

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 8/6/10 3:57 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Colorado Springs School District 11 -- , (S385A100085)

Reader #1: *****

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

1.Project Design	60	48
Adequacy of Support for the Proposed Project		
1.Adequacy of Support	25	20
Quality of Local Evaluation		
1.Quality of Local Eval.	5	3
Sub Total	100	78

Priority Questions

Priority Preference

Competitive Preference Priority 1

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

Competitive Preference Priority 2

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

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

Total	110	85
--------------	-----	----

Technical Review Form

Panel #4 - Panel - 4: 84.385A

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: Colorado Springs School District 11 -- , (S385A100085)

Questions

Evaluation Criteria - Absolute Priority 1

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

Comment on how well the applicant demonstrates that --

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

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

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

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

General:

(a) The applicant has appropriate plans to provide differentiated rewards to teacher and principals based on their effectiveness in improving student achievement as measured by classroom observations conducted at least twice a year (p. 5), performance evaluations and objective student growth data from standardized tests of the MAP testing in reading, math and science three times a year. (p. 2). The applicant has given significant weight to student growth with 50% of the evaluation for teachers based on growth data. (p. e19). The amounts of incentives appears to be substantial as incentives will allow principals to earn as much as a promotion to the district office would afford (p. 21) and incentives for teachers provide for \$2500 as performance based compensation and a bonus of \$2000 for hard to staff areas (p. 21).

(b) The applicant has clear plans to use an observation based assessment of teacher and principal performance by using the TAP measure (p. 3) that is aligned with national board teaching standards, results in 5 rating categories of skills, knowledge and responsibility, and requires training and certification. (p 2).

(c) The applicant has appropriate plans to use other indicators such as projections of students placement as proficient or advanced on the state test on MAP scores. (p. 2).

Reader's Score: 0

Evaluation Criteria - Absolute Priority 2

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

Comment on how well the applicant demonstrates that - -

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

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

General:

(a) The applicant has clearly indicated projected costs associated with the development and implementation of the PBCS during the project years and beyond and has accepted responsibility to provide compensation based on performance to teachers and principals by specifying performance bonus amounts for teachers and principals and assistant principals (p. 2-3).

(b) The applicant has appropriately planned to leverage additional funds from its general operating budget and use funds from Title I and Title IIa and funds from the Mill Levy Override and general fund contingency reserve to supplement grant funds and bring the project to additional schools (p. 5). The applicant has appropriate plans to steadily increase its share of costs over the 5 years of the grant (p. 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 has appropriate plans to use data and evaluations to inform professional development and use measures of student growth to determine tenure and retention decisions as dictated by state law (p. 6). The applicant has an appropriate policy that two years of less than one year's student growth will result in a teacher losing tenure (p. 5). These policies constitute a coherent strategy for strengthening the educator workforce.

Reader's Score: 0

Requirement - Requirement

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

General:

The applicant has appropriate plans to provide incentives for mentor teachers who provide day to day coaching and mentoring for 8 of these teachers with an average yearly salary increase of \$5000 (p. 35). Master teachers who oversee professional development and team teach with colleagues and conduct teacher evaluations will be rewarded appropriately with a \$10,000 salary adjustment (p. 35-36).

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 has appropriate plans to communicate to key stakeholders the components of the performance based compensation system which began with the project director meeting with staff at each school site to explain the core principles of the TAP (p. 23) and conducting follow up visits (p. 26). Teachers and principals from each proposed project school site have been appropriately involved in planning the project (p. 26). The project will be disseminated by recruitment fairs and state conferences to hire effective teachers for project schools (p. 21). The project will be disseminated by annual and final reports (p. 58). Dissemination could be enhanced by such means as a project website, blog, or newsletter.

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 appropriately documented staff support for the project by surveying teachers and principals in proposed project schools and demonstrated by descriptive statistics that the majority (at least two thirds) of the staff in those schools desire to participate in the project. (p. 26). The applicant also provided appropriate support for the project from the teachers' union by documentation in the form of a letter of support from the union director (p. 27). The applicant also clearly stated that the

teachers and principals have been involved in planning this project for over 6 months prior to writing the proposal. (p. 26). The applicant did not provide a letter of support from the principal of one of the project high schools.

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:

(1) The applicant has appropriate plans to use a rigorous, transparent and fair evaluation system for teachers and principals that results in differentiated effectiveness using multiple rating categories that take into account student growth by using multiple measures, including scores on state assessments, MAP test scores, and the TAP instructional rubric (p. 19). The applicant has appropriately chosen an objective evidenced based rubric aligned with national teaching standards and developed by researchers at the Milken Family Foundation and administered through the National Institute for Excellence in Teaching. (p. 18).

(2) The applicant has appropriately provided for observations of each teacher 4 times per year and each principal twice per year. (p. 28).

(3) The applicant has clearly provided for the collection of multiple forms of evidence by using MAP scores and state measures. (p. 19).

(4) The applicant has appropriate plans to conduct trainings with the TAP and establish inter-rater reliability required for certified evaluators with this instrument and to establish validity and reliability on an assessment of instructional leadership for principals. (p. 22).

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 has appropriate plans to use the CODE data management system to allow teachers to input their growth plans into the system and track attendance, participation and content areas for weekly cluster meetings; the system includes an appropriate mechanism to link student achievement data with payroll and human resource records and allows for calculation of teacher bonus amounts at the end of the school year. (p. 31).

Reader's Score: 0

Evaluation Criteria - Core Element 5

1. Core Element 5:

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

General:

The applicant has appropriate plans to train teachers in each school in the use of CODE data management system and the value added method before the school year begins and as part of their ongoing professional development to ensure that data are generated by the system are used for professional development (p. 8).

Reader's Score: 0

Evaluation Criteria - High Quality Professional Development

1. High Quality Professional Development:

Comment on the applicant's demonstration that ---

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

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

General:

- (1) The applicant has not planned for a formal needs assessment measure, such as a survey of teachers at the site schools, but will base professional development at high needs schools on informal assessments of individual teachers' needs (p. 32).
- (2) The applicant has clear plans to base professional development on results of analysis of individual teacher's student work to determine areas of need. (p. 32).
- (3) The applicant has appropriate plans to provide teachers with coaching during the regular school day and allow for collaborative planning (p. 34). It is unclear if master teachers or principals and assistant principals will receive professional development or what the content of that training would consist of to enable continual effective practices or support their efforts to take on additional leadership roles.
- (4) The applicant has appropriately provided for professional development by offering at least 5 hours of training on the TAP and by providing examples of the type of specific feedback that teachers will receive regarding their performance with the TAP rubric that will enable them to improve their performance (p. 28).
- (5) The applicant did not provide a process for regularly assessing the effectiveness of the professional development in improving teacher and leadership practice.

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:

(1) The applicant clearly identified high needs schools as those 10 schools in the district that are classified as low growth and low proficiency by the state growth model and are considered academically high need (p. 8-9). The applicant appropriately described their need to recruit highly qualified teachers in hard to staff subject areas of mathematics, science and special education by descriptive statistics demonstrating that only 40% of math and science teachers majored in those areas while only 70% of their special education teachers are licensed to teach special education (p. 9). Need was further clearly documented by citing the 10% teacher turnover rate per year which is a higher than the district average of 3%.

(2) The applicant clearly documented gaps in student achievement by providing descriptive statistics that show the mean percentage of students performing at or above proficiency on the state test was only 45.9% compared to the district average of 75% and the state average of 78% (p. 12) and lower growth rates at these schools than the district average (p. 13). The applicant also appropriately demonstrated need by comparisons of achievement test scores from the 10 pilot schools to demographically similar schools in

two nearby districts indicating that students in the project schools score at lower levels in reading, math and writing than students in comparison schools (p. 16). The applicant further clearly documented need by comparisons of achievement test data from the 10 specific pilot schools to 10 comparison schools demonstrating that project schools score lower in math and writing than all other comparison schools and lower in reading than most other comparison schools (p. 17).

(3) The applicant appropriately identified comparison schools as those schools in the district or nearby that are demographically similar to project schools in terms of size and poverty levels (p. 14).

Weaknesses:

It appears that retention bonuses cannot be earned until a teacher is in the district for 2 years so there is no actual recruitment bonus. There does not appear to be an equitable bonus system as there is not a plan for staff who transfer from within the district to a high needs area position and bonuses are only planned for new faculty. There was no indication of a recruitment plan for teachers who can work with ELL students which was identified as a high need area.

Reader's Score: 7

Selection Criteria - Project Design

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Strengths:

(1) The applicant has selected appropriate methods to determine teacher efficacy by using multiple measures, including the TAP that was developed by researchers at the Milken Family Foundation and is administered through the National Institute for Excellence in Education and is based on national teaching standards. (p. 18). The TAP appropriately requires training and certification for evaluators including establishing inter rater reliability. This measure will also be used appropriately as a measure of principals' and assistant principals' performance in leadership. The applicant will appropriately base 50% of teachers' bonuses calculated by student achievement data using state test scores and MAP scores as indicators of student growth, including growth projections based on two years of data (p. 19). The bonuses are of sufficient size for principals as they would allow principals to earn as much as they would by a promotion to the central office at an average of 5% of their average salary (p. 21). The incentives for teachers are sufficient as they allow an average yearly salary increase of \$5000 (p. 35) for Mentor teachers and \$10,000 a year for Master teachers (p. 35-36). The applicant clearly plans to conduct teacher observations more than twice a year. (p. 27, 28). The applicant appropriately defined effective by using the state definition (p. 24).

(2) The applicant demonstrated appropriate teacher support for the project by conducting a survey and providing descriptive statistics indicating that at least 2/3 of the teachers in each of the 10 project schools have requested to participate in the project (p. 26). The applicant also clearly demonstrated support for the project by providing a letter of support from the president of the local teachers union (p. e2). The applicant demonstrated some administrator support for the project by letters of support from 5 school administrators and demonstrated district support by a letter of commitment from the board of education (p. e0-7)

(3) The applicant has appropriate plans to use a rigorous, transparent and fair evaluation system for teachers and principals that differentiates levels of effectiveness with the TAP by indicating levels of expertise within the categories of designing and planning instruction, learning environment, and teacher responsibilities (p. 29).

(4) The applicant has appropriate plans to use a relevant CODE data management system that will allow for linking student achievement data to teacher and principal payroll and human resource systems. The system will enable teachers to input their own growth plans into the system and will track their attendance at cluster meetings (p. 31). The data system has an appropriate provision of a teacher payout module that will calculate the teacher bonuses at the end of the year and tie bonuses to performance (p. 31).

(5) The applicant has appropriate plans to conduct professional development in a variety of formats such as cluster group meetings for a minimum of 90 minutes per week with master teachers responsible for creating agendas, plans and follow up activities (p. 34), The applicant also has appropriate plans to provide assistance to colleagues from mentor teachers in classroom follow ups.

Weaknesses:

(1) The applicant failed to define jargon such as what was meant by a 360 degree assessment of principal effectiveness (p. 22). The applicant failed to describe how the leadership instrument would be subjected to empirical study in the district. (p. 22). The applicant failed to describe how the proposed project will be different from the current performance compensations.

(2) The applicant did not provide a letter of support from the high school principal or assistant principals at Mitchell to demonstrate administrator support for the project.

(3) It is unclear if teacher observations will occur at least three times a year as stated on page 27 or if they will be conducted at least four times a year as stated on page 28. Rigor is appropriately demonstrated as the evaluators will be trained for 5 days and must pass the evaluation test before beginning observations with the TAP and be recertified annually (p. 30). It is unclear why some teachers would have no student data on which to calculate payouts and reward teachers (p. 31). The professional development plan failed to provide for targeting the specific content areas that the applicant identified as areas of need (p. 20).

(4) No weaknesses were noted with the data management system.

(5) The plan for professional development relies nearly entirely on internal coaching and inservice providers which may not be adequate to meet the needs of teachers to improve their instruction in identified areas of need such as effective reading instruction. The total amount, content, frequency and duration of the professional development is unclear. It is unclear how the effective strategies will be identified for the monthly networking seminar and newsletter (p. 35). It is also unclear how the program director will determine effective and successful strategies to disseminate to teachers or how leadership team members will be taught to locate research based effective practices or how those practices will be considered to be designated as research based (p. 33, 37). It is unclear how professional development will be linked to specific measures of teacher and principal effectiveness, particularly for improving areas of need, including those areas already identified by student achievement measures, such as instruction for ELL students.

Reader's Score: 48

Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Support for the Proposed Project

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

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

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

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

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

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

Strengths:

(1) The applicant has an appropriate plan to establish an advisory board to oversee the project that will be composed of central office administrative staff, master teachers from each site and their principals, and a representative from the National Institute for Excellence in Teaching, the vendor for the TAP (p. 40). The applicant has clear plans for each school's leadership team to meet weekly to review implementation which is likely to keep the project on track (p. 40). Key project personnel such as the Project Director and Program Specialist have clearly defined and relevant role responsibilities (p. 42-43).

(2) The project director is well qualified given her extensive experience in the district, her experience teaching teachers, and her related degrees. Her full time devotion to the project should assist to keep the project on track (p. 41). The inclusion of program specialists to assist the master and mentor teachers with their responsibilities appears to be an effective strategy for supporting grant activities (p. 43).

(3) The applicant has appropriate plans to support the project with other funds, such as funds from the general operating budget, Title I and Title IIA funds, and funds from the Mill Levy and general fund contingency reserve (p. 45). The applicant also has appropriate plans to seek funding from private, state and federal sources and anticipates that local support will increase due to the passage of state legislation requiring tenure and evaluations to be linked to student performance (p. 45).

(4) Requested funds appear to be sufficient to support grant activities and goals and are reasonable costs.

Weaknesses:

(1) The timeline and management plan outlined in table 8 does not allow for the local evaluation, indicate the timing of professional development or allow for reporting project findings (p. 39). The management plan was not tied to project goals and objectives (p. 39).

(2) The management plan could be enhanced by inclusion of additional program specialists as one specialist serving 6 elementary schools and one serving two high schools appears to be inadequate in serving the needs of all teachers (p. 43).

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:

(12) The applicant has clearly tied the logic evaluation model to three relevant goals of raising student achievement, increasing teacher and principal effectiveness, and retaining and recruiting effective teachers and principals with seven measurable objectives related to those goals (p. 51). The evaluation is appropriately designed as a quasi experimental design with 10 control schools as comparisons. (p. 50).

(2) The applicant has appropriate plans to collect and analyze quantitative data, such as annual surveys of teachers' reactions to the program, a student climate survey, and a survey for principals to report changes, implementation progress and challenges and

successes. (p. 52-53). Other relevant quantitative data include student test scores, attendance records, recruitment and retention data, participation records (p. 52). The applicant also has clear plans to collect qualitative data by conducting focus groups with teachers in the intervention group (p. 54). The applicant has also appropriately planned for relevant data analysis methods for both types of data. (p. 53-56).

Weaknesses:

There was not a strong strategy for providing feedback for continuous improvement and reporting to all stakeholders. No qualifications were provided for the evaluator and no evaluator was identified making it difficult to evaluate the quality of the evaluation plan.

Reader's Score: 3

Priority Questions

Priority Preference - Competitive Preference Priority 1

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

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

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

Strengths:

(1) The applicant has appropriate plans to implement a value added model as a significant factor in calculating differentiated levels of compensation by using multiple sources of data, including student state test scores, MAP scores and results of TAP measures.

(2) The applicant has appropriate plans to explain the data management system and the evaluation methods to teachers and enable them to input their own growth plans into the system and use the data to improve their practice.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were noted.

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:

(1) The applicant clearly demonstrated selection of high needs schools by using student achievement and poverty level data .

(2) The applicant has appropriate plans to retain effective teachers in identified hard to fill areas of math, science and special education by salary incentives of \$2000 bonuses following two years of service (p. 9).

(3) The applicant has relevant plans to offer bonus incentives to fill vacancies with effective teachers and has appropriately searched the professional literature to arrive at a relevant definition of an effective teacher and selected a performance instrument designed to measure teacher effectiveness that is consistent with that definition (p. 23-24).

Weaknesses:

The applicant failed to provide a plan for retention for teachers of English Language Learners despite identifying this as an area of high need. The applicant did not provide a plan for a process of communicating to teachers the schools that are high need and the subjects and speciality areas that are considered hard to staff.

Reader's Score: 2

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 8/6/10 3:57 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 8/6/10 3:57 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Colorado Springs School District 11 -- , (S385A100085)

Reader #2: *****

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

1.Project Design	60	35
Adequacy of Support for the Proposed Project		
1.Adequacy of Support	25	18
Quality of Local Evaluation		
1.Quality of Local Eval.	5	4
Sub Total	100	63

Priority Questions

Priority Preference

Competitive Preference Priority 1

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

Competitive Preference Priority 2

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

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

Total	110	67
--------------	-----	----

Technical Review Form

Panel #4 - Panel - 4: 84.385A

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: Colorado Springs School District 11 -- , (S385A100085)

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 intends to adopt the TAP system approach with ten pilot schools in the district. The system includes observations based on a rubric plus measured gains in student growth on the standardized tests in reading, math and science three times per year. (p. 2) Principals will be evaluated on a 360 degree tool completed by their supervisor as well as teachers and staff at their schools. (p. 3) The applicant states that the selected compensation rate of 5% of salary is sufficient to motivate the staff based on survey input from the staff. (p. 3) The TAP system has an established formula that 50% of teacher bonuses are calculated from student achievement as measured by value-added growth and 50% based on measures of teacher performance based on observations. (p. 20) There do not appear to be measures outside of the TAP system.

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 indicates that it will assume an increasing cost share over the five year period, beginning with 5% of costs in year one and rising to 50% in year five. (p. 5) The budget details the projected costs over the five year period. The applicant states it will use general fund dollars after the fifth year of operation and will try to leverage other funds such as Title I, Title IIA, and others to support the infrastructure and possible expansion to other schools. (p. 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 states that the TAP system aligns performance pay with teacher career advancement, highly effective professional development, and meaningful, constructive evaluations. (p. 6) The applicant further indicates that data and evaluations gathered through the PBCS system will also inform retention and tenure decisions. (p. 6) The state has recently passed legislation requiring teachers to achieve student growth of at least one academic year each year for three years to achieve tenure. (p. 6)

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 states that based on input from surveying the teachers, the proposed incentive of 5% of salary is sufficient to motivate teachers to participate in the TAP project. It appears that additional bonuses of \$5,000 or more that would be given to those who take mentor and/or master teacher positions in addition to the salary incentive would also be sufficiently motivational in terms of taking on additional responsibilities/leadership roles.

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 states it has held meetings with the outside contractor NIET and the project director, superintendent, and representatives from the board of education and the superintendent's cabinet to explain the TAP system, and also met with individual school principals. The project director explained the tenants [sic] of the TAP system at staff meetings in the proposed project schools. (p. 23) Teachers were surveyed as to whether they wanted to join the TAP system. This system appears to have been effective in terms of developing the application.

It is less clear how other school personnel or the community at large has been informed of the project components or how they would be informed in the future.

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 states it discussed the proposed project with teachers and principals and gave an opportunity for teachers to indicate if they wanted to join the TAP project. (p. 23). All of the schools received at least 75% support in favor of joining the project. The union supports the proposed project and provided a letter of support.

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 plans to adopt the TAP approach and has therefore not developed its own model of evaluation. The TAP system provides several rubrics that are tied to professional teaching standards and that have objective criteria based on Charlotte Danielson's work. There would be at least three observations during the year. The applicant states there would be training for evaluators and that inter-rater reliability would be monitored. The actual instruments that would be used and the manner in which they are tied to standards are not sufficiently explained. The manner in which inter-rater reliability would be maintained is not sufficiently clear and does not appear to be sufficiently rigorous. The qualifications of the evaluators are not clear. (p. 28) There do not appear to be additional forms of evidence beyond the TAP system and student outcomes. (p. 27)

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 will contract with an external vendor of a CODE system (Innovation Architects) that would link all of the specified data to teacher and principal payroll and human resources systems. (p. 49). It is not clear that this system contains sufficient safeguards for the privacy of individual student information.

Reader's Score: 0

Evaluation Criteria - Core Element 5

1. Core Element 5:

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

General:

The applicant states that it has held meetings with teachers and principals to explain the TAP system .(p. 23) The applicant indicates that data from evaluations will guide the professional development to be provided. Information about the actual measures were not sufficiently explained in the application, however. (p. 28)

The applicant's PBCS approach is mainly applicable to core teachers of language arts/reading, math and science although the applicant states that all teachers would be involved. The applicant's approach is to have all of the other teachers select one of these three areas to tie their evaluation and professional development to for purposes of compensation. It does not appear that this approach would provide individualized professional development to support teaching and learning across the curriculum. It is difficult to see how a secondary level teacher of world languages, for example, who typically does not even use English for classroom instruction or student evaluation purposes, would benefit from staff development aimed at math teachers or English language reading teachers, for example.

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 indicates the professional development would be tied to the student outcomes. Student outcomes, however, are measured in only three core areas of language arts/reading, math and science. The professional development appears to be related to only some of the high needs areas, which were stated to include math, science, and special education. All teachers would be provided staff development in one or more of these areas regardless of what the teachers actually taught even if they are non-core teachers in any other area besides these three. It is difficult to make sense of this approach to staff development since it would not be directly related to the teacher's content area or teaching responsibilities. It is also difficult to see the relationship between professional development and meaningful classroom observation given the seeming lack of relationship between professional development and what the teacher actually teaches. (p. 20)

The actual content of the professional development to be provided is very vague and no examples are given of what the development activities might look like. It is not clear that these would exemplify the characteristics of high quality professional development in terms of a continuous approach rather than one-shot experiences. (p. 28)

Although the applicant indicates there would be master and mentor teachers with differentiated compensation, the qualifications for how one would advance to these positions are not clear. It is not clear how these individuals would have been deemed to be effective.

There does not seem to be a process for regularly assessing the effectiveness of the professional development in improving teacher and leadership practice.

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 states that the ten target schools have higher enrollments of limited English proficient students, higher mobility rates, and are harder to staff. The key lack of staff is particularly in the areas of math, science, and special education. (p. 9) The applicant intends to offer retention bonuses as a recruitment tool to help fill vacancies. Student achievement in these schools, particularly the high schools, is also lower compared to similar schools in Denver and in Mesa County with similar enrollments and FRL statistics. (p. 13, p. 16)

Weaknesses:

The applicant states that it will offer retention bonuses of \$2000 for any incoming, highly qualified teacher in the area of math, science, or special education. This bonus will be contingent upon remaining for at least two years in the designated TIF school, completing all required professional development sessions, and receiving an evaluation score of proficient or better for each of the two years they are employed. (p. 9) It is not clear why the applicant would not offer this bonus in an equitable manner to existing teachers of these subjects who meet the same requirements or who choose to move from a non-TIF school to a TIF school, since the applicant has a priority need in these areas. It could potentially destabilize the intended collaborative approach if teachers of the same subject in the same school are differentially treated for no other reason than one is incoming and the other not.

There is no indication of any recruitment approach or bonuses for teachers who can work effectively with English learner students, which was also stated to be a high need area.

There does not seem to be any different approaches taken to identifying and meeting the unique needs of the high schools as compared to the elementary schools within the recruitment and/or bonus approach. The high schools are stated by the applicant to have the lowest overall achievement of the schools in the project.

Reader's Score: 6

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Strengths:

The applicant plans to adopt the entire TAP model and will use outside consultants from NIET (National Institute for Excellence in Teaching) to guide this implementation. (p. 18) Teacher compensation would follow exactly the TAP model, with 50% of teacher bonuses calculated from student achievement as measured by value-added growth (p. 19) and 50% on measure of teacher instructional performance used in classroom observations. (p. 20) Non core teachers and those non-tested areas would choose one of the three core areas tested to link their pay to gains made by these students. (p. 20)

For principals, the compensation would be based on school-wide value added achievement (p. 21) according to the TAP formula of 50% school wide value added, 25% 360 degree leadership evaluation, and 25% TAP system leadership rubric score. (p. 22)

The data management will also be conducted by contracts with an outside vendor of the CODE system. This system is stated to be capable of incorporating the required elements of linking performance data with pay systems and human resources.

The applicant's definition of effective teachers (p. 24) is those who have achieved a minimum of one year's growth in their and effective as those who have achieved a minimum of one year's growth school-wide as determined by the state standardized assessment.

The applicant states that teachers and principals from the project schools have been involved in planning the PBCS for more than six months. (p. 26) Teachers were surveyed as to their desire to be involved with the project and more than two-thirds indicated approval. (p. 26) The union provided a letter of support.

The applicant will use the TAP evaluation system (Skills, Knowledge, and Responsibilities Performance Standards). (p. 27) A sample rubric portion is provided. (p. 28) The TAP is based on the work of Charlotte Danielson and provides rubrics based on key instructional characteristics across several domains. Observations would be conducted at least three times per year.

Trained evaluators are to score according to the rubrics and they must pass an evaluation test before beginning observations. An annual recertification would be required. (p. 30) The applicant states that inter-rater reliability is continuously monitored in leadership team meetings. (p. 30)

The applicant will provide time during the school day for teachers and administrators to meet, learn, plan, and coach. (p. 33) Professional development would be embedded within the school day for at least 90 minutes per week plus follow up. (p. 34) Cluster groups would provide an opportunity for collaboration on instructional practices based on student data. (p. 34)

Weaknesses :

Despite the clear indication of the highest need areas (math, science, special education, and English learners), the project design and the professional development do not appear to address any of these areas specifically.

It appears on the management chart that the external organization NIET is higher than the district staff in hierarchy. There is a concern for who is actually responsible for this project and to whom the principals and other district staff are accountable. (p. 41)

It is difficult to make sense of the approach to performance-based compensation and the professional development since these would not be directly related to the teacher's content area unless that teacher taught one of the three tested core areas. This situation is problematic in the high school context. (p. 20) The applicant states that the principal's working day is consumed by managerial tasks having little bearing on improving instruction. It is not clear why the project does not incorporate approaches to relieving the principals of managerial tasks not related to instruction but still expects principals to provide the instructional leadership demanded in a PBCS system. (p. 22)

The state definition of effective teachers would apply only to those who teach the three tested core areas. It is not clear how any other teachers could meet the definition of effective teacher (p. 24)

The applicant indicates that since the evaluation instrument and scoring are not content-specific, all teachers, including those in the special areas can be evaluated fairly by individuals who do not have content expertise in the subject observed.(p. 30) It is difficult to see the fairness and equity and transparency of this type of evaluation context for teachers nontested areas, where content-specific pedagogy is a key factor in student achievement. If the evaluator could not understand what was being presented in the classroom or how appropriate the approach being used was, it is difficult to see how teachers would be fairly and equitably evaluated for compensation and retention purposes. This evaluation system also does not take into consideration the lack of connection between the professional development provided to teachers and their actual teaching responsibilities for teachers other than English language arts, math and science.

The evaluation test for observers using the rubric to evaluate teachers is not explained. The standard for calibration of raters is not explained. It is not clear how inter-rater reliability is continuously monitored in leadership team meetings. (p. 30) Determination of inter-rater reliability is dependent on having scorers consistently apply a scoring rubric to candidates in such a way that the candidate would receive the same score from different evaluators. If the same teacher is not being observed or rated by two or more scorers, then it is not clear how inter-rater reliability would be established. The standard for recertification is not explained. (p. 30)

It is not clear in what way this project offers a career ladder. There are mentor/master teacher positions, but it appears these are already occupied by existing staff. The qualifications for advancing to either of these positions are not clear. The applicant states that the project creates the opportunity for teachers to take on new or expanded roles in evaluation, professional development, and instructional support with commensurate compensation (p. 33) but how this happens in practice is vague.

The applicant states that in all of the schools where the project director has concentrated her efforts, double digit student achievement gains on state assessments have been achieved. (p. 42). This would appear to be an impressive achievement, so it is not clear why the district needs an entire new project at a multimillion dollar cost instead of following this individual's lead and approach at each school.

Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Support for the Proposed Project

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

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

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

Strengths:

The applicant provided a general implementation timeline showing key project activities and persons responsible. (p. 30)

The project director and other key personnel are experienced district personnel and appear as a group to have the qualifications to manage this project. (p. 41)

The time commitments of personnel are indicated, with the project director at 100% time, the deputy superintendent at 10% time, program specialists at 100% time, and mentors at 30% time. The time commitments appear adequate for this project's scope. (p. 43)

The project will leverage other funds, including Title I, Title IIA, and others to sustain the project. (p. 45) Additional funds will come from the general fund and/or contingency funds. (p. 45)The requested funds appear adequate to support the project's activities.

Weaknesses:

The implementation timeline does not appear to include the key activities relating to training and implementation of observations, or professional development. (p. 39)

The management chart appears to place external contractors above the authority of the district's own staff. (p. 41) The President of the NIET is listed directly below the superintendent and appears to have authority over all other district staff than the superintendent, according to the graphic provided. (p. 41)

The proposed project director appears to have teaching experience only at the elementary level, and only has a B.A. related to education/instruction. It is not clear how these qualifications relate to the needs of secondary schools, which are stated to be the lowest achieving of all.

The applicant appears to already have a compensation system involving performance pay (p. 43), with Dr. Thurman overseeing this system and having developed it for the district. This factor was not mentioned previously or explained in the narrative.

Once the district's contracts with the outside vendors who appear to have all of the

expertise regarding the project's design and implementation end, it is not clear who would have the expertise to keep the project running and/or expand to other schools.

Reader's Score: 18

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 provided a coherent evaluation plan that will consist of quantitative data regarding student outcomes from tests and qualitative information from surveys, interviews and the like. (p. 50) Project objectives are clearly defined with resources, activities, and intended outcomes displayed in a table (p. 51). The application would be conducted by an external evaluator. (p. 55)

Weaknesses:

The feedback process is less developed than the other aspects of the evaluation plan. It is not clear how the feedback loop would be implemented other than being provided to the TIF advisory board and the school's advisory board. (p. 55)

It would have been helpful to have an indication of who the external evaluator would be and what their qualifications would be.

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 has chosen the TAP model, which includes value-added methodology as 50% of the performance criteria in its overall system. The differentiated levels of compensation include student growth. The data system would be provided by an external contractor which apparently has experience in providing these types of services. The applicant has explained the TAP model to staff and given staff an opportunity to express their desires to join the project through a staff survey. Mentor and master teachers as well as cluster meetings are to help teachers use the data generated through the model to improve classroom practices.

Weaknesses:

The overall project appears to be effective mostly for teachers of English language arts, math and science, given the use of value-added data as 50% of the performance criteria although all teachers are included in the project. There does not seem to be professional development tied to the needs of teachers other than in these three content areas; in fact, all teachers of other subjects need to pick one of these three areas to be evaluated on even if they do not teach these areas. This does not seem to be a sufficiently robust improvement design for all schools, especially the secondary schools which are stated to have the lowest achievement of all the schools. It is difficult to see how these teachers would be able to use the data generated through the model to improve classroom practices. The evaluators do not need to have content-specific expertise. This factor also mitigates against the utility of their feedback to improve instruction across the curriculum in general, and at secondary schools in particular. The project also does not address the needs of special education or English learner students although these were stated to be priority areas of need for the district.

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 intends to provide a retention bonus for new hires in the areas of math, science and special education who stay two years and fulfill other requirements.

Weaknesses:

Other than trying to hire special education teachers through a retention bonus, it is not clear that the district has addressed the areas of special education, math, science, and English language acquisition which were stated to be the highest needs areas. Despite having a population of English learners of significant size, the applicant does not even mention the area of English language acquisition in the entire application. It is not clear that the applicant has a recruitment plan or would offer recruitment bonuses. The applicant states that the retention bonuses constitute recruitment bonuses, but this does not appear to be the case in practice and is not likely to attract new hires since they would have to perform for two years in order to qualify for what is actually a performance bonus rather than a recruitment bonus. There does not seem to be a plan for communicating high needs areas to teachers.

Reader's Score: 1

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 8/6/10 3:57 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 8/6/10 3:57 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Colorado Springs School District 11 -- , (S385A100085)

Reader #3: *****

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

1.Project Design	60	45
Adequacy of Support for the Proposed Project		
1.Adequacy of Support	25	16
Quality of Local Evaluation		
1.Quality of Local Eval.	5	3
Sub Total	100	71

Priority Questions

Priority Preference

Competitive Preference Priority 1

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

Competitive Preference Priority 2

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

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

Total	110	75
--------------	-----	----

Technical Review Form

Panel #4 - Panel - 4: 84.385A

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: Colorado Springs School District 11 -- , (S385A100085)

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:

Reviewer Comment Priority 1:

Strengths:

The compensation model is based on 50% student growth using state assessments (CSAT) and progress monitoring data (MAP). Within this 50%, teachers within tested core content areas split the percentage into 30% based on classroom growth and achievement and 20% on school-wide growth and achievement. Non-core teachers use the 50% but can opt to focus on a particular tested area within their own content and also use the 30/20 formula. Principals use the 50% based on student growth formula as well, when determining eligibility for performance compensation (pp. 3-4).

Teacher evaluation will be based on an objective SKR Score that reflects both teacher classroom performance via observations using the TAP rubric as well as a survey of performance standards used in the classroom.

Principals will be evaluated using a 360-evaluation tool as well as evaluation using the TAP System Leadership Rubric (p.3).

Differentiated incentive payments were outlined on pages 3-4. Based on average SKR scores and student performance data, teachers can earn up to \$2500 per year. Principals can earn up to \$4500 per year based on their 360 evaluations, scores on the TAP Leadership rubric, and student performance. Both Teacher and Principal amounts are based on a 5% of average salary bonus. The applicant cited literature and provided justification on how a 5% bonus was sufficient to generate interest and value. In addition, CSSD11 also conducted a survey of the teachers and principals at the targeted TIF schools, which indicated that over 75%, were very satisfied with the recommended bonus amount (p. 4).

Weaknesses:

Information on how often Principals would be observed was not provided.

Information on determination of "effectiveness" for potential candidates to be hired was not provided. Even though the applicant globally defined effectiveness through research literature on pages 24-25, it did not provide concrete details of exactly how these constructs would be applied in recruitment and retention efforts, especially in hard-to-staff areas. More direct tie in to evaluation tools is needed to provide this clarity (e.g. what SKR score is needed to be determined "effective" and how the SKR incorporates indicators as found in the research).

There is some confusion as to the number of times teachers will be observed. While meeting the minimum of two observations, it states on pages 2 and 27 that a minimum of 3 times per year will be conducted using the TAP evaluation rubric. Then on pages 24 and 28 it states that there would be four observations conducted annually. Further, the narrative states there will be an additional 2 times per year as mandated by the district (p. 6). Totally observations of TIF teachers range from 3 to 6 times per year. More information is needed to provide clarity as to the exact number of observations to be conducted on TIF teachers.

While additional leadership roles were discussed in the form of career, mentor, and master teachers on pages 30-31 and on pages 35-36, it is unclear by what criteria teachers could become mentor or master teachers or if all teachers would have equal access to this opportunity for more responsibilities and subsequent compensation. More detail is also needed to understand how mentor and master teachers could assume the numerous additional responsibilities and still remain a classroom teacher.

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:

Reviewer Comment Priority 2:

Strengths:

The applicant documents the increasing commitment of CSSD11 to the TIF project by providing a table (p. 5) that shows this increasing funding share.

The narrative provides specific information on where additional funds will be sought (i.e. Title I, Title IIA, mill levies, and fund reserves) (p. 5).

Weaknesses:

Since the current system of compensation will be eventually replaced with the new PBCS, no information was provided regarding to what degree some of the monies used for the current system of compensation will be diverted to fund the district portion of the TIF program.

Reader's Score: 0

Evaluaton Criteria - Absolute Priority 3

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

Comment on how well the applicant demonstrates that - -

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

General:

Reviewer Comment Priority 3:

Strengths:

The project will follow the State of Colorado mandate that teachers must achieve student growth of at least one academic year for three years to achieve tenure and will use state CSAT Data and State Growth Model data to determine this. Colorado has also mandated that if a teacher fails to show this growth over a two-year period, the teacher would lose their tenure status. CSSD11 intends to follow these mandates and seamlessly incorporate them into the PBCS plan (p 6.)

TAP professional development is guided by results from evaluations and is designed to help teachers become more effective in their individualized need areas (p. 32). It also takes into account samples of student work and student growth as monitored through MAP tests administered three times during the year.

Weaknesses:

None noted.

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:

Reviewer Comment:

Strengths:

The leadership team structures, both at the district and school level, provides various opportunities for teachers to assume new responsibilities while providing support to colleagues in the area of professional development. The proposed PBCS will therefore provide educators with pay incentive to take on the role of Master Teachers (Budget Summary)

Weaknesses:

While additional leadership roles were discussed in the form of career, mentor, and master teachers on pages 30-31 and on pages 35-36, it is unclear by what criteria teachers could become mentor or master teachers or if all teachers would have equal access to this opportunity for more responsibilities and subsequent compensation. More detail is also needed to understand how mentor and master teachers could assume the numerous additional responsibilities and still remain a classroom teacher.

It was unclear if mentor teachers would be provided incentive pay to take on these responsibilities. This information could not be found in the narrative or budget summary.

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:

Reviewer Comment Core Element 1:

Strengths:

Designers of CODE will facilitate the training for personnel to understand how the system works and how to best effectively use the data to improve professional practice (pp. 31-32).

Key district personnel and the Leadership teams at both the district and school levels will facilitate professional development that focuses on the use of student and teacher performance data to improve practice.

Weaknesses:

The plan needs more explanation on how teachers fit within the various levels of teacher groups. It is unclear how career teachers, both with and without student achievement data can move to become mentor and master teachers (p. 31)

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:

Reviewer Comment Core Element 2:

Strengths:

Key stakeholders have been included in the development of the grant proposal and have demonstrated support for the project, including union support. A letter of support from the president of the Board of Education and the Superintendent, as well as letters from the head of the teachers union, TAP, and 5 of the 10 principals, were included in the appendices.

Weaknesses:

None noted.

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:

Reviewer Comment Core Element 3:

Strengths:

Teacher evaluation will be based on an objective SKR Score that reflects both teacher classroom performance via observations using the TAP rubric as well as a survey of performance standards used in the classroom (using CSAP and MAP). The evaluation plan, as a result, appears to be fair and equitable for all teachers. The SKR score is derived from use of an evidence-based instructional rubric designed by TAP (p. 2, 19) and is aligned to empirical studies from the literature (p. 29). Principals are observed using a TLT rubric aligned to leadership standards (p. 22)

Principals will be evaluated using a 360-evaluation tool as well as evaluation using the TAP System Leadership Rubric (p.3, 22).

Half of the observations would be announced observations while the remaining half of the observations would be unannounced, ensuring that teachers demonstrate desired teaching methods, even when they are not aware they would be observed, increasing validity of the overall evaluation scores.

Annual evaluator re-certification is required and inter-rater reliability is continuously monitored in leadership team meetings. The Project Director and his staff will conduct observations and debriefings in participating schools to ensure the rubrics are being applied correctly and to check for inter-rater reliability (p. 30).

Weaknesses:

Information on how often Principals would be observed was not provided.

There is some confusion as to the number of times teachers will be observed. While meeting the minimum of two observations, it states on pages 2 and 27 that a minimum of 3 times per year will be conducted using the TAP evaluation rubric. Then on pages 24 and 28 it states that there would be four observations conducted annually. Further, the narrative states there will be an additional 2 times per year as mandated by the district (p. 6). Totally observations of TIF teachers range from 3 to 6 times per year. More information is needed to provide clarity as to the exact number of observations to be conducted on TIF teachers.

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:

Reviewer Comment Core Element 4:

Strengths:

TAP incorporates the use of an online data entry system known as CODE, which collects data on classroom observation scores, formal evaluation information, and student growth data at the school, classroom, and student levels. The CODE system is integrated with payroll and HR systems through a module within CODE called the Teacher Payout Module. The module is responsible for calculating teacher bonuses at the end of each school year.

Designers of CODE will facilitate the training for personnel to understand how the system works and how to best effectively use the data to improve professional practice (pp. 31-32).

The data management system will be fully operational before Year one of the project (p. 32).

Weaknesses:

None noted.

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:

Reviewer Comment Core Element 5:

Strengths:

Designers of CODE will facilitate the training for personnel to understand how the system works and how to best effectively use the data to improve professional practice (pp. 31-32).

Key district personnel and the Leadership teams at both the district and school levels will facilitate professional development that focuses on the use of student and teacher performance data to improve practice.

Weaknesses:

There was scant mention of how Principals would learn to use available data to improve their professional practice. The Principal component is weak and needs more attention.

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:

Reviewer Comment High Quality Professional Development:

Strengths:

TAP professional development is guided by results from evaluations and is designed to help teachers become more effective in their individualized need areas (p. 32). It also takes into account samples of student work and student growth as monitored through MAP tests administered three times during the year and CSAP assessment results.

The professional development, which occurs at weekly 90-minute meetings facilitated by members of the school Leadership Team, is job-embedded and will specifically focus on both pedagogy and content area strategies relative to the needs of the group and the students they teach. The process entails field-testing potential strategies to be used and sharing those that are shown to be effective with their students, with modifications is needed. The TIF Project Director and staff members will teach leadership team members to find effective research-based practices, prove the effectiveness of the strategies with students from their own school, and then teach the strategies to other teachers in the school.

The narrative states that staff in non-targeted schools may be included in years subsequent to the close of the funding period should results from the pilot prove beneficial.

Designers of CODE will facilitate the training for personnel to understand how the system works and how to best effectively use the data to improve professional practice (pp. 31-32).

Key district personnel and the Leadership teams at both the district and school levels will facilitate professional development that focuses on the use of student and teacher performance data to improve practice.

Weaknesses:

The narrative does not address how teachers in non-target schools will have access to the

professional development that target schools will provide. It also does not address how teachers and principals who are found to not be "effective" are provided support.

More information is needed on the criteria for designation as a mentor or master teacher and whether these criteria will allow equal access by all teachers to assume these roles of leadership in addition to their regular classroom duties.

There was no mention in the narrative how the district would assess the quality of the professional development delivered TAP, CODE, district office personnel, mentors, or master teachers.

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 demonstrates that the district experiences difficulty in filling hard-to-staff areas by providing data on the low percentage of teachers trained in math and science content (40%) and the percent of teachers who are considered to be highly qualified in special education (70%) (p. 9).

A \$2000 retention bonus will be awarded to new highly qualified teachers who demonstrate proficiency and meet all requirements for two years, while remaining in the TIF School. The district hopes to attract qualified candidates to fill hard-to-staff positions.

The narrative provided evidence that the schools targeted for the project meet the definition of high need and exceed the 50% FRL minimum (p. 13). Additionally, the Colorado Growth Model has indicated that all 10 schools targeted are classified as high need due to low academic achievement as per the "low growth, low proficiency" designation (p. 9). Detailed information on student performance as compared to similar schools was also provided in table 1 page 13.

Justification and definition on how comparable schools were derived was detailed on page 12 and further drilled down to match comparable schools on pages 15-17. Using both CSAT and the Colorado Growth Model, targeted students are achieving at less than a 50% growth rate (45.4%) and less than 50% proficiency (45.5%) which is 30% lower than the districts own average of 75%.

Schools targeted for TIF inclusion comprise two distinct feeder/cluster patterns from elementary to middle and high school. A flow chart was provided to show the continuum on

page 11. Using cluster patterns will highlight how interventions impact the entire K-12 system more clearly.

Weaknesses:

The narrative gave general address to problems in recruitment (p. 14).

The narrative lacked sufficient detail on the problem of retaining high quality principals within the targeted TIF schools.

Reader's Score: 7

Selection Criteria - Project Design

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Strengths:

A letter of support from the Board of Education, which indicates their willingness to commit to the increasing financial burden of funding the PBCS during and after the funding period, was present in the appendices.

The compensation model is based on 50% student growth using state assessments (CSAT) and progress monitoring data (MAP). Within this 50%, teachers within tested core content areas split the percentage into 30% based on classroom growth and achievement and 20% on school-wide growth and achievement. Non-core teachers use the 50% but can opt to focus on a particular tested area within their own content and also use the 30/20 formula. Principals use the 50% based on student growth formula as well, when determining eligibility for performance compensation (pp. 3-4).

Teacher evaluation will be based on an objective SKR Score that reflects both teacher classroom performance via observations using the TAP rubric as well as a survey of performance standards used in the classroom.

Principals will be evaluated using a 360-evaluation tool as well as evaluation using the TAP System Leadership Rubric (p.3).

Differentiated incentive payments were outlined on pages 3-4. Based on average SKR scores and student performance data, teachers can earn up to \$2500 per year. Principals can earn up to \$4500 per year based on their 360 evaluations, scores on the TAP Leadership rubric, and student performance. Both Teacher and Principal amounts are based on a 5% of average salary bonus. The applicant cited literature and provided justification on how a 5% bonus was sufficient to generate interest and value since staff are used to 1% increases. In addition, CSSD11 also conducted a survey of the teachers and principals at the targeted TIF schools, which indicated that over 75%, were very satisfied with the recommended bonus amount (p. 4).

The project will employ the use of a pilot that targets 10 high-need schools for participation (p. 18).

The application provides evidence of support in the form of targeted staff surveys (p. 23, 26), letters of support from most target school principals, as well as from the head of the teachers union (Appendices).

The program includes identification of a robust data management system known as CODE which will also calculate the eligibility for PBCS incentive. A Teacher Payout Module is also included within CODE, which links student achievement data to teacher and principal payroll and human resource records (p. 31).

Weaknesses:

The narrative did not providing specific goal(s) and objectives for the project based on needs. No measureable outcomes were provided.

Information on how often Principals would be observed was not provided.

There is some confusion as to the number of times teachers will be observed. While meeting the minimum of two observations, it states on pages 2 and 27 that a minimum of 3 times per year will be conducted using the TAP evaluation rubric. Then on pages 24 and 28 it states that there would be four observations conducted annually. Further, the narrative states there will be an additional 2 times per year as mandated by the district (p. 6). Totally observations of TIF teachers range from 3 to 6 times per year. More information is needed to provide clarity as to the exact number of observations to be conducted on TIF teachers.

While additional leadership roles were discussed in the form of career, mentor, and master teachers on pages 30-31 and on pages 35-36, it is unclear by what criteria teachers could become mentor or master teachers or if all teachers would have equal access to this opportunity for more responsibilities and subsequent compensation. More detail is also needed to understand how mentor and master teachers can feasibly assume the numerous additional responsibilities and remain a classroom teacher, as well as determining the fairness in equality of access to some of the leadership roles that are proposed as part of the multiple career paths.

A TLT Observation Rubric was mentioned on page 22 without explanation if this rubric is the TAP Leadership Evaluation tool or the 360 Assessment tool for Principals.

Information on determination of "effectiveness" for potential candidates to be hired was not provided. Even though the applicant globally defined effectiveness through research literature on pages 24-25, it did not provide concrete details of exactly how these constructs would be applied in recruitment and retention efforts, especially in hard-to-staff areas. More direct tie in to evaluation tools is needed to provide this clarity (e. g. what SKR score is needed to be determined "effective" and how the SKR incorporates indicators as found in the research).

Reader's Score: 45

Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Support for the Proposed Project

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

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

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

Strengths:

Leadership teams will be created at both the district and site level to build capacity for implementing project objectives, specifically observations, data analysis, growth planning, professional development, and supports that will directly enhance teacher practice (i.e. mentor and master teachers).

A governance structure will be created for quarterly systemic review of all program activities. The TIF Advisory Board is comprised of key district and site leadership personnel (p. 40).

The Graphic on page 41 is helpful in understanding the interactions and line authority of various levels of structure.

General descriptions for key personnel were provided on pages 43-45.

The district commits to funding the pilot and the PBCS as well as the infrastructure (staff development and mentor and master teachers) after the funding period from the general operating budget. They also plan to leverage Title I, IIA, and mill levy and fund reserve balances to support expansion of the project.

The grant amount and project costs are sufficient to attain project goals.

Weaknesses:

The management plan provided on page 39 is not directly tied to specific goal(s) and objectives for the project (even though they are mentioned). It is therefore difficult to determine if project activities are adequate to comprehensively address these objectives. In addition, no milestones were included for the activities that were provided. The plan that was provided lacks sufficient detail to indicate all facets of the program have been accounted for in planning. The document as presented is general in nature and cannot be used to help Leadership teams understand all phases of the project. The Advisory Board does not have union/teacher representation. There is no "teacher voice" in the systemic review of current status and continuous improvement of project objectives.

The Graphic on page 41 seems contradictory with regard to the role of the Advisory Board. From the narrative it sounds like the Advisory Board has oversight and provides direction for the entire project, yet in the graphic appears the TIF Advisory Board appears to have an ancillary role rather than a direct line that supersedes that of the Directors. This is confusing.

The staff identified to be the Project Director has the experiences as defined by the job description as provided by the responsibilities stated on pages 42-43. However, project directors generally have more global authority for the oversight and implementation of project goals and objectives, and management of project funds. While Ms. Bailey is qualified to lead the professional development piece through her work as an instructional data coach, she has limited experience in coordinating comprehensive and complex projects to adequately implement the project effectively. In addition, the resumes of other key personnel, including Dr. Thomas, were not provided in the appendices.

It is unclear if staff has already been identified for key personnel as outlined on pages 43-45. If they have been identified, resumes were not included to allow review of qualifications to requirements of the job. If they are to be hired, a thorough job description for each description would need to have been included. It is therefore difficult to determine if key personnel are adequate for successful implementation of the project.

On page 36 the narrative states that the tiered system allows for good teachers (i.e. master and mentor teachers) to remain in the classroom, yet in the general job descriptions on page 43-45, mentor teachers would devote 30% of their time to the TIF project and Master Teachers would devote 100% of their time to the TIF project. More information is needed to clear up the contradiction.

Use of general operating fund dollars to support major district initiatives, can be tricky when state and local education budgets are being constrained. In addition, the narrative does not explain if expansion efforts will target all of the rest of the schools and staff in the district or if it will be a partial expansion. Since the project only involves a pilot targeted to 10 targeted high-need schools rather than the entire district, expansion costs will significantly increase the burden on securing funds from a variety of sources when the grant period has expired. Counting on the legislature to fund the new evaluation mandates is optimistic.

Costs of having 4 master teachers for each secondary school rather than one master teacher (as elementary has) (Budget Narrative) was not justified in the narrative. More information is needed.

COMMENT (No points taken):

Even though grant amount and project costs are sufficient to attain project goals, the costs appear excessive in that costs extending beyond startup are recurring in nature due to the use of online databases that require annual subscriptions and support. It is unclear to the reviewer if these costs to create and maintain robust data management systems are normal and customary.

Reader's Score: 16

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 project will employ the use of an independent external evaluator to continually assess the TIF program (p. 45).

The evaluation will employ a mixed-methods design that incorporates the collection from stakeholder groups using both quantitative and qualitative measures. The narrative provides multiple examples of measures to be used on pages 51-55.

The general plan utilizes a logic model to align goals and objectives to activities of the evaluation.

Weaknesses:

The evaluation plan does not provide sufficient detail. A schedule of data collection and reporting to/from all stakeholder groups was not provided. How these reports would inform ongoing improvements in the project was also not included. Also absent are goals, objectives, and activities to measure not only outcomes, but also the process goals to determine the effectiveness of implementation of project activities (i.e. the quality and delivery of professional development activities as mentioned earlier in the narrative).

Reader's Score: 3

Priority Questions

Priority Preference - Competitive Preference Priority 1

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

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

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

Strengths:

The CSSD11 PBCS Plan has defined "significance" through the use of the Colorado Growth Model as the tool for assessing student growth. This data will comprise 50% of targeted teacher and principal evaluations when determining eligibility and differentiation of performance compensation (p. 7). This level appears adequate.

The district will utilize a comprehensive online data entry system (CODE) to collect evaluation data (SKR) and student growth data (CSAP and MAP). CODE will then integrate this data with software that will determine compensation reward amounts for teachers (p. 8). Teachers will be trained on the use of CODE to track their own performance.

Weaknesses:

No explanation was provided on how principal information would be collected and tracked or how compensation rewards would be determined.

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 narrative provided evidence that the schools targeted for the project meet the definition of high need and exceed the 50% FRL minimum (p. 13). Additionally, the Colorado Growth Model has indicated that all 10 schools targeted are classified as high

need due to low academic achievement as per the "low growth, low proficiency" designation (p. 9).

The applicant demonstrates that the district experiences difficulty in filling hard-to-staff areas by providing data on the low percentage of teachers trained in math and science content (40%) and the percent of teachers who are considered to be highly qualified in special education (70%) (p. 9).

A \$2000 retention bonus will be awarded to new highly qualified teachers who demonstrate proficiency and meet all requirements for two years, while remaining in the TIF school. The district hopes to attract qualified candidates to fill hard-to-staff positions.

While the teacher turnover rate for the targeted schools is higher than the district average (10% as opposed to 3%), these turnover rates are still lower than many districts experiencing similar performance problems (No points awarded or taken).

Weaknesses:

The narrative did not include consideration of recruitment incentives to attract qualified candidates to teach in hard-to-staff positions within TIF schools. Recruitment incentives are immediate and may appeal to potential candidates as they consider relocation and other costs associated with job relocation.

Information on determination of "effectiveness" for potential candidates to be hired was not provided. Even though the applicant globally defined effectiveness through research literature on pages 24-25, it did not provide concrete details of exactly how these constructs would be applied in recruitment and retention efforts, especially in hard-to-staff areas. More direct tie in to evaluation tools is needed to provide this clarity (e.g. what SKR score is needed to be determined "effective" and how the SKR incorporates indicators as found in the research).

ELL students were stated as a high need. However the narrative did not provide any information on how this population would be addressed.

The narrative failed to include a plan on how the district would communicate with stakeholders on which schools were designated high need and which content areas would be considered as hard-to staff.

Reader's Score: 1

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 8/6/10 3:57 PM