

Status: Submitted

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

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** The College-Ready Promise -- , (S385A100082)

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

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

1.Project Design	60	54
<b>Adequacy of Support for the Proposed Project</b>		
1.Adequacy of Support	25	20
<b>Quality of Local Evaluation</b>		
1.Quality of Local Eval.	5	4
<b>Sub Total</b>	100	88

**Priority Questions**

**Priority Preference**

**Competitive Preference Priority 1**

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

**Competitive Preference Priority 2**

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

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

<b>Total</b>	110	95
--------------	-----	----

## Technical Review Form

Panel #6 - Panel - 6: 84.385A

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

Applicant: The College-Ready Promise -- , (S385A100082)

### 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 affirms that key components of this project include using value-added measures of student growth, instituting new career paths and differentiated compensation for the most effective educators, and implementing new recruitment and induction efforts, p. e0 (Abstract). The College-Ready Promise (TCRP) represents collaboration among five California-based Charter Management Organizations (CMOs). TCRP has established a 7-year, 9-point plan to collectively better develop, identify, reward, deploy, and retain the most effective educators. The goal is to further increase student achievement and ensure students are prepared to enter college-level courses without remediation. These TIF-sponsored components of the overall effort are referred to in this proposal as the Educator Effectiveness Project, p. 4. The applicant indicates that 40 percent of teacher evaluations will be based on student achievement and growth and sixty percent on teacher practice and behavior, p. 18. Teachers will be observed up to 10 times per year. Once per semester will be a full session, planned in advance. Five times per semester there will be informal, unplanned observations for part of a session. The observer will most likely be the principal, who will be trained by a TIF-funded vendor to use the rubric. All observers will be trained (same vendor) to use the rubric to optimize inter-rater

reliability. Principals will be evaluated by a supervisor within each CMO, who will also be trained in the rubric and methods so evaluation will be consistent, p. 43. Details provided clarity related to how principals and teachers would be evaluated and how those evaluations will be tied with student achievement and this PBCS. The applicant reports that teachers at the Highly Effective level on the career path will work 11-12 months per year. Highly Effective teachers will have the option of promotion to (1) Master Teacher (2) Teacher Coach or (3) Administrator, p. 27. The project provides two incentives: compensation based on the teacher skill and work level, and career paths which offer opportunities for leadership, promotion, and choice of direction, p. 29. The applicant reports that TCRP will begin work during the SY2010-11 to establish a rubric for principals and an evaluation system based significantly on student value-added metrics and on principal ability to move teachers along the career path and retain highly effective teachers. In addition, principal evaluations will likely include measures of student graduation, college enrollment, student/family feedback and at least to supervisor evaluations each year, p. 42. Principals with strong performance ratings will be retained and compensated, p. 43. In the new compensation plan to be developed, the most highly effective principals will earn approximately 7-15% over base, p. 45. The applicant reports that entry-level teachers and others beginning their careers, or those with strong need to improve skills as measured by student achievement, will be paid the base compensation amount while they learn effectiveness. In the Emerging category, that teacher will earn an additional \$3,000 more. Teachers at the Achieving level will be paid \$8,000-\$10,000 more than entry level. A Highly Effective II teacher will earn up to \$25,000 more than entry salary and has the potential to earn significantly more when a career path is selected. In the career path, the highest paid teachers (i.e. master teachers and coaches) earn \$70,000 to \$93,000. The applicant reports that research on how large incentive amounts must be to attract and retain high-quality teachers in low-performing schools, along with teacher focus groups, to have informed the decision making process. The compensation component of the teacher career path will be implemented in 5 case study schools, in years 2 and 3. It will be fully launched after 2 years of data collection, pp. 31-32. Details were provided in this section.

**Reader's Score: 0**

#### **Evaluation Criteria - Absolute Priority 2**

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

**Comment on how well the applicant demonstrates that - -**

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

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

#### **General:**

The applicant meets the criteria of this Absolute Priority.

The applicant notes a total budget for the TCRP Educator Effectiveness Project over the five years of the project to be \$81,546,900 of which they are requesting \$11,152,100 in support from grant, p. 1 (Budget Narrative). Projected funding for differentiated compensation includes 6 percent from TIF funds and 94 percent from other funds indicating an acceptance for the responsibility to provide performance-based compensation, p. 3 (Budget Narrative). The costs appear to be appropriate.

The applicant provides a clearly delineated chart that show an increasing share of

performance-based compensation paid to educators from non-TIF funds over the course of the five-year project period, p. 15 (Budget Narrative).

**Reader's Score: 0**

### **Evaluation Criteria - Absolute Priority 3**

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

**Comment on how well the applicant demonstrates that - -**

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

#### **General:**

The applicant meets the criteria of this Absolute Priority.

The applicant presents a strong framework for the proposed PBCS. Components are aligned to ensure an ever-increasing effective workforce. Significant components include the value-added growth-to-standard measure, p. 19, and evaluations for professional development, movement through the career paths, and retention decisions. Figures 6 & 7 detail the possible movements of teachers through the differentiated levels, p. 26. No Charter Management Organizations offer tenure, p. 27.

**Reader's Score: 0**

### **Requirement - Requirement**

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

#### **General:**

The applicant meets the criteria of this Requirement. The PBCS presents a well-developed plan to offer both teachers and principals incentives to take on additional responsibilities. As the educators move through their career paths, they can opt into more responsibilities at the Highly Effective levels. For teachers, this includes mentorship, coaching or administrative responsibilities, p. 27. For principals, this includes the opportunity to become a mentor principal, turnaround/transformational principal, or cluster principal, p. 44.

**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 of Core Element 1. The applicant reports that there has been a great deal of stakeholder participation and input into development of the PBCS. TCRP has letters of support from all eligible schools. To reach those educators who did not directly participate in pilots, focus groups, or discussion panels, each CMO also is communicating with all its educators about the processes underway. This communication takes place through meetings, intranet, and newsletters. Communication surveys are used to collect feedback to gauge the extent to which educators feel they are included in reform efforts, pp. 16-17. Community communication takes place through partners and union participation.

**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 of this Core Element. The applicant reports that TCRP has letters of support from all eligible schools included in The Educator Effectiveness Project, featuring signatures of principals, teacher representatives and parent representatives and unionized organization. TCRP stakeholders held monthly discussion panels and focus groups throughout summer 2010, involving a total of more than 1,000 participant hours of work, all focused on critiquing the initial teacher evaluation design and assessment rubric, p. 17.

**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 of Core Element 3. The applicant indicates that key components of this PBCS project include using value-added measures of student growth, instituting new career paths and differentiated compensation for the most effective

educators, and implementing new recruitment and induction efforts, p. e0 (Abstract).

The applicant details how teams of educators created an initial draft of a new set of standards, the Teacher Effectiveness Framework (the Framework), in May 2010. It is a standards-based framework that defines the various abilities and practices of the highly effective teachers and will be the basis of 60% of teacher evaluations. Based heavily on the work of Charlotte Danielson, the Framework includes standards in the areas of planning and preparation, classroom learning environment, instruction, assessment and data-driven instruction, professional responsibilities, and partnerships with families and community. After additional review sessions, a vendor will convert the modified framework into an evaluation rubric. The developed evaluation rubric will be piloted by five schools during 2010-2011 to determine needed modifications. The finalized evaluation rubric will then be implemented in 2011-2012, pp. 22-23.

Details of this application indicate that teachers will be observed up to 10 times per year, p. 23. Other measures of evaluation may include portfolios, student/family feedback, and survey of attitudes and beliefs, p. 18.

Observations will be implemented by an observer (probably the principal), who will be trained by a TIF-funded vendor to use the rubric in a fair, consistent manner. All observers throughout TCRP will be trained by the same vendor to use the same rubric, thus optimizing inter-rater reliability, p. 23. The principal evaluation is described on page 43.

**Reader's Score: 0**

#### **Evaluation Criteria - Core Element 4**

##### **1. Core Element 4:**

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

##### **General:**

The applicant adequately meets the criteria of this section. The applicant reports that data system development is already underway with the aid of a grant from the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation. This data system will sufficiently link student achievement data to payroll and human resource systems.

Each of the five Charter Management Organizations will need to have their data systems retooled to include the student growth measure. The new data system will enable the evaluation system and career path strategic initiatives to capture and facilitate the use of evaluations, provide for a compensation design and the implementation of the value-added model based on a number of sources (e.g., evaluations, assessments), coordination of compensation with career laddering, and alignment of financial incentives with effectiveness and connect needs and human resources (e.g., helping leadership match schools and classrooms with the most appropriate teachers) and other measures, pp. 48-49.

**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 of Core Element 5. The applicant reports that each teacher will receive training from the vendor, The Value-Added Analysis Network, on how to read and understand the value-added annual report in order to use it for professional growth. In addition, each school principal will not only know how to read, explain and use the reports, but will also know how to assign to the teacher those students who are most likely to benefit from that teacher's classes, p. 33. The applicant describes training that will be provided to ensure that teachers and principals under the specific measures to be included in the PBCS. As described, this training appears to be sufficient.

**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 meets this criteria. The applicant reports that, as part of the PBCS, each teacher will receive and/or help to co-create an annual, customized personal learning plan that focuses professional development on specific areas where the teacher needs to improve in order to lift student achievement. This plan will be developed in collaboration with TIF-funded Implementation Coaches and will be based on an annual report generated from the data system along with individual personnel evaluation results.

This report will include records of student achievement and a clear value-added score to show student actual progress toward the goal of college readiness. If the teacher needs improvement, Implementation Coaches can tap a number of resources, such as coursework, mentor and master teachers, summer sessions, and workshops to provide targeted support in the area of need, p. 32. The information with the application noting the items listed above provides clear and concise descriptions.

All schools will participate in the PBCS. Teachers who are thriving will also receive customized professional development to keep them growing and to guide them along one of the differentiated career path options. Again, the Implementation Coaches will play a significant and high-touch role as career coaches, orchestrators of targeted professional development, and as liaisons between the teacher and the career path review panel, p 33.

The applicant notes that as the educators move through their career paths, they can opt into more responsibilities at the Highly Effective levels. For teachers this includes mentorship, coaching or administrative responsibilities, p. 27. For principals, this includes the opportunity to become a mentor principal, turnaround/transformational principal, or cluster principal, p. 44. The career steps are clearly delineated.

Each teacher will receive training from The Value-Added Analysis Network on how to read and understand the measures of effectiveness in the annual report in order to use it for professional growth. In addition, each school principal will not only know how to read, explain and use the reports, but will also know how to assign to the teacher those students who are most likely to benefit from that teacher's classes, p. 33. As described, this training will provide a link for teachers and principals to more fully understand how student academic achievement is tied directly to the PBCS.

The evaluation will drive improvement and fine-tuning of the project by examining the implementation of the elements of the Educator Effectiveness Project. Using varied research methods (observations, interviews, focus groups and qualitative case studies), the evaluator will provide regular feedback on the research questions that will guide the Implementation Study. One of the question concerns how new policies and professional development are producing observable changes in practice in schools and classrooms, p. 68-69.

**Reader's Score: 0**

#### **Selection Criteria - Need for the Project**

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

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

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

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

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

**(2) Student achievement (as defined in the Federal Register notice) in each of the schools whose educators would be part of the PBCS is lower than in what the applicant determines are comparable schools in the LEA, or another LEA in its State, in terms of key factors such as size, grade levels, and poverty levels; and**

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

**Strengths:**

The applicant adequately addressed need for the project. The applicant affirms that this project would be implemented in high need schools. TCRP schools currently serve more than 26,000 students in 85 public schools. Of these schools, 46 are eligible for TIF funding. While ineligible schools will not receive funds from this TIF grant, the comprehensive reform effort outlined in this application will be extended to them through other funding sources on the same timeline as TIF-eligible schools. All TIF-eligible schools have at least 50% of students eligible for Free and Reduced-Priced Lunch (FRPL), or, in the case of select middle and high schools with low reporting rates, at least 50% of FRPL-eligible students in the direct feeder school. The average TIF-eligible school serves 80% FRPL-eligible students, p. 6.

The applicant reports that turn-over, experience, and subject-area expertise are a problem. First-year teachers make up 15-40% of the teaching population in any year. Additionally, in hard-to-staff subjects and specialty areas, such as math and science, there are far fewer candidates for each open position, and principals cannot be selective with new hires.

The applicant notes that retention of effective teachers and principals is also a challenge. In exit surveys, teachers cite an insufficient evaluation system, lack of advancement opportunities and desire for more effective professional development as reasons for departing. Currently 25-40% of teachers leave each year across all TCRP schools; most leave voluntarily, but 6-12% are dismissed. These rates compare to a 13% turnover California-wide in the first two years. Through the descriptive information provided in this application, the applicant addresses efforts to increase retention rates for highly effective teachers and principals.

The applicant makes sufficient comparison of TCRP TIF-eligible schools to comparable schools in California that are performing at higher levels than each TIF-eligible school. In the High-Need Schools Documentation, school comparison data is offered for each TIF-eligible school that opened in 2008 or prior. The comparison uses the California Standards Test for elementary and middle school and the California High School Exit exam for high school. For each school, several comparison schools were located that are seeing students succeed at a higher rate, p. 7-8.

The applicant clearly discusses how schools were matched by school type (e.g., K-8, middle, high) and socio-economic disadvantage, using the federal level of poverty that includes free and reduced priced lunch (FRPL) and a measure of parent education level. This poverty measure was used in lieu of straight FRPL levels due to the fact that some high schools and many charter schools in California do not report FRPL levels, p. 8.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses were found.

**Reader's Score: 10**

**Selection Criteria - Project Design****1.(B): Project design (60 points)**

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

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

Federal Register notice). With regard to the effectiveness of teachers, principals, and other personnel, the Secretary will consider whether--

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

(ii) The participating LEA would use the proposed PBCS to provide performance awards to teachers, principals, and other personnel (in those sites in which the grantee wishes to expand the PBCS to additional staff in its schools) that are of sufficient size to affect the behaviors of teachers, principals, and other personnel and their decisions as to whether to go to, or remain working in, the high-need school; and

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

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

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

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

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

#### **Strengths:**

The applicant clearly notes that this project is part of a system-wide plan for improving evaluation of teachers and principals and ensuring that evaluation results inform decisions regarding compensation, recruitment, retention, support, career paths, and professional growth, p. 14. Student growth measures are included along with the use of a standards-based rubric and other measures of effectiveness, p. 19.

The applicant presents details to indicate that forty percent of teacher evaluations will be based on student achievement and growth, and sixty percent will be based on teacher practice and behavior, p. 18. The value-added student growth methodology will include multiple measures and will involve a growth-to-standard measurement of student achievement (or another value-added model), p. 19.

The highest paid teachers (i.e., master teachers and coaches) earn \$70,000 to \$93,000. In the new compensation plan to be developed, the most highly effective principals will earn approximately 7-15% over base salary, p. 45. The applicant used research on the topic of effective amounts of differential compensation, along with information from teacher focus groups, to inform the decision making process.

The applicant has developed a definition of "highly effective" to be teachers who help the majority of their high-need students consistently make more than one year of academic progress in a given year. Effective principals ensure that the majority of high-need students in their school consistently make more than one year of academic progress in a given year, p. 8.

The applicant delineated that TCRP has letters of support from all eligible schools featuring signatures of principals, teacher representatives and parent representatives and all unionized organizations. TCRP stakeholders held monthly discussion panels and focus groups throughout summer 2010, all focused on critiquing the initial teacher evaluation design and assessment rubric, p. 17.

The applicant affirms that key components of this PBCS project include using value-added measures of student growth, instituting new career paths, and differentiated compensation using multiple rating categories for the most effective educators, p. e0 (Abstract). Teachers are observed up to 10 times per year, p. 23. Principal evaluations will likely include measures of student graduation, college enrollment, student/family feedback, and at least two supervisor evaluations each year, p. 42.

The applicant presents details to indicate that a new data system will be developed to capture and facilitate the use of evaluations, provide for a compensation design and the implementation of the value-added model based on a number of sources (e.g., evaluations, assessments), coordination of compensation with career laddering, alignment of financial incentives with effectiveness, connect needs and human resources, and other types of measures, pp. 48-49.

**Weaknesses:**

The details provided in this section related to evaluation adequately align with the TIF requirements. Details were lacking as to how the amounts were selected based upon the information presented.

**Reader's Score: 54**

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

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

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

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

**Strengths:**

The project will likely meet its proposed objectives on time and within budget, with clearly defined responsibilities and detailed timelines and milestones, pp. e22-e35 (Appendix). All key personnel have an extensive array of experience that would enable them to successfully implement the project, pp. 54-59.

The applicant has projected funding for differentiated compensation to include six percent from TIF funds and 94 percent from other funds, p. 3 (Budget Narrative). The requested grant amount and project cost are quite reasonable in relation to the total

amount that will be spent on this project and should be sufficient to attain project goals related to the funding requested.

**Weaknesses:**

A clear delineation of the individual responsibilities noted in the management plan is needed (e22-e35).

**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 evaluation offers both goals and strategies that are clearly aligned with raising student effectiveness, increasing the effectiveness of teachers and principals and retaining and recruiting effective teachers and principals, p. 63-71.

Quantitative measures will be used to guide the study for the Impact Evaluation of delineated objectives and performance measures. The overall student achievement goal will be measured by State assessments, high school graduation rates, and college readiness objectives. Various research methods (observations, interviews, focus groups and qualitative case studies) offer feedback on the research questions that guide the Implementation Study, p. 63-70. The evaluation plan contains procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement, p. 68-70.

**Weaknesses:**

Information on the evaluation of principals was not presented or detailed.

**Reader's Score: 4**

**Priority Questions**

**Priority Preference - Competitive Preference Priority 1**

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

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

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

**Strengths:**

The applicant presents a clear explanation that the value-added student growth methodology that will be used will include multiple measures to ensure that TCRP takes advantage of the most current research and evidence base about how to best assess the impact of a teacher on student achievement. It will involve a growth-to-standard measurement of student achievement (or another value-added model). Also, it must be based on a large enough sample size to produce reliable value-added results in each situation. Growth-to-standard models differ from the typical value-added model in three ways: (1) they establish an end target for student growth (in this case, readiness for college), (2) they specify a desired amount of growth towards the end target each year, and (3) growth-to-standard models empirically test the probabilistic likelihood of students at different initial achievement levels attaining the desired growth, p. 19.

It is apparent that a great deal of pre-planning has taken place in the development of the PBCS data system with the aid of a grant from the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation. Each of the five CMO will need to have their data systems retooled to include the value-added student growth measure. The new system will enable the evaluation system and career path strategic initiatives to capture and facilitate the use of evaluations, differential compensation with career laddering, and alignment of financial incentives with effectiveness and connect needs and human resources (e.g., helping leadership match schools and classrooms with the most appropriate teachers) and other measures, pp. 48-49.

The applicant aptly described how each teacher and principal will receive training from the vendor, The Value-Added Analysis Network, on how to read and understand the value-added annual report to use for professional growth, p 33.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses were found.

**Reader's Score: 5**

**Priority Preference - Competitive Preference Priority 2**

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

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

language acquisition, and (3) fill vacancies with teachers of those subjects or specialty areas who are effective or likely to be effective. The applicant must provide an explanation for how it will determine that a teacher filling a vacancy is effective or likely to be effective. In addition, applicants must demonstrate, in their applications, the extent to which the subjects or specialty areas they propose to target are hard-to-staff. Lastly, applicants must demonstrate, in their applications that they will implement a process for effectively communicating to teachers which of the LEA's schools are high-need and which subjects and specialty areas are considered hard-to-staff.

**Strengths:**

The applicant specifies that nearly all of their students meet the definition of high-need students. They are at risk of education failure, or otherwise in need of special assistance and support. Moreover, 80% of TCRP students qualify for Free and Reduced Priced Lunch (FRPL). TCRP schools serve more than 94% minority students and 20% English Language Learners, p. 5. The applicant has developed plans for filling vacancies of teachers through the prospective teacher residency program.

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant does not discuss retaining effective teachers in teaching positions in hard-to-staff subjects and specialty areas. The applicant does not discuss filling vacancies with teachers of those subjects or specialty areas who are effective or likely to be effective. The applicant does not provide an explanation for how it will determine that a teacher filling a vacancy is effective or likely to be effective.

The applicant does not discuss the extent to which the subjects or specialty areas they propose to target are hard-to-staff. The applicant does not discuss the implementation of a process for effectively communicating to teachers which of the schools are high-need and which subjects and specialty areas are considered hard-to-staff.

**Reader's Score: 2**

---

**Status:** Submitted

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

Status: Submitted

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

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** The College-Ready Promise -- , (S385A100082)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Evaluation Criteria</b>		
<b>Absolute Priority 1</b>		
1.Absolute Priority 1	0	0
<b>Absolute Priority 2</b>		
1.Absolute Priority 2	0	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	0	0
<b>Evaluaton Criteria</b>		
<b>Absolute Priority 3</b>		
1.Absolute Priority 3	0	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	0	0
<b>Requirement</b>		
<b>Requirement</b>		
1.Requirement	0	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	0	0
<b>Evaluation Criteria</b>		
<b>Core Element 1</b>		
1.Core Element 1	0	0
<b>Core Element 2</b>		
1.Core Element 2	0	0
<b>Core Element 3</b>		
1.Core Element 3	0	0
<b>Core Element 4</b>		
1.Core Element 4	0	0
<b>Core Element 5</b>		
1.Core Element 5	0	0
<b>High Quality Professional Development</b>		
1.Professional Development	0	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	0	0
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Need for the Project</b>		
1.Need for Project	10	9
<b>Project Design</b>		

1.Project Design	60	55
<b>Adequacy of Support for the Proposed Project</b>		
1.Adequacy of Support	25	17
<b>Quality of Local Evaluation</b>		
1.Quality of Local Eval.	5	4
<b>Sub Total</b>	100	85

**Priority Questions**

**Priority Preference**

**Competitive Preference Priority 1**

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

**Competitive Preference Priority 2**

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

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

<b>Total</b>	110	93
--------------	-----	----

## Technical Review Form

Panel #6 - Panel - 6: 84.385A

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

Applicant: The College-Ready Promise -- , (S385A100082)

### Questions

#### Evaluation Criteria - Absolute Priority 1

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

Comment on how well the applicant demonstrates that --

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

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

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

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

#### General:

The applicant adequately addresses Absolute Priority 1. The calculation of student learning growth is provided on page 19, and will utilize a value-added model. The method used to calculate growth takes into account an end target for students, a desired amount of growth toward the target each year, and a growth-to-standards analysis, all indicating a multi-faceted approach to determining growth in student achievement (p. 19).

The applicant proposes a redesign of the teacher and principal evaluation system which could potentially impact retention and instructional practices (p. 18). The development of a new set of standards, the Teacher Effectiveness Framework, is currently underway, and it defines the various abilities and practices of highly effective teachers (p. 22). Critical components that are research-based are incorporated in this framework. Once the work is approved, the model will be converted into rubric form so that specific criteria can be examined along a continuum of effectiveness (p. 22). Teachers will be observed up to 10 times per year (p. 23). This increases the opportunities for leaders to see visible evidence of highly effective practice in the classrooms. Inter-rater reliability is addressed as all observers will be trained by the same vendor and use the same rubric

(p. 23). As noted, this practice incorporates a measure of consistency so that fair assessments can be made.

Opportunities for promotion within the teaching career are mentioned and provide chances for teachers to become leaders through the Career Path component. This practice helps build the capacity of the other teachers in the school.

The applicant evidences best practice in researching incentive amounts. Using information from the National Center on Teacher Quality as well as literature from other sources, the applicant put together focus groups to derive incentive amounts that are likely high enough to create change in the behavior of current and prospective teachers in order to ultimately improve student outcomes (p. 25-29).

**Reader's Score: 0**

#### **Evaluation Criteria - Absolute Priority 2**

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

Comment on how well the applicant demonstrates that - -

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

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

#### **General:**

The applicant adequately addresses the criteria in Absolute Priority 2. The applicant references funding from the Gates Foundation as that which would be easily integrated with the proposed project (p. 62). Such connections establish a solid foundation for improvement and increase the likelihood of project success.

The applicant addresses funding sources by explaining how funds could potentially be secured from donor and likely federal grants (p. 61). Such possibilities exploration of multiple avenues to acquire the resources necessary to enhance student achievement.

Reasonable cost estimates are provided demonstrating prior financial planning and foresight (p. 62). On page 16, the applicant outlines a funding plan in which Year 1 will be used for planning, TIF funds will be used for partial compensation of performance in Years 2 and 3, and then non-TIF funds will be used in Years 4 and 5.

**Reader's Score: 0**

#### **Evaluation Criteria - Absolute Priority 3**

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

Comment on how well the applicant demonstrates that - -

The proposed PBCS is aligned with a coherent and integrated strategy for strengthening the educator workforce, including in the use of data and evaluations for professional

development and retention and tenure decisions in the LEA or LEAs participating in the project during and after the end of the TIF project period.

**General:**

The applicant adequately addresses Absolute Priority 3. Evidence of a coherent and integrated strategy can be seen in the proposed project. The calculation of student learning growth is provided on page 19, and will utilize a value-added model. The method used to calculate growth takes into account an end target for students, a desired amount of growth toward the target each year, and a growth-to-standards analysis, all indicating a multi-faceted approach to determining growth in student achievement (p. 19).

The applicant references funding from prior work with the Gates Foundation as an example of a coherent strategy which would be easily integrated with the proposed project (p. 62). Such connections establish a solid foundation for improvement and increase the likelihood of project success.

Customized learning plans are included for educators based on data and evaluations (p, 32). On pages 26 and 27, the applicant illustrates the movement of teachers through different levels depending on measures of effectiveness. The applicant notes that no CMOS offer tenure, but that data will be used to help strategically place teachers to maximize the impact on students and support teacher retention efforts in the process (p. 38).

**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 provides sufficient evidence to meet this requirement. Opportunities for promotion within the teaching career are mentioned and provide opportunities for teachers to become leaders without sacrificing the effective practice provided to students (p. 25). According to the Career Path component, the effectiveness score for teachers is based 40% on student achievement, 30-40% on observations, and 20-30% on other factors, indicating a variety of mechanisms that foster opportunities for teacher growth and needs assessment (p. 25).

**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 under Core Element 1. Letters of support from not only the eligible schools, but from the union working with Green Dot (Appendix), indicates widespread support for the proposed project, which increases likelihood of project success. Ongoing stakeholder sessions with monthly discussion panels and focus groups of more than 1000 participants also demonstrate a commitment to providing opportunities for feedback and ongoing communication regarding project components (p. 17). Based upon the information provided, teacher voice and input has been included in the project from the

beginning of the process (see specifically p. 17). The communication with the union and parents represents efforts to address the community-at-large (p. 17, Appendix).

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 sufficiently addresses the criteria in Core Element 2. Letters of support from not only the eligible schools, but from the union working with Green Dot (Appendix), indicates widespread support for the proposed project, which increases likelihood of project success. Ongoing stakeholder sessions with monthly discussion panels and focus groups of more than 1000 participants also demonstrate a commitment to providing opportunities for feedback and ongoing communication regarding project components (p. 17). Teacher and parent input has been incorporated throughout the planning process which increases the likelihood of effective implementation of this proposed program (Appendix).

Reader's Score: 0

#### Evaluation Criteria - Core Element 3

##### 1. Core Element 3:

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

##### General:

The applicant adequately meets the criteria in Core Element 3. The applicant 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. The standards based framework and the placement of teachers by a hiring committee based on concrete data and specified components (p. 27-30).

On pages 22 and 23, the applicant provides information about the process by which the vendor will convert the evaluation framework into a rubric to be used in the evaluation process. On page 23, the teacher observations will be conducted up to 10 times per year. The vendor will also provide training to observers to ensure knowledge of the standards and increasing awareness of inter-rater reliability (p. 23).

On page 41, the applicant discusses plans for the Principal Residency component including ongoing coaching and training along with a robust principal evaluation system which will weight teacher movement along the career path and the retention of the most highly-effective teachers as a key measurement of success.

**Reader's Score: 0**

#### **Evaluation Criteria - Core Element 4**

##### **1. Core Element 4:**

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

##### **General:**

The applicant adequately addresses Core Element 4. The applicant describes the proposed data system, and sufficiently demonstrates that it can link student achievement data to teacher and principal payroll and human resources systems and the professional development and learning management system (p. 49).

**Reader's Score: 0**

#### **Evaluation Criteria - Core Element 5**

##### **1. Core Element 5:**

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

##### **General:**

The applicant adequately addresses Core Element 5. Professional development that is tied directly to data and coaching experiences will lead to overall improvements in quality through targeted, sustained efforts (p. 32-33). The creation of customized learning plans (p. 32) will help to focus professional development efforts on identified areas of need which is critical in designing and implementing quality instructional programs. Teachers will receive training on the various components that are required to glean effective performance (p. 32). On page 33, the applicant sufficiently describes training for principals in how to utilize the data and reports to make informed decisions about staffing and campus initiatives.

**Reader's Score: 0**

#### **Evaluation Criteria - High Quality Professional Development**

##### **1. High Quality Professional Development:**

**Comment on the applicant's demonstration that ---**

**Its proposed PBCS will include a high-quality professional development component for teachers and principals consistent with the definition of the term professional development in section 9101(34) of the ESEA. The applicant must demonstrate that its PBCS**

has a professional development component in place, or a specific plan for developing one, that is directly linked to the specific measures of teacher and principal effectiveness included in the PBCS. The professional development component of the PBCS must - -

- (1) Be based on needs assessed either at the high-need schools (as defined in the Federal Register notice) participating in the applicant's proposed PBCS or LEA-wide;
- (2) Be targeted to individual teacher's and principal's needs as identified in the evaluation process;
- (3) Provide --
  - (a) Those teachers and principals in participating TIF schools who do not receive differentiated compensation based on effectiveness under the PBCS with the tools and skills they need to improve their effectiveness in the classroom or school and be able to raise student achievement (as defined in the Federal Register notice); and
  - (b) Those teachers and principals who are deemed to be effective and who, therefore, receive differentiated compensation under the PBCS, with the tools and skills they need to
    - (1) continue effective practices in the classroom or school and raise student achievement (as defined in the Federal Register notice), and
    - (2) successfully assume additional responsibilities and leadership roles (as defined in the Federal Register notice);
- (4) Support teachers and principals to better understand and use the measures of effectiveness in the PBCS to improve practice and student achievement (as defined in the Federal Register notice); and
- (5) Include a process for regularly assessing the effectiveness of this professional development in improving teacher and leadership practice to increase student achievement (as defined in the Federal Register notice) and making modifications necessary to improve its effectiveness.

**General:**

The applicant adequately addresses this requirement. Professional development that is tied directly to data and coaching experiences will lead to overall improvements in quality through targeted, sustained efforts (p. 32-33). The creation of customized learning plans will help to focus professional development efforts on identified areas of need which is critical in designing and implementing quality instructional programs (p. 32). A PBCS is provided based upon student achievement data as well as other educational factors.

On page 33, the applicant notes that all schools will participate in the proposed project. Implementation coaches and mentors will support teachers in need of improvement and have access to a variety of resources, including course-work, summer sessions, and workshops (p. 33).

Principals will be trained on the use of the data and generated reports to make informed decisions about teacher placement and professional development options (p. 33).

The applicant indicates in the evaluation, that regular feedback on all project components, including professional development, will guide the implementation study (p. 68-69).

**Reader's Score: 0**

**Selection Criteria - Need for the Project**

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

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

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

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

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

(2) Student achievement (as defined in the Federal Register notice) in each of the schools whose educators would be part of the PBCS is lower than in what the applicant determines are comparable schools in the LEA, or another LEA in its State, in terms of key factors such as size, grade levels, and poverty levels; and

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

#### **Strengths:**

The applicant provides evidence of need in terms of poverty levels and high needs students (p. 5). 80% of students qualify for Free and Reduced Price Lunch, and the school serves a 20% ELL population which requires a specialized set of skills to properly address student needs (p. 5). This fulfills the 50% or more TIF requirement.

Further evidence of need can be determined by looking at the 31% drop out rate in one of the districts served (p. 7).

The applicant demonstrates difficulty recruiting effective teachers in hard-to-staff areas such as math and science due to the low number of applicants (p. 9). This can be particularly challenging when the content in the middle school and high school courses incorporates more in-depth content requiring subject-matter expertise.

For comparison purposes, the applicant indicates that each school is listed along with schools that are matched by school type, socioeconomic disadvantage, and a measure of parent education level which allows for conducting appropriate analyses without manipulating many different variables (p. 8).

The applicant estimates that 10-15% of teachers are highly effective as a result of high-turnover rates, limited experience, and limited subject matter expertise (p. 9). This combination can have a negative effect on student achievement.

The applicant also addresses retention of both effective teachers and effective principals (p. 9). With 25-40% of teachers leaving each year, consistency in instruction is impaired which can have adverse effects on students and their academic achievement.

#### **Weaknesses:**

Specific student achievement data disaggregated by grade, subject, and student group is not provided which limits the extent to which such information can be used to isolate a critical need.

**Reader's Score: 9**

#### **Selection Criteria - Project Design**

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

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

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

effectiveness as determined in significant part by student growth (as defined in the Federal Register notice). With regard to the effectiveness of teachers, principals, and other personnel, the Secretary will consider whether--

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

(ii) The participating LEA would use the proposed PBCS to provide performance awards to teachers, principals, and other personnel (in those sites in which the grantee wishes to expand the PBCS to additional staff in its schools) that are of sufficient size to affect the behaviors of teachers, principals, and other personnel and their decisions as to whether to go to, or remain working in, the high-need school; and

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

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

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

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

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

#### **Strengths:**

Letters of support from not only the eligible schools, but from the union working with Green Dot (Appendix), indicates broad support for the proposed project, which increases likelihood of project success. Ongoing stakeholder sessions with monthly discussion panels and focus groups of more than 1000 participants also demonstrate a commitment to providing opportunities for feedback and ongoing communication regarding project components (p. 17). The calculation of student learning growth is provided on page 19. The applicant plans to utilize a value-added model. The method used to calculate growth takes into account an end target for students, a desired amount of annual growth toward the target, and a growth-to-standards analysis, all indicating a multi-faceted approach to determining student achievement progress (p. 19). Likewise on page 41, the applicant sufficiently describes the process by which principal evaluations will take place. The robust principal evaluation system will weight teacher movement along the career path and the retention of the most highly-effective teachers as a key measurement of success (p. 41). On page 18, the applicant proposes a redesign of the teacher and principal evaluation system. This redesign could potentially impact retention and instructional practices. The development of a new set of standards, the Teacher Effectiveness Framework, is currently underway, and it defines the various abilities and practices of highly effective teachers (p. 22). Critical components that are research-based are incorporated in this framework. Once the work is approved, the model will be converted into rubric form so that specific criteria can be examined along a continuum of effectiveness (p. 22). Teachers will be observed up to 10 times per year (p. 23). This increases the opportunities for leaders to see visible evidence of highly effective practice in the classrooms. Inter-rater reliability is addressed as all observers will

be trained by the same vendor and use the same rubric (p. 23). As noted, this practice incorporates a measure of consistency so that fair assessments can be made. Opportunities for promotion within the teaching career are mentioned and provide opportunities for teachers to become leaders without sacrificing the effective practice provided to students (p. 25). According to the Career Path component, the effectiveness score for teachers is based 40% on student achievement, 30-40% on observations, and 20-30% on other factors, indicating a variety of mechanisms that foster opportunities for teacher growth and needs assessment (p. 25). The different levels of compensation based on levels of effectiveness 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 (p. 30). Specifically, an additional \$10,000 is a significant increase given the base salary offered to teachers (p. 31).

The applicant 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. The standards based framework and the placement of teachers by a hiring committee based on concrete data and specified components (p. 27-30, 41). Professional development tied directly to data and coaching experiences will lead to overall improvements in quality through targeted, sustained efforts (p. 32-33). The creation of customized learning plans will help to focus professional development efforts on identified areas of need which is critical in designing and implementing quality instructional programs (p. 32). The applicant describes the proposed data system, and demonstrates that it can link student achievement data to teacher and principal payroll and human resources systems and the professional development and learning management system (p. 49).

**Weaknesses:**

While the \$70,000 to \$93,000 range represents a substantive amount, it is unclear what calculations were used to derive these amounts in teacher salary. A concrete description of how this was calculated is lacking in the application (p. 31).

Information regarding professional development for principals that would be critical in assessing instructional programs across content areas is unclear and vague.

**Reader's Score: 55**

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

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

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

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

**Strengths:**

Some responsibilities and an overview of a timeline are included within the application to demonstrate prior planning of human resources and specific strategies to be accomplished during a given period of time (p. e22).

Support for the project can be seen in the letters of support from principals, parent representatives, and union representatives (Appendix). Stakeholder support can contribute to program success.

The applicant references funding from the Gates Foundation as that which would be easily integrated with the proposed project (p. 62). Such connections can contribute to program success.

The applicant addresses funding sources by explaining how funds could potentially be secured from donor and likely federal grants (p. 61). Multiple funding sources can contribute to long-term sustainability.

Reasonable cost estimates are provided demonstrating prior financial planning and foresight (p. 62).

**Weaknesses:**

Some aspects of the management plan are vague and could have additional specificity (p. e22-e35, Appendix). For example, the applicant states plans to implement the differentiated compensation pilot in 5 case study schools. This is a broad statement that encompasses many different activities, and breaking down this activity into separate, more manageable tasks may be helpful in facilitating task completion (p. 23, Appendix).

Clearly articulated roles and responsibilities for each level of this more general task can contribute to task completion.

**Reader's Score: 17**

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

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

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

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

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

**Strengths:**

The applicant sufficiently describes plans to use an external evaluator who will facilitate a thorough evaluation based on both formative and summative data analysis (p. 70). The use of pilot sites and resulting case studies will provide useful information that will facilitate ease of program implementation on a larger scale (p. 69).

Both quantitative and qualitative data will be collected and compared with yearly performance measures to gauge progress toward realizing the established goals (p. 68). The inclusion of specific research questions are important as they can help guide the project components.

Evaluation techniques based on objective performance measures will inform not only the impact of the project on teacher effectiveness, but also on principal effectiveness as well. Linking pay and leadership performance to the resulting teacher effectiveness and student achievement facilitates the development of a process that identifies and rewards highly effective strategies (p. 67).

**Weaknesses:**

Without identification of an outside evaluator at the beginning of the project, it is unclear if he or she will have sufficient expertise and qualifications.

**Reader's Score: 4**

**Priority Questions**

**Priority Preference - Competitive Preference Priority 1**

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

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

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

**Strengths:**

The applicant sufficiently describes the use of a value-added measure of student achievement. A thorough description of the calculation of student learning growth is provided on page 19, and the applicant plans to utilize a value-added model. The method used to calculate growth takes into account an end target for students, a desired amount of growth toward the target each year, and a growth-to-standards analysis, all indicating the consideration of multiple data points in determining growth in student achievement (p. 19).

The applicant indicates plans to coordinate the implementation of the value-added model with the creation of a new data system, which is one of the nine components in the plan (p. 20-21). Targeted training on the use of the value-added model is included for teachers and principals, increasing the likelihood that teachers will become more involved with the data analysis aspect (p. 21, p. 33).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses were noted in this section.

**Reader's Score: 5**

**Priority Preference - Competitive Preference Priority 2**

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

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

**Strengths:**

The applicant explains the current use of a teacher residency component for recruiting teachers who are able and willing to teach in hard to staff subjects (p. 34). This is an important consideration because increasing depth of knowledge required of students calls for content expertise and highly effective instructional practices. The residency program contains components that can help teachers develop these skills.

**Weaknesses:**

There is no specific explanation for how the applicant will determine that a teacher filling a vacancy is effective or likely to be effective.

The applicant does not specifically target teacher retention in certain specialty areas based on student achievement data or other indicators of student need. Such information would provide a rationale for a focus in the identified areas of need.

**Reader's Score: 3**

---

**Status:** Submitted

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

Status: Submitted

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

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** The College-Ready Promise -- , (S385A100082)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Evaluation Criteria</b>		
<b>Absolute Priority 1</b>		
1.Absolute Priority 1	0	0
<b>Absolute Priority 2</b>		
1.Absolute Priority 2	0	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	0	0
<b>Evaluaton Criteria</b>		
<b>Absolute Priority 3</b>		
1.Absolute Priority 3	0	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	0	0
<b>Requirement</b>		
<b>Requirement</b>		
1.Requirement	0	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	0	0
<b>Evaluation Criteria</b>		
<b>Core Element 1</b>		
1.Core Element 1	0	0
<b>Core Element 2</b>		
1.Core Element 2	0	0
<b>Core Element 3</b>		
1.Core Element 3	0	0
<b>Core Element 4</b>		
1.Core Element 4	0	0
<b>Core Element 5</b>		
1.Core Element 5	0	0
<b>High Quality Professional Development</b>		
1.Professional Development	0	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	0	0
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Need for the Project</b>		
1.Need for Project	10	9
<b>Project Design</b>		

1.Project Design	60	52
<b>Adequacy of Support for the Proposed Project</b>		
1.Adequacy of Support	25	20
<b>Quality of Local Evaluation</b>		
1.Quality of Local Eval.	5	4
<b>Sub Total</b>	100	85

**Priority Questions**

**Priority Preference**

**Competitive Preference Priority 1**

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

**Competitive Preference Priority 2**

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

<b>Sub Total</b>	10	6
------------------	----	---

<b>Total</b>	110	91
--------------	-----	----

## Technical Review Form

Panel #6 - Panel - 6: 84.385A

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

Applicant: The College-Ready Promise -- , (S385A100082)

### Questions

#### Evaluation Criteria - Absolute Priority 1

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

Comment on how well the applicant demonstrates that --

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

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

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

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

#### General:

This priority was met. The applicant will implement a differentiated compensation system (p.16). A standards-based framework has been established that will form 60% of a teacher's evaluation. The framework includes standards for planning and preparation, classroom environment, instruction, assessment, data driven instruction, professional responsibilities, and partnerships with families and communities (p.21). This means that only 40% of the evaluation remains for student academic achievement. On page 25, the system is described as based on 40% student achievement, 30-40 percent observations, and 20-30 percent other factors. The applicant did not clearly explain what is meant by "other factors" which would be used in the rating system.

Teacher observations are addressed on pages 18 and 22. Opportunities are provided for professional advancement (p.25).

The proposed incentive funding for teachers (p.30) appears to be sufficient, especially at the upper levels, to encourage change. Funding differential levels were based on a review of literature from the National Center for Teacher Quality and others sources in

the field (p32). The use of literature was an excellent method of enriching the plan.

Reader's Score: 0

#### Evaluation Criteria - Absolute Priority 2

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

Comment on how well the applicant demonstrates that - -

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

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

#### General:

This priority is met. The applicant plans to use Year 1 for planning. The costs appear to be appropriate for the programming proposed. The applicant plans to use TIF funds to partially pay for differentiated compensation based on performance in Years 2 and 3 only. Non-TIF funds will cover Years 4 and 5 (p.16). TIF funds will be used to contract with a firm to develop new content-area tests (p.20). TIF funds will also be used to employ a vendor to convert the modified framework into a rubric (p.22). A chart on page 15 shows increasing percents of funds from non-TIF sources.

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:

This priority was met. TIF funds will be used to contract with a firm to develop new content-area tests (p.20). TIF funds will also be used to employ a vendor to convert the modified framework into a rubric (p.22). Content tests and rubrics are tools to assist in identifying workforce needs that require strengthening.

Teachers are to receive help in creating an annual customized personal learning plan focused on professional development in specific areas of need (p.32). Teachers will be encouraged to take on additional roles as they move through the incentive levels. For example, one might opt to select a "Teacher Coach" career path where they would mentor and coach other teachers (p.28). Additional roles and responsibilities were unclear. Figures 6 and 7 on page 26-27 address details related to tenure decisions.

Reader's Score: 0

**Requirement - Requirement**

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

**General:**

This requirement is met. Teachers will be encouraged to take on additional roles as they move through the incentive levels. For example, one might opt to select a "Teacher Coach" career path where they would work with other teachers (p.28). The descriptions of movement through the incentive levels are clear.

Reader's Score: 0

**Evaluation Criteria - Core Element 1**

- 1. Core Element 1:**

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

**General:**

This element is met. Initial communication efforts appear designed to reach the widest audience possible. Multiple representatives from each of the 5 districts have participated in planning (p.17). Representatives have included staff, parents and unions. Stakeholder participation is ongoing during summer, 2010 (p.17). For those not involved in planning, principals are communicating through meetings, intranet and newsletters. Surveys are used to collect feedback (p.18).

Reader's Score: 0

**Evaluation Criteria - Core Element 2**

- 1. Core Element 2:**

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

**General:**

This element is met. The project has obtained signed letters of support from principals, teachers and parent representatives. Of the five involved districts, only one is unionized. In that case, a letter of support from the union has been obtained (p.17). Review of the letter indicates strong union support for a differentiated pay system (appendix). Multiple representatives from each of the 5 districts have participated in planning (p.17).

Reader's Score: 0

### Evaluation Criteria - Core Element 3

#### 1. Core Element 3:

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

#### General:

This element is adequately met. The applicant plans to implement a differentiated compensation system (p.16). A standards-based framework has been established that will form 60% of a teacher's evaluation. The framework includes standards for planning and preparation, classroom environment, assessment, data driven instruction, professional responsibilities, and partnerships with families and communities (p.21). This means that 40% of the evaluation remains for student academic achievement. On page 25, the system is described as based on 40% student achievement, 30-40 percent observations, and 20-30 percent other factors. The meaning of "other factors" is not clearly stated.

Teachers will be observed up to 10 times in a year. Observers are to be trained by a vendor to optimize inter-rater reliability (p.23). Portfolios and surveys (p.18) will also be used.

Reader's Score: 0

### Evaluation Criteria - Core Element 4

#### 1. Core Element 4:

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

#### General:

This core element is met. The 5 project districts are in final stages of a three-year, foundation-funded effort to design and build a data warehouse (p.47). As described, it sounds like the system is primarily for teachers to track student data. New systems are proposed to track evaluations, compensation, professional development, instructional support, content and document management among other things (p.49). The link between both the student data system and the human resources system is discussed on pages 48-49.

Reader's Score: 0

## Evaluation Criteria - Core Element 5

### 1. Core Element 5:

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

#### General:

This core element is adequately met. The quality of the actual plan for helping staff understand specific measures is unclear. The applicant only provides information that it interviewed 10 vendors of proposed value-added systems and has selected the Value-Added Analysis Network. The firm is committed to explaining the system in such a way that participants can calculate it for themselves (p.19). Principals will be taught to understand and use the reports for decisions related to staff improvement (p.33). Training is also to be provided to teachers. The pre-planning details contained within this application were helpful to better understand the totality of the proposed program.

Reader's Score: 0

## Evaluation Criteria - High Quality Professional Development

### 1. High Quality Professional Development:

Comment on the applicant's demonstration that ---

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

- (1) Be based on needs assessed either at the high-need schools (as defined in the Federal Register notice) participating in the applicant's proposed PBCS or LEA-wide;
- (2) Be targeted to individual teacher's and principal's needs as identified in the evaluation process;
- (3) Provide --
  - (a) Those teachers and principals in participating TIF schools who do not receive differentiated compensation based on effectiveness under the PBCS with the tools and skills they need to improve their effectiveness in the classroom or school and be able to raise student achievement (as defined in the Federal Register notice); and
  - (b) Those teachers and principals who are deemed to be effective and who, therefore, receive differentiated compensation under the PBCS, with the tools and skills they need to
    - (1) continue effective practices in the classroom or school and raise student achievement (as defined in the Federal Register notice), and (2) successfully assume additional responsibilities and leadership roles (as defined in the Federal Register notice);
    - (4) Support teachers and principals to better understand and use the measures of effectiveness in the PBCS to improve practice and student achievement (as defined in the Federal Register notice); and
    - (5) Include a process for regularly assessing the effectiveness of this professional development in improving teacher and leadership practice to increase student achievement (as defined in the Federal Register notice) and making modifications necessary to improve its effectiveness.

**General:**

This criteria is met. The applicant describes professional development around the understanding and use of the performance pay program. Greater specificity is needed regarding the term "targeted professional development" and the mechanism for administering it (p.32). For example, whether professional development will be provided during release time, by consultants working with groups of teachers from the five districts with similar needs, or based on individual enrollment in university courses.

All schools and teachers will participate in the PBCS (p.33). Resources are available for use with teachers who do not receive incentive pay (p.32). Additional opportunities will be available to teachers and principals (pp. 27 and 44). Principals will receive assistance on the appropriate use of evaluation data to guide the process (p.68-69).

**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:**

One strength of the application is that it presents data showing that 50% or more of the students to be involved in the program are free and reduced price lunch recipients (p.5). The applicant estimates that only 10-15% of their teachers are highly qualified. Teacher turnover is also an issue (p.9) with 25-40% of teachers leaving each year, most voluntarily but with 6-12% dismissed (p.10). The applicant states that for hard to staff subjects, there are few teacher applicants limiting the principal's staffing choice options (p.9).

**Weaknesses:**

Actual data about staff placements in difficult to fill subjects was not presented. The applicant states that only 10-15% of teachers are highly qualified based on a measure of student growth. The measure of student growth used to define a teacher as highly qualified is not presented.

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 data system is to link student data with human resources data (p.49).

The project is in the initial stages of planning. Thoughtful and descriptive information is presented related to a differentiated salary scale based on performance (p.16).

There is some mention of mentoring teachers in need of assistance and of providing targeted professional development. A number of decisions in the initial plan have been

made after a review of related research and literature. This approach (an example is presented on P. 32) provides a firm foundation for the activities identified in the proposal.

**Weaknesses:**

The variables to be monitored are not clearly identified. "Targeted professional development" is often mentioned (p.21), but additional detail is needed about the types of professional development the applicant thinks might be needed. For example, there may be a need to increase the content knowledge of teachers, especially in STEM areas.

Much of the principal professional development is to be related to use of the teacher evaluation system. Specificity is not given related to other types of professional development that might be appropriate for principals. For example, principals who will be observing and rating teachers may benefit from increased awareness of the components of a well-instructed mathematics classroom.

**Reader's Score: 52**

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

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

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

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

**Strengths:**

Support for the project has been obtained from a variety of stakeholders. A management system is in place and key staff have been identified (pp. 50-58).

**Weaknesses:**

Actual responsibilities were not presented for each person noted on the management chart on page 54. Additional clarity is needed regarding the use of other funds (federal, state, and/or local) to support the project.

**Reader's Score: 20**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of Local Evaluation**

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

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

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

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

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

**Strengths:**

An external evaluator is to be selected. The evaluation is planned to provide both formative and summative information as well as qualitative and quantitative data (p. 63-70). The evaluation will include a determination of the project's impact on principals (p .67). The evaluation as described has the potential to provide information useful for both project modification and an assessment of the project's overall impact.

**Weaknesses:**

The evaluator was not involved at the preparation stage of the application. Early involvement of the evaluator may have added clarity and conciseness to the stated goals and objectives.

Reader's Score: 4

**Priority Questions**

Priority Preference - Competitive Preference Priority 1

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

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

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

**Strengths:**

The applicant interviewed 10 vendors of proposed value-added systems and has selected the Value-Added Analysis Network. This demonstrates appropriate pre-planning on the part of the applicant. The Value-Added Analysis Network has provided a commitment to "explaining the system thoroughly to teachers in such a way that they can calculate it for

themselves" (p.19). The firm is not to be paid with TIF funds (p.19). The system uses a calculation of the gap between a student's ability and the ultimate goal of meeting the standard set for college readiness (p.19).

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant did not adequately explain the components of the value-added system and the procedures to be used in establishing long-range targets.

**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 plans to use a teacher residency component to increase the number of teachers in hard to staff subjects (p.34). These residents would be individuals who are not yet full teachers. This component may be of assistance in recruiting new teachers to the district.

**Weaknesses:**

Detail is needed regarding how in-service teachers will be encouraged to improve their skills and/or be recruited to move into hard to staff subjects.

**Reader's Score: 3**

---

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