leadership Framework" (p.8). The use of existing professional standards is a positive addition to the proposed plan.

At least 2 observations for teachers and principals are proposed on page 27.

The preliminarily proposed award amounts (p.34) can not be assessed for adequacy without additional detail. There is not justification for the incentive payment amounts.

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:**

This priority is partially met. The applicant has projected costs associated with both development and implementation and has accepted responsibility to provide greater portions of the total cost from local funds over the 5 year term of the program (p.35). At this stage of the planning grant, additional details would provide greater assurance that other funds will be available for use in the future.

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:**

This priority is partially met. The program goals include those that will provide professional development based on the specific needs of teachers and administrators (p. 10). It is intended that coaches for both principals and teachers will be provided on an as needed basis (p.19). Principals will be trained in ways to use evaluation results to tailor teachers' individual professional development plans (p.20). The application lacks specific details as to how this will be done. Pages 9-10 present information related to the use of data for staff retention but not for tenure decisions.

Reader's Score: 0

**Requirement - Requirement**

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

**General:**

This requirement is partially met. The program focuses on providing differentiated compensation based on student achievement, participation in the evaluation system, engaging in professional development and engaging in self-reflection (p.25). Mechanisms to provide incentives to take on additional responsibilities and leadership roles are not described in the application.

**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:**

This core element is met. The applicant has plans for a leadership team composed of project staff, central office administrators, school-based administrators, union leaders and up to five teachers from each participating school (p.12). It is expected that school administrators will inform parents and that the community will be informed through Board meetings and media releases (p.12). This multi-level plan for information dissemination is a strong component of the initial plan.

**Reader's Score: 0**

**Evaluation Criteria - Core Element 2**

**1.Core Element 2:**

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

**General:**

This core element has been met in that the local district is synchronizing its plans with state mandates planned for implementation. The State teachers' union has objected to the State plans. The applicant district has received a letter of support from the president of the union attesting to support for the district's application (p.13).

**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 is met. Principals and teachers would be observed at least twice per year (p.11). There was reference to observations at one point in the evaluation design (p.46). A rubric for observations is being developed. Criteria for use in conducting observations are partially developed (p.27).

It is stated on page 14 that there will be "model teacher and principal evaluation tools and rubrics that meet the needs of principals, executive officers, and schools that ensure a high degree of inter-rater reliability" (p.14). The method for establishing inter-rater reliability for observers needs more specificity. A recognition of the importance of rubrics is a positive contribution to the application as it demonstrates recognition by the applicant of the detail with which plans must be developed. The applicant has also recognized the need to plan for test validity (p.16).

**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:**

This core element is partially met. The applicant plans to link payroll and student performance data systems (p.17). The applicant lacks additional details about the capacity of the vendor to implement this by the 2011-12 school year.

**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:**

This core element is partially met in this planning proposal. The applicant plans to provide "in-depth training on program elements and implementation" (p.16). However, without additional information, it is difficult to ascertain the quality of these proposed efforts.

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:

This evaluation criteria is partially met. The applicant plans to provide targeted professional development "aimed at developing and improving skills to produce substantial improvement in the learning" of students (p.17). New teachers are to be provided with a mentor and receive opportunities to co-teach, observe classrooms, and engage in other developmental activities. This mandate is a State mandate to be implemented in 2010 and fully compliant by July 2011. The applying district is synchronizing their program with the State mandate (p.18). The applicant will design a method of providing mentors to coach both teachers and principals (p. 18-19).

Both formative and summative evaluations for teachers and principals are to be conducted to assure fidelity to the program goals (pp. 26-27). Professional development is to be provided based on student needs established through assessments (p.24). Additional specificity is needed related to the proposed procedures to be used to link student assessment data with professional development offerings and outcomes.

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 adequately demonstrated need. The need is based on student poverty described on page 3 as being above 50% free and reduced price lunch and the percent of teachers holding advanced professional certification (p.6). The applicant also has considered student mobility (p.6) which is an important consideration in high needs schools. Additionally, shortages in key areas have been considered (p.24).

#### Weaknesses:

The application needs more specification about recruitment of teachers in high-needs subjects.

Reader's Score: 9

## Selection Criteria - Project Design

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

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

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

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

(ii) The participating LEA would use the proposed PBCS to provide performance awards to teachers, principals, and other personnel (in those sites in which the grantee wishes

to expand the PBCS to additional staff in its schools) that are of sufficient size to affect the behaviors of teachers, principals, and other personnel and their decisions as to whether to go to, or remain working in, the high-need school; and

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

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

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

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

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

#### **Strengths:**

The applicant intends to include the following in its final plan: A communication plan, involvement and support of schools and unions, a rigorous, transparent and fair evaluation system for principals and teachers that includes multiple rating categories and accounts for student growth and classroom observations conducted at least twice a year, a linked data system and training for staff in the use of the system (p. 12). These stated plans indicate a recognition by the applicant of the requirements of TIF.

The planning team is expansive and inclusive of individuals at different levels in the district including union representation (p.14). While the actual plan is not developed, considerable thought has been given to the detailed elements that are necessary in the final plan. For example, on page 15, the levels of effectiveness are presented along with some of the components to be assessed in establishing one's level. Additionally, it is noted that plans are needed for items including those not attaining desired level, scoring rubrics, and a matrix for determining how different criteria combine to an overall summative rating. The need to assure test validity is noted (p.16). These above items are noted as representations of the careful preplanning that this applicant appears to have done.

#### **Weaknesses:**

The planning grant lacks specificity in areas including vendor plans to implement the data system, methods for establishing inter-rater reliability, and methods for establishing professional development needs based on student assessment data.

**Reader's Score: 50**

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

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

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

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

#### Strengths:

The management plan (p.40) is likely to achieve the objectives because key staff indicate full support of TIF implementation. The district superintendent is fully behind the plan and other key staff are on board (p.42). District funds will be used for an annually increasing share of the required funds (p.35). The requested funds appear to be sufficient for the proposed program.

#### Weaknesses:

A carefully worded letter of support from the union president is presented (attachment 1). The letter, in fact, carefully avoids supporting a performance based compensation system. Additional information is needed about the applicant's plans to continue efforts to assure union understanding and support for the program.

Reader's Score: 10

## 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 local evaluation will be both qualitative and quantitative (p.44). This district will hire an independent external evaluator whose efforts will be coordinated through the district's office of Testing and Accountability (p.45). This approach means that the internal Office can facilitate the needs of the external evaluator while the evaluation maintains independence from the district. Research questions have been developed by the internal office for presentation in the application. The questions are clearly and concisely stated (pp. 45-46). The impact part of the study will use comparison schools (p. 46).

**Weaknesses:**

A measure of growth is needed for teachers who are participating in professional development designed to increase their content knowledge. For example, if the professional development addresses middle school algebra, than a test of the teacher's knowledge of both algebra content and instructional methodologies 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's performance-based compensation system incorporates the one proposed by the State in its Race to the Top application (p.20). This avoids duplication of requirements for district staff. The state is planning to convert to a new testing system based on the Common Core Standards. Until that assessment is in place, existing measures of student growth will be used (p.21). If assessments are not currently available for specific areas, new selections will be made (p.22). The combined index will value not only individual work but also the collective work of teams. Consideration will be given to criteria established by the National Psychometric Council (p.22). While many of these activities are those of the State, not the applicant, the district is to be commended for its recognition of work previously done and also for its restraint in "reinventing the wheel."

**Weaknesses:**

While student growth is noted as a variable in the proposed system, value-added is not specifically highlighted. However, the development team plans to visit systems that have implemented successful PBCS and incentive programs. It is expected that value-added conversations will take place at that time. The applicants definition of growth models and value-added models is not clear (pp. 20-21).

**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:**

Schools to be included in the initial program have been selected based on high-need students, student mobility rates, attendance rates and percentage of teachers with Advance Professional Certification. Hard to staff subjects have also been taken into account and the plan is to provide additional compensation for teachers in these areas. A retention award is also being proposed to retain teachers (p.24).

**Weaknesses:**

The application lacks a plan for communicating to LEA teachers those schools that are high needs and the subjects that are hard to staff.

**Reader's Score: 4**

---

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