

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 8/6/10 4:04 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Center for Educational Innovation - Public Education Association -- ,
(S385A100095)

Reader #1: *****

Points Possible Points Scored

Questions

Evaluation Criteria

Absolute Priority 1

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

Absolute Priority 2

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

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

Evaluation Criteria

Absolute Priority 3

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

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

Requirement

Requirement

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

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

Evaluation Criteria

Core Element 1

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

Core Element 2

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

Core Element 3

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

Core Element 4

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

Core Element 5

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

High Quality Professional Development

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

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

Selection Criteria

Need for the Project

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

Project Design

1.Project Design	60	50
Adequacy of Support for the Proposed Project		
1.Adequacy of Support	25	25
Quality of Local Evaluation		
1.Quality of Local Eval.	5	5
Sub Total	100	87

Priority Questions

Priority Preference

Competitive Preference Priority 1

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

Competitive Preference Priority 2

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

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

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

Technical Review Form

Panel #7 - Panel - 7: 84.385A

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: Center for Educational Innovation - Public Education Association -- ,
(S385A100095)

Questions

Evaluation Criteria - Absolute Priority 1

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

Comment on how well the applicant demonstrates that --

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

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

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

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

General:

This proposal puts forth a PBCS plan to build a framework to support the expansion its current salary schedule based compensation system to one based on increasing student performance, assuming additional responsibilities and promoting school wide improvements in teaching and learning for six high-need charter schools. It will support participating schools and educators with targeted professional development and resources to attain build individual evaluation instruments and metrics aligned with this framework. The incentive amount will be researched by participating schools to determine which amount, between four to eight percent, is sufficient to change behaviors of current and prospective educators in their schools.

Reader's Score: 0

Evaluation Criteria - Absolute Priority 2

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

Comment on how well the applicant demonstrates that - -

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

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

General:

The applicant has costs adequate to support the development and implementation of the PBCS framework in the six participating school. Individual schools will determine their level of non TIF financial contribution based on their resources and approval from their boards.

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 move towards the implementation of a PBCS is part of an cohesive collaborative strategy to increase student performance in the six participating charter schools. The Consortium recognizes the challenges that ensue in coordinating the policies and procedures of these independent schools, and has identified a program model that keeps at the center improved student learning while acknowledging school-specific strategies. The use of data to inform retention and tenure decisions will be left to the individual schools.

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 proposed PBCS program will provide the six participating charter schools with a framework and a template to develop school specific strategies to incentivize educators to take on additional responsibilities. The review Panel, developed during the planning

year, will serve to ensure that the individual school plan is aligned with the overall goals of the Consortium.

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 development of the PBCS plan among the Consortium schools is intentionally designed to be collaborative and involve a broad stakeholder base. During the planning year the program's communication plan, as developed by the Review Team, will be informed by their input and feedback.

Reader's Score: 0

Evaluation Criteria - Core Element 2

1. Core Element 2:

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

General:

The Consortium held several meetings for area charter schools interested in participating in the development of the PBCS framework. Each school secured approval from their faculty before participation could be secured. The Consortium conducted an assessment of readiness to identify the school's need and determine how to support them (E33).

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 seeks a planning period to successfully plan and implement this program in the participating six high need charter schools. Focus will also be on developing the instruments needed to determine teacher and principal effectiveness. Both observation tool used employs protocols and standards developed by the Consortium but tailored to meet the needs of the individual schools. Components have been identified to support the direction of the teacher and principal effectiveness evaluation but its actual plan is undeveloped. The Consortium will establish standards that will include significant student growth through absolute and value added performance targets. Data will be collected by administrators, master teachers and peers allowing for inter-rater reliability. Additionally these individuals will receive professional development on the evaluation instrument.

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 six individual schools will contract with PICCS-Buffalo to use its data management system. It will link Human Resources and payroll to student achievement data. It seeks to be a one-stop resource for all consortium educators and can be customized to support individual school needs.

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:

During the planning period, participating schools will be actively involved in developing a site specific PBCS that correlates with the framework and template set forth by Consortium. The Consortium will train all participating schools in the protocols of professional learning communities to ensure equalized involvement. Each school will have the ability to customize the evaluation plan to meet the specific needs of the school but all will schools will weight student assessment data at fifty-one percent. Once created, all teachers will undergo training to ensure understanding the evaluation instrument.

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 proposed project will address the academic needs of six charter schools belonging to a Consortium. A thorough needs assessment reveals that these schools are high poverty with high teacher turnover, as well as less experienced. Although scoring as well or better than comparable schools, concern is raised that based on past performance, their students' growth will decline if an intervention is not in place.

The evaluation system will collect data on student performance on formative and summative assessments to inform professional development activities targeted to the teacher or the school. The framework proposed will look at absolute and value added performance measures.

Teachers have multiple, ongoing supports if they are not meeting standards indicated on the evaluation rubric. Each school will establish a school wide professional learning communities identify school based PLC coaches and will network the six schools to create a consortium wide learning community.

Teachers will be supported by peer reviewers and instructional coaches, leadership positions available to teachers who consistently demonstrate effectiveness.

The PBCS model immerses participating teachers and principals into a data culture of common language and support using student assessment as the foundation of their conversation and professional development. The assessment of educators in this model is ongoing as well as the monitoring of student growth. The model provides a feedback loop so that professional development and instructional practice is tied to student performance.

Interconnected is a periodic assessment to ensure that professional development is improving teacher and leader 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 proposed project will address the academic needs of six charter schools belonging to a Consortium. A thorough needs assessment reveals that these schools are high poverty with high teacher turnover, as well as less experienced. Although scoring as well or better than comparable schools, concern is raised that based on past performance, their students' growth will decline if an intervention is not in place.

Weaknesses:

Reference is made to the potential of declining student growth as evidence in past performance of students, however, no concrete data is provided to assess the real need in the individual six schools.

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 move towards the implementation of a PBCS is part of an cohesive collaborative strategy to increase student performance in the six participating charter schools. The Consortium recognizes the challenges that ensue in coordinating the policies and procedures of these independent schools, and has identified a program model that keeps at the center improved student learning while acknowledging school-specific strategies. The use of data to inform retention and tenure decisions will be left to the individual schools.

The goal of this PBCS plan to build a framework to support the expansion its current salary schedule based compensation system to one based on increasing student performance, assuming additional responsibilities and promoting school wide improvements in teaching and learning for six high-need charter schools. It will support participating schools and educators with targeted professional development and resources to attain build individual evaluation instruments and metrics aligned with this framework.

In collaboration with the individual schools, the applicant identifies an adequate compensation size between four to eight percent over base pay as sufficient to influence retention behaviors of principals and teachers. However, the final amounts will be determined by each school.

Educator effectiveness will be determined using multiple measures using the absolute and value added performance measurements, observations conducted by peer reviewers and other classroom based artifacts (E19). Effective teachers and principals would be defined as those who qualify for any portion of the awards as determined by the individual school site (E33). Student growth is a significant part of the effectiveness measured and fifty-one percent of the compensation eligibility.

Participating schools will customize a framework developed by the Consortium to meet the individual needs of the students and educators.

The proposal enjoys support from the participating schools. Schools chosen had to secure approval from staff and undergo a needs assessment to determine readiness. (E39).

During the planning period, participating teachers and administrators will be involved in comprehensive year-long collaboration to build a site specific teacher and principal effectiveness evaluation plan aligned with the Consortium. They will work develop the evaluation instrument as well as understand the data used to assess them.

The LEA will contract with Consortium to use its data management system. It will link Human Resources and payroll to student achievement data. It seeks to be a "one-stop" resource for all consortium educators and can be customized to support individual school needs.

Weaknesses:

Although the Consortium recognizes the challenges that ensue in coordinating the policies and procedures of these independent schools, and has identified a program model that keeps at the center improved student learning while acknowledging school-specific strategies, it remains unclear as to what the actual PBCS will look like for the individual teachers and principals participating in it.

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 was developed with input from multiple stakeholders. It provides an adequate planning period timeline needed to build site specific evaluation rubrics that align to Consortium's framework. The project timeline is very intentional in including collaboration into the development process.

The project director and other key personnel are more than capable to carry out their responsibilities. The time commitments are adequate and responsibilities are clearly defined.

The collaborating LEA will support the program with graduated non-TIF funds throughout and after the grant period.

The project costs and requested amount are acceptable to meet project goals as described.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were identified.

Reader's Score: 25

Selection Criteria - Quality of Local Evaluation

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

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

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

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

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

Strengths:

The applicant puts forth a focused local evaluation plan centered on two purposes: to provide feedback for continuous improvement and to examine the implementation of the program framework between schools (E1). The evaluation proposed identifies adequate performance objectives related to the goals of the project.

The comprehensive data collected will be both qualitative and quantitative including performance data collected through its data management system, Consortium and school produced rubrics, state standardized assessments, student work, surveys, interviews and observations (E3).

The procedures identified will ensure feedback and continuous improvement of the project.

Weaknesses:

No weakness was identified.

Reader's Score: 5

Priority Questions

Priority Preference - Competitive Preference Priority 1

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

To meet this competitive preference priority, the applicant must demonstrate, in its

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

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

Strengths:

The PBCS will incorporate absolute and value added performance targets into its data collection methodology (E-3) of student assessment data, teacher's evaluation results, and teacher recruitment and retention data. This information can then be compared at the school level as well as across the Consortium schools to provide the project additional feedback on its performance. Data will be analyzed to provide teachers through school wide and content specific professional learning communities to improve classroom practice (E29).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were identified.

Reader's Score: 5

Priority Preference - Competitive Preference Priority 2

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

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

Strengths:

This proposed project will address the academic needs of thirteen chronically underperforming schools in a LEA (E3). A thorough needs assessment reveals that these schools are high poverty and high minority, have lower achievement than comparable schools, and low graduation rates.

The PBCS includes student growth data to inform tenure decisions (E26), and to transfers from within the district. The LEA will offer a recruitment and retention bonus (E15) for educators willing to teach hard- to-staff subjects.

Weaknesses :

A needs assessment of the LEA reveals that educator salaries are lower than neighboring districts. In state-identified hard to staff subjects, the LEA has difficulty hiring qualified educators (E6). However, the specific impact this has on recruitment in the thirteen schools participating in this PBCS is not shared. Although turnover data is shared for the district, it is not clear the impact this has on all participating schools. Allusions are made to the impact this may have on instruction but no concrete data is provided to assess the actual educator need in the thirteen particular schools.

Previous success in existing TAP schools in the LEA support the position that increased retention in hard to staff subjects and recruitment into high-need schools will occur with this proposal although no evidence is provided to that effect.

Minimal promotion of vacancies is offered. The LEA will post job openings and indicate if they are high- need or hard-to-staff on the announcement (E18). This recruitment strategy may not be effective in encouraging new educators to the school or hard to staff subjects.

Reader's Score: 2

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 8/6/10 4:04 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 8/6/10 4:04 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Center for Educational Innovation - Public Education Association -- ,
(S385A100095)

Reader #2: *****

Points Possible Points Scored

Questions

Evaluation Criteria

Absolute Priority 1

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

Absolute Priority 2

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

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

Evaluation Criteria

Absolute Priority 3

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

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

Requirement

Requirement

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

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

Evaluation Criteria

Core Element 1

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

Core Element 2

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

Core Element 3

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

Core Element 4

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

Core Element 5

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

High Quality Professional Development

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

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

Selection Criteria

Need for the Project

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

Project Design

1.Project Design	60	55
Adequacy of Support for the Proposed Project		
1.Adequacy of Support	25	24
Quality of Local Evaluation		
1.Quality of Local Eval.	5	4
Sub Total	100	90

Priority Questions

Priority Preference

Competitive Preference Priority 1

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

Competitive Preference Priority 2

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

Sub Total	10	6
------------------	----	---

Total	110	96
--------------	-----	----

Technical Review Form

Panel #7 - Panel - 7: 84.385A

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: Center for Educational Innovation - Public Education Association -- ,
(S385A100095)

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 narrative provides sufficient evidence that each LEA in the Consortium will develop and implement a PBCS. Each PBCS will pay out at least 51% of the TIF supported compensation based on student growth (page 17). The evaluation process for teachers and principals will include at least two observations (page 35). The size of the awards will range from 4%-8% of base pay, which research indicates is a sufficient amount to change behavior (page 25).

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:

In this application, each charter school in the consortium is its own LEA. The application provides sufficient narrative to conclude the Consortium has projected costs during the program and beyond to provide performance-based compensation to teachers, principals, and other staff in each LEA school. The Consortium will increase the amount of its funds for the compensation from 10% in year 2 (after the planning year) to 75% in year 5 (page 59). This is a realistic and appropriate schedule for the increase.

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 narrative outlines the Consortium's strategy for improving the educator workforce and improving student achievement. At the center of their strategy is a focus on professional development designed to build capacity of teachers and principals in areas that directly relate to student outcomes (page 42). The Consortium will build data cultures through extensive professional development on data and data use, and professional learning communities (page 46). The PBCS, linked to the evaluation system, will play a key part of the focus for professional development during and after the TIF grant period.

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 narrative provides sufficient support that the Consortium will provide educators with incentives to assume additional leadership roles and responsibilities (pages 18 and 19). For teachers, for example, the role may be serving as a peer review member or a leader in

a PLC.

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 narrative provides evidence of a strong communication plan to Consortium LEA's. Prior to submission of the application, each LEA was required to secure buy-in from board members, school leaders, teacher representatives, and others (page 32). A survey on readiness for implementation was required, which is a best practice (page 33). The Consortium PBCS plan includes a planning year, with communications to key groups involved in the system a major focus (pages 33-34). The narrative does not address communications with the community at large.

Reader's Score: 0

Evaluation Criteria - Core Element 2

1. Core Element 2:

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

General:

The narrative provided sufficient evidence that each LEA was required to secure buy-in from board members, school leaders, teacher representatives, and others, including union representatives in participating union charter schools (page 32).

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 narrative provides a thorough presentation on how each LEA will develop a plan that meets the requirements of an overall Consortium PBCS model. Each LEA will have a committee develop a Performance Based Compensation Plan (PBCP) that will determine the structure of the evaluation system for that LEA.

Each PBCP will include absolute student performance targets and measures, and value-added performance targets and measures. During the planning year, each LEA will determine how the targets will fit with other data collected to create rating categories.

The narrative provides evidence the Consortium will base observations on Danielson's work, with rubric measuring teacher effectiveness in four areas (page 36). Teachers and principals will be observed twice each year. Teachers will also self assess, and discussions will be held regarding reliability of agreement between the teacher and observer (pages 37-38).

The evaluation process includes using multiple observers to rate teachers, but the narrative does not discuss inter-rater reliability for 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 narrative provides strong evidence that the Consortium will implement a data management system that, through its data warehouse component, will have the capacity to link student achievement data to payroll and human resources data (pages 38 and 62-64).

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 narrative provides strong evidence that the Consortium's professional development strategy includes training in the use of data from the evaluation system (page 45). The focus of professional development is on using the data to differentiate instruction for increased student achievement.

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 narrative includes evidence that the Consortium will include professional development for teachers and principals that target needs for each participating LEA, and are directly related to the performance measures and criteria for effectiveness of the LEA's PBCP (page 42).

Professional development will be structured based on an analysis of student assessment data and progress towards meeting student, classroom, and schoolwide plans for improvement. The PLC's within in each will support increasing understanding about the evaluation system and the improvement of instructional practices (page 43).

The Consortium's professional development framework includes ongoing analysis to improve the teacher and principal evaluation process (page 43).

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:

Each LEA in the Consortium is a high need charter school. The narrative provides adequate evidence that the Consortium LEA's have high teacher turnover rate, large percentages of teachers who do not have appropriate certification, and large percentages of inexperienced teachers (page 3).

The narrative provides a definition of what the Consortium considers a comparable school.

Weaknesses:

The narrative notes that student achievement in the Consortium LEA's is higher than "comparable schools", which the applicant stated is the Buffalo public school district. Most of the schools in the Consortium have higher average performance than the average level in the entire Buffalo school district.

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 narrative notes that the Consortium schools have an integrated and comprehensive school improvement model, and the PBCS is aligned with it (page 7).

The applicant is including a planning year in the project. As a part of the planning, the Consortium will determine the final design for the PBCS. All schools in the Consortium will use that framework.

The narrative provides compelling evidence that the PBCS has the support of staff in each of the Consortium schools.

The evaluation system will include absolute and value-added performance targets, based on student growth. Growth will account for 51% of the weight in the overall evaluation. Included in the evaluation process are classroom observations (minimum of 2 per year), which use Danielson's model of effective teaching.

The narrative includes a data management system that will collect all required data into a data warehouse (pages 38-40). The data management system will enable the applicant to link student achievement data to payroll and human resources systems.

The narrative notes that the project includes a variety of professional development activities. Each school will use PLC's, and extensive training in data use in a part of the project design.

Weaknesses:

All of the separate Consortium schools need to develop their own final model, using the overall Consortium model as a template. It is difficult to determine how similar or different schools will be within the Consortium, and how that might impact the overall project.

Reader's Score: 55

Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Support for the Proposed Project

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

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

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

Strengths:

The narrative includes an adequate management plan in most areas. The Consortium will have an initial planning year, which is detailed in the management plan with events and responsible persons or entities. This planning year timeline is presented by quarters of the year, which provides adequate information to monitor progress.

Project personnel delineated in the narrative, including the Director and key staff, are experienced and knowledgeable.

The narrative provides evidence that the applicant will leverage TIF funds with additional public and private monies (page 60).

The narrative provides sufficient evidence that the requested grant amount is sufficient to attain the project goals.

Weaknesses:

The management plan needs more specificity in years 3-5. The management plan for years 3-5 does not include yearly evaluation reports.

The Project Manager and Project Coordinator will be new hires. These staff will need training and education during the initial months of the project, which may impact implementation.

Reader's Score: 24

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 narrative includes a strong local evaluation plan, with measureable performance objectives related to the project goals.

The evaluation instruments and plan will produce both quantitative and qualitative data, that will provide feedback to staff regarding effectiveness (pages 64-65).

The narrative denotes that the evaluation design includes ongoing communications with project stakeholders, which will provide feedback and information for continuous improvement during the project period (page 66).

Weaknesses:

The evaluation plan is not specific enough for years 3-5. The timeline of events does not include yearly evaluation reports for year 3 and 4 (page 57).

Reader's Score: 4

Priority Questions

Priority Preference - Competitive Preference Priority 1

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

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

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

Strengths:

The narrative provides sufficient support and documentation that the applicant will use a value-added measure for student growth, and that student outcomes (as measured by student growth) is a significant factor in determination of performance compensation.

The narrative provides sufficient evidence that the applicant has the capacity to collect the data for the value-added model.

The application notes that as a part of PLC and other professional development activities, the value-added model and how it is incorporated into the evaluation process

is discussed.

Weaknesses:

The narrative does not include a statement on how much of a factor the value-added growth will play in the overall evaluation system.

Reader's Score: 4

Priority Preference - Competitive Preference Priority 2

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

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

Strengths:

The project will serve high need students in the Consortium schools.

Weaknesses:

The narrative does not provide sufficient documentation that the proposed PBCS will assist in retaining effective teachers in hard to staff areas.

The application does not describe how the Consortium schools will determine that a teacher filling a vacancy is likely to be effective.

The narrative does not provide sufficient documentation on how it communicates which subjects are considered hard to staff.

Reader's Score: 2

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 8/6/10 4:04 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 8/6/10 4:04 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Center for Educational Innovation - Public Education Association -- ,
(S385A100095)

Reader #3: *****

Points Possible Points Scored

Questions

Evaluation Criteria

Absolute Priority 1

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

Absolute Priority 2

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

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

Evaluaton Criteria

Absolute Priority 3

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

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

Requirement

Requirement

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

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

Evaluation Criteria

Core Element 1

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

Core Element 2

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

Core Element 3

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

Core Element 4

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

Core Element 5

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

High Quality Professional Development

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

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

Selection Criteria

Need for the Project

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

Project Design

1.Project Design	60	49
Adequacy of Support for the Proposed Project		
1.Adequacy of Support	25	23
Quality of Local Evaluation		
1.Quality of Local Eval.	5	4
Sub Total	100	83

Priority Questions

Priority Preference

Competitive Preference Priority 1

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

Competitive Preference Priority 2

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

Sub Total	10	3
------------------	----	---

Total	110	86
--------------	-----	----

Technical Review Form

Panel #7 - Panel - 7: 84.385A

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: Center for Educational Innovation - Public Education Association -- ,
(S385A100095)

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 application has a planning year. This grant is for a consortium of six charter schools. In the first year of the grant, the consortium will plan the specifics of the PBCS and give guidelines to each of the individual charter schools. In those guidelines, the planning team will require significant emphasis on student growth with at least 51% of the performance-based compensation be based on student growth measures. The consortium budgeted about five percent of base salaries for performance-based compensation incentives; however, each charter will decide what is best for their school.

The applicant indicates that observation-based assessments will be required at multiple times during the year and those doing the observations will be trained in a rubric system. The incentives are large enough to effectively motivate teachers to take on the additional responsibilities.

Reader's Score: 0

Evaluation Criteria - Absolute Priority 2

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

Comment on how well the applicant demonstrates that - -

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

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

General:

The applicant has provided a reasonable five year budget for both the grant funds and local funds. The budget explains where additional funds will come from to sustain the program. Over the five years, the applicant takes on more fiscal responsibility each year for the performance-based compensation with plans to fully-fund the PCBS in year six.

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 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, in the area these charter schools serve. The applicant's plan is to make this program a school-wide integrated system on each of the charter schools in the consortium.

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 has designed a plan to offer multiple opportunities for staff to take on additional responsibilities and leadership roles including mentoring teachers and principal responsibilities (p. 29-30). The specific plans call for a timeline of activities that will train new teachers and reduce turn-over rates and at the same time increase the student success rates. The incentives are large enough to effectively motivate teachers to take on the additional responsibilities.

Reader's Score: 0

Evaluation Criteria - Core Element 1

1.Core Element 1:

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

General:

After the planning year, the charters begin implementing their PBCS. The plan calls for multiple communication activities that include meeting with parents/community stakeholders, conferencing with teachers, mid-year summary evaluations, and individualized plans for differentiated compensation (p. 34).

Reader's Score: 0

Evaluation Criteria - Core Element 2

1.Core Element 2:

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

General:

The applicant has established timelines and procedures for communicating to teachers, administrators, and other school personnel, including teacher unions (where applicable) during the planning year(p. 33). The applicant has already met with the interested charter schools and has secured "buy-in" formally and informally (p. 32). The schools have provided data for baseline information on recruitment, retention, etc. Communication will take place through the use of professional learning communities during the planning year.

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:

During the planning year, the applicant will develop a template for each charter school to develop its own customized evaluation rubric. This template will require a minimum of 2 - 3 observations with pre and post conferences planned each year. The evaluation will include value-added student growth measure of at least 51% weight (p.17). Training in data-based instructional strategies will be expected in each plan. The evaluation approach will require a rubric system based on Danielson's work. There is no reference to inter-rater reliability.

Reader's Score: 0

Evaluation Criteria - Core Element 4

1. Core Element 4:

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

General:

The data management warehouse system will be an all encompassing web portal that includes information on student achievement, individual student and campus learning plans, professional development tools, peer review, PLC information, and analytical tools. It includes a dashboard of systems including an online curriculum management system, assessment builder, and curriculum connector. The application was unclear if this data, especially the student achievement data would directly connect to the teacher and principal payroll and human resource systems (p. 41-42).

Reader's Score: 0

Evaluation Criteria - Core Element 5

1. Core Element 5:

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

General:

The applicant has a strong plan to deal with the teachers' and principals' understanding of the use of data and how it will be used to measure effectiveness. They plan on providing technical training through workshops using webinars, videos, podcasts and in-school coaching. The applicant will survey staff and then develop content specific training on the use of data according to individual needs based on the research of Love (2008). This comprehensive approach on the use of data and the professional development

the applicant has planned will ensure a quality outcome. The professional development plan will be driven by the teacher and principal evaluation results (p.42).

Reader's Score: 0

Evaluation Criteria - High Quality Professional Development

1.High Quality Professional Development:

Comment on the applicant's demonstration that ---

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

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

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

(3) Provide --

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

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

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

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

General:

The applicant has already secured some data on the needs of the charter schools involved with this project. This data, along with a planning year of gathering benchmark data and providing training to the charters, will assist the applicant in providing professional development based on the needs assessments of the high-need schools.

The applicant will establish a system during the planning year that to assist principals in identifying targeted needs of the teachers using individualized classroom learning plans (p. 12). The applicant will collect this data and develop school-wide learning plans to target each principal's need for professional development (p. 14).

The professional development will focus on what teachers and principals need to do in order to be effective and earn the differentiated compensation. The applicant has strong processes in place 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:

The applicant has done an outstanding job of documenting need for this grant by providing information on the high-need schools in this application. They are charter schools with a vast number of poor students in a poor large urban setting with a significant number of special education needs. The charters are also high-need in that they have difficulty retaining teachers with teacher turnover rates of about one-third each year. One-third of the teachers have less than three years experience.

The charter uses the state of New York's definition for "comparable" schools. This makes it clear that the charter is comparing with similar schools in the state. While the student achievement data shows these schools have students that perform well (see weaknesses), the data also shows that student performance on state achievement assessments declines as the students move through the system.

Weaknesses:

The student achievement data shows that compared to comparable schools in this state, these students perform well overall .

The application does not address the difficulty specifically in hiring hard-to-fill positions, such as math and science; although it does address a high turn-over rate in teachers in general.

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 establishes the criteria for paying out TIF supported compensation based on student achievement measures (p. 17). The applicant requires the TIF supported compensation be at least 51% based on student growth. The remaining factors will be based on other measures such as formal evaluations and leadership.

The applicant has visited with board, administration and faculty of the schools that would be involved with developing and implementing this PBCS. The applicant has detailed a Planning Year. The schools involved (all charters) have, at least informally, signed off on the application (p.9). The planning year will provide training and time for each charter to develop its own evaluation system and PBCS using a template and guidelines provided by the consortium.

The consortium will establish a comprehensive data system that will provide a link between student achievement and the teachers' evaluation data. The data system will have curriculum resources and will provide a way to share curriculum resources between teachers and schools. Assessments and reports are available as well in the data system (p. 40-41).

Weaknesses:

The applicant indicated that the evaluation standards will be established by each of the consortium schools individually (p. 27). This makes it difficult to state if the system is rigorous, transparent, and fair since it hasn't been developed yet and a template has not been established.

The professional development activities are purposefully planned to build capacity of the teachers and principals to be more effective in increasing student achievement (p. 42). However, there is no specific activity listed except Professional Learning Communities and how to use the data warehouse to evaluate whether the professional development activities are high-quality or even linked to specific measures of teacher and principal effectiveness.

Reader's Score: 49

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 is very likely to achieve the objectives of the proposed project within budget because they have experience with previous TIF programs in other districts (p. 51). The project director and other key personnel are qualified to carry out their responsibilities (p. 52). There is no evidence of a weakness with time commitments. A quarterly timeline has been provided in the application to ensure the project stays on schedule.

The funding is adequate and each year the charter schools take on more responsibility.

Weaknesses:

The proposal does not state where the funding will come from to sustain the project after year five. The TIF funding may exceed what is necessary to reach the objectives of the proposal.

Reader's Score: 23

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 goals that the evaluation will address include value-added student growth measures (p. 61). The applicant will produce quantitative and qualitative evaluation data. The template requirements for each charter will require continuous feedback. This is accomplished in the meetings held between each principal and each teacher each year to review progress of students and the class as a whole.

Weaknesses:

The measurable performance objectives are at best weak, if at all present, thus making it difficult to evaluate if the PBCS has an impact on recruiting and retaining effective teachers, principals and other personnel.

Reader's Score: 4

Priority Questions

Priority Preference - Competitive Preference Priority 1

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

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

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

Strengths:

The plan requires each school to develop a PBCS with both absolute and value-added student data to evaluate teacher and principal effectiveness (p. 28-30). The consortium will provide a template during the planning period to assist the individual charter

schools with this requirement.

Weaknesses:

The application does not adequately provide information to determine if the schools have the capacity to implement the proposed (unknown) value-added model or even if the school can explain the value-added model to the teachers. It is yet to be determined what the value-added model will look like in these schools.

Reader's Score: 2

Priority Preference - Competitive Preference Priority 2

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

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

Strengths:

The applicant is proposing a PBCS to assist a consortium of high-need charter schools in Buffalo based on the student performance needs of the district and with the goal of improving the retention of teachers in the district.

Weaknesses:

The application does not address filling hard-to-fill subject areas. It doesn't address how they will communicate to recruit for hard-to-fill positions.

Reader's Score: 1

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 8/6/10 4:04 PM