

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 8/6/10 3:53 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** Butler County Board of Education -- , (S385A100075)

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

|  | Points Possible | Points Scored |
|--|-----------------|---------------|
| <b>Questions</b>                             |                 |               |
| <b>Evaluation Criteria</b>                   |                 |               |
| <b>Absolute Priority 1</b>                   |                 |               |
| 1.Absolute Priority 1                        | 0               | 0             |
| <b>Absolute Priority 2</b>                   |                 |               |
| 1.Absolute Priority 2                        | 0               | 0             |
| <b>Sub Total</b>                             | <b>0</b>        | <b>0</b>      |
| <b>Evaluaton Criteria</b>                    |                 |               |
| <b>Absolute Priority 3</b>                   |                 |               |
| 1.Absolute Priority 3                        | 0               | 0             |
| <b>Sub Total</b>                             | <b>0</b>        | <b>0</b>      |
| <b>Requirement</b>                           |                 |               |
| <b>Requirement</b>                           |                 |               |
| 1.Requirement                                | 0               | 0             |
| <b>Sub Total</b>                             | <b>0</b>        | <b>0</b>      |
| <b>Evaluation Criteria</b>                   |                 |               |
| <b>Core Element 1</b>                        |                 |               |
| 1.Core Element 1                             | 0               | 0             |
| <b>Core Element 2</b>                        |                 |               |
| 1.Core Element 2                             | 0               | 0             |
| <b>Core Element 3</b>                        |                 |               |
| 1.Core Element 3                             | 0               | 0             |
| <b>Core Element 4</b>                        |                 |               |
| 1.Core Element 4                             | 0               | 0             |
| <b>Core Element 5</b>                        |                 |               |
| 1.Core Element 5                             | 0               | 0             |
| <b>High Quality Professional Development</b> |                 |               |
| 1.Professional Development                   | 0               | 0             |
| <b>Sub Total</b>                             | <b>0</b>        | <b>0</b>      |
| <b>Selection Criteria</b>                    |                 |               |
| <b>Need for the Project</b>                  |                 |               |
| 1.Need for Project                           | 10              | 7             |
| <b>Project Design</b>                        |                 |               |

|   |     |    |
|---|-----|----|
| 1.Project Design                                    | 60  | 48 |
| <b>Adequacy of Support for the Proposed Project</b> |     |    |
| 1.Adequacy of Support                               | 25  | 20 |
| <b>Quality of Local Evaluation</b>                  |     |    |
| 1.Quality of Local Eval.                            | 5   | 2  |
| <b>Sub Total</b>                                    | 100 | 77 |

**Priority Questions**

**Priority Preference**

**Competitive Preference Priority 1**

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

**Competitive Preference Priority 2**

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

|                  |    |   |
|------------------|----|---|
| <b>Sub Total</b> | 10 | 2 |
|------------------|----|---|

|              |     |    |
|--------------|-----|----|
| <b>Total</b> | 110 | 79 |
|--------------|-----|----|

## Technical Review Form

Panel #2 - Panel - 2: 84.385A

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

Applicant: Butler County Board of Education -- , (S385A100075)

### 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:

PayPLUS is a performance based compensation system that will reward educators at different levels for improving student achievement. In 2005, Butler developed a strategic plan that targeted school improvement, lower dropout and higher graduation rates, and changing parent perceptions and improving satisfaction (p. 2). PayPlus has multiple components designed to align employee behavior with these teaching and learning goals of the district: 1) improve school performance, 2) raise student achievement, 3) recruit, support and retain effective teachers.

(a) The narrative does not support the requirement that significant weight be given to student achievement. More information is needed about linking the student achievement data, the observation evaluation determinations, the existing PayPlus requirements, and how these are measured and rewarded.

(b) Pay PLUS will use an existing system of teacher and principal observation evaluation, EDUCATEAlabama and LEADAlabama, respectively. There are four rating categories for these instruments, Emerging, Applying, Integrating, and Innovating, and the goal is to move a

certain number of educators from the lower categories to the higher skill levels.

The LEADAlabama instrument will be used to observe principals twice each year and will be in place for the first year of the project.

Because state evaluations occur once every three years, teachers will be able to choose if they want to have classroom evaluations in the first year of the PBCS. In following years, site administrators will conduct two observations annually. Additional district observation tools will be developed for use by Mentor teachers (p.39).

c) Pay PLUS has components for rewarding teachers that take on additional roles and responsibilities.

The applicant cites a broad range of incentives to effect change in teachers' and principals' behavior: "Though no individual bonus is exceptionally high, because of the broad range of incentive offered an employee is able to achieve a substantial bonus equaling more than 5% of the employee's salary" (p.24).

**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:**

(a) Butler has given some consideration to continuation funding issues. The budget information describes costs necessary to carryout the project goals with some allowance made for increasing numbers of staff receiving bonuses over the course of the grant period (budget narrative, p. e3, e5, e7, e9). Title I professional development funds will gradually fund the curriculum project. State money for sick days will fund the attendance stipends.

(b) No information was provided on the amount or plans for an increasing share (p.36)

**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:**

In 2005, Butler developed a strategic plan that targeted school improvement, lower dropout and higher graduation rates, and changing parent perceptions and improving satisfaction (p. 2). PayPlus has multiple components designed to align employee behavior with these teaching and learning goals of the district: 1) improve school performance, 2) raise student achievement, 3) recruit, support and retain effective teachers.

The PayPLUS components are: mentor and master teachers; teacher effectiveness bonus; principal effectiveness bonus, National Board Certification, Teacher Collaboration Grants, Curriculum Project, Parent and Teacher Surveys, and four indicators from the original project, Attendance, Leadership, AYP progress, and School Culture.

The district has identified DecisionEd as its data management and reporting tool.

Professional development is aligned to the observation components of the evaluation.

No mention of using professional development to inform tenure decision.

**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:**

Pay Plus provide more opportunities for teacher growth and the ability to move up without having to pursue additional degrees (p.4). A mentor teacher will be hired for each school and will be responsible for supporting 6-8 teachers in collaborative groups. Two master teachers at each school will provide job embedded support and training (p.5).

Teacher Collaboration Grants will be made available to teachers who collaborate to improve their schools and create plans to address specific objectives (p.17). The teams will define steps and benchmarks to meet an intended goal for improving reading, math or attendance and reducing discipline referrals.

A curriculum project gives teachers the opportunity to collaborate with teachers from around the county to vertically plan curriculum.

Bonuses will also be awarded to teachers who complete the National Board Certification process.

**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 original PayPLUS planned was communicated to key stakeholders in a variety of ways and ultimately resulted in 99% participation rate.

Presentations at board meetings, system institutes, faculty meetings, newspaper stories, and information on the district's website were all used to share information with the community (p. 40). Interviews by an external evaluator helped project staff find holes in the communication plan and procedures were modified.

**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:**

PayPLUS has been developed in collaboration with key stakeholders. A system-wide committee composed of three representatives from each school and central office staff members developed the plan. Committee members were both certified and classified, and represented a cross section of subjects and grades (p.41). Alabama does not have a teacher's union designated for the purpose of collective bargaining.

**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:**

PayPLUS will use an existing system of teacher and principal observation evaluation, EDUCATEAlabama and LEADAlabama, respectively. There are four rating categories for these instruments, Emerging, Applying, Integrating, and Innovating, and the goal is to move a certain number of educators from the lower categories to the higher skill levels.

(1) The metrics are designed to provide data about a teacher or principals current performance against the Alabama Quality Teaching /Leadership Standards (p.25, p.42).

(2) Administrators and master teachers conduct teacher observations twice each year and district observations (not yet developed) will be used by mentor teachers.

(3) PayPLUS will also look at student achievement using quantitative and qualitative data to determine a bonus for both principals and teachers using value-added data. Half of the Effectiveness bonus will be based on this student achievement measure, and half on the observation instruments.

(4) All evaluators will be trained and evaluated for reliability. The PayPLUS coordinator and other district office personnel will periodically conduct observations to check consistency and reliability of scores (p.42).

**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 district has identified DecisionEd as its data management and reporting tool. The system will consolidate data from multiple existing sources, and produce reports to show correlations between teacher and principal practices and student achievement (p.16). All student assessment data, teacher and principal evaluation data, teacher and student attendance and other data will be accessible.

**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:**

Professional development is closely aligned to the observation components of the evaluation.

With the implementation of master and mentor teachers, professional development will be offered that is ongoing, job embedded, collaborative, student centered and led by expert instructors. The PayPLUS coordinator, administrators, and master teachers will use the findings of evaluations and value-added data to guide group and individualized targeted training to support student growth and increased teacher effectiveness (p.27). Collaborative group meetings will allow teachers to examine student data together, engage in planning and learn instructional strategies that have proven successful in their schools. Master and mentor teachers will also use in-class coaching to build the skills of individual teachers (p.27). DecisionEd will provide all necessary training of teachers and principals as contracted.

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:**

- 1) The management plan mentions that district professional development needs will be indentified (p.30). Professional development described is closely aligned to the observation components of the evaluation and will be ongoing, job embedded, collaborative, student centered and led by expert instructors.
- 2) The PayPLUS coordinator, administrators, and master teachers will use the findings of evaluations and value-added data to guide group and individualized targeted training to support student growth and increased teacher effectiveness (p.27). Collaborative group meetings will allow teachers to examine student data together, engage in planning and learn instructional strategies that have proven successful in their schools. Master and mentor teachers will also use in-class coaching to build the skills of individual teachers (p.27).
- 3) The narrative does not specifically discuss providing PD to teachers or administrators who do not earn an award or for those educators who do earn an award and should receive professional development as support for taking on additional roles and responsibilities.
- 4) Training for DecisionEd will allow teachers and principals to view reports that will be determining effectiveness. DecisionEd will provide all the necessary training of teachers and principals (p.44).

5) The narrative does not describe a plan to regularly assess the effectiveness of the professional development.

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:

Butler County students are performing far below the state average and PayPlus is designed to close that gap. The county graduation rate was 77% compared to the state average 87%. Butler's students scored in the 49th and 46th percentiles for math and reading, respectively.

The applicant's comparable LEAs were selected based on demographics; high free and reduced lunch rates, similar size, median income and racial makeup (p.6).

#### Weaknesses:

The comparable schools provided are performing at similar levels as the Butler schools: Butler's state reading and math scores are between the comparable schools scores that are provided.

The application acknowledges that they do not have any hard-to-staff subjects (p.4).

No additional documentation provided to support assertions about recruitment challenges (p.3).

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:**

In 2005, Butler developed a strategic plan that targeted school improvement, lower dropout and higher graduation rates, and changing parent perceptions and improving satisfaction. Butler Co has already seen gains with the district cleared from school improvement status; the dropout rate has been cut in half and graduation rates have increased 16 percentage points (p.5).

There are multiple opportunities for teachers, administrators, and other school staff to earn an award under PayPLUS. The PayPLUS components award teachers for attendance, taking on additional leadership roles, improving schools culture improving student achievement. A bonus amount is attached to a designated completion rate. The components are: Mentor and master teachers; teacher effectiveness bonus; principal effectiveness bonus, National Board Certification, Teacher Collaboration Grants, Curriculum Project, Parent and Teacher Surveys, and four indicators from the original project, Attendance, Leadership, AYP progress, and School Culture.

Previous bonus amounts were not sufficient size to motivate behavior (p.21). Butler does

not provide additional narrative to document the decision to set award amounts as described.

The district has identified DecisionEd as its data management and reporting tool.

Professional development is described to be closely aligned to the observation components of the evaluation.

Additional components for evaluating teacher effectiveness were added to the original system: consisting of teacher observations and student academic improvement, and the applicant discusses including value-added measures of student growth.

Butler involved a variety of stakeholders in creating the PBCS. A system-wide committee composed of three representatives from each school and central office staff members developed the plan. Committee members were both certified and classified, and represented a cross section of subjects and grades (p.41).

**Weaknesses:**

It is not clear that student growth plays a significant factor in the evaluation system. The PBCS first makes awards on the staff attendance and leadership criteria. The remaining funds are available for increases in AYP and improved school culture, and the effectiveness indicators (student achievement and observations). Evidence of student academic growth is one of 5 indicators in the school culture component, and schools must attain 4 of 5 indicators to earn the bonus, so it is possible that student growth is not needed for that award. Further, growth is determined by an increase of scores on any 2 of 6 standardized tests that may not reflect student achievement (SAT10, ADAW, AP test, ACT, DIBELS, PSAT). (-10)

Sufficient detail is not provided on which achievement indicators or assessments will be considered for determining student achievement growth in the teacher effectiveness indicator described on page 14. It is not clear if the same six assessments listed for the school culture component are applicable.

**Reader's Score: 48**

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

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

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

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

**Strengths:**

Job descriptions for master teachers, mentor teachers, and the project coordinator are provided and are appropriate for the responsibilities of carrying out the PBCS.

The Coordinator and Master teacher positions are full-time supporting the PBCS. Master teachers are in the schools but not assigned a class of students.

The budget information is sufficient to carryout the project goals with some allowance made for increasing numbers of staff receiving bonuses over the course of the grant period (budget narrative, p. e3, e5, e7, e9).

The applicant provided a management plan for the 5-year grant period that includes responsibilities and timelines (p.28).

**Weaknesses:**

Specific information was not provided on the amount or rate of support that will be provided by the district from other non-TIF sources. Future funding is dependent on unspecified state, "political discretionary" funds, and other potential grants (p.36).

**Reader's Score: 20**

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

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

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

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

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

**Strengths:**

An external evaluation of the original implementation of PayPlus provided valuable quantitative and qualitative feedback from participants that allowed Butler to make adjustments to the system and ultimately achieved 99% participation rate in the voluntary system.

The three components of the evaluation are related to the overall project goals : raising student achievement, increasing the effectiveness of teachers, principals and other personnel, and retaining and recruiting effective teacher, principals and other personnel (p.37).

**Weaknesses:**

The evaluation will be conducted in years two and three only. Details provided do not suggest that the criteria are rigorous or strongly connected to raising student achievement. The applicant provides no information on the evaluation of efforts to

recruit effective teachers. The application could benefit from stronger benchmarks and performance objectives.

**Reader's Score: 2**

### **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:**

There are multiple opportunities for teachers to participate in the PBCS through additional leadership roles that would promote teacher retention. These include, National Board Certification, Teacher Collaboration Grants, Curriculum Project, Master, and mentor teacher roles.

#### **Weaknesses:**

Butler stated in the application that "no specific subjects are considered hard to staff" (p.4).

There is no discussion provided in the narrative that describes district actions to fill vacancies with highly effective educators.

The application does not discuss a process for informing teachers about high-need subjects or hard-to-staff areas.

**Reader's Score: 1**

#### **Priority Preference - Competitive Preference Priority 2**

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

To meet this competitive preference priority, the applicant must demonstrate in its application that its proposed PBCS is designed to assist high-need schools (as defined in the Federal Register notice) to (1) serve high-need students (as defined in the Federal Register notice), (2) retain effective teachers in teaching positions in hard-to-staff subjects and specialty areas, such as mathematics, science, special education, and English language acquisition, and (3) fill vacancies with teachers of those subjects or specialty

areas who are effective or likely to be effective. The applicant must provide an explanation for how it will determine that a teacher filling a vacancy is effective or likely to be effective. In addition, applicants must demonstrate, in their applications, the extent to which the subjects or specialty areas they propose to target are hard-to-staff. Lastly, applicants must demonstrate, in their applications that they will implement a process for effectively communicating to teachers which of the LEA's schools are high-need and which subjects and specialty areas are considered hard-to-staff.

**Strengths:**

There are multiple opportunities for teachers to participate in the PBCS through additional leadership roles that would promote teacher retention. These include, National Board Certification, Teacher Collaboration Grants, Curriculum Project, Master, and mentor teacher roles.

**Weaknesses:**

Butler stated in the application that "no specific subjects are considered hard to staff" (p.4).

There is no discussion provided in the narrative that describes district actions to fill vacancies with highly effective educators.

The application does not discuss a process for informing teachers about high-need subjects or hard-to-staff areas.

**Reader's Score: 1**

---

**Status:** Submitted  
**Last Updated:** 8/6/10 3:53 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 8/9/10 5:24 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** Butler County Board of Education -- , (S385A100075)

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

|  | Points Possible | Points Scored |
|--|-----------------|---------------|
| <b>Questions</b>                             |                 |               |
| <b>Evaluation Criteria</b>                   |                 |               |
| <b>Absolute Priority 1</b>                   |                 |               |
| 1.Absolute Priority 1                        | 0               | 0             |
| <b>Absolute Priority 2</b>                   |                 |               |
| 1.Absolute Priority 2                        | 0               | 0             |
| <b>Sub Total</b>                             | 0               | 0             |
| <b>Evaluaton Criteria</b>                    |                 |               |
| <b>Absolute Priority 3</b>                   |                 |               |
| 1.Absolute Priority 3                        | 0               | 0             |
| <b>Sub Total</b>                             | 0               | 0             |
| <b>Requirement</b>                           |                 |               |
| <b>Requirement</b>                           |                 |               |
| 1.Requirement                                | 0               | 0             |
| <b>Sub Total</b>                             | 0               | 0             |
| <b>Evaluation Criteria</b>                   |                 |               |
| <b>Core Element 1</b>                        |                 |               |
| 1.Core Element 1                             | 0               | 0             |
| <b>Core Element 2</b>                        |                 |               |
| 1.Core Element 2                             | 0               | 0             |
| <b>Core Element 3</b>                        |                 |               |
| 1.Core Element 3                             | 0               | 0             |
| <b>Core Element 4</b>                        |                 |               |
| 1.Core Element 4                             | 0               | 0             |
| <b>Core Element 5</b>                        |                 |               |
| 1.Core Element 5                             | 0               | 0             |
| <b>High Quality Professional Development</b> |                 |               |
| 1.Professional Development                   | 0               | 0             |
| <b>Sub Total</b>                             | 0               | 0             |
| <b>Selection Criteria</b>                    |                 |               |
| <b>Need for the Project</b>                  |                 |               |
| 1.Need for Project                           | 10              | 7             |
| <b>Project Design</b>                        |                 |               |

|   |     |    |
|---|-----|----|
| 1.Project Design                                    | 60  | 50 |
| <b>Adequacy of Support for the Proposed Project</b> |     |    |
| 1.Adequacy of Support                               | 25  | 22 |
| <b>Quality of Local Evaluation</b>                  |     |    |
| 1.Quality of Local Eval.                            | 5   | 2  |
| <b>Sub Total</b>                                    | 100 | 81 |

**Priority Questions**

**Priority Preference**

**Competitive Preference Priority 1**

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

**Competitive Preference Priority 2**

|                          |   |   |
|--------------------------|---|---|
| 1.Competitive Priority 2 | 5 | 0 |
|--------------------------|---|---|

|                  |    |   |
|------------------|----|---|
| <b>Sub Total</b> | 10 | 3 |
|------------------|----|---|

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

## Technical Review Form

Panel #2 - Panel - 2: 84.385A

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

Applicant: Butler County Board of Education -- , (S385A100075)

### 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:

- a) Significant weight is applied to student growth using objective data. A growth model that will assess individual student performance over time will be developed using DecisionEd data software (p. 26). State achievement tests, graduation rates, drop-out rates also will be used.
- b) State quality teaching standards evaluation forms will be used by trained evaluators for observing teachers twice a year (p. 42). Administrators and trained mentor and master teachers use district-level evaluations for observing teachers several times each year for improving performance. A newly developed Alabama quality teaching standards-based evaluation will be used by trained evaluators for observing principals twice a year (p. 42).
- c) Additional teacher measures will include school-wide improvement plans developed by collaborative teacher teams; completion of annual collaborative curriculum projects that result in common assessments, updated pacing guides, training for new programs, and promotion of job embedded professional development; and National Board Certification (p. 13-18). Each of these components is compensated individually.
- d) The applicant provided information that showed that the evaluations of previous PayPlus

system rewards were insufficient motivators to change teacher behavior (p. 21).

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:**

a) The application includes projected costs and a strong plan for funding beyond the grant period that includes expanding the performance-based plan to central office personnel and other school-based staff.

b) The applicant does not include non-TIF funds.

Reader's Score: 0

**Evaluaton Criteria - Absolute Priority 3**

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

Comment on how well the applicant demonstrates that - -

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

**General:**

The applicant noted that the data management system to be developed will allow the district provide a coherent strategy for strengthening the educator workforce to consolidate disparate data that can be used for making decisions about professional development (p. 26).

The applicant noted that district observational and assessment data will be used to for planning professional development (p. 27).

Insufficient information was provided to determine whether will include decision-making about hiring and retention.

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 provided a description of how the proposed PBCS system will provide incentives for educators to assume additional responsibilities and leadership roles. For example, the applicant noted that additional incentives would be paid to educators assuming roles such as serving as department chair, mentoring other teachers, and sponsoring extra curricular activities (p. 11).

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:**

Presentations will be made at school board meetings, system institutes, and faculty meetings to explain the components of the PBCS program. In addition, the local newspaper will be asked to write an article about the system and a procedure document outlining the program will be posted on the district's web site (p. 40).

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:**

Because the state does not have a teachers' union, this was not an issue. Three representatives from each school and central office were involved in planning the PBCS. They included teachers as well as secretaries, janitors, lunchroom workers (p. 41).

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 observation protocols for teacher and principal evaluations were developed by the state and are aligned with state teaching standards (p. 25).

Teachers and principals will be observed twice a year (p. 42).

No discussion was apparent regarding the incorporation of additional forms of evidence.

To ensure the reliability of implementing the observation protocols, evaluators will be trained and the project director will periodically conduct observations of the data collection for consistency of application (p. 42).

**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:**

A data-management system currently is not in place. However, plans were discussed in the application for purchasing DecisionEd, a data system that will allow linking the various student achievement data with the human resources system. Insufficient information was provided as to how the information will be used for making employment decisions (p. 40).

**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:**

Educators will be shown copies of the reports that will be used for determining their effectiveness during training sessions on the data system (p. 39).

Throughout the school year, the project coordinator will work with principals and teachers to evaluate the data used in determining effectiveness bonuses. Individual, school, and district professional development will be based on data received from the system (p. 44).

**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 professional development components of the proposed system will be based on the assessment of needs identified for the district (p. 30).

Insufficient evidence was provided in the application about whether teachers and principals in participating schools who do not received differentiated compensation will receive professional development or support for improving student achievement.

No discussion was provided regarding additional responsibilities and/or leadership roles.

To ensure that teachers and principals understand the measures of effectiveness, teachers and principals will receive reports that will be used for determining effectiveness and will have daily access to data for monitoring progress. The PayPLUS coordinator will work teachers and principals throughout the year to evaluate the data used for determining effectiveness bonuses (p. 44).

Insufficient data was provided in the application about a process for assessing professional development.

**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 proposed offering teacher and principal incentive pay tied to student achievement as a strategy for recruiting and retaining effective teachers (p. 3, 7).

The applicant noted that for the past 3 years, the teacher turnover rate has been 16% (p. 4).

Although the data provided by the applicant indicates that the district's student achievement levels are on par with comparison schools; it also indicates that compared to state averages, the district's student achievement is low (p. 6).

#### **Weaknesses:**

Insufficient data was provided data for comparison schools to support the assertion that achievement is lower in project schools (p. 5).

The applicant stated that the district does not have hard-to-staff subject areas (p. 3).

**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 stated that the PBCS system proposed fits into a county-wide strategic plan developed in 2005 (p. 2).

The system for measuring effectiveness involves using standardized tests and instruments that have been found to be reliable and valid (p. 6, 13).

Although the state does not have a teacher's union, to garner support for the project, the applicant established a system-wide committee comprised of 3 representatives from each school, site, or central office. The committee members included secretaries, janitors, lunchroom workers, teachers, principals, counselors, etc. (p. 41).

Teachers and administrators will be observed twice a year as part of the effectiveness

evaluation (p. 42).

The applicant included evidence that the system would provide high quality professional development that is linked with the measures of teacher and principal effectiveness in increasing student achievement (p. 27).

**Weaknesses:**

Insufficient evidence was provided to support the contention that student growth is a significant factor in determining bonus awards for any component other than teacher effectiveness (p. 14). While student growth and achievement account for 50% of the teacher effectiveness bonus, teacher effectiveness only accounts for about 20% of the total bonus possible (budget narrative).

Evidence presented from the evaluation of the previous implementation of the system proposed shows that the rewards were insufficient motivators for changing behavior (p. 21).

Although the applicant indicated that the existing data system is robust enough to allow the district to consolidate data from a variety of sources, insufficient evidence was provided to show that it will be linked with human resources and payroll data systems (p. 26).

**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 included a timeline with responsibilities and milestones that indicates that the project could achieve its objectives (p. 28).

The applicant stated that by the end of the grant period, Title I, state funding, local funding, and other grants, the district will gradually assume financial responsibility for the program (p. 36).

The job descriptions and time commitments included in the application indicate plans to hire highly qualified and experienced professionals (p. 36 and job descriptions).

**Weaknesses:**

Insufficient information was provided to show how non-TIF funds would be used to support the program (p. 36).

The applicant provided information that suggests that the amounts allocated for educator bonuses may be insufficient for attaining project goals. For example, the largest sums are to be paid for attendance on the job, sponsoring extracurricular activities, and schools' AYP status. Only a small portion of incentive funds will be based on teacher effectiveness or changes in teacher behavior (budget narrative).

Insufficient evidence was provided to determine whether the amounts of incentives are enough to expect a change in teacher behavior.

**Reader's Score: 22**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of Local Evaluation**

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

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

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

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

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

**Strengths:**

The use of an external evaluator offers greater of expertise and objectivity, providing a technically sound evaluation and more credible results (p 39).

The evaluation planned will produce both quantitative and qualitative data (p. 37).

**Weaknesses:**

Insufficient information was provided about how evaluation data will be used for continuous improvement.

Insufficient detail is provided about the evaluation plan and the responsibilities of the external evaluator to determine quality or usefulness of the plan (p. 39).

**Reader's Score: 2**

## 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:

Although a value-added system is not yet in place, one will be developed that will utilize the newly expanded data management system (p. 26).

#### Weaknesses:

While there are plans to develop a value-added model using a data system, insufficient information was included in the application to determine what it might include or how it will fit into the overall PBCS (p. 26).

Although the application stated that teachers will have access to value-added data, insufficient information was provided about how the value-added model will be used to help or train teachers to improve their practice (p. 27).

Insufficient information was provided to assess the applicant's capacity to implement and explain value-added methods or measures.

Reader's Score: 3

### Priority Preference - Competitive Preference Priority 2

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

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

staff. Lastly, applicants must demonstrate, in their applications that they will implement a process for effectively communicating to teachers which of the LEA's schools are high-need and which subjects and specialty areas are considered hard-to-staff.

**Strengths:**

No strengths found.

**Weaknesses:**

None; the applicant noted that hard-to-staff subject areas is not a need (p. 4).

**Reader's Score: 0**

---

**Status:** Submitted  
**Last Updated:** 8/9/10 5:24 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 8/10/10 9:59 AM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** Butler County Board of Education -- , (S385A100075)

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

|  | Points Possible | Points Scored |
|--|-----------------|---------------|
| <b>Questions</b>                             |                 |               |
| <b>Evaluation Criteria</b>                   |                 |               |
| <b>Absolute Priority 1</b>                   |                 |               |
| 1.Absolute Priority 1                        | 0               | 0             |
| <b>Absolute Priority 2</b>                   |                 |               |
| 1.Absolute Priority 2                        | 0               | 0             |
| <b>Sub Total</b>                             | 0               | 0             |
| <b>Evaluaton Criteria</b>                    |                 |               |
| <b>Absolute Priority 3</b>                   |                 |               |
| 1.Absolute Priority 3                        | 0               | 0             |
| <b>Sub Total</b>                             | 0               | 0             |
| <b>Requirement</b>                           |                 |               |
| <b>Requirement</b>                           |                 |               |
| 1.Requirement                                | 0               | 0             |
| <b>Sub Total</b>                             | 0               | 0             |
| <b>Evaluation Criteria</b>                   |                 |               |
| <b>Core Element 1</b>                        |                 |               |
| 1.Core Element 1                             | 0               | 0             |
| <b>Core Element 2</b>                        |                 |               |
| 1.Core Element 2                             | 0               | 0             |
| <b>Core Element 3</b>                        |                 |               |
| 1.Core Element 3                             | 0               | 0             |
| <b>Core Element 4</b>                        |                 |               |
| 1.Core Element 4                             | 0               | 0             |
| <b>Core Element 5</b>                        |                 |               |
| 1.Core Element 5                             | 0               | 0             |
| <b>High Quality Professional Development</b> |                 |               |
| 1.Professional Development                   | 0               | 0             |
| <b>Sub Total</b>                             | 0               | 0             |
| <b>Selection Criteria</b>                    |                 |               |
| <b>Need for the Project</b>                  |                 |               |
| 1.Need for Project                           | 10              | 6             |
| <b>Project Design</b>                        |                 |               |

|   |     |    |
|---|-----|----|
| 1.Project Design                                    | 60  | 50 |
| <b>Adequacy of Support for the Proposed Project</b> |     |    |
| 1.Adequacy of Support                               | 25  | 20 |
| <b>Quality of Local Evaluation</b>                  |     |    |
| 1.Quality of Local Eval.                            | 5   | 2  |
| <b>Sub Total</b>                                    | 100 | 78 |

**Priority Questions**

**Priority Preference**

**Competitive Preference Priority 1**

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

**Competitive Preference Priority 2**

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

|                  |    |   |
|------------------|----|---|
| <b>Sub Total</b> | 10 | 3 |
|------------------|----|---|

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

## Technical Review Form

Panel #2 - Panel - 2: 84.385A

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

Applicant: Butler County Board of Education -- , (S385A100075)

### 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 purports to utilize a holistic approach for its PBSC that recognizes the impact of educators and support staff on educational effectiveness.

While the applicant has identified differentiated levels of compensation for teachers and principals (Appendix, p. e3), there is no justification provided that the allocated amounts are substantial enough to promote a change in the behavior of educators. Teachers and principals are to receive an observation evaluation twice a year that utilizes EducateAlabama and LeadAlabama.

The applicant states that teachers and principals will be compensated at 50% based on the state evaluation of school teachers (EDUCATE Alabama) and administrators (LeadAlabama) and 50% based on student academic improvement (p. e13) and the achievement of school culture for administrators (p. e14). In addition, the applicant contends that the compensation for principals will be based, in part on student achievement (p. e15) which is a component of the school culture evaluation. However, no specific percent of the weight of student achievement within the school culture evaluation is made clear.

Both the EDUCATEAlabama and LeadAlabama observation evaluations are based on the Alabama quality standard (p. e14).

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 program has articulated a plan for utilizing Title I to support professional development at a gradual rate over time (e.35) and Race to the Top funds to support differentiated teacher pay based on effectiveness. Here again, the specific amount(s) of contribution(s) is unclear. The program purports that state monies will be available to support differentiated compensation beyond the life of the grant. However, no assurance is provided that such funding will be available. Because the applicant does not offer the reader pay formulas or specifics on the proposed contribution, limited trustworthiness is achieved with regard to the actualization of the priority.

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 comprehensive design of the program to include professional development support for teachers, offering data feedback pathways.

The PBCS attends to the holistic learning of student learning (i.e., attending to the academic, social, and emotional growth of student (p. 12)). These are considerations are addressed through the fourth pay component related to the school such as reducing discipline referrals, improving student satisfaction, increasing extra-curricular activities, expanding celebrations and recognition. However, there are no professional development activities specifically identified within the plan to fully support these stated aims.

The program does not discuss how decisions of tenure are to be developed and addressed.

The program has not proposed a systematic approach for retaining teachers beyond the life of the grant.

**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 incentive for teachers to engage in school level, extracurricular activities is uniquely tied to the program plan for the comprehensive renewal of schools (p. e6). The opportunities for teachers to serve as mentors and master teachers are a strong component given the clear criteria for selection into these roles (Appendix pp 3-6). However, there is no mention as to how long one may remain in such positions.

**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 communication system, as presented, is quite promising, particularly since it predicated on the approaches and lessons learned from the implementation of the district's initial PayPlus program (p. e39). For example, the applicant intends to make presentations during county board meetings, systems institutes, and faculty meetings.

**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:**

In order to include the involvement of key and support personnel necessary for the development and implementation of the program, the applicant explains that a plan is in place to develop a system-wide committee composed of three representatives from each

school or site and central office members (p. e40). Committee members may be chosen from classified and certified personnel.

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 explains that the LeadAlabama (the state evaluation for principals, based on Stand standards for administrators) and the EDUCATEAlabama (the state evaluation for teachers, based on state standards) will be utilized for evaluating principals and teachers, respectively. Teacher observations to be conducted by mentor teachers (p. e37) and the two annual EDUCATEAlabama observations scheduled be conducted by site administrators are scheduled to be acted upon in coherence with PBCS measures for educator effectiveness and to provide teacher feedback and support.

Because the state evaluation systems are standardized, a level of reliability is included; however, there is no discussion of how inter-rater reliability will be ensured for teacher observations.

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 states that the DecisionED Data system will be purchased for the management of data. However, a discussion of how student achievement data will be utilized through this system and linked to teacher and principal payroll and human resources systems is not developed (p. e42).

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 states the training on the DecisionED data system for teachers and principals to inform them of the components of the educator effectiveness (p. e43). However, there are various questions as to the coherence among the various evaluations and supports in alignment with the educator effectiveness measures/activities as part of the PBCS. As such, the quality of the anticipated training is brought into question.

Mentor and master teachers are expected to provide teachers with individual instructional support as a means of professional development. Principals are schedule to conduct EDUCATEAlabama observations of teachers. However, it is unclear how the supports from mentor and master teachers and feedback from observations, when occurring, will be coordinated in a meaningful way.

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:**

1. The applicant states that the DecisionEd system, particularly through the use of the district Dashboard (that include observational data on teachers and administrators, evaluation results, attendance data on teachers and students as well as discipline, grade history, all current assessment data both standardized and district on students) will be utilized to determine the needs for professional development (p. e42).

2. The applicant explains that the DecisonEd data based system will allow principals to look at school data and to encourage teachers to look at class and individual data. These processes, along with the assistance of mentor teachers working with classroom teachers, is designed to allow for the development of individualized (pp., e26, e43) professional development for teachers. The applicant does not discuss how individualized professional develop needs will be determined and address for principals.

3.(a).(b). (1). As the program is district-wide, all teachers and principals are to be included in the PBCS. However, the applicant does not address how educators who do or do not meet targets for teacher/principal effectiveness will be provided related, additions or individualized professional development.

3.(2). The PBCS is to award mentor teachers two additions weeks salary (p. 14). In addition, a component of the compensation system is to motivate and reward teachers and staff who assume leadership positions in their respective schools. School personnel can receive bonusawards by demonstrating leadership while serving as (1) a grade-level, department, or committee chair, (2) a teacher mentor, or (3) a sponsor of extracurricular activities. All money remaining after payout for Attendance and Leadership will be divided equally between Unity of Effort to Achieve AYP and School Culture. (p. 11).

4. The role of the Payplus coordinator will be to work with teachers and faculty to evaluate data used in determining effectiveness. This data, as housed in the DecisionEd data system, will be used to inform individual, school, and district professional development (p. 44).However, is it is not apparent that the data will be used to inform growth plans, particularly at the classroom level.

5. The applicant has explained how the instructional support provided to teachers by mentor and master teachers, administrators, a focus on outcomes on student data, and teacher effectiveness evaluations will lead to additional professional development. However, it has not been made specifically known how the program will employ a systematic process for providing similar cycles of professional development for administrators.

**Reader's Score: 0**

**Selection Criteria - Need for the Project**

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

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

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

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

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

(2) Student achievement (as defined in the Federal Register notice) in each of the schools

whose educators would be part of the PBCS is lower than in what the applicant determines are comparable schools in the LEA, or another LEA in its State, in terms of key factors such as size, grade levels, and poverty levels; and

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

**Strengths:**

The applicant has identified a need for the project based on the Title I status of schools with 78% of the students receiving free or reduced meals (p. e1) In addition, while the applicant does not identify particular content areas as high needs, an expressed difficulty for recruiting highly qualified teachers has been identified (p.e2). Furthermore, the applicant reports a 16% teacher turn over within the past three years.

The application does, however refer to the current Stanford 10 Achievement Tests as a marker of high needs with regard to student achievement, citing 49th percentile for mathematics and 46th percentile for reading.

**Weaknesses:**

Assessing the student achievement level of student in comparison to surrounding LEAs does not provide a level of significance with regard to the district's high needs status as the State mathematics and reading scores are similar across LEAs, ranging between 70-79%.

While the applicant has expressed difficulty recruiting highly qualified teachers, no quantifiable measure of the number of teachers meeting this classification are provided. The 16% teacher turnover rates may be taken with caution given that no measure of the raw number (n) of teacher attrition nor how such attrition may be compared with surrounding LEAs of comparable size and student population. Furthermore, the applicant addresses teacher satisfaction as a condition of retention but does not articulate how teacher effectiveness may pertain to the current attrition rates of teachers.

The applicant states that there are not hard to fill content areas.

**Reader's Score: 6**

**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 purports to define teacher and principal achievement based on student learning as well as through multiple data points, including the absolute priority of two observations occurring annually for teachers and principals. The proposal includes a unique feature which awards effectiveness bonuses for teachers and principal in two parts, each determined by independent measures (i.e., teacher/principal annual evaluations and student achievement improvement). While the applicant does not define the criteria for performance on annual evaluations that will merit bonuses, a schedule to do so during the planning period has been expressed.

The applicant has expressed a plan to purchase and utilize the DecisionEd Data system (p. e25, e42) and by providing access to all educational personnel to the system to track program data, including teacher/principal evaluations and added value of student learning outcomes (year-over-year), offers a high level of transparency and fairness.

The utilization of multiple school culture and student learning goals as part of the program may very well foster a comprehensive model for school improvement and reform as well as address student success holistically to include social, emotional, and academic domains.

The applicant has proposed a plan to included all school and district support personnel in the PBCS and to provide compensation in the amount of 50% of the certified employee rate if AYP is made at a school level (for the employees of that school) and for AYP at the district level.

Professional development for teachers is expected to be based on multiple data sets and to be differentiated by individual and by school.

In order to include the involvement of personnel necessary for the development and implementation of the program, the applicant explains that a plan is in place to develop a system-wide committee composed of three representatives from each school or site and central office members (p. e40). Committee members may be chosen from classified and certified personnel.

Because the state evaluation systems are standardized, a level of reliability is included; however, there is no discussion of how inter-rater reliability will be ensured

for teacher observations.

**Weaknesses:**

While the applicant plans to use the DecisionED data system to monitor added value growth models for student learning, no clear assurance of the efficacy of this program to do so and to account for context variables such as resources for opportunities to learn as correlated with student learning is offered.

The applicant addresses a particular performance incentive amount for employee attendance in the amount of \$125.00 and Adequate Yearly Progress (appendix p. e7), but no other performance incentive amounts are presented. Furthermore, the applicant does not provide a justification with regard of the fidelity of the anticipated incentive amounts for teachers and principals to leverage change in personnel performance. In this regard, the differentiation of the PBCS is not fully addressed.

The applicant has not clearly described how student data will be linked to payroll and human resources (i.e., for tenure, promotion, and retention considerations).

**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 greatest strength of the management plan is the district's prior experience with the PayPlus program, including its evaluation and lessons learned. These are promising factors to ensure the successful management of the TIF grant.

The program has created a detailed timeline for program implementation as well as specific selection criteria and job descriptions for the program manager, mentor teachers, and master teachers.

The program has articulated a plan for utilizing Title I to support professional development at a gradual rate over time (pp., e.35, e 36) and Race to the Top funds to support differentiated teacher pay based on effectiveness. The program purports that state monies will be available to support differentiated compensation beyond the life of the grant.

**Weaknesses:**

The amount of Title I and Title two funds (pp., e35, e36) to be contributed to program development and implementation are not articulated. In addition, there is now explanation as to which professional development activities will be funded by these sources. Furthermore, the applicant does not make clear how much will be allocated from each of these sources toward the program which diminishes the quality of the proposed support. Because the applicant does not offer the reader pay formulas or specifics on the proposed contribution, limited trustworthiness is achieved with regard to the actualization of the priority.

**Reader's Score: 20**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of Local Evaluation**

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

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

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

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

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

**Strengths:**

The proposed use of the DecisionED data system, enabling employees at various levels to access program outcome data, as well as the anticipated schedule for the program director to meet with school leaders to review program outcomes, is a strength of the evaluation system.

The program has articulated goals for increased student achievement at the district level as well as teacher effectiveness (measured by EDUCATEAlabama) at rate increase of 3% year-over-year in the number of teachers achieving integrating or innovating status. In addition the program aims to reduce teacher retention by 5% over five years (p.e36) and to higher an external evaluator.

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant proposed to hire an external evaluator for years 2 and 3 of implementation (p.e38); however, no rationale for the limiting evaluation to these years has been expressed. In addition, the lack of base line data with regard to the current number of teachers who attrite limits the credibility of the expressed retention goal. The same caution may be raised with regard to the 3% goal for the annual increase in teacher effectiveness. Not to mention, this goal or effectiveness is limited to teachers and includes only one data sources of the many to be utilized within the program and does not account for student learning growth.

**Reader's Score: 2**

## 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 program proposes to assess state data to measure added value in student growth year-over-year. This includes managing data through the DecsionED data stem.

#### Weaknesses:

The efficacy of the DecisionED (p. e25) system to correlate opportunity-to-learn factors and student learning outcomes is not fully developed. Such explanation would be beneficial for establishing the full extent of the efficacy of the data system. It is not definitively clear what percentage, if any, of the measure of student achievement used within the PBSC is factored by a value added model.

The applicant does not specifically articulate its systematic approach for explaining the added value added model to teachers.

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 program proposes to retain teachers, by increasing teacher satisfaction (p. e3).

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant does not 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.

The recruitment of highly effective teachers for hard-to-staff content areas is not addressed.

**Reader's Score: 1**

---

**Status:** Submitted

**Last Updated:** 8/10/10 9:59 AM