

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 8/6/10 4:06 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Center for Educational Innovation - Public Education Association -- ,
(S385A100096)

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	46
Adequacy of Support for the Proposed Project		
1.Adequacy of Support	25	20
Quality of Local Evaluation		
1.Quality of Local Eval.	5	3
Sub Total	100	76

Priority Questions

Priority Preference

Competitive Preference Priority 1

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

Competitive Preference Priority 2

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

Sub Total	10	5
------------------	----	---

Total	110	81
--------------	-----	----

Technical Review Form

Panel #8 - Panel - 8: 84.385A

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: Center for Educational Innovation - Public Education Association -- ,
(S385A100096)

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 proposal indicates that the applicant will develop and implement differentiated compensation for effective teachers, principals and other staff across a consortium of seven schools which incorporates and enhances the differentiated pay model currently in operation. (P.8). The model will give significant weight to student growth. Fifty-one percent (51%) of PBCP will be based on student growth as measured by objective data and 49% on other multiple measures. The evaluation process will include formal, observation-based assessments of teachers and principals at multiple points during the year by trained evaluators. (Pgs. 16 -17). It is likely that this will increase the possibility of fairness and objectivity. Principal effectiveness as part of the PBCS will be based upon school-wide attainment of absolute goals tied to school performance data and specified in charter agreements, value-added goals tied to individual student, classroom and grade-level performance; and site determined measures. (Pgs. 17 - 18). Teacher effectiveness as a part of the PBCS will be site determined and based upon absolute performance targets tied to school performance and specified in charter agreements and research-based value-added targets which include a range of student, classroom and

teacher variables. (Pgs. 27-28). This element of the proposed plan appears to be reasonable and achievable. The applicant goes further to include measures to determine the effectiveness of other instructional administrators, instructional paraprofessionals, guidance counselors, social workers and school librarians. The model will include provisions to support the collaborative development and measurement of performance targets and professional growth objectives for teachers based upon research-based strategies and using research-based rubrics. (Pgs. 35 - 37). The application states that consortium schools will design their PBCS plans based upon compensation reform research in both education and the private sector which confirms the setting of PBCP in the general range of 4% to 8% of base salary which is considered sufficient enough to affect change in teacher and principal behavior to ultimately improve student outcomes. (P.24). The applicant has included a rationale for the percentage of the award which is research-based and likely to support the objectives.

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 accepts the responsibility and cost of providing a PBCP for teachers, principals, and instructional staff. The applicant includes a projection of costs associated with PBCS development and implementation over a five-year period beginning with the 2010-11 school year. The budget narrative indicates that each school will provide from non-TIF funds an increasing percentage of the PBCP budgeted annually beginning in the 2011-12 school year from 10% to 75%. (Pgs. e0 - e10). This projection appears to be attainable if non-TIF funds are likely to increase on an annual basis.

Reader's Score: 0

Evaluaton Criteria - Absolute Priority 3

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

Comment on how well the applicant demonstrates that - -

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

General:

The applicant indicates that the proposed PBCS will align with a coherent and integrated strategy to strengthen its teachers and principals in areas directly related to performance measures and will include criteria for effectiveness and improving student achievement. The project will include professional development for teachers and principals who will engage in professional learning activities to promote a collaborative, data-driven, performance-focused school culture. (Pgs. 41 - 44). Professional development for teachers will include technical training focused on available data systems and training in the use of data. Professional development for principals and other instructional administrators will focus on improving their capacity to make informed data-driven decisions; provide teacher support in using data and differentiating instruction. (Pg. 44). The applicant cites the need to address a high teacher turnover rate of 27% on average among schools with available data as a challenge but the use of data and evaluation with reference to teacher retention and tenure decisions is not specifically found in the application. (Pgs. 2-3). The plan to strengthen teachers and principals appears to support the objectives of the project and likely to promote a data-driven culture.

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 indicates that TIF funds will be used to provide differentiated, performance-based compensation that supports and rewards teachers and other instructional staff for taking on additional leadership roles and responsibilities in schools including financial incentives for teachers who volunteer for specific leadership roles and successfully fulfill their responsibilities. The applicant indicates that financial incentives for taking on new leadership responsibilities will be supplemented by targeted professional development designed to improve capacity and increase effectiveness in leadership roles. (Pgs. 22 -23). The use of PCPS funds to encourage teachers to assume additional responsibilities and leadership roles provides motivation for teachers to help promote the success of school wide achievement goals.

Reader's Score: 0

Evaluation Criteria - Core Element 1

- 1. Core Element 1:**

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

General:

The applicant meets the criteria for Core Element 1. The application includes copies of letters of support from school leaders and other stakeholders. (Project Narrative Pgs. e0 - e20). All interested schools were required to secure evidence of stakeholder collaboration and buy-in for the PBCP. The application provides evidence of efforts to secure support for the project including informal meetings with representatives of consortium schools; informational presentations to all charter school personnel; site-based stakeholder surveys; letters of commitment from principals and other stakeholders documenting each school's full participation. (Pgs. 31-32). The applicant states that

schools will be provided with a general process and set of template documents to help ensure teacher, student and parent engagement in the roll-out process for use in Year 2 and beyond. (Pg. 33). The applicant has taken the initiative to begin the planning process prior to grant approval and has given significant importance to stakeholder buy-in by making it a requirement for participating schools.

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 meets the criteria for Core Element 2. The application provides evidence of extensive and commendable efforts to ensure that the process of developing PBCPs at each school will be collaborative involving administrators, teachers and other personnel. The applicant indicated that consortium-wide and school-specific communication initiatives will be included to ensure stakeholder awareness and participation in the planning and implementation of the school's PBCP. (Pg. 32). The applicant stated that training will be provided for all schools in the use of protocols of Professional Learning Communities during the Planning Year to ensure full and balanced participation by all stakeholders. The PLC's will be implemented in Year 2 and beyond. (Pg. 33). The applicant represents a charter school consortium and did not specifically reference the involvement and support of unions in the application. The applicant made an effort to foster collaboration among teachers, administrators and other school personnel during the development of the PBCS which will likely help to promote the success of the project.

Reader's Score: 0

Evaluation Criteria - Core Element 3

1. Core Element 3:

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

General:

The applicant meets the criteria for Core Element 3. The applicant provided evidence of a high quality comprehensive approach to establishing a fair, rigorous, transparent and educator-supported evaluation process across the consortium of schools in implementing their PBCP which includes multiple measures that take into account student growth data and whether educators met or made significant progress in student growth. Evaluations of

principals and leadership staff will include multiple observations by one or more Board of Trustee members facilitating professional development and/or conducting other activities relevant to school leadership and at least two observations by the principal of other instructional administrators in a manner to be determined by each school. The plan includes support for schools in establishing processes that facilitate the collaborative development and measurement of performance targets and professional growth goals for teachers. Rubrics will be used to measure teacher effectiveness in planning and preparation; creating and maintaining an effective classroom environment; instruction and professional responsibility. The teacher evaluation process includes a rubric-based self-assessment to be discussed with the principal; multiple observations focused on teacher instruction, teacher/student behavior and classroom environment; analysis of student assessment results; teacher interviews and review and analysis of student work; a year-end meeting with the principal to discuss the results of the year-long evaluation. (Pgs. 35 - 37).

The effort to ensure a rigorous, transparent and fair evaluation appear to be reasonable and likely to contribute to the goal of improving student achievement.

Reader's Score: 0

Evaluation Criteria - Core Element 4

1. Core Element 4:

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

General:

The applicant meets the criteria for Core Element 4. The proposal includes a plan to implement a quality data management system with the support and involvement of multiple outside providers with expertise in building data cultures in schools to promote student achievement, continuous introspection and improvement by individual educators, school teams and school leadership. Professional development for teachers and school leaders will include technical training, training in the use of data and training to promote effective leadership and data-driven decision making. All consortium schools will have access to a data system to support the establishment of appropriate achievement targets, improve and individualize instruction and meet student, classroom and school-wide learning objectives. The system includes a digital warehouse feature which allows for storage and instantaneous access by teachers, principals and board members to school and student data 24 hours a day from any location (Pgs 39 - 44). The data system will also provide appropriate personnel with access to student assessment and PBCP data to support accuracy in determining who qualifies for performance based incentives and the amounts of the awards to ensure that PBCP payments are made and documented properly. (Pgs. 37-38). The involvement of outside providers with expertise in building data cultures is an excellent addition to the plan to help ensure teacher understanding of the use of data to inform instruction and improve student achievement.

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 meets the criteria for Core Element 5. The applicant included plans to ensure that teachers and principals are well trained in the specific measures of effectiveness included in the PBCS. Consortium-wide professional development will be designed and implemented to build the capacity of teachers and principals in areas directly related to performance measures and criteria for effectiveness of the PBCP and that support them in improving student academic achievement. The applicant included provisions to train peer reviewers to promote collaborative inquiry in the planning year and the implementation of an extensive peer review process involving multiple trained raters to insure inter-rater reliability in Years 2 -5.(Pgs. 46-48.) The professional development initiatives were designed to support the project's focus on using performance-based compensation as a critical component of an integrated school improvement plan. The professional development plan will include support for educators in using data effectively and building data cultures; working collaboratively through professional learning communities, and the effective use of online resources to effect improvement in student achievement and professional practice currently. (Pgs. 41 - 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 application includes extensive plans for a high-quality professional development component for teachers and principals that is directly linked to the specific measures of

teacher and principal effective included in the PBCS. The applicant stated that a comprehensive program of professional development is designed to build the capacity of teachers and principals in areas that are directly related to the PBCP performance measures and criteria for effectiveness. The professional development plan is ultimately designed to support teachers and principals in improving the academic achievement of students. The professional development initiatives included in the plan are designed to support the project's focus on using performance-based initiatives as a critical component of an integrated overall school improvement initiative. The applicant indicates that the goal in terms of data use is to establish strong data cultures across consortium schools to support continuous introspection and improvement by individual educators, school teams and school leadership through technical training, training in the use of data and training in supportive leadership. (Pgs. 43-44). The applicant includes strategies to help teachers and principals better understand and use the measures of effectiveness in the performance-based compensation plan and to improve student achievement and improve professional practice concurrently. (Pgs. 41 - 42). The application includes plans to regularly assess the effectiveness of training in improving teacher and leadership practice including modifications to improve effectiveness. A peer review process as a part of a collaborative approach to evaluation is included. (Pgs. 35 - 37); (Pgs. 46 - 48).

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 explains that all seven consortium schools serve students in low income neighborhoods and have difficulty recruiting and retaining highly qualified educators compared to similar schools in the New York Public Schools. Evidence that all consortium schools meet the "high needs" criteria includes student demographic data indicating that an average of 80% of students are eligible for free and reduced lunch; 13% qualify for special education services and 7% are designated as English Language Learners. The application also states that based on available data, the teacher turnover rate across consortium schools which is considered high, averages 27% annually. (Pgs. 3-4) The applicant indicated that although students in consortium schools are outperforming their peers in comparable non-charter schools, most continue to lag behind their averages for the state of New York and all have larger percentages of students performing slightly above proficient and as a result are "in peril of demonstrating early but unsustainable achievement." (Pg. 1-3). The applicant indicated that an average of 32% of students are taught by teachers without appropriate certification and that an average of 41% of students are taught by teachers with less than three years of experience. (Pg. 3) The

applicant defines "comparable school" as other public schools located within the local community school district.

Weaknesses:

The applicant indicated that the level of student performance in consortium schools is higher than comparable schools even though they continue to lag behind the state. (Pg. 3). The applicant did not provide data indicating which subject areas or specialty areas are hard-to-staff such as mathematics, science, English language acquisition, special education and the corresponding retention rate of teachers in such areas. In addition, data indicating the retention rate for principals and other instructional administrators was not provided.

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 plan presents a thorough account of the design of the proposed project. During the first year of the project, each school in the consortium will establish a PBCP that will include performance measures to determine educator effectiveness. (Pg. 10). Schools will use a comprehensive model that includes professional development was developed and implemented previously in consortium schools. This will include the use of valid and reliable measures of student growth to determine teacher effectiveness. Representatives from each school will be on the PBCP committee. Administrators, teachers in all subject areas and grade levels, paraprofessionals, librarians, counselors and social workers will be eligible to receive PBCP compensation. Fifty-one percent (51%) of the compensation will be based on student outcomes and up to 49% for other measures. (Pg. 16-17). There will be at least two observations of principals and teachers conducted each year. There was support for this project from all stakeholders, at each school, evidenced by letters of support in the appendices.

The plan includes the use of outside support providers with documented expertise in the development and implementation of innovative and effective PBCS models and/or specific model components such as building data cultures, collaborative evaluation and peer review models and cutting edge data management systems. (Pgs. 51-52), (Pgs. 57-58), (Pgs. e2-e15).

Weaknesses:

The applicant did not include a formula or percentages used to determine that the size of the performance award is sufficient to affect behavior of teachers and principals and their decisions to remain working in high needs schools. In determining effectiveness, the weight given to specific components is not clearly defined for principals, teachers and other instructional personnel. (Pg.19-20). Information on the type of research-based rubrics to be used in the evaluation of teachers and principals is not provided. Information indicating that the data-management system is linked to payroll and human resources is insufficient. The application does not include specific strategies to recruit and retain highly qualified teachers and principals when vacancies occur.

Reader's Score: 46

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:

On pages 48-53, a management plan that aligns the activities and timelines of the project will ensure that the project is implemented in a way that is consistent with the proposed design. The applicant indicated that the project will be managed by a locally based non-profit organization with a history of creating successful public schools and educational programs. The application includes plans for consortium-wide management, school level management, a detailed timeline delineating activities and events on a quarterly basis from Year 1 (planning year) through Year 5. The applicant included an identification of the duties and responsibilities of key personnel responsible for activities and events. Evidence to support the qualifications of key personnel is included in the plan in the form of resumes or descriptions of professional responsibilities. The proposed budget indicates that the applicant will use other Federal or State funds to support the proposed plan. The funds requested seem adequate to carry out the PBCP for each school in the consortium. (Pgs. 48 -59).

Weaknesses:

Although a five year timeline is included, it does not appear to allot sufficient time for all of the items listed through Year 2 to be accomplished. (Pgs. 53-57). The time commitments were not clear for key staff members. The applicant indicated that charter schools receive less state funding than local public schools and it is not clear that they will be able to acquire sufficient funding to support sustainability in five years. The strategy to be used to seek other grants as an alternate source of income was not provided.

Reader's Score: 20

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

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

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

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

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

Strengths:

The application indicates that an extensive local evaluation will be completed by a nationally-recognized and experienced research and evaluation contractor who will conduct an independent evaluation that will provide consortium schools and partners with information on specific project components including the PBCP and the impact on student achievement outcomes and other site-specific outcomes. The evaluation will provide both quantitative and qualitative data using several data collection methods including student achievement data, surveys, individual interviews, focus group interviews, record review and site visitations. Data will be collected to assess program implementation and to assess program impact. Data will be collected to support a comparative review of student achievement growth and other indicators in comparable local schools. The findings will be shared with project stakeholders through periodic briefings, annual progress reports and a final evaluation report and will be used for planning and decision-making. (Pgs.

60-65). The components of the local evaluation appear to be adequate to support the objectives of the performance-based compensation system.

Weaknesses:

The local evaluation did not include strong and measurable performance objectives for increasing student achievement. Objectives for the recruitment and retention of effective personnel were not included. (Pg. 60). The specific timeframe for feedback or briefings was not provided. (Pg. 65).

Reader's Score: 3

Priority Questions

Priority Preference - Competitive Preference Priority 1

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

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

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

Strengths:

During the planning year, the applicant will work with compensation reform experts to create a value-added model for the project. The applicant indicated that the performance-based compensations for principals and other instructional administrators will take into consideration value-added goals tied to student growth at each grade level as well as school-wide. The goals will be established each year and documented in the school's PBCP. Evaluations of teachers and other instructional personnel will also include both absolute and value-added measures. The applicant indicated that the current value added model is the model used in the department of education of the local public school district and that the applicant will work closely with this public agency to coordinate data collection and analysis. (Pgs. 17-19; 27-31).

Weaknesses:

The applicant did not include a plan to train teachers on the value-added model to allow them to effectively use the model to improve instruction. (Pg. 28-29).

Reader's Score: 3

Priority Preference - Competitive Preference Priority 2

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

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

Strengths:

The applicant provided evidence that the proposed PBCP is designed to assist high-need schools to serve high-need students as evidenced by demographic and other data included in the explanation of need (Pgs. 1-4).

Weaknesses:

The applicant did not clearly identify which subjects or specialty areas are hard-to-staff.

The applicant did not specifically explain how the proposed PBCP will address the retention of effective teachers in hard-to-staff subjects and specialty areas such as mathematics, science, special and English language acquisition or the procedures to be used to fill vacancies in the subjects and specialty areas with teachers who are effective or likely to be effective. The applicant did not include evidence of a process to effectively communicate to teachers which schools are considered high-need or which subjects or specialty areas are considered hard-to-staff.

Reader's Score: 2

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 8/6/10 4:06 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 8/6/10 4:06 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Center for Educational Innovation - Public Education Association -- ,
(S385A100096)

Reader #2: *****

Points Possible Points Scored

Questions

Evaluation Criteria

Absolute Priority 1

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

Absolute Priority 2

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

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

Evaluaton Criteria

Absolute Priority 3

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

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

Requirement

Requirement

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

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

Evaluation Criteria

Core Element 1

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

Core Element 2

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

Core Element 3

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

Core Element 4

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

Core Element 5

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

High Quality Professional Development

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

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

Selection Criteria

Need for the Project

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

Project Design

1.Project Design	60	45
Adequacy of Support for the Proposed Project		
1.Adequacy of Support	25	20
Quality of Local Evaluation		
1.Quality of Local Eval.	5	3
Sub Total	100	75

Priority Questions

Priority Preference

Competitive Preference Priority 1

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

Competitive Preference Priority 2

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

Sub Total	10	4
------------------	----	---

Total	110	79
--------------	-----	----

Technical Review Form

Panel #8 - Panel - 8: 84.385A

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: Center for Educational Innovation - Public Education Association -- ,
(S385A100096)

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 proposer seeks to enhance and expand performance-based compensation systems in a consortium of seven high need schools, by assisting each school in converting its current salary schedule-based compensation system into comprehensive performance based compensation system (PBCS) that provides incentives for teachers, instructional administrators, schools leaders (principals), and instructional staff based on their effectiveness in attaining student achievement targets, as well as for fulfilling leadership responsibilities and promoting school-wide improvements in teaching and learning (p. 6). The PBCS will provide for differentiated compensation at least at the individual teacher and administrator level, and at the discretion of each school, at grade level, cohort level, or other non-school wide category (p. 10). Student achievement targets to be established in each school will include schoolwide, classroom and individual learning measures based on absolute and value added annual growth. For awarding performance based compensations, measures of student growth will be based on scores of State assessment for tested grades and subjects, and other classroom assessment measures for non-tested grades and subjects, and will be valued as 51 percent of the

criteria, which seems likely to be effective in promoting changes in teacher effectiveness. Observation of teacher performance will be carried out twice a year by trained evaluators, and measured through a rubric. Principals will be observed by Board of Trustee trained evaluator, and their evaluation includes school wide achievement. Forty-nine percent of the criteria for awarding performance based compensation is based on other professional measures including taking on leadership roles related to improving school effectiveness to enhance student performance. The weights assigned to the different elements for this performance based compensation seem convincing. The levels of compensation proposed are between 4 and 8 percent of the annual salary, and are based on research findings that indicate that this is an adequate level to promote behavioral changes. The specific compensation amounts will be established during the planning year, and revised annually through a trial and error approach to identify what works best. This is a sound approach to determine the effectiveness of the amounts for performance based compensation to promote improvements. Overall, the quality of the applicants plan to address this priority is of high quality.

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 plan to ensure that the PBCS at each school is fiscally sustainable does not seem strongly convincing, even though it is stated that accurate financial cost projections will be made into the schools' long term planning, programming and evaluation procedures as well as personnel policies (p. 6). Through memoranda of understanding, each school has committed to steadily increase the financial incentives over the course of the project starting in the second project year which is the first year in which TIF incentives will be paid. Starting with project year 2, each school has committed to provide 10 percent of total amount of financial incentives from its operating budget or other non-TIF funds, and will increase these allocations to 25, 50, 75 and 100 percent in each successive year, which seems ambitious but possible to achieve given their commitment and substantive success in seeking for additional funds. It is indicated that other funds will be sought through a strategic grant development initiative (p. 59-60). Furthermore it is stated that the project will leverage and expand upon the programming, technology infrastructure and professional development model designed and implemented in the original PBCS project (2007).

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:

A well focused professional development component is an integral part of the proposed PBCS plan to promote overall school improvement and increases in student achievement by building the capacity of teachers and principals to use data to make instructional decisions. An overall plan will be established at the consortium-wide level during the planning year to be tailored to each school according to findings of a thorough needs assessment based on student achievement targets (p. 37). Professional development initiatives across the consortium will be aligned with the project evaluation framework to ensure training and technical assistance in areas relevant to the evaluation process and to improving student achievement (p. 41). The project has adopted a Professional Learning Community model for the design of the professional development component to build instructional school personnel capacity in areas directly related to performance measures and effectiveness criteria. The component comprises three main elements- building data cultures, promoting collaboration to improve teaching and learning, and peer review of learning experiences. Although the applicant has presented a high quality strategy for addressing this priority, there is no explanation on how the PBCS will be used for retention and tenure decisions during or after the TIF project 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:

A substantial part of the performance based compensation criteria (49 percent) for teachers provides for taking on leadership roles that lead to school improvement, many related to the project implementation such as Communications Liaison, Peer Reviewer, Data Coordinator, Data Coach. School administrators have committed to provide opportunities and release time for teachers to fulfill these roles and participate in professional training (p. 6, 16, 18, 19). This plan is very adequate to provide teachers with compensation for taking on important additional roles that will contribute significantly to the improvement of the schools' capacity to increase student achievement.

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:

Even though the applicant indicates that strong emphasis is placed on making all stakeholders at the participating schools and the community at large aware of the initiative and encouraging their participation in the different aspects of the planning and implementation phases the information provided is not sufficiently specific. It is

mentioned that Communication Liaisons will be named at each school with the responsibility of facilitating communication between the school level and the consortium Committee and undertaking a lead role in the planning and implementation of the project in their school (p. 31-32). It seems that the extent to which this core element is met is not strong enough.

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 addresses this core element by bringing in diverse stakeholders from all seven consortium schools, including unions where present, and having them highly involved in the project since its inception. Letters of support testify to their involvement and commitment to the successful implementation of the project. A Consortium Wide Committee to oversee the project planning, implementation and evaluation will be established with representation from all consortium schools, and each school will establish a PBCP Committee with representatives from all stakeholders, including unions where present. Numerous opportunities for participation and leadership will be available to consortium school staff as part of the project, which will implement a professional learning community strategy (p.31-33). The extent to which this core element is addressed is adequate.

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 proponent meets this core element, yet there are some weaknesses. Each school will establish a PBC plan with annual school wide measures, classroom and individual student learning targets. Student achievement is a significant factor in the evaluation of teacher performance and it will be measured through state tests for tested subjects, while in non tested subjects other assessment measures will be used. Classroom observations of teachers will be completed twice a year by the principal or designee.

The evaluation of teachers will be based on an evidence based rubric, yet the evidence that will be used for the evaluation is not sufficiently described (p. 35-37). Additional forms of evidence to be collected for evaluation include student assessment results, informal evaluations, teacher interviews, student work, and analysis of lesson plans. Inter-rater reliability in the use of the evaluation instrument is not mentioned in the plan.

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:

Even though the applicant proposes to establish a comprehensive data system that will provide all consortium schools with extensive access to student achievement data, user friendly reports to facilitate data analysis and differentiated instruction, curriculum mapping tools and a variety of online resources that support professional development, collaboration and peer review, the explanation of the data management system to be developed by the proposer does not explicitly establish that student achievement data can be linked to human resources systems (37-40), therefore this core element is not met in the application.

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 meets this core element well as the PBCS will be explained to each teacher and together with the principal, targets for performance will be established, and this will be a formal agreement. Through the Professional Development component, based on the professional learning communities concept, training on data and its use to improve teaching will be provided to all teachers (p. 36, 37, 43, 44).

Reader's Score: 0

Evaluation Criteria - High Quality Professional Development

1. High Quality Professional Development:

Comment on the applicant's demonstration that ---

Its proposed PBCS will include a high-quality professional development component for teachers and principals consistent with the definition of the term professional

development in section 9101(34) of the ESEA. The applicant must demonstrate that its PBCS has a professional development component in place, or a specific plan for developing one, that is directly linked to the specific measures of teacher and principal effectiveness included in the PBCS. The professional development component of the PBCS must - -

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

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

(3) Provide --

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

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

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

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

General:

The professional development program proposed will be based on the specific needs identified in each of the schools, and on the results of annual evaluation of student performance (p. 41-47). The comprehensive program of professional development will focus on building professional learning communities to design, implement, and develop effective practices based on the analysis of student data, through collaboration and ongoing support, and a peer review process. How teachers who do not receive differentiated compensation based on effectiveness under the PBCS will be supported is not specifically addressed. There is no mention of how the teachers and principals will be explained about the effectiveness measures through the professional development program, Although it is mentioned that the effectiveness of the evaluation process will be assessed, it is not sufficiently clear how this will be achieved. Because several elements of this core element are not addressed by the applicant, it is not met adequately.

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:

Participating schools all fulfill the criteria as high need schools in terms of the poverty levels of student families, and low student achievement in comparison to similar schools in the state, as well the need to recruit a substantial number of highly qualified teachers. Comparable schools is defined as other public schools from within their local community school districts (p. 1-3).

Weaknesses:

The student achievement levels reported on pages 3 and 4 indicate that the four schools are in general, outperforming comparable schools. Although special areas of need in recruiting highly qualified teachers in the schools is suggested by the data presented on student characteristics and academic performance, including special education, mathematics and reading (p. 1, 4), there is no mention of the need to recruit teachers in these areas.

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 seven schools in this consortium are charter schools that have LEA status, and have joined forces with several highly experienced and successful partners in school improvement. Each of the school communities have fully participated in the conception of the proposal, and have provided memoranda of understanding, which aims to reform their salary system as a strategy to address identified needs in student academic achievement. Following a common template, each school will elaborate a performance based compensation plan, in which school, classroom and individual student achievement targets will be established. Achievement is defined in terms of student outcome data on state tests and other objective assessments. The performance based incentives proposed will be based on a formula in which 51 percent is based on gains in student achievement as measured through increases in state tests performance and other assessment data, and 49 percent is related to professional growth and leadership in areas that are critical for the improvement of instruction and learning according to the PBCP established by the School Committee and individual plans agreed upon between the parties. Compensation will be awarded after a rigorous evaluation process to determine performance improvement based on analysis of absolute and value added measures in relation to established targets. Plans will be evaluated and revised annually.

The diverse stakeholders from all seven consortium schools, including unions where present, have been highly involved in the project since its inception, and letters of support testify to their involvement and commitment to the successful implementation of the project. A Consortium Wide Committee to oversee the project planning, implementation and evaluation will be established with representation from all consortium schools, and each school will establish a PBCP Committee with representatives from all stakeholders. Numerous opportunities for participation and leadership will be available to consortium school staff as part of the project. A communications component will be developed to disseminate information on the project and its development among the school communities (p. 31-33).

A Value Added Model (VAM) which is developed by a leading edge expert in compensation reform specialist and used by Teacher Data Initiative (TDI) of NYC will provide for determining teacher effectiveness. The TDI will coordinate data collection and value added analysis to compare with other school (p. 27). Value added student growth is defined as the difference in proficiency ratings between the predicted and actual scores on state assessments. A specific VAM will be created for the project (p. 37), to provide access to all schools to the data and online resource for professional development and allow for establishing appropriate achievement targets.

The professional development component seeks to increase the capacity of teachers through curricular and instructional strategies that are appropriate for meeting the identified needs in terms of student achievement. The achievement of this professional development program seems achievable.

Weaknesses:

Ways in which other school professionals (e.g., counselors, librarians) would be awarded compensation are not based on standardized or valid student assessment measures. It is stated that while compensation will range between 4 and 8 thousand dollars, the exact size of awards will be developed during the planning year based on research findings and the lessons learned through the original project, and will be revised annually according to evaluation results. The value added model proposed includes several variables besides student growth which make it seem ambiguous (p. 28-29). The validity of the rubric to evaluate teacher effectiveness does not provide specific links to student achievement, and the reliability of these measures is vague. The procedures to ascertain that the evaluation system is consistent and fair are vague.

It is not clear that the digital data management system will link student achievement data and teachers and principal payroll system (p. 37-41).

Reader's Score: 45

Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Support for the Proposed Project

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

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

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

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

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

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

Strengths:

A management plan is presented to achieve the objectives and spells out the specific responsibilities of each key staff member, together with timelines for each year and quarter (p. 48-58). The Project Director and other key personnel are very qualified to fulfill the implementation. The budget request is appropriate for the proposed plan, and matching funds are committed by each school in memoranda of understanding (p. 59) .

Weaknesses:

Time commitments were not clear for key staff members making it uncertain whether sufficient time will be allocated to the undertaking of this complex endeavor (p. 57-58).

Reader's Score: 20

Selection Criteria - Quality of Local Evaluation

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

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

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

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

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

Strengths:

The design of the local evaluation identifies effectiveness variables as a main focus including the measurement of changes in instructional leadership, teaching practices, and student outcomes in terms of number and percent of students making accelerated gains. The Value-added model will be used to assess student gains and compare these with non-project schools. In addition to the mentioned quantitative data, surveys will also be administered and qualitative data will be collected from participants through individual and focus group interviews. (p. 60-65).

Weaknesses:

Insufficient information is provided on strong performance objectives that will allow the applicant to determine whether the project goals are achieved. Although it is stated that the results of the evaluation will be shared with project stakeholders through periodic briefings and annual progress reports, it is not clear how the data will be used as an important source of feedback to promote continuous improvement of efforts.

Reader's Score: 3

Priority Questions

Priority Preference - Competitive Preference Priority 1

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

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

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

Strengths:

A well defined Value Added Model (VAM) will be developed to determine teacher effectiveness, which is developed by a leading edge expert in compensation reform and used by Teacher Data Initiative of NYC. It will allow comparisons between PICCS student achievement and that of other schools. Value added is defined as the difference in proficiency ratings between the predicted and actual scores on state assessments (p. 27-28).

Weaknesses:

The ways in which the value added model will be thoroughly explained to teachers, principals and other school personnel were mentioned but not sufficiently to convince that this will be successfully accomplished.

Reader's Score: 3

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

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

Strengths:

The project targets high need students as evidenced by the poverty and academic achievement levels (p. 1-4).

Weaknesses:

Teacher recruitment and retention in hard to staff subjects is not addressed in the proposal, despite being underscored as areas of need in the assessment of student achievement (p. 3-4). No explanation is provided on how it will fill vacancies with teachers who are likely to be effective. It is not mentioned that teachers will be communicated which schools are high need and which subjects are hard to staff.

Reader's Score: 1

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 8/6/10 4:06 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 8/6/10 4:06 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Center for Educational Innovation - Public Education Association -- ,
(S385A100096)

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	45
Adequacy of Support for the Proposed Project		
1.Adequacy of Support	25	19
Quality of Local Evaluation		
1.Quality of Local Eval.	5	2
Sub Total	100	73

Priority Questions

Priority Preference

Competitive Preference Priority 1

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

Competitive Preference Priority 2

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

Sub Total	10	4
------------------	----	---

Total	110	77
--------------	-----	----

Technical Review Form

Panel #8 - Panel - 8: 84.385A

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: Center for Educational Innovation - Public Education Association -- ,
(S385A100096)

Questions

Evaluation Criteria - Absolute Priority 1

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

Comment on how well the applicant demonstrates that --

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

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

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

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

General:

The applicant provided evidence that teachers will be able to receive differential compensation through absolute performance targets and value-added performance targets which will be used to determine teacher effectiveness (pg. 26). The student variables were identified for the value-added index which focused on student growth (pg. 28). In addition, details were provided for the ways in which principal effectiveness will be determined including student growth measures which was appropriate (pg. 29). Appropriate research was cited to support various dollar amounts of incentive compensations, however, the actually amounts for this particular project were not provided (pg. 24). Additional measures such as classroom variables and number of suspensions were also noted (pg. 28). Observation-based assessments of teachers and principals will take place at least twice a year.

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 project costs associated with the development and implementation of the PBCS during the project (pg. 59). The schools will provide an appropriate increasing amount of financial incentives over the course of the project which should be sustainable after the project ends. Each year the applicant states the schools will contribute an increasing amount of funds. Year three each school will contribute 25%, year four each will contribute 50%, year five each will contribute 75% and 100% after year five, which is reasonable (pg. 59). The applicant provided evidence of an aggressive grant strategy for winning successful grant awards, but the outcome of future grant awards is not secure and should not be considered as concrete funds (pg. 59).

Reader's Score: 0

Evaluation Criteria - Absolute Priority 3

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

Comment on how well the applicant demonstrates that - -

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

General:

The professional development activities planned are appropriate for strengthening the current educator workforce by including components such as building data cultures among teachers and school leaders (pg.42), technical training, training in the use data, and training supportive leadership (pg. 44). Overall the professional development activities are connected to each other and will focus on using and manipulating student achievement data to make instructional decisions which should result in student growth (pg. 42-44). The focus of the professional development is to build the capacity for teachers and principals for using data to improve student achievement to promote retention (pg. 41). Tenure was not mentioned in the application so a judgment cannot be made. It is important to note that the applicant is a charter school and therefore tenure may not be not applicable.

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:

Leadership roles was stated as a component used to measure teacher effectiveness, such as taking on a leadership role to coordinate a peer review initiative (pg. 22). The applicant provides multiple examples of types of leadership roles educators may be available to qualify for incentive compensation (pg. 23). The financial incentives will be used for teachers who volunteer for the leadership roles. However, the amount of the financial incentive for engaging in leadership roles was not clearly provided (pg. 23).

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:

A workshop is planned to inform teachers of the teacher rubric and self-assessments to be conducted (pg. 36). Principals or designees will meet with teachers throughout the year to review self-assessment and progress towards meeting the achievement and professional growth targets (pg. 36). A clear timeline or a planned number of meetings between teachers and principals was not provided. The applicant did not specify the number of meetings to be held when using the term - "throughout the year". There was not a clear plan for communicating the performance-based compensation incentive to administrators, other school personnel, and community at large. The applicant met the criteria for Core Element 1.

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:

A collaborative approach is proposed by the applicant to include stakeholders at various levels (pg. 10, 32). Committees will be formed at all levels of the program to involve teachers, principals, and other personnel (pg. 42). Union representatives for the charter school educators will be included on the PBCP committee (pg. 15, 32). The applicant has an appropriate level of involvement which should lead to the support of teachers,

principals, and other personnel. The applicant met the criteria for Core Element 2.

Reader's Score: 0

Evaluation Criteria - Core Element 3

1. Core Element 3:

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

General:

The evaluation process will include the use of objective evidence-based rubrics created by Dr. Paula Bevan, but no additional information was provided on the rubrics to determine if the rubrics are appropriate (pg. 35). Teacher observations will take place at least twice a year by a principal or other instructional administrator (pg. 35). Multiple forms of evaluation will be collected to demonstrate student learning (pg. 35-37, pg. 63). Inter-rater reliability or any type of reliability measures were not mentioned in the proposal. For example, there is no information indicating that the rubrics will include multiple rating categories which take into account data on student growth. The applicant met the criteria for Core Element 3.

Reader's Score: 0

Evaluation Criteria - Core Element 4

1. Core Element 4:

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

General:

The applicant stated the student achievement data will be linked to the payroll system to allow for performance-based compensation. The proposal does not specifically mention the term human resources or payroll but said appropriate personnel will be provided with access to student assessment data to accurately identify educators qualified for the incentive (pg. 38). The logistical information provided on the data-management system itself was limited which makes it difficult to make judgments on the applicant's ability to implement the system. The applicant met the criteria for Core Element 4.

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 provided clear evidence of planned professional development for teachers and principals (pg. 41). The professional development will have a focus on ensuring teachers and principals understand specific measures which will be used to determine effectiveness of teacher and principals (pg. 36). The professional development will enable educators to use data generated by the data management system to improve their practice through technical training, and data use training, training supportive leadership, and building data cultures (pg. 33 and 44).

The extent to which the applicant will measure teachers and principals understanding of the specific measures of teacher and principal effective included in the PBCS was somewhat unclear. The applicant stated "The Principal and/or designee will engage in discussions with each teacher to review the teacher's self assessment and prior year's year-end evaluation, and to discuss areas and rubric components where the Principal and/or designee believes that growth is warranted. At the conclusion of this process, the Principal and teachers will document their understandings," which does not explain the way the applicant will ensure understanding. The applicant met the criteria for Core Element 5.

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 states that the professional development program will support educators in: a) using data effectively and building data cultures; b) working collaboratively through development of professional learning communities, peer review and effective use of online and social media related resources; and c) improving the teacher and Principal evaluation process but the ways in which the applicant will do that was not provided (pg 37, 39). The topics for the planned professional development activities are appropriate for meeting the project goals. A peer review of learning experience is planned for peer review learning experiences at the school and PBCS level (pg. 46). It is not clear whether the peer review of learning experiences is designed to evaluate the effectiveness of the professional development (pg. 42, 46). Additional information related to assessing the effectiveness of professional development activities are missing.

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:

Strengths: The proposal provided clear evidence of high need by showing over 50% of students were eligible for free and reduced lunch (pg. 1). Evidence was provided of a high teacher turn over rate at 17-35% and an average of 27% annually (pg. 3). On average, 32% of the teachers do not have the appropriate certification which indicated trouble recruiting highly qualified or effective teachers. The applicant provides a definition for comparable schools (pg. 3). Although all schools in New York State are not "comparable schools," most of the schools lag behind the New York State averages (pg. 3).

Weaknesses:

Weaknesses: Schools included in the LEA are out-performing their comparable schools (pg. 3). Although the turn over-rate was provided, the proposal did not clearly identify difficulty recruiting highly qualified or effective teachers, only difficulty in retention. There was no mention of recruiting for the hard to staff subjects, such as mathematics, science, English language acquisition, or special education. The turn-over rate was described which was a strength for the proposal, but additional information

detailing the turn-over rate besides percentages would provide additional details to judge the extent of the need. The proposal did not mention principal retention.

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:

STRENGTHS:

Principals, instructional administrators, teachers in all subjects and all grade levels, instructional paraprofessionals, school librarians and media specialists, and guidance counselors and social works are eligible to receive TIF-supported PBCS compensation (pg.

9). The ways in which Classroom Instruction Plans (CIPs) will be established were identified and an example was provided (pg. 11). Individual learning plans (ILPs) will be developed for each student and specific targets focused on student progress towards specific performance objectives, as measured over the course of the year will be created (pg. 12) to increase academic achievement. Variables for consideration in determining the effectiveness of instruction administrators, teachers in tested subjects, teachers in non-testing subjects, instructional paraprofessionals, guidance counselors and social workers, school librarians and media specialists, and other leadership roles were clearly identified (pg. 28). The proposal cites research supporting different percentages to use for bonus pay (pg. 24). Absolute performance targets and value-added performance targets will be used to determine teacher effectiveness (pg. 24). The student variables were identified and appeared to be comprehensive (pg. 28). Details were provided for the ways in which principal effectiveness will be determined (pg. 29). Collaboration with stakeholders at various school levels was sought by way of surveys and letters of commitment to the project (pg. 32). PBCPs will be developed at each school and representatives from each school will be represented on the PBCP committee (pg. 32). Initiatives allow for individual schools to make a compensation plan applicable to the needs of each individual school. The evaluation system will include at least two observations by one or more Board members of the principal providing or facilitating professional development for teachers (pg. 34, 35). A collaborative evaluation approach will be used to engage stakeholders throughout the process (pg. 35). Research-based rubrics are proposed to be used to evaluate teachers (pg. 35). A data management system will be created and will include data warehouse. The data management system will be available 24 hours a day for access by personnel (pg. 39). Data management and analysis tools will also be included to allow teachers, principals and other personnel the ability to manipulate data and pull user-friendly information from the system. The proposal provides information regarding the type of professional development to be conducted which appears to support the project goals (pg. 41). Professional development will support educators to use data effectively and build data cultures and improve teacher and principal evaluation process. The planned professional development activities appear to provide educators with appropriate information to use data to inform instructional practice (pg. 42).

Weaknesses:

Weaknesses:

Specific details on performance measures to determine the effectiveness for the purposes of qualifying to receive performance-based compensation were limited. In addition, details were lacking on the process for making and documenting decisions and payments regarding each school's PBCP. Information such as the actual student academic outcomes to be improved (as stated on pg. 22 of the proposal regarding school librarians and media specialist) was missing. The descriptions for specific ways components will be measured were vague. Although research was cited using various percentages and dollar amounts regarding differential compensation, the actual amount and support for the formula to be used if the grant is awarded was not provided (pg 24). The variables were identified for determining teacher effectiveness (pg. 28) but the specifics of the "complex analysis" for calculating the value-added measures was not provided (pg. 28). Principal effectiveness will be determined but the weight for each category was not provided (pg. 29). The proposal states if a principal "is effective via the value-added criterion if the majority of the teachers in his or her school achieve their individual value-added targets." Due to the limited definition provided for measuring teacher effectiveness, it is difficult to judge the appropriateness of this component for measuring principal effectiveness (pg. 29). The specific ways in which teacher effectiveness will be measured for performance-based compensation is limitedly defined (pg. 29). A cut off score or value for determining teacher effectiveness is unknown, which corresponds with principal effectiveness. Additional information regarding the research-based rubrics is missing. For example, there is no information indicating the rubrics will include multiple rating categories which take into account data on student growth. The proposal does not include any information about the data management system specifically linking student achievement data to teacher and principal payroll and human resources systems (pg. 37).

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:

Strengths: The organizations identified in the project appear to be appropriate and qualified to carry out the responsibilities assigned (pg. 51-53). The organizations appeared to be selected based on their expertise in the area in which they were identified to work in the proposed project. A timeline of events with responsible persons/entities was provided with an overview of the events. The personnel appear to be qualified and experienced for their positions based on previous experiences. For example, Frank San Felice's has experience leading projects (pg. 51-53 and in resume). In the matching funds section, the schools will provide an increasing amount of financial incentives over the course of the project (pg. 59). Based on winning prior grant awards the PICCS consortium is likely to obtain additional funding in the future to sustain programs (pg. 59). Based on the budget proposed, the requested grant amount appears to be appropriate for attain the project goals and support the professional development activities (appendix).

Weaknesses:

Weaknesses: The extent to which all of the planned activities will be able to be completed during the planning year is difficult to judge (i.e., plan the framework at the project level then create unique individual school plans (pg. 52), after school plans are created volunteers will be recruited to serve positions such as data coordinator and training personnel). The beginning of the proposal discusses information about lack of funding which raises questions as to where each school will be able to leverage funds from (pg. 2). Year four each school is required to pay 50% of the financial incentives, but no information is presented to explain which schools will be able to do this (pg. 59). Dependence on new grant awards or renewal of current awards in the future for sustainability is not secure (pg. 59).

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:

Strengths: Four primary objectives were clearly stated for the evaluation and align with the project (pg. 60). Qualitative and quantitative data will be collected (pg. 62-63). Specific examples of qualitative data to be collected were identified (pg. 63). Feedback will be provided in the form of briefings periodically and annually (pg. 65).

Weaknesses:

Weaknesses: Measureable objectives were not provided for raising student achievement, increasing effectiveness of educators, and retaining and recruiting effective teachers, principals, and other personnel. Specific time-frames for periodic briefing to share findings with project stakeholders were missing. Variables were identified for antecedent, implementation, and effectiveness but the ways in which these variables will be measured is unclear (pg. 62-63).

Reader's Score: 2

Priority Questions

Priority Preference - Competitive Preference Priority 1

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

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

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

Strengths:

Strengths: Four primary objectives were clearly stated for the evaluation and align with the project (pg. 60). Qualitative and quantitative data will be collected (pg. 62-63). Specific examples of quantitative and qualitative data to be collected were identified (pg. 63). Feedback will be provided in the form of briefings periodically and annually (pg. 65).

Weaknesses:

Weaknesses:

Measureable objectives were not provided for raising student achievement, increasing effectiveness of educators, and retaining and recruiting effective teachers, principals, and other personnel. Specific time-frames for periodic briefing to share findings with project stakeholders were missing. Variables were identified for antecedent, implementation, and effectiveness but the ways in which these variables will be measured was not provided (pg. 62-63). Specific procedures for providing feedback periodically were not provided (pg. 65).

Reader's Score: 3

Priority Preference - Competitive Preference Priority 2

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

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

Strengths:

STRENGTHS: The project will serve students who are high-need students (pg. 1). Over 50% of the students in each school are eligible for free and reduced lunch which qualifies the students as high-need (pg. 1).

Weaknesses:

WEAKNESSES:

The proposal did not clearly identify difficulty recruiting highly qualified or effective teachers. There was no mention of hard to staff subjects, such as mathematics, science, English language acquisition, or special education. No information was presented on the way the applicant will fill vacancies with teachers who are effective or likely to be effective. The applicant did not provide a plan to communicate to teachers which schools are high-need and which subjects/specialty areas are hard-to-staff.

Reader's Score: 1

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 8/6/10 4:06 PM

