

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 8/6/10 4:09 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Community Training and Assistance Center, Incorporated -- , (S385A100110)

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	9
Project Design		

1.Project Design	60	57
Adequacy of Support for the Proposed Project		
1.Adequacy of Support	25	23
Quality of Local Evaluation		
1.Quality of Local Eval.	5	5
Sub Total	100	94

Priority Questions

Priority Preference

Competitive Preference Priority 1

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

Competitive Preference Priority 2

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

Sub Total	10	8
------------------	----	---

Total	110	102
--------------	-----	-----

Technical Review Form

Panel #10 - Panel - 10: 84.385A

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: Community Training and Assistance Center, Incorporated -- , (S385A100110)

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:

Overall, this application demonstrates that student growth will be utilized to determine value added compensation for both teachers and principals. Student achievement as demonstrated on a variety of standardized assessments administered over time will be used to determine the bonuses, in addition to the successful completion of student and school wide learning targets. Significant weight on student growth is included in this compensation model. Teachers will be observed and evaluated based on the Professional Qualities and Instructional Responsibilities (PQRs) several times throughout the year by principals and other district personnel. These observations will then be used to create an evaluation of teacher effectiveness. Similarly, principals will be observed by district administrators to gauge their effectiveness. The amount of incentive payments paid out by the district will be based on how well teachers and principals meet their goals. Teachers and principals who fulfill only 50% or below of their goals will not receive any incentives. The total maximum incentive payments of \$8k to \$10k are enough to provide a positive incentive for teachers and principals (p. 23-39).

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:

Overall, the application successfully projects the costs associated with the development and implementation of the proposed incentive fund program. The program is part of the district's long-term strategic plan. As a result, it has committed funding to the program designed and has made plans to absorb the program's total costs after five years. The district has committed to pay 25.4 % of the overall program budget cost (p. 1 of Budget Narrative). Budget projections for year 1 to 5 of the project are clearly outlined in the budget narrative (p. 2-15) and seem reasonable based on the activities involved. In addition, the school district has pledged to increasingly contribute non TIF monies to finance the staff incentive compensations. They will contribute 25% in year 3, 50% in year 4 and 75% in year five (p.47).

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:

Although the application describes how teacher observations will be the basis for developing and implementing differentiated teacher professional development, the program does not relate key components of the program to how it will impact teacher tenure or retention (p. 11). The application states that evaluative data collected about teachers will be a key part of the compensation system (p. 12). However, the proposal does not mention how this information will specifically impact teacher tenure.

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:

Although the proposal wants to make every teacher a "leader" (p. 12), there are limited options for teachers to adopt leadership roles. Teachers can become "lead coaches" (e13); however, the hourly stipend earned by these master teachers seems limited. It is unclear if the proposal's minimal hourly rate will motivate these teachers to take on more responsibilities.

Reader's Score: 0

Evaluation Criteria - Core Element 1

1. Core Element 1:

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

General:

The project currently has a communication structure based on their pre-existing PBCS. However, the application notes that it needs improvements. Their proposal for improving communication includes the formation of a communication team that will focus on building and maintaining the communication plan for the Initiative. The application, which also includes a specific communications strategy, includes the implementation of school level meetings, ongoing sessions with the teachers association, community forums, and briefings with policy makers and the media (p.. 42, 43). Details regarding how all of these groups are going to communicate to each other do not seem to be in the application.

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:

Stakeholders' input in the project is strong. During the planning of the project, forums were held to gather teacher and community input (p. 29). The union is supportive of the project as demonstrated by a letter from the union president in the application (e4). The evaluation plan includes regular surveys and interviews by teachers and other district personnel (p. 54).

Reader's Score: 0

Evaluation Criteria - Core Element 3

1. Core Element 3:

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

General:

This district already has an evaluation system in place based on Professional Qualities and Standards. These standards provide the basis for teacher observations and yearly evaluations. Teachers and principals will focus more on these standards to increase inter-rater reliability. These observations will then provided the basis for teachers to work with administrators to develop their professional growth plans (p.39).

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 project currently utilizes school and district data systems that are already in place. However, they are not interfaced with a student data management system. As a result, it will develop the Oracle HR data system to interface with existing data systems to link student achievement with teacher and principal payroll data systems (p. 60). This will successfully assist in managing the technical nature of the program. However, specific details regarding how the integration of these data systems are not addressed in the proposal.

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 project includes plans to conduct a Professional Development Academy at the beginning of each school year to educate teachers about the compensation process and how to use the data systems. It is unclear if having only one such session in the beginning of the year is sufficient (p. 10-12).

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 Assistant Director for Organizational Development and Staff Development will lead the professional development team. This team will work with lead coaches to establish professional development that is differentiated and aligned with teachers' needs as determined by their evaluations. More detail was needed regarding the professional development plan overall. For instance, it is unclear if professional development will occur at each school site or on a district level (p.14). It is also unclear if non TIF teachers will have the opportunity to participate in the program's professional development seminars. The plan also did not include details about how it would monitor the quality of the professional development activities for continuous improvement.

The professional development plan includes a myriad of choices for teachers to adopt the skills they need to raise student achievement. For instance, teachers who need to improve their practice will have access to "coaching from mentors, virtual course materials specific to the Charlotte Danielson Framework for Teaching, resources from Henrico County Public School's online learning service (video workshops), HCPS "Laying the Foundation" training- middle and high school and "Effective Questioning" training for all grade levels (p. 14). These professional development opportunities should allow teachers and principals to create ways to increase their teacher effectiveness. The design proposal includes opportunities for teachers to take on leadership roles. Teachers who demonstrate exceptional abilities can become lead coaches and teacher mentors (p13).

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 application provides a convincing explanation for the need for the project. Out of the region's 23 high need schools, the project selected 8 schools with the highest need in regards to low student achievement and high percentage of inexperienced teachers (p.2). Non TIF selected schools are compared to the 8 TIF selected school to demonstrate differences in regards to student achievement and teacher experience (p. 5, 6). Within 8 of the TIF schools, almost half of the teachers have probationary contracts. This demonstrates a need for increased teacher retention. The application identifies math, science and special education as hard to staff subjects and specifies that the project will focus on recruiting teachers for these subjects (p.4). The application also successfully demonstrates the need for the project by providing data regarding the low performance of the selected schools on state and local assessments. For example, 4 of the selected schools did not meet the math proficiency on the annual Standards of Learning Assessment (p. 6).

Weaknesses:

One weakness is that the application does not address or provide data regarding the retention of principals for the 8 selected schools.

Reader's Score: 9

Selection Criteria - Project Design

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Strengths:

In order to assess and document teacher and principal effectiveness and student achievement, this project will utilize pre-existing teaching standards called Professional Qualities and Instructional Responsibilities (PQRs) as a means of assessment. Since these standards have been in place and utilized for over two years already, they should provide a sound framework to evaluate teacher's professional growth and student achievement. Another high quality component of this protocol is that the PQRs have been aligned with Charlotte Danielson's Framework for Teaching. This project design will also utilize a convincing assortment of value added assessments to provide evidence of student growth from year to year. These assessments include the Virginia Standards of Learning Assessment, the Phonemic Awareness Literacy Screening (PALS), and the Measures of Academic Progress (MAPS) (p.20). These evaluations should provide extensive data for the project to gauge student growth, teacher and principal effectiveness. This evaluative information will also provide strong data for teachers and staff to develop annual individualized student learning targets (p. 19). The project design includes comprehensive financial bonuses up to \$10k in total for teachers and principals based on whether they have successfully met their target teaching standards and target student learning goals (p. 19, 23). The amount of compensation is proportionately tied to the level of successful completion of their goals; thus, the plan should successfully compensate and motivate teachers and principals to improve their performance. The project sets a high bar by not providing any type of compensation for teachers and principals who meet only 50% of their target goals. The project design includes ample evidence that teachers will have a clear vision and definition of what effective teaching entails. Teachers will receive annual rigorous evaluations that are evidence based and they will

be observed frequently by principals and district personnel utilizing rubrics based on the PQRs. Teachers and principals will collectively work on setting student learning targets based on collected default goal measures based on value added assessments. However, teachers will have the flexibility to adjust these goals if necessary. This flexibility will allow both teachers and principals to set realistic goals in regards to student achievement (p.22). Evidence of the involvement of key stakeholders was demonstrated during the initial planning stage of the project. The project designers conducted a community forum in which teachers and principals discussed and commented on the overall project design. The application also includes a letter from the president of the Henrico Education Association acknowledging that the teacher union has met with the project designers and that they are willing to support the grant initiative. The project proposal includes the proposal for an innovative data management system called Observational Data System that will store teacher observational data, "staff growth plans, instructional artifacts, and student learning contracts" (p. 37). This system will then be able to interface with the project's pre-existing district and county data systems that already contain information regarding teachers and student data. These integrated systems should provide the necessary data for all stake holders required to implement this particular project (p. 37). Overall, this project design lays out a well thought out plan for the execution of the described proposal.

Weaknesses:

The weakest aspect of the project design is the project's professional development plan. The application did not emphasize that teacher professional development would be differentiated based on data collected from the teacher evaluations and class observations. However, the proposal was extremely vague in describing the project's overall professional development plan. For instance the application states that during professional development teachers will learn how "to improve student learning by developing professional learning cultures in the schools and classrooms" (p. 14). But the application does not provide any specific details about how this particular goal will be met. An additional weakness in the application is that the applicant states that 21.9% of teachers leave the participating schools because of issues related to student discipline and because of administrators who do "not support teachers" (p. 26). Yet, the project failed to address how the project will deal with these particular concerns.

Reader's Score: 57

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 application includes a strong plan for providing support to execute such an ambitious project. The project's steering committee will include key strategic stakeholders like the district's superintendent and will meet on a monthly basis to dissolve any barriers that may block the success of the project's execution. In order to successfully manage all of the various tasks that will need to be completed within the program, the project will include a myriad of "work teams" that all have specific functions and duties. For instance, the communication team will make sure that all of the stakeholders and work teams are privy to program information and will work out strategies to dispense the immense amount of data that this initiative will generate. In addition, the profiles of the chosen staff are exemplary. The timeline of program activities provided in Table C.2 are very detailed and seem realistic in regards to execution. Out of the total budget of \$22,128,873, the school district has committed to provide \$5,620,650. This funding and in-kind contribution demonstrates the district's support of the program and its willingness to sustain the program after the grant's five year program period. Overall, the application includes a strong support component that should successfully execute the project's objectives and goals.

Weaknesses:

The project has numerous committees and work groups; however, there is no plan that identifies how their work will be coordinated or how they will effectively communicate with each other.

Reader's Score: 23

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

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

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

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

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

Strengths:

The evaluation plan contains specific details regarding measuring student achievement and principal and teacher effectiveness. It is noteworthy to highlight that data from the 8 selected schools will be compared to non-participating Title 1 schools in the district (p. 49). Thus, the project should yield study results that are attributable specifically to the program implementation. This evaluation plan is well rounded because it will use both quantitative and qualitative measures to assess student outcomes. An assortment of value added assessments will be collected and analyzed by teachers, principals and the evaluation team. Likewise, classroom observations, various student/ teaching artifacts, surveys and interviews will be collected, performed and analyzed. Overall, the evaluation plan is very comprehensive.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were noted.

Reader's Score: 5

Priority Questions

Priority Preference - Competitive Preference Priority 1

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

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

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

Strengths:

The project uses a specific formula for granting teachers and principals differentiated levels of compensation for a value added measure of their student's growth as demonstrated by various state and local assessments. This differentiated compensation is also based on the students' and schools' successful completion of their learning targets. Principals and teachers who do not meet at least 50% of their targets are not compensated at all (p. 19 to 22). The application briefly outlines a communication plan that will assist teachers and other key stakeholders "in understanding the design, implementation and evaluative phases of the initiative" (p. 42). Once this communication plan is implemented, teachers will be able to take resources learned from the program to enhance their teaching practice.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses are 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:

The application successfully proved that the project will serve high needs students. The Community Disadvantage Index (CDI), provided in the project's narrative revealed that the regions where the 8 selected schools are located had a higher population of disadvantaged students and families than the non participating regions(p. 2). The grant narrative also successfully identified science, math and special education teachers as the teacher populations that need increased retention in the selected schools.

Weaknesses:

It does not include any specific targeted recruitment plan that demonstrates that teachers who are targeted to fill the vacancies at the 8 selected schools will stay or are selected because of their effectiveness. It is unclear if the communication team will develop a strategy to inform teachers regarding which of the schools are high needs and which subjects are hard to staff.

Reader's Score: 3

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 8/6/10 4:09 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 8/6/10 4:09 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Community Training and Assistance Center, Incorporated -- , (S385A100110)

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	8
Project Design		

1.Project Design	60	55
Adequacy of Support for the Proposed Project		
1.Adequacy of Support	25	20
Quality of Local Evaluation		
1.Quality of Local Eval.	5	2
Sub Total	100	85

Priority Questions

Priority Preference

Competitive Preference Priority 1

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

Competitive Preference Priority 2

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

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

Total	110	90
--------------	-----	----

Technical Review Form

Panel #10 - Panel - 10: 84.385A

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: Community Training and Assistance Center, Incorporated -- , (S385A100110)

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 indicates that student growth and academic performance are a significant component of the proposed PBCS. Both teacher and principal differentiated compensation is determined by individual goal attainment based upon data from multiple (quarterly) observation assessments of teachers and principals as well as student outcomes on state tests and value added assessments. The rubrics for the observation component are aligned with standards of the National Association of School Principals and include professional teaching standards. The applicant indicates that teachers and principals had significant input into the proposed differentiated compensation systems throughout the planning process. Surveys, focus groups, and forums determined the levels of compensation that would likely be substantial enough to be effective. (pp. 23-29; 57)

Reader's Score: 0

Evaluation Criteria - Absolute Priority 2

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

Comment on how well the applicant demonstrates that - -

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

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

General:

The applicant has provided a budget and budget narrative that indicate projected costs for the development and implementation of the PBCS during the project period and beyond. Budget items included are professional development, purchase of an observation data system, differentiated incentive compensation for principals and teachers, professional development, related staff salaries, and contractual expenses such as implementation and evaluation.

The applicant provides evidence that it will provide from non-TIF funds, over the course of the five year project, an increasing share of PBCS to teachers and principals. For example, the applicant proposes to pay 25%, 50%, and 75% of the compensation costs in years 3, 4, and 5 respectively through non-TIF sources. This is supported by letters of commitment from the Board of Education and the Superintendent. (pp. 23-29; Budget Narrative 1; 16; Appendix e85)

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 proposes a PBCS that is coherent and aligned with strategies for strengthening the workforce positions of teachers and principals in this district. The applicant describes the incorporation of data and evaluations for professional development in the identified 8 "challenge schools". (pp. 11-12) The applicant already has an evaluation system in place (Professional Qualities and Instructional Responsibilities Assessment) and proposes the addition of a data and observation-based component to that assessment.

The applicant does not describe how the PBCS will be integrated and related to retention and tenure decisions during and after the end of the TIF project period. (pp. 11-12; No page found)

The applicant has generally met the criteria for this priority, and through the planning process will have met it completely by the time of implementation.

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 describes how its proposed PBCS will provide teachers and principals with incentives to take on additional responsibilities and leadership roles such as Learning Leaders coaches, mentors, and teacher leaders. In addition, there are incentives for participation in the professional development academy, and a one time sign on bonus for teachers in the identified "challenge schools" in mathematics, science and special education at the middle and high schools. This is in addition to the differentiated compensation for teachers and principals for the attainment of individual goals related to student growth. (pp. 23-25)

Reader's Score: 0

Evaluation Criteria - Core Element 1

1. **Core Element 1:**

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

General:

The applicant describes a comprehensive plan for communication to stakeholders regarding the PBCS. The details of the communication plan are complex and involve 5 different committees. (pp. 37; 42-43)

The applicant has met the criteria for Core Element 1.

Reader's Score: 0

Evaluation Criteria - Core Element 2

1. **Core Element 2:**

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

General:

The applicant describes the involvement of teachers, principals and other stakeholders throughout the planning process. A letter from the teacher union president is included in the appendix. The letter does not express strong support, but is making a request for more information and involvement in the implementation of the proposed PBCS project. (pp. 26-29; Appendix e4)

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 describes the proposed implementation plan for differentiated compensation for teachers and principals based on student growth. The plan uses multiple ratings and is based on the attainment of individual goals as they relate to student academic growth and improvement. The plan also includes quarterly observations aligned with professional teaching and leadership standards for teachers and principals.

While the applicant indicates that the evaluation model is based upon the work of Charlotte Danielson and the Center for International Education's Rigor and Relevance as well as the LEA's Professional Qualities and Responsibilities Assessment, a rubric or specific details of the evaluation plan are not described. The applicant indicates that these will be developed during the first year of the proposed TIF project (pp. 11-12)

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 describes the proposed data management system, which includes the purchase of an observation data reporting system and other software to interface and share data with the fiscal and payroll systems on teachers and principals. The applicant does not indicate how the system will interface or be coordinated with human resource systems. However, the applicant states that they will be working with the technology consultant to address the interface during the planning process to ensure that it is in place for data collection in Year 2 of the project. (pp. 30; 35)

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 describes a plan for ensuring the teachers and principals understand the specific measures of teacher and principal effectiveness in the proposed PBCS, including the multiple observations and measures of student academic growth. Multiple teams including a steering committee, professional development team, data management team, communication team, instructional team, and Learning Leaders Coaches. It is not clear how the teams will be coordinated. (pp. 33-37)

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 describes its proposed plan for differentiated compensation that is targeted to individual teachers' and principals' goals and needs as they relate to student academic growth. The proposed plan provides opportunities for teachers and principals deemed as effective to continue their effective practices and engage in

opportunities for continued professional growth. Learning Leader coaching, mentoring, academies, and other leadership roles and additional responsibilities are also described. The project is voluntary in nature. The applicant describes its existing professional development structure, which includes a process for regularly assessing its effectiveness, providing feedback for continuous improvement in practice as well as student academic growth. This includes the ability to make modifications necessary based on feedback and stakeholder input. Activities such as professional learning academies are offered to all staff including those who do not receive differentiated compensation. (pp. 8; 14-15)

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 the need for the proposed project with supporting data for the 8 targeted high needs schools, identified as "challenge schools". Data include high percentages of students receiving free and reduced lunch, student academic performance, percentages of students with disabilities, and data on teacher experience and longevity in high needs schools. Five of the schools are elementary, two are middle schools and one is a high school. The applicant provides a rationale for the identification of the targeted schools for the proposed TIF project in terms of comparable schools in the Henrico district. These schools are comparable in terms of ethnic make-up, poverty levels and academic performance. (pp. 1-7; 56)

Weaknesses:

While the applicant indicates that there are increasing numbers of English Language learners in the identified challenge schools, no consideration of incentives for recruitment or retention of hard to staff positions in this area is addressed. (pp. 1-7; 24)

Reader's Score: 8

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 proposes to use multiple measures to determine teacher and principal effectiveness in the identified high needs schools. These include student academic growth on the Virginia Standards of Learning, several value-added assessments as well as quarterly observations, walk-throughs, and the district's existing Professional Qualities and Responsibilities evaluation tool. (pp. 11-23)

The applicant indicates that the amount of the differentiated performance compensation for teachers and principals was determined through a two-year collaborative process involving all stakeholders, and was determined to be adequate to be effective for the proposed PBCS. (pp. 26-29)

The applicant indicates that there is a "robust data system already in place in the

district" such as an Oracle Human Resource system and a Student Information System data warehouse. The proposed project includes plans to develop and implement a Classroom Observation Data system and Learning Management System to plan, track, and aggregate observational and professional development data. After the planning process, when observation-based assessment tool and the Learning Management System are incorporated with links of student performance and evaluation data to payroll and human resources, this system can effectively be used as a model of student growth to determine teacher and principal effectiveness(pp. 29-31)

Weaknesses:

While the applicant identifies multiple measures of teacher and principal effectiveness and includes a data management plan to link student achievement data to the teacher and principal payroll, consideration to link the student data to the Oracle Human Resource system is not addressed. (pp. 29-30)

The applicant identifies training for teachers and principals in a Charlotte Danielson model of evaluation along with the Rigor and Relevance model from the Center for International Education but does not clearly link this professional development to specific measures of teacher and principal effectiveness. For example, an identified rubric with specific evaluation criteria is not described. (pp. 13-17)

The applicant indicates that the proposed PBCS has included significant involvement and support of principals and teachers and other support personnel and the community at large. However, the letter of support from the teacher union president indicates more of a request for involvement in rather than support for the proposed project. There is no letter of support from the principals or their representative. (pp. 27-29; Appendix e4)

Reader's Score: 55

Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Support for the Proposed Project

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

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

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

Strengths:

The applicant has provided a well-detailed timeline indicating clearly defined responsibilities and milestones for accomplishing project tasks. The management plan, timeline and budget indicate that the applicant is likely to achieve the proposed project objectives in a timely manner and within the requested budget allocation. (pp. 38-41; Budget Narrative 1-21)

The applicant indicates that Title 1 and other federal, state, and local resources will support the proposed project. The requested budget amounts are sufficient to attain project goals and reasonable in relation to the proposed objectives and project design. (pp. 47-48; Budget Narrative 1-21)

The applicant has provided resumes and biographies to indicate that the project director and key project personnel have appropriate qualifications and experience to implement the project effectively. For example, the front line key personnel overseeing the daily operations of the project have leadership experience in education ranging from 14 to 27 years. (pp. 43-47; Appendix - No page numbers)

Weaknesses:

The applicant describes 5 leadership teams that will work together to effectively implement the project. These include a steering committee, a data management team, instructional team, professional development team, and a communication team. Stakeholder representation from the elementary and secondary areas is evident on these committees, but middle school representation is not. In addition there is no description of a process of coordination of the 5 leadership teams. (pp. 31-37)

Reader's Score: 20

Selection Criteria - Quality of Local Evaluation

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

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

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

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

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

Strengths:

The applicant indicates that the evaluation plan includes measurable performance objectives aligned with the goals of the project, specifically to improve student academic growth through increased teacher and principal effectiveness. The evaluation plan incorporates both quantitative and qualitative data including student assessments, multiple observations, interviews, surveys on professional development, and focus groups. (pp. 48-55)

The evaluation plan includes both summative and formative components. The formative component will be ongoing during the initiative from mid-year each year and annually. This component will ensure feedback and data driven decisions for continuous program improvement. The summative aspect at the end of the 5-year period will compare the difference in outcome measures between treatment and comparison groups pre and post implementation. (pp. 48-55)

Weaknesses:

The Henrico County School District in Virginia proposes to contract with the applicant agency, the Community Training and Assistance Center, Incorporated from Massachusetts. Significant portions of the requested budget are allocated to the applicant agency, including implementation and evaluation. It is not clear how the applicant will ensure objectivity in the evaluation process as some of the tools to be used, such as the observation-based assessment, oversight of the project, and the concerns raised about the existing evaluation tools that are not integrated in to the decision making process for staff retention and tenure. (pp. 48; 55; Budget Narrative 1-21)

Reader's Score: 2

Priority Questions

Priority Preference - Competitive Preference Priority 1

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

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

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

Strengths:

The applicant identifies the value-added measures of student growth to be used for the proposed PBCS. Student scores on state tests (Virginia Standards of Learning) as a measure of student learning and the commercial Measures of Academic Progress System (MAPS) assessment, which measures individual student growth and allows for the determination of the value added by the teacher for the student's learning, are the tools identified. The applicant proposes that they will pilot a student growth calculation for the state as part of these tests. (pp. 19-22; 58)

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not provide an explanation of how the chosen value-added assessment instruments will be clearly explained to teachers to enable them to use the data generated through the model to inform and improve instructional practice. (pp. 19; 24-25; 58)

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 indicates that the proposed PBCS is designed to serve high needs students in 1 identified high needs high school, 2 middle schools, and 5 elementary schools ("challenge schools"). The applicant also proposes to offer a one time sign-on bonus at the high and middle schools for teachers of mathematics, science and special education to attract experienced and highly qualified teachers to these schools. The applicant describes a process of posting hard-to- staff vacancies and positions throughout the district. (p. 24; 58)

Weaknesses:

While the applicant describes the incentive to attract teachers to hard-to-staff positions and high needs schools, it does not describe incentives or any measures to retain experienced and highly qualified teachers in the hard-to-staff positions of the identified "challenge schools". While the applicant indicates that the district has an increasing population of limited English language proficient students, it does not identify any efforts to recruit, retain or compensate teachers for the hard-to-staff position of English Language acquisition instruction. (p. 24; No page found)

The applicant does not describe how they will effectively communicate information to teachers which schools are high need and which subjects and specialty areas are hard to staff. (No page found)

Reader's Score: 2

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 8/6/10 4:09 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 8/6/10 4:09 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Community Training and Assistance Center, Incorporated -- , (S385A100110)

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	53
Adequacy of Support for the Proposed Project		
1.Adequacy of Support	25	20
Quality of Local Evaluation		
1.Quality of Local Eval.	5	5
Sub Total	100	85

Priority Questions

Priority Preference

Competitive Preference Priority 1

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

Competitive Preference Priority 2

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

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

Total	110	90
--------------	-----	----

Technical Review Form

Panel #10 - Panel - 10: 84.385A

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: Community Training and Assistance Center, Incorporated -- , (S385A100110)

Questions

Evaluation Criteria - Absolute Priority 1

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

Comment on how well the applicant demonstrates that --

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

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

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

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

General:

The application includes a differentiated compensation system based on both student performance and observations for both teachers and principals. In this system, teachers and principals receive greater compensation for better effectiveness with a majority of the effectiveness rating being derived by student scores. For teachers this contribution is on their students. For principals this contribution is based on both total school performance and performance of their participating teachers. Both teacher and principal calculations employ a similar graduated formula where 100% of goal attainment results in 100% of incentive and lower performance results in appropriately lower incentives with no incentives paid below 50% of target. Teacher observations are conducted by independent professionals and using formalized methods and rubrics for staff evaluations (p. 10). Principal's evaluation does not appear to be external, but based on reflection and feedback from staff (p. 15, 16). It is not clear how often these evaluations will be conducted. The applicant does discuss the rationale for the amounts chosen for this program. The amounts seem sufficient to incentivize participants in this plan.

Reader's Score: 0

Evaluation Criteria - Absolute Priority 2

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

Comment on how well the applicant demonstrates that - -

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

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

General:

The applicant has projected costs associated with the development and implementation of the PBCS for the five program years, but not beyond. This program has the commitment of the LEA who is not the fiscal agent for TIF for providing financial, management, and logistics support for the program. The applicant does provide non-TIF funds in an increasing share of the performance-based compensation (front matter and budget appendix p .1, p.17).

Reader's Score: 0

Evaluaton Criteria - Absolute Priority 3

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

Comment on how well the applicant demonstrates that - -

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

General:

The applicant has proposed a coherent and integrated strategy for strengthening the educator workforce (p7-31). The applicant is using several data systems that are to be integrated into the overall program, including assessment, observation, and special education systems (p. 29-31). At the teacher and principal level some important common constructs are used that integrate the work and provide opportunities for staff commitment/buy-in, including the student learning contracts (p-15-37) and Professional Qualities and Instructional Responsibilities (p.11-20).

The applicant could go further in providing detail on the use of data in the evaluations and professional development. While there is discussion around these topics, there are few details. There is also little discussion of the retention and tenure decisions based upon data. Further, while there is a discussion of a time-series model for the quantitative analysis, the observational or evidentiary basis for this model was not discussed.

Reader's Score: 0

Requirement - Requirement

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

General:

The applicant provides mechanisms for teachers to become Teacher Leaders in program schools (p.8, 12). Principals are given incentives for strengthening their cultural leadership and instructional responsibilities. Incentives for principals to take on additional formal role (ex: "Master Principal"), beyond those that are already articulated within the program, were not apparent in the application.

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 included communication into many parts of the proposal, including at the Steering Committee level (p.32) and with a Communications Team (p.36) and a clearly described communications strategy that has both internal and external components (p.42). This communications plan may suffer from potential coordination issues, but is addressed in a comprehensive way by the applicant.

Reader's Score: 0

Evaluation Criteria - Core Element 2

1. Core Element 2:

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

General:

The applicant has involved teachers and principals in the foundation of the plan (p.7, p. 26-29, p.59). This input included the design of the plan overall as well as the compensation system. An educational union representing the teachers in the LEA (appendix) has voiced support and requested participation in the management of the program. The union leaders are included in the plan for feedback and data collection (p. 54). This plan has strong support from the district's professional stakeholders as well as from the state education office, which will further strengthen its ability to make an impact (appendix).

Reader's Score: 0

Evaluation Criteria - Core Element 3

1. Core Element 3:

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

General:

The applicant does have a plan to implement an evaluation system for teachers and principals that includes observations of teaching (p. 8-19) and a principal observation of post-observation meetings (p.17) by their supervisors. This plan builds on much existing work, but would be new to the program. The observations will be entered into a database that will facilitate tracking and comparisons (p. 30, 37). This database does not currently exist and would need to be built or acquired. There is a lack of clarity on the normal ongoing observation intervals beyond the baseline period of the grant. It is possible that that applicant may adopt differing approaches based on school type, teacher experience, subject, etc.

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 presented frequent descriptions of data system use (p.12-21). Most of these data systems are existing currently (p. 29-31). One component is on the path for acquisition. The observational data management system is the only system to be purchased as part of this program (p.30), which does not present great concerns given its discrete nature. The use of data systems seems credible in this application, although important details not presented in the plan, including the ability to integrate data, could present future challenges. Some of these challenges could be significant, including the transfer of students, issues with student identifiers, withdrawals and readmissions, use of special education as a way for teachers to improve their cohort performance. This part of the application could be stronger with schematics or other discussions that detail the data integration plans that will be required as part of this program.

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:

A central component in the applicant's plan is the Professional Qualities and Instructional Responsibilities (PQRs). These PQR's (p.10-20) are developed according to at least two pre-existing frameworks (p.11-12). Teacher and principal incentives are tied to these PQRs (p.25) and there is a multi-day training academy planned that will communicate the PQRs (p. 38).

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 uses a differentiated professional development model (p.8) that is intended to provide the information teachers need when they need it, including in the classroom (p. 14) and from their Learning Leader coaches (p.14). Specific details and examples of

this approach were not provided and it was not clear in this application that this professional development would be based on needs identified for the schools. Those teachers that do not receive differentiated compensation would still receive professional development under this plan. The professional development approaches will be audited and evaluated under this plan (p.15) in a method that the applicant pioneered several years ago.

It is not clear in this application how the professional development for effective teachers and principals would take advantage of the data that shows they are effective to allow them to assume additional responsibilities and continue in their jobs. There is also little information in the application that discusses the complexities or challenges the applicant envisions with teaching teachers about the measures that are being used in the program.

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 does provide a description of the need for the project, including those that are high-need (p.2,3). Those students in the schools where the PBCs will be used are among those in the LEA that have higher free and reduced lunches (p.3). The applicant does include a discussion of high-need subject areas (p.5) and the lower pass-rates in the program schools (p.7). These pass rates are lower for all subject areas reported for the high-need schools than in other schools in the LEA (p.6).

Weaknesses:

The level of poverty in the pilot schools is not much different from other schools in the LEA and the LEA's amount of high-risk schools is not extreme (p.8-12). The retention rate in the program schools is actually higher than in the other district schools and the transfer requests are lower so that these are the lower need schools in the district (p. 6). The applicant does not describe comparable schools.

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:

This is a very strong application with a comprehensive design that allows the participants an active voice in both the process of reviewing their individual performance (p.18) and at the management/strategic level (p.31). The program is part of a LEA strategy. The methodology is good and includes a balance of measures with connections to the state test and measures of student growth. The applicant would use the awards to reward effective teachers and the size of these awards is supported by research in the LEA with participants likely to be candidates for this program. The

logic for determining effectiveness is clear. The applicant does utilize the state assessments and benchmarks (p.19-22) and does have the support of the state education association (p.53, 59). Further, the applicant uses a range of qualitative and quantitative measures, including well described quantitative methods with a formally-defined value-added model (p.21).

Weaknesses:

This strong application could be stronger with the inclusion of more schools in the design. The small numbers, specifically at the middle and high-school levels may undermine efforts to learn meaningful lessons about this program's implementation of PBCS (p. 3). Further, since some of the data systems described as part of this program are not in existence or may require integration efforts, there are risks that the project could be impacted by technical issues (p 29-32). Additional detail on the potentially substantive issues associated with linking teacher and student data was not provided. There was also not clear presentation of how the high-quality professional development would be directly linked to measures of effectiveness.

Reader's Score: 53

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:

This application has a well described management plan that includes team/sub-team structures and responsibilities (p. 31-46). The proposed team members have good qualifications (p.42-45) and the applicant provides funds beyond those provided by TIF (appendix). The budget figures seem reasonable.

Weaknesses:

One potential weakness in the support of this program is the lack of a project director who is an employee of the LEA (p. 33). While a senior LEA staff member will manage the effort, the project will be directed by someone who is not local to the area and may have other ongoing projects. The costs provided from the TIF program are substantially greater than those provided by the LEA.

Reader's Score: 20

Selection Criteria - Quality of Local Evaluation

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

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

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

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

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

Strengths:

The applicant has produced a solid and balanced evaluation plan with both qualitative and quantitative data and some measure of externality from the fiscal agent's staff (p48-55). The evaluation plan included credible descriptions of the types of data to be collected and analysis to be used and that are tied to the project goals of improving teacher and principal effectiveness. It shows relationships between the quantitative and qualitative measures (p.52).

Weaknesses:

No significant weaknesses in the local evaluation plan were found by this reviewer.

Reader's Score: 5

Priority Questions

Priority Preference - Competitive Preference Priority 1

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

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

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

Strengths:

The applicant does have a value added measure based on the state tests (p. 19). Further, the applicant has a team that is highly qualified to understand the nature of value-added statistical models that may be used (p.42-46).

Weaknesses:

The communication and professional development dimensions of value-added models such that participants will understand and buy-in to the process of value-added modeling were not fully addressed in the application. While the use of the term was professionally used in the application, the applicant failed to demonstrate how they would translate these complex statistical processes into the language of practitioners. The value-added measures do not seem to be integrated into the different levels of compensation.

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 does provide incentives for teachers in high-need areas (p.58).

Weaknesses:

The incentives provided by the applicant for high-need teaching areas and other efforts to recruit these teachers seem underdeveloped in comparison to the rest of this program (p. 24) with no specific attention to special education. There is also no attention to the issue of ensuring that teachers in hard-to-staff subject areas are qualified or effective.

Reader's Score: 2

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 8/6/10 4:09 PM